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INTRODUCTION

Longitudinal examination of phenomena through history, offers a special perspective. That perspective is the extent to which local circumstances, in a particular time, affected or effected change in that phenomenon through this method.

I attempted to find this perspective by examining the way in which students have lived at college and why they lived so. Through historical review and a case study of an old, prestigious liberal arts college, I have examined the development of a style of collegiate life through cycles of changing political, social, and economic conditions and attitudes as well as successive generations of students with highly varying characteristics, needs, and desires.

My intent was to concentrate, where possible, on the dining or commons component of a collegiate living situation. This effort met with mixed success. Much of what has been written and said about the extracurricular appears to assume lodging and dining (and to a point worship) as a package. Consequently, dining has been treated separately for anecdotal and factual-descriptive purposes, but treated as a part of the whole of the collegiate tradition for purposes of philosophical and
educational foundation and rationale. I hope readers will be able to appreciate glimpses of the commons experience available through records and documents which have been left without becoming frustrated by the need to return often to the larger issue of the extracurriculum in order, historically, to trace its development.

I ask my readers' indulgence also in accepting a rather arbitrary interchangability of terms such as collegiate tradition, collegiate way of living, collegial living, communal living and dining. All are intended to describe the same phenomenon and are used simply to avoid some otherwise unavoidable repetitiveness.

The appendix requires a word of explanation. In researching this topic, voluminous data emerged. Much of it is interesting but not essential to the text. Rather than clutter the text with material not directly pertinent, or mix documents, pictures, etc. within the text and also in an appendix, I have placed all documents in the appendix. A table of contents precedes the appendix and includes a brief description of each item included therein. My hope is that those readers who have the interest may find the appendix can add flavor and texture to the mental picture of life at colleges and universities, during different periods and at different locations, which may have been created in the narrative.
CHAPTER 1

THE COLLEGIATE WAY OF LIVING
The Collegiate Way of living is a term credited to Cotton Mather, an Anglican clergyman who lived and worked in Boston, Massachusetts, during the late seventeenth and early eighteenth centuries. This Collegiate Way of living, according to Williams College historian Frederick Rudolph, was

one of the oldest traditions of the American college, a tradition so fundamental, so all-embracing, that to call it merely a tradition is to undervalue it. For what is involved here is nothing less than a way of life, the Collegiate Way.

The Collegiate Way is a notion that a curriculum, a library, a faculty, and students are not enough to make a college. It is an adherence to the residential scheme of things. It is respectful of quiet rural settings, dependent on dormitories, committed to dining halls, permeated by paternalism. It is what every American college has had or consciously rejected or lost or sought to recapture. It is William Tecumseh Sherman promising to be a father to an entire student body; it is comfort and full tobacco jars in a Princeton dormitory; in an urban university it is counselors helping the socially inept to overcome their weaknesses.

Imported with so much of everything else from England, the Collegiate Way in America was from the beginning the effort to follow in the New World the pattern of life which had developed at the English colleges... Had the first American colleges been the work of Scotchmen or of continental Europeans, perhaps a curriculum, a library, faculty, and students would have been enough. But, then, Americans would have had to wait longer for their colleges. For the development of the English pattern in the New World was not simply a conscious effort to adapt the collegiate system to American circumstances. It was at first the only solution to the absence of large concentrations of population. Not to have the Collegiate Way would have required cities - cities that could offer up sufficient numbers of houses that could find rooms in their attics and in their basements for students attracted to the college from the surrounding countryside. In the absence of cities and knowing the English pattern, the founders of Harvard and other colonial colleges naturally subscribed to the Collegiate Way. By the time that the colleges in Philadelphia and New York were under way, the collegiate pattern was not a necessity, for these were cities. But by then what had been a necessity had become a tradition, and from then on the founders of American colleges either adhered to the tradition or clumsily sought a new rationale. For the adherent of the tradition, the college was a large family, sleeping, eating, studying,
and worshipping together under one roof. The claims made for it were often extravagant, but they became so much of the language of the colleges that in time it was difficult to separate the real thing from the myth which collegians and college officials created out of the collegiate way. 1

Some of the greatest American College Presidents spoke on the subject. Charles Elliot, long time president of Harvard College and father of the elective system, believed that "In spite of the familiar picture of the moral dangers which environ the student, there is no place so safe as a good college during the critical passage from boyhood to manhood."2 The view of Dartmouth College’s President Smith was that "Earnest young men crave real guidance. They welcome, too, a proper system of compulsion and restraint...."3 Noah Porter of Yale found benefits in college life even for the weakest and least motivated.

The effects [of the collegiate way] are so powerful and salutary that it may well be questioned whether the education which they impart does not of itself more than repay the time and money which it costs, even to those idlers at college who derive from their residence little or nothing more than these accidental or incidental advantages... Such idlers sometimes awake to manliness and duty when they leave college... To many who persistently neglect the college studies, the college life is anything rather than a total loss. Even those who sink downward with no recovery, find their descent retarded."4

Colleges were perceived as agencies of total education; not just academic, but moral, social, religious, and cultural development was expected and thought appropriate. The gradual molding of an entire person through a highly structured process of strong discipline and ceaseless supervision was the essence of the American version of the collegiate way of living.

At its best, the collegiate way may have accomplished some of what is claimed for it in the above passages. At its worst, it was accused of
being a prop or a justification for poor academics, allowing or perhaps even creating a de-emphasis of the intellectual component of the experience. Benjamin Rush, President of Dickinson College rejected dormitories and their use as "monkish ignorance." Phillip Lindsley, President of the University of Nashville, stated, "This is certain: that parents need never look to a college for any miraculous moral regeneration or transformation of character." Francis Wayland, President of Brown University, rejected the collegiate way as "utterly unsuited" because it had been designed originally for "the education of the medieval clergy and modified by the pressure of an all-powerful aristocracy."

The collegiate way established fundamentals of the non-intellectual component of and rationale for colleges. No college was merely an institution of classroom learning. The collegiate way, with its paternalistic treatment of students and its parochial influence on students, masters, and even communities, may even have delayed development of some colleges into universities. Rudolph suggests that the collegiate way prolonged adolescence in a society in which that phenomenon was little known. Certainly, the residential-communal orientation precluded attendance at college of many categories of students common today such as part-time, itinerant, older, and transfer students.

Questionable though the benefits may have been, and able to serve only the few who could attend and then thrive or even cope with life at college, adherents of the collegiate way, such as Noah Porter of Yale, believed it to be vastly superior to any of the alternatives.
let any reflecting man think for a moment of...the trickery of business, the jobbing of politicians, the slang of newspapers, the vulgarity of fashion, the sensationalism of popular books, the shallowness and cant that dishonor pulpit and defile worship, and he may reasonably rejoice that there is one community which for a considerable period takes into its keeping many of the most susceptible and most promising of our youth, to impart to them better tasks, higher aims, and, above all, to teach them to despise all sorts of intellectual and moral shams.

Colleges and universities can be considered total institutions in that they stand for and provide a complete round of life for their constituents. As such they may well be compared to such complex total institutions as mental hospitals, monasteries, the military, or possibly a company town or large corporation.

As with other institutions, the college or university has acquired a distinctive ethos or group of legends which, in fact, emphasize the gamut of services, activities, rituals, and structures of daily and annual life that make the institution special — a theoretical base summarized well in the opening quote by Frederick Rudolph in his account of the collegiate way.

Activities, rituals, and structures of colleges can be evaluated from an organizational theory perspective. Robert Merton, in his Social Theory and Social Structure, examines "manifest functions" of organizations as opposed to "systems maintenance" functions. The collegiate way of life would suggest that some functions seen as systems maintenance by other organizations, would be seen by colleges and universities as manifest functions or portions thereof.
Evidence presented in later chapters will suggest that college presidents, faculties, and even boards of trustees routinely devoted extraordinary portions of their time and energies on the non-academic components of institutional life. The goal was nothing less than total education and development of an individual. Naturally, such a goal required constant guidance and supervision of the individual as well as unceasing vigilance against the temptations and corrupting influences of the world.

Recreation, study, worship, living habits and eating habits were all legitimately within the jurisdiction of the president and masters. These components of institutional life were each highly structured and regulated as well as carefully justified in official documents such as charters and statutes which described in some detail how each component of collegiate life was to be lived and often explained the reasoning for requirements in terms such as vulnerability to temptation and the dangers of idleness.

Dining halls and food services are particularly intriguing in that today they may be taken for granted as an omnipresent but unspectacular part of the organization. Certainly, dining halls are not central to faculty meetings about curriculum or board meetings about the state of the institution, but this indifference may be misleading.

Despite the fact that the best reports of food quality and satisfaction level with the commons experience are neutral and that the majority are negative in the extreme, for some reason mandatory communal dining persisted. The tenacity with which colleges held to this tradition is evidenced by continued adherence to the commons as a
valuable component of collegiate living even in the face of consistent
dissatisfaction and complaint and even, on occasion, rebellion.

Rudolph chooses a dramatic example in reviewing the abbreviated
tenure of Harvard College's first president, Nathaniel Eaton, whose "wife
served meatless meals, which featured sour bread and dry pudding. Eaton
was dismissed..."9

Henry Sheldon's Student Life and Customs makes several observations
about student dissatisfaction with collegiate dining during the eighteenth
and nineteenth centuries.

Our first glimpses into the social life of the students
discover a dreary round of fast days, early chapels, severe
punishment, and bad board.

In 1693 the Harvard authorities warned the students
against the dangers of an over-supply of plum cake. Nearly 30
years later, a law was passed to the effect that no plum cake,
roasted, boiled, or baked meats or pies should be made by any
'commencier.'

(Regarding Yale in the 18th century.) One of the most
grievances on the part of the students was in the
quality and the quantity of food served in the college
commons. We have reliable authority that rations were
unusually bad. One graduate considered the board furnished at
Yale as absolutely destructive of health.

We have the notices of rebellion in the different
colonial colleges, going as far back as 1750. Harvard was
carely subject to these disturbances. The rebellion in 1766
was of such dimensions that it interrupted the regular work of
the college for more than a month. It arose because of
dissatisfaction with the commons.

The freshmen and sophomores of Yale rebelled in 1819
because of the quality of the commons, in 1828 there was a
more extensive uprising, known as the 'bread and butter
rebellion.' At South Carolina College the commons were a
source of endless boycotts and rebellions.10

Despite such turmoil, the tradition remained largely intact.

Consider what Professor Hugh Jones at the College of William and Mary
wrote in 1724 specifically with regard to the commons component of the Collegiate Way.

[Trustees] appoint a person, to whom they grant special Privileges and Allowances to board and lodge the masters and scholars at an extraordinary cheap rate ... When the college should be full and complete as here directed and wished, the collegians may be boarded... it is thought as yet more advisable to board in the college...11

An excerpt from the Undergraduate Program catalogue, 1983/84 of the College of William and Mary under the heading of "A Commitment to Liberal Education", suggests that the commitment to educate the whole person had changed little in 260 years.

The College's commitment in all programs to liberal education is the source of institutional coherence. William and Mary emphasizes, in its undergraduate, graduate and professional programs, the development of the student as a whole individual. Excellence in teaching and learning, in class and out of class, is at the heart of the educational process. Education that is rounded and thorough, preparing its students to live and make a living.12

The benefit of the collegiate way is and was an important social fact. Whether or not true or even testable, the important social fact is that it may be perceived as such. Advocates, spokesmen, alumni, and students believe it to be so. It is part of the real and embellished memory of an institution.

The purpose of this dissertation is to examine the collegiate way of living; how it began, how it developed and changed, and why institutions have continued to adhere to it. Within that context, the commons or communal dining component of the collegiate way of living will
be studied in detail. This dissertation will attempt to determine why colleges have believed that communal dining was important enough to require it despite widely ranging circumstances and differing student populations over a period of at least four hundred years.

The stated, or official, rationale given for the collegiate way of living and for communal dining will be compared with available evidence in an effort to learn whether or not they were and/or are consistent. The collegiate way of living truly may be the ideal vehicle for total education and development of the individual regardless of changing circumstances and populations or it may be merely a tradition so deeply embedded that rationale for its existence was developed, as needed, in order to retain the tradition.

I believe that some evidence may suggest that education and development of the whole person, the essence of the collegiate way, has been at times liberally interpreted. Certainly, one of the most interesting re-interpretations is the change from an emphasis on structure and supervision to avoid worldly evils and temptations to an emphasis on developmental counseling and enhancing students' collegiate experience. Additionally, the fiscal benefits to colleges, masters, and students of communal living and dining have been cited only rarely as official rationale, but appear to be a major factor in discussions and decisions on the subject.

European, English, and early American colleges and universities will be examined first. Beginning with the University of Paris, but with an emphasis on Oxford and Cambridge Universities in England, chapter two will attempt to establish the presence of communal living and dining at
universities as early as the 12th century. The reasons and official rationales, if any, for such phenomena will be examined and an attempt will be made to provide some insight into the nature of living and dining arrangements for students and masters at those institutions. It is in this comparison of Continental and English universities that clear differences appear in motivation and rationale supporting similar arrangements for communal living and dining.

Chapter three will review the successful export of the collegiate way of living to America. Some description and explanation of New World thinking and circumstances will help provide a foundation for understanding why the English collegiate tradition was attractive to early Americans. Some of the earliest-established colleges will be examined, described, and some reasons offered for their choice of and emphatic adherence to the collegiate way of life.

Chapters four and five will attempt a detailed case study of one of the outstanding successful examples of the collegiate way of living at a prestigious, venerable American institution. The College of William and Mary in Virginia is the second oldest college in America. William and Mary was founded by charter from the English crown "that the youth be piously educated in good Letters and Manners" entirely on the Oxford and Cambridge model of communal living, dining, and worship. Masters, students, and servants all living together in a college under the watchful eye and firm hand of the president who, for the first one hundred years of the College's history, typically was an Anglican clergyman and usually the Anglican Bishop of Virginia.

The crown, determined to ensure that the above-stated goal could be
met, provided the College's President with a Board of Visitors made up of respectable and influential members of the colony and a Rector of the College, a personage no less august than the Archbishop of Canterbury.

Begun as a college primarily intended to train priests, lawyers, and teachers, the College of William and Mary developed into a traditional liberal arts, undergraduate college. Although now a medium size university, William and Mary retains the name college as well as much of its historical tradition and its residential, undergraduate liberal arts character.

Chapter four will examine and describe two significant periods in the life of the College of William and Mary. After establishing the presence and importance of the collegiate way and the commons experience at the time of the establishment of the College and its continued prominence throughout its early years, the late 16th century will be considered in some detail. Available evidence regarding the routine of College life, and the place of the Commons within it, will be presented. Through use of secondary source descriptions, maps, organizational charts, blueprints, Board of Visitors and faculty meeting minutes a sense and flavor for life at William and Mary in the late 1700's will emerge.

After brief observations regarding the nineteenth century, Chapter four will concentrate next on providing a picture of life at William and Mary during the 1920's and early 1930's; a period of growth under the dynamic leadership of President J. A. C. Chandler. Photographs, publications, some correspondence and a few recorded oral histories are available to enrich the picture of College routine beyond the level possible with the limited documents and sources available for earlier periods.
Both periods are intriguing because they are times of great change in American society. During both periods much that was traditional was discarded and the young, in particular, demanded new and better ways more suited to them, their desired lifestyles, and their goals. Revolution in the first period and post-war boom times, flappers, and economic speculation in the second period notwithstanding, the College of William and Mary in Virginia appears never to have seriously considered altering its commitment to paternalism and the education of the whole person, institutionalized in the collegiate way.

Chapter five will treat the present and very recent past at the College of William and Mary. Residential living and the extracurriculum generally will be examined and described. Through documents and interviews a sense of the institution's philosophy and policies regarding present day college living will emerge.

Emphasis will be placed upon the role of dining and the commons experience and how it is perceived by the different constituencies within the College community. A description of the dining facilities and the program offered will be supplemented by pictures, building schematics, floor plans, publications, correspondence and contracts. Organizational structure of food service within the College, and the roles of administration, students, and parents will be examined. A financial analysis reviewing growth, profitability and the advantages and disadvantages of contract management versus self operation will conclude chapter five.

Chapter six will attempt to provide some insight into this tradition and way of living which has persisted in several different
countries, societies, and centuries, despite societal and educational upheavals as well as significant and continued opposition and resistance from within all constituencies which have participated in higher education.

From a general point of view, chapter six will examine the historical pattern of official documented rationale for the collegiate way of living and compare it to the legend, saga, and evidence provided by unofficial sources. Specifically, the same comparison will be made for the College of William and Mary in Virginia during its three hundred year history and an intensive analysis of the comparative data on the dining component of the tradition, or the commons, will be provided. The College, its similarities to and differences from the general patterns in American higher education will be noted.

Finally, I hope to offer some generalizations and observations about the dining component of the collegiate way, its role in American higher education, and its current state and status.
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CHAPTER 2

EUROPEAN AND ENGLISH UNIVERSITIES:

ANTECEDENTS OF THE AMERICAN COLLEGIATE TRADITION
European Universities

Higher learning has existed, in some form, since at least as long ago as the early Greeks, perhaps longer. As permanent institutions with buildings, an associated group of faculty, and a set of mores and rituals, however, universities as agents of higher learning appeared for the first time only in the middle ages. Then, academic requirements, regalia, and certification of work completed all were features of an organization and of a phenomenon which, having become institutionalized, had begun to take on identifiable characteristics and to develop traditions.

Charles Homer Haskins offers the following description of the European university and comparison to American higher education as he perceived it in the 1920's.

The contrast between these earliest universities and those of today is of course broad and striking. Throughout the period of its origins the mediaeval university had no libraries, laboratories, or museums, no endowment or buildings of its own; it could not possibly have met the requirements of the Carnegie Foundation! As an historical text-book from one of the youngest of American universities tells us, with an unconscious touch of local color, it had "none of the attributes of the material existence which with us are so self evident." The medieval university was, in the fine old phrase of Pasquier, "built of men" - bâtie en hommes. Such a university had no board of trustees and published no catalogue; it had no student societies - except so far as the university itself was fundamentally a society of students - no college journalism, no dramatics, no athletics, none of those "outside activities" which are the chief excuse for inside inactivity in the american college.1
As different as those earliest universities were from those which were established in the United States, they are indisputably the ancestors of western higher education. Masters affiliating in guilds, academic rank and regalia, official charters from the ruling authority, rules regulating life and behavior in the academic community, and, of course, certification or the award of something tangible demonstrating accomplishment all began in the medieval university. These continued in some form throughout the years in most western institutions of higher education and virtually all English and American colleges and universities.

One major difference between the medieval universities and those English and American institutions which will be examined in this dissertation is the apparent absence of non-academic communality. That component of English and American higher education which is termed the collegiate way of living appears to be missing in early European universities.

No records appear to exist which could establish the presence at Paris or Bologna of institutionally affiliated residential colleges or commons. In point of fact, some European universities, the above included, operated as institutions of higher learning in multiple and different places and facilities over a period of years before establishing a permanent location or campus; a requirement Americans would probably consider fundamental and essential to any higher education enterprise.

The absence of an official residential/communal component notwithstanding, medieval universities should not be assumed to have had
no interest in students outside of the teaching relationship. A sensitivity did exist to the need for proper development of the whole person because one recognized function of the university was the education of individuals in theology and their preparation for holy orders. An emphasis existed, of course, on health, the avoidance of material temptations and constant vigilance against the inherent weakness of the human character. The following excerpts from the "Rules of Health of Salerno" suggest that, at the very least, advice was offered to these ends.

Rise early in the morn and straight remember,  
with water cold to wash your hands and eyes,  
In gentle fashion retching every member,  
And to refresh your braine when as you rise,  
In heat, in cold, in July and December.  
Both comb your head and rub your teeth likewise.  
If bled you have, keepe coole, if bath, keepe warme.  
If dined, to stand or walk, will do no harme.  
Three things preserve the sight, grasse, glasse and fountains,  
At eve'n springs, at morning visit mountains.

If in your drinks you mingle Rew with Sage,  
All poyscon is expelled by power of those,  
and if you would with all Lusts heat assuage,  
And to them two the gentle flowre of Rose:  
Would not be sea-sicke when seas do rage  
Sage-water drinke with wine before he goes,  
Salt, Garlicke, Parsley, Pepper, Sage and Wine  
Make sauces for all meates, both course and fine,  
Of washing of your hands much good does rise,  
Tis wholesome, cleanly, and relives your eyes.  

Living habits, bathing instructions, advice on the preparation of food and on avoidance of carnal impulses suggest that those at the University of Salerno who authored the "Rules of Health" had some concern for students beyond their intellectual development. This same concern manifested itself in more concrete ways at other universities such as
those at Naples and at Paris.

A recognition of scholars' and masters' basic human needs developed early. Poor scholars in Italy and France, especially, benefited from the early intervention and continued oversight of the crown. In addition to decreeing the security of scholars' property, the safety of their persons, and placing them under his personal protection, Emperor Frederick II ruled that "they will be accommodated in the best hospitium available in the city...loans shall be made." 3

Having established hospitia, or halls of residence, for poor scholars at the College of the Sorbonne, Robert of Sorbon included the following rather extensive regulations regarding dining.

Nobody shall eat meat during Advent (four weeks before Christmas) nor on Monday or Tuesday preceding Lent and not between Ascension and Pentecost.

...

As regards the fellow students who eat in their chambers, the leftovers should be collected so they would not perish and returned to the dispenser who will use them for the common profit of poor clerics. Also...that those eating in their chambers be quiet and refrain from noise

...

If a student is late for breakfast..., if he comes from school or sermon or from business in the service of the community he shall have his full portion; if from business of his own he will have bread only.
Also, if a student eats in the house five days or less he will be treated as a guest; if he eats in the town he will not pay less than if he was eating in the house...

...

No student shall bring friends...frequently to drink at the expense of the community; if he does he has to defray the costs according to the estimate of the dispenser.
No student shall have the keys of the kitchen.

No woman of whatever status shall eat with students in their chambers. If anyone does this he must pay the fixed penalty, that is, six denars. If a student attacks, knocks down or severely beats one of the servants he has to pay one sester of wine to his fellows, and this wine ought to be of a better to best quality.

In all these and other food customs the dispenser shall be way and efficient. If he relaxes he shall be forced to pay the penalty of the house imposed on the offenders.

Hospitia, or halls, generally considered to be the forerunners of colleges such as those found at the English universities at Oxford and Cambridge and later in America, should not be over emphasized in a review of the development of the collegiate tradition. These halls were established in an attempt to achieve a limited practical objective; to provide an inexpensive place for poor scholars to lodge and board. Until as much as three centuries later only a small minority of students had experience with halls. "The majority of students probably lived in houses supervised by Masters of the University; they enjoyed almost unlimited freedom."

Although Paris has been called the true home of the collegiate system, it did not come into its own until the sixteenth century, when the Sorbonne stood for the whole university and its hall and schools held the public disputations of the faculty."
It appears that colleges at the University of Paris were not yet truly colleges as the English and Americans came to know them. Most lacked endowment and those with endowment were often only partially self-supporting. Membership changed from year to year. Location also changed, as halls were hired more often than owned. As such, students and masters probably did not feel strong identification with place and with others, engaged in the academic enterprise, who shared their quarters and their table. Initially a provision for poor scholars, and at Paris, ultimately a convenient method to obtain lodging and board, the hospitia-halls-colleges lacked the sense, as well as the actuality, of permanence and continuity which might have generated personal identification with and loyalty to a college.

Charles Homer Haskins, in The Rise of Universities, awards the University of Paris a more significant place in the history of the collegiate tradition suggesting that some Paris colleges “became normal centres of life and teaching” and that there were sixty eight colleges at Paris by the sixteenth century. Haskins concedes, however, that the college system at Paris did not survive the revolution and that

the ultimate home of the college was Oxford and Cambridge, where it came to be the most characteristic feature of university life, arrogating to itself practically all teaching as well as direction of social life, until the university became merely an examining and degree conferring body.
Oxbridge

Communal living and dining at the English universities took as its first form hostels and hired halls. Similar in most ways to those at Paris, these halls were rented, consequently impermanent, and the membership often changed completely from year to year. The halls were not endowed and as a result depended for their existence entirely upon fee paying scholars supervised most often by a master.

Hired halls for lodging and dining at Oxford and Cambridge had emerged in reaction to the difficult conditions under which scholars lived and worked in the thirteenth century. The tension produced by the adversarial relationship between scholars and masters on one hand and town dwellers and merchants on the other resulted in constant bickering, and even violence, over the cost, quality, and availability of lodging and food.

As in the cases of many European universities, the crown placed universities, scholars, and masters under its protection and granted rights and privileges to scholars and masters as a group, as individuals, and specifically to those, such as the chancellor, who hold university office. Some royal decrees addressed the pricing and distribution of food.

No regrater shall buy up victuals in our town of Oxford outside and on the way of being imported into the city nor should he buy up any commodity and then resale it before the ninth hour and if he does he will be fined and lose the proceeds of his sale.
The bakers and brewers of Oxford will not be punished for the first offence, but for the second they will lose their bread and for the third they will be sentenced to the pillory. Every baker should have his (trade) sign and mark his bread with it so that it can be recognized. The townsman who brews for sale should expose his trade sign; otherwise he loses his beer. Wine will be sold at Oxford in public and indiscriminately to clergy and layman alike after it had been tapped for retail.

The assay of bread shall take place twice a year two weeks after St. Michael (September 29) and in March around the feast of St. Mary (March 25) and the assise of beer shall take place on the same days according to the price (valorem) for barley and malt; whenever the assay of bread and beer takes place the Chancellor of the University or his deputies shall be present if they are asked and want to; if not present or not asked to be the assay will not be valid.9

Other decrees awarded scholars the privilege of coming to trial for criminal offenses before the chancellor of the university rather than the municipal authority.

If a clerk inflicts a serious wound on a layman he should be imprisoned in the aforementioned (king’s castle at Oxford) castle until the Chancellor of the mentioned University will have asked for his surrender; if the injury was a minor one he should be imprisoned in the town jail until his liberation by the Chancellor.10

Earlier, in 1227, Henry III had intervened directly into university versus community disputes over lodging. At that time Henry established a form of rent control setting base rents and limiting the size of future increases.

Royal ordinances and decrees were issued on a regular basis in response to petitions from scholars complaining about extortionate prices and unfair trade practices. Evident is a familiar and oft repeated cycle
of government attempting to control business practices. Even medieval
governments, with authoritarian methods and lack of limits on royal
discretion, were no more able to break the cycle than were later ones.

A second and similar reason for the emergence of communal living
and dining, in the form of hired halls, was the boisterous nature of the
students themselves. Unsupervised and often idle, it appears that a
great many medieval scholars counted fighting among themselves and
vandalising each other's property among their favorite and most regularly
pursued pastimes.

Difficulty was created for the university by unruly unsupervised
scholars and the regular disruptions to academic life and routine caused
by the constant struggles with local merchants, authorities and
citizens. This experience provided a real and powerful incentive to
develop an alternative to the each-for-himself lodging and boarding
arrangements prevalent until the late thirteenth century at Oxford and
Cambridge.

Henry III, in 1231, granted to university masters the
responsibility and authority to discipline scholars. Predictably,
however, it "did not prove effective because it did not extend to the
areas of a student's life where trouble was most likely to arise. It was
the halls that were to provide the discipline" 11

Halls were initially established, therefore, as a form of group
protection for scholars and for the benefits, in part, which accrue from
the power of numbers and volume purchasing of food stuffs and supplies.
Equally important and valuable to the university was the presence of a
supervising master who, having been granted by the crown authority to
discipline scholars, could, ostensibly at least, provide a beneficial
influence on the scholars habits and morals.
in the English colleges instructors usually ate with their students and the collegiate architecture provided complete quadrangles with single exits, which could be effectively guarded by a porter.  

The above passage refers to instructors. By the fourteenth century halls were not only supervised by live-in masters, but used for instruction. "Between about 1340 and 1430 in England...Colleges emerged as the primary administrative, physical, social, and educational focus at the expense of the older halls."  

At first, the differences between halls and colleges were slight. In time, however, the term college came to signify a hall which most likely was owned, housing a self-selecting, self-governing body of masters and, initially, graduates. The college was often endowed by generous patrons and, having an income, was not as dependent on fees or as subject to the whims and fortunes of individuals. Poor scholars could in some cases be admitted without regard to finances.  

As numbers of students declined in the late fourteenth century, colleges began to actively recruit members, even undergraduates. The older form of communal life, the hired hall, could not compete for new scholars against colleges which, enjoying income of their own, could subsidize the scholars they wished to admit.  

Wealthy colleges began to acquire additional property and often annexed or gained control over nearby halls. Typically a college would install one of its fellows as principal or head of the new acquisition and it might then be used to house and/or feed guests or the lowest order of the college's membership, the undergraduate.
The emergence of strong colleges in the English universities changed the close relationship between the crown and the universities. As colleges became self supporting, and hence more independent, they also began to assume more and more of the functions performed heretofore by the university.

...college men came to dominate the important university jobs, especially those of proctor and scribe. Moreover, as early as 1410, the heads of the colleges were being summoned, along with experts from the faculties, to make an important decision...

The Colleges brought a certain amount of order to the administration, financing, discipline, and even studies of that unruly gathering which was the medieval university.¹⁴

Some colleges were established by monastic orders with requirements and restrictions appropriate to the order. Others were established through the generosity of benefactors or patrons. Often these benefactors placed conditions on the membership, subject of study, or style of life to be lived at the college.

Merton College at Oxford University was founded in 1264 by Walter de Merton for the expressed purpose of "providing for eleven bachelors preparing to become masters of arts."¹⁵ Merton had donated an estate in Surrey as an endowment, the income from which could be spent to support the college and the scholars therein. Merton did not, as did some other patrons, require that his family be given priority consideration for admission, but he did require that "...scholars were to live in the same hall and have a uniform."¹⁶

The scholars and masters, once admitted to the college, became
members of the landowning body, receiving income from the rents and
receipts from the estate in their own rights rather than paying fees to
support the college using funds garnered from family, savings, or pension
from others.

Merton appears to have been typical in its emphasis on communal
living and eating, and upon close and constant daily contact with and
supervision by masters. Dining together as a college and dining well
appears to have been a high priority to college members from the earliest
years.

... (students) spent most on food and drink... The central
importance of dining raised into prominence all the purveyors
of food, from fancy pastry chefs and other banquet specialists
in the towns to their counterparts in the collegiate
societies.¹⁷

... Catering was in the hands of the manciples, on whose honesty
the well being of the members depended. Each member paid a
weekly sum for the... commons, ... the servants were to take an
oath at the beginning of every term to serve the masters and
scholars faithfully, and not to buy food to sell or for the
use of regrators but only for the needs of members of the
hall.¹⁸

As wealthy, self selecting, self governing, and self perpetuating
bodies, it is unsurprising that some colleges, at least, lost their focus
on the intellect and on academic rigor and evolved into a type of
gentleman’s club. Such colleges placed higher priority upon good food
and drink, a pleasant and comfortable lifestyle, and the development of
good manners and taste, not to mention political and other useful
contacts, than was placed upon academic pursuits. The Earl of Chatham wrote to his nephew, Thomas Pitt, that

You are to be a gentleman of such learning and qualifications as may distinguish you in the service of your country hereafter; not a pedant, who reads only to be called learned, instead of considering learning as an instrument only for action.19

By the early nineteenth century, colleges were often perceived as anti-intellectual. "They seem to have little to do with career preparation, scholarship, or avocations and were likely to have been formed for pleasure - their principal activities were eating and drinking - rather than edification,..."20

John Thelin, in Higher Education and its Useful Past, refers to this period as one of institutional stagnation and states that "The period after 1660, stretching well into the nineteenth century, has the dubious and uncontested reputation as the longest, lowest era in the academic and educational life of the universities."21 He also notes that this period, when the sporting life rather than the academic life was predominant, happened to be the time when much of the splendid university architecture appeared, creating the image and ideal of a university which persists today.

By the seventeenth century, when the first American colleges were established, colleges at English universities and the collegiate way of
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living were well and firmly established institutions. Although founded in reaction to problems of lodging, board, and relationships with local communities, colleges had acquired over time a public acceptance of their appropriateness, their worth, and their place in English society.

The objective was education, but not simply academic education. It was academic, moral, social, political, and cultural education. The process for achieving the objective was highly structured, highly supervised, and if properly done, highly consistent. The product, in this case the college graduate, was to share a common experience with his fellows as well as common manners, beliefs, attitudes, interests, and perhaps knowledge. By the seventeenth century, it was a commonly held notion that living collegiately, that is living, dining, worshiping, and recreating communally, was the prescribed and preferred avenue to those ends.
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CHAPTER 3

EARLY AMERICAN COLLEGES
Establishing Colleges:

Collegiate Design, Support, and Purposes

By the end of the eighteenth century, the English New World colonies were host, and, in some fashion, supporters of several colleges. These institutions of learning were distributed roughly one for each colony and were variably modeled on the English universities at Oxford and Cambridge, although each location had added refinements according to local needs and tastes.

The presence of colleges throughout the New World was not an accident of history, but rather a reflection of priorities held by English colonists. In the pamphlet New England's First Fruits it is noted that after the construction of housing, a place of worship, and a governmental structure having been established, "One of the next things we longed for, and looked after, was to advance Learning and perpetuate it to Posterity..."¹

Significant numbers of Oxford and Cambridge men came to the colonies and some participated in the founding of Harvard College. Partially a reaction to the dissolute and profligate reputation that English universities were acquiring, Harvard was founded because

...they intended to re-create a little bit of old England in America. They did what people a long way from home often do, and certainly what Englishmen have often done. It was the
most natural thing in the world for an officer of the colonial service in the nineteenth century to dress for dinner in the jungle as if he were dining at his club in London, it was no less natural for the Englishmen of early Massachusetts to found themselves a college, an English college such as those they had known at Oxford but particularly at Cambridge where Puritan theology and Puritan aspiration had been especially nurtured.2

From the first, this desire for a college included the notion of living collegiately. John Winthrop, Governor of Massachusetts Bay Colony, wished to "...make others Conditions our owne, rejoice together, mourne together, labour and suffer together, all wayes having before our eyes our Commission and Community in the worke, our Community as members of the same body."3

Cotton Mather, son of a Harvard president, wrote a history of Harvard College in 1702. In that work Mather noted that living collegiately and dining communally was, from the first, a priority for the new college.

"Tis true, the University of Upsal(sic) in Sweden(sic), hath ordinarily about seven or eight hundred students belonging to it, which do none of them live collegiately, but board all of them here and there at private houses; Nevertheless, the government of New England, was for having their students brought up in a more collegiate way of living."4

Mather also notes the detail with which student life was planned and ordered by the College's first overseers in the following excerpt from the Statutes, Laws and Privileges...of Harvard College.

All persons admitted to the College must board at the commons, and must pay three pounds to the steward on their entrance, and must discharge all arrears at the end of every three months; nor shall any undergraduate of the institution be allowed to board out of the College, unless by special permission of the President....5
The emphasis on living collegiately was, in large part, a
reflection of Puritan thought and priorities. Believing English
universities to have abdicated their responsibility for the religious and
moral welfare of students, the New World elite set about establishing
institutions that would provide safe havens for their sons as they
prepared for positions of leadership in American society.

While remaining an integral part of a college education,
thetical training, in American colleges, was rarely the sole
objective. Many early colleges, Harvard, William and Mary, and Yale among
them, were established with the expressed intent of preparing, through
professional education, the leaders of their colonies. Although
established to serve the church, American colleges in addition were
expected to feel an obligation to the state and to the community in which
they were located.

State support, in the form of the Charlestown ferry rents awarded
to Harvard or the assignment of revenues from export taxes on skins,
furs, and tobacco to William and Mary, was reflective of the role of
colleges in the eyes of local government and communities. This support
and expectation was rewarded in the training of ministers, teachers,
lawyers, surveyors, and civil servants.

Colleges in America were not, despite growing opinions regarding
social equality and classlessness, popular institutions. They did not
serve, nor were they available to, the general public. In describing
students during Harvard's first century, James Axtell states that
...the majority of students came from families that enjoyed high social status and the benefits of material wealth. They were the sons of ministers, magistrates, physicians, merchants, and prosperous farmers, many of whom had attended Harvard before their sons. By virtue of heredity, they were halfway members of a self perpetuating elite. A Harvard degree secured them full admission and confirmed their birthright of social leadership...

He further states that,

The function of education was less to make these young men eligible for membership in the elite than to complete and confirm their qualification, right, and obligation to govern that already existed...

And,

The correspondence of social prominence and political authority could hardly have been made clearer, and a college education was the crown of the whole process.6

Axtell explains that the political value of social prominence was enhanced yet further by the fact that class ranking appeared to correlate directly with future prominence, and that rank was based upon the social position in the community held by the family from which the young man came. In fact, upon matriculation, Harvard freshmen were assigned a provisional place in the class. Based upon that placement "a student would recite before the faculty, seat and serve himself at meals, sit in chapel, march in academic procession...and they commonly had the best chambers in the College assigned to them."7
The Nature of Collegial Living: Tradition Unencumbered by Progress

Many colleges were established in isolated rural locations. Many Americans appear to have believed that human growth and development could proceed in a milieu that was more moral, more sound, and capable of better character building when it was done at some distance from throngs of people, and the vices and temptations of town and city. Thomas Jefferson raised this agrarian notion of land as a source of virtue and a great moving force in history to a level of popular political theory.

Colleges, having been established in such a context, required housing and dining quarters of necessity whether or not their founders believed collegiate living to be intrinsically good. Once established and accepted, dormitory living and common dining became part of the American college tradition even when urban colleges, such as King's (Columbia) or William and Mary were founded, or when towns and cities grew up around a college which once had enjoyed a quiet rural setting.

Dormitory life made possible the sharing of common experiences, academic and otherwise, as well as constant supervision, characterized as parental concern, by the faculty (masters). The goal was to develop, through structured supervised experience, good manners, good habits, respect for others, and maximization of opportunities for learning while avoiding temptations and idleness.
Often the reality of dormitory life in early American colleges was not so beneficial and positive in its influence on student life. Frederick Rudolph noted that the dormitory placed students in close quarters, under uncomfortable conditions and did not provide enough intellectual demands on them, enough structure on their time, or adequate opportunities for relaxation, privacy, and recreation. Duels were not rare; violence and argument common.

The intensity and the harshness which characterized dormitory living at some colleges resulted in open rebellion against what was described by President Ashbel Green of Princeton as "...the whole system established in this college...a system of diligent study, of guarded moral conduct and of reasonable attention to religious duty..."  

Residential living had its critics, among them Francis Wayland of Brown and Frederick Barnard of Columbia who noted that dormitory life was unnatural and that it was inappropriate to subject students of all ages to the same rules and regulations. Practical opposition based on poor finances and the unwillingness to take on parental responsibilities were also expressed.

The tradition was established however and dormitory living as a part of the college experience was secure. Jesse Rosenberger offers an excerpt from an editorial in the University of Rochester student newspaper as evidence of the groundswell of support for building additional dormitories at American colleges in the late nineteenth century.

It seems to us that the greatest need of our University is that of dormitories, since without them we can never enjoy a decent supply of that delightful article, vaguely called college spirit...The absence of dormitories...deprives us
of all those delightful associations and those lifelong friendships which add so much to the glory of college days, and which, after all, are the only things to which students love to revert in after years.9

Almost inseparable from communal living was the commons or dining component of the collegiate way of living. Seen as part and parcel of the whole, group dining (as with all aspect of collegiate life, well supervised) was integral to the goal of total education. Early on, Harvard College prohibited its students from living or boarding with any family or person in Cambridge without permission of the President. Axtell, in The School Upon a Hill, reports that at Harvard College "all students and faculty who lived in the college were required to dine in the fellowship of Commons to avoid the great disorders of those living out."10
Communal Dining

Communal dining was probably the least successful component of the collegiate way of living. The commitment to and emphasis on rural isolation obligated colleges to provide meals and severely limited the available alternatives. American collegiate history is replete with examples of poor commons and with episodes of protest and even rebellion over bad board.

Although frequent and, on occasion, violent, the protests and rebellions over inadequate dining arrangements only occasionally had any impact on a college's determination to continue requiring communal dining and seldom on the quality of the food itself. The president at South Carolina reported that, "the College is in yearly jeopardy of being destroyed by the disputes about eating."[1]

Some colleges gave up. In the years following the Civil War, Williams, Yale, Harvard and William and Mary all opened dining halls which had been given up during the first half of the nineteenth century.

Some colleges attempted more ambitious forms of communal dining. President Green at Princeton, and one early president at The College of William and Mary, invited a few students at each meal to dine with them in their homes. In neither case did it prove effective in furthering the
development of gentlemanly manners or in producing an enjoyable dining experience for the presidents. President Green reported that he "found that it had but little effect in reclaiming the vicious," and Isaac Weld, in his travel journal, describing student behavior at the president's table at the College of William and Mary in 1796 stated, "Some are without shoes or stockings, others without coats. During dinner they constantly rose to help themselves at the side board." The above report is of ironic interest in light of the following excerpt from the Statutes of the University of William and Mary, 1792, titled "On the Subject of Good Order and Decorum: . . . No person shall sit down to, or retire from the table, until Grace be said . . . at table all persons shall be uncovered, shall observe the strictest order and decorum." As difficult as the imposition and maintenance of a paternal living, worshiping and studying arrangement was, it paled before the difficulties of attempting to replace the maternal domain of the kitchen and dining room. Several colleges began leasing the kitchen and dining halls to local entrepreneurs willing and courageous enough to attempt to satisfy the students. Others, as mentioned previously, when located in areas with other dining options, briefly ceased having commons altogether. Even those, however, ultimately reinstated commons in some form (often at the request of its severest critics, the students).

In a letter to the Board of Visitors of the College of William and Mary, written in 1796, students decried the cessation of a boarding program the previous year and requested reestablishment.
The regulations adopted for the government of different seminaries have been as various as the seminaries have been numerous. One, however, seems to have pervaded the whole, a general permission to the students to reside in the walls of the seminary. It has been said, that college cannot afford to support a table, this objection is too absurd to merit a confutation.
The early American colleges borrowed much from the Oxford - Cambridge model of universities and colleges. The American institutions were adapted to suit the unique needs and requirements of local circumstances, but the intent was to be similar and the perception was that American colleges were similar to English colleges.

The philosophy which undergirded the curriculum in some American colleges deviated from their English counterparts in that a greater emphasis was placed upon professional education. An attempt was made to go beyond providing a liberal education to the sons of the elite, pre-selected and predetermined to be society's leaders. American colleges went beyond liberal education to prepare young men for professions as lawyers, teachers, surveyors, civil servants, or in commerce.

What did not vary significantly in approach, if occasionally in implementation, was the collegiate way of living and its required component parts such as communal dining. Preparation for social, clerical, and governmental leadership required, in the eyes of college founders and supporters, a careful nurturing of the individual; stern
discipline, constant supervision, physical removal from temptation, and unceasing vigilance against weakness of the flesh.

Even students, while railing at the confinement and the restrictions, such as "the absurd rule forbidding a student to take his meals at a public house,..." recognized the effect of the collegiate life package.

If, as I imagine, the chief value of a college course lies not in the scholarship or absolute knowledge with which it supplies a man, but rather in that intangible thing called culture, or discipline, or mental balance, which only its possessor can appreciate, and which he cannot describe, - certainly no one can say that the peculiar life and customs which the students themselves adopt form an important, even though it be an unrecognized, part of that course...the object of any scheme of education worthy of the name is not the making of good scholars, or good lawyers, or good doctors, or good specialists of any sort; it is rather the making of good men.17

The adherents of the collegiate way certainly believed that theirs was the best way to achieve the making of good men. The weakness inherent in the collegiate way was the inability or disinclination of its adherents and its practitioners to refine it and adjust to successive and changing student populations who had different characteristics, needs, and expectations.

Despite protest and rebellion at many colleges throughout the nineteenth century significant change had to wait for the middle of the next century. Older students continued to be treated like children. Indignities, humiliation, and corporal punishment were meted out to mature men who, unsurprisingly, resisted on occasion. Periods of social
unrest and great national change swept past altering society forever, but having little impact on colleges and their chosen round of life. New institutions were started, often in an effort to accomplish something, such as education of women, education of blacks, or the implementation of a curricular experiment, but the established, elite, early American colleges were slow to change.

One student, at least, wondered if the food were as antiquated as the subject matter he was required to study and the manner in which he was forced to live. Augustus Torrey wrote in his diary in 1822, "Goose for dinner. Said to have migrated to this country with our ancestors."18

At least until the late 1830's, American colleges allowed little in the way of extracurriculum. As harsh and unpleasant as college life appears sometimes to have been, dormitories and dining halls were the only available vehicles for non-academic interaction among members of the collegiate community.

In the following chapter, student creativity in utilizing these settings for unintended purposes, at the College of William and Mary, will be reviewed together with the corresponding reaction on the part of the President of the College, the masters, and the Board of Visitors.
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CHAPTER 4

THEIR MAJESTY'S ROYAL COLLEGE
The College of William and Mary in Virginia:
The Early Years

Following two earlier abortive attempts at establishing colleges in Virginia, William and Mary of England established, by royal charter in 1693, their Majesty's Royall Colledge later known as The College of William and Mary in Virginia. The College was endowed with a royal grant of some one thousand acres of land, and with revenues from the fur and tobacco trades. The charter called for a "President, six masters or Professors with a hundred scholars, more or less."¹

The charter is explicit in stating the royal expectations as to the nature of the institution being founded and what its goals were to be.

...being desirous, that forever hereafter, there should be one such college...of the masters...scholars, and all others inhabiting or residing therein...that the Youth may be piously educated in good Letters and Manners...²

Some of the earliest documents and correspondence still in existence treat collegial living in very specific terms, and at some length. Significant time, attention, and energy were directed to ensuring the establishment of what was perceived to be a correct collegial environment. Governor Nicholson, writing in 1705 to the Archbishop of Canterbury, stated that
President James Blair (is) to go live in the College and as many masters and scholars as are willing to board there; and Mr President Blair hath undertaken for the first year to provide for their accommodation...kitchen and pantry...3

More specifically put in anonymous correspondence in the same year, "The building in (college) is to consist of a Quadrangle, two sides of which, are yet only carried up. In this part are already finished all conveniences of Cooking, Brewing, Baking, etc. and convenient Rooms for the Reception of the President, and Masters, with many more Scholars than are as yet come to it; in this part are also the Hall and School-Room."4

In the Statutes of William and Mary, written in 1727, the objectives of a college education are stated clearly and followed immediately by an expressed intention that all members of the college live collegiately.

In the election of a president or masters, let them (The Board of Visitors) have a principle regard to their Learning, Piety, Sobriety, Prudence, Good Morals, Orderliness, and Observance of Discipline, and that they be of quiet and peaceable spirit...

... 

There are Three Things, which the Founders of this College propose to themselves, to which all its Statutes should be directed. The First is, that the Youth of Virginia should be well-educated to learning and Good Morals...

...

If any (parents and guardians) have their house so near the College, that from thence the College Bells can be heard and Publick Hours of Study be duly observed, we would not by these Statutes hinder them...from lodging them at their own houses. Nevertheless we hope that all Things relating to the Table or Lodging will be so well supplied within the College, that they can be no where cheaper or better accommodated.5
Any question regarding the model for the new college in Virginia is put rather firmly to rest by Professor Hugh Jones, who in 1724 noted that "The Nature of the Country scarce yet admits of the Possibility of reducing the Collegians to the nice Methods of Life and Study observed in Oxford and Cambridge; tho' by Degrees they may copy from thence many useful Customs and Constitutions." Professor Jones further states and emphasizes that specifics of dress, lodging and dining should conform to the Oxbridge model.

...the President and Masters...should be obliged to wear gowns, and be subject to the same Statutes and Rules as the Scholars...as...in Oxford. These should maintain themselves, and have a particular Table and Chambers for their accommodation.

For to wait at the four high tables, hereafter mentioned, there should be elected by the President and Masters four Servitors, who should have their Education, and such Allowances, as the Servitors in Oxford.

Jones further and more directly addresses the living and dining arrangements for the scholars.

Let them be boarded and lodged in the Dormitory, as they are at present; or upon such terms as may from Time to Time seem most proper to the President and Masters...

(The Visitors) appoint a person, to whom they grant several Privileges and Allowances to board and lodge the Masters and Scholars at an extraordinary cheap Rate.

This office is at present performed in the neatest and most regular and plentiful Manner, by Mrs. Mary Stith, a Gentlewoman of great Worth and Discretion, in good favour with the Gentry, and great Esteem and Respect with the common People.

The importance placed upon collegial living by the crown, the Visitors, the President and the masters is demonstrated by the presence
of the above mentioned Mrs. Stith, described as a gentlewoman; clearly not a servant. A gentlewoman, brought to the College to ensure a proper style of living and dining, suggests that these components of college life at William and Mary were not merely necessities provided only due to lack of alternatives.

Mrs. Stith was not the first housekeeper or stewardess at the College. After several unsuccessful experiments, a certain Mrs. Jackson declined, in 1716, the dubious honor and privilege of serving as college stewardess. Such difficulties in obtaining that service which was deemed of such great import led the Board of Visitors, at their meeting of March 26, 1716, to ask the president to "Solicit persons interested in keeping the college table."9

Having no luck, the Board of Visitors, at their meeting in June of that same year, asked the president to "Appoint a committee to find anyone to keep the college table upon the best terms they can..."10

Finally, at the October, 1716, meeting, the Visitors retained "Mrs. Mary Barrett to keep college table at 11 pounds per year."11 Mrs. Barrett was furnished with a servant in addition to the eleven pounds per year compensation. In celebration, the Board of Visitors asked the president to "Send to England for standing furniture for the College kitchen, Brewhouse, and Laundry, and...a bell..."12

One is moved to ask why collegiate living was established as a priority in the minds of those who founded and administered the College of William and Mary. Documentation reviewed and evidence presented thus far suggest that the primary consideration, at least that
which was officially stated, was the proper and moral upbringing of the young men of the colony. Mentioned occasionally in official documents, and suggested more often by historians, is the simple absence of alternatives and the natural inclination to reproduce the familiar.

J.E. Morpurgo appears to support the above interpretation stating that "William and Mary took over from the schools of Britain; a concern for the spiritual and moral welfare and for the social behavior of its pupils...."¹³ He further states that, "The early Virginians who were familiar with the British University traditions ...(saw to it) that the methodology scholarship, etc. of 17th century British Universities was the same as that of every member of the early William and Mary faculty."¹⁴

An official history published by the Federal Bureau of Education in 1867 agrees with Morpurgo but questions the sincerity of the occasionally stated goal and desire to spread Christianity.

The motives of the English, whether in Virginia or New England, in providing for the pious education of their sons in good letters and good manners, were but colonial outcroppings of the same public spirit which found the various colleges which now make up the universities of Oxford and Cambridge. The propagation of the Christian faith ... was ... secondary.¹⁵

Perhaps the intentions for founding a college in the British collegiate tradition were altruistic where conscious, and at least neutral where they were the result of habit. A suggestion of a more practical reason surfaces, however, in Hugh Jones description of the College (1724).
...because if any but the President dieted themselves, it would create Confusion; and if any belonging to the College but such Masters as have Families were permitted to eat elsewhere; it would not be worth anybody's while to lay in Provision, when they could not tell what Number they must provide for.¹⁶

Apparently there was a recognition of the financial advantages of communal boarding as well as the educational and moral advantages believed to be inherent in that milieu.

Although a quadrangle was never completed, the College of William and Mary did succeed in providing teaching, worship, lodging, and boarding for the entire college community under one roof. By the latter part of the eighteenth century, these aspects of life were firmly fixed in the routine of college affairs. Periodically the regulations regarding the round of life were refined or modified.

The Board of Visitors, at their meeting of August 29, 1754, decreed, "That the boys regularly attend Dinner and Supper in the hall, and...not...allow any Victuals ... sent into Private Rooms..."¹⁷. The president and masters, at their March 11, 1766, meeting, concluded that mere regularity of attendance was inadequate and resolved, "That the Scholars boarding in the College be order'd to attend in the Common-Room every Evening, at nine o'Clock..."¹⁸

Special consideration was granted to professors by themselves at a faculty meeting in 1778. "Resolved that those professors, who forego the use of the college table, be allowed, in consideration...one or more joints of meat, the whole not exceeded 14 pounds if fresh, if salt 10 pounds."¹⁹
Despite minor refinements, the officially stated objective of collegiate living was often reinforced. Even when asking for permission to establish one rate for "Board, Lodging, and Rooms at the College: The President assured the Board of Visitors that the request was not motivated by a desire for "Cheapness of Living" but rather a desire to develop "competent scholars and well-behaved gentlemen."20

J. E. Morpurgo suggests that, for a time at least, boarding at the College of William and Mary may have been a reasonably pleasant experience. Several consecutive college housekeepers, Mrs. Clayton, Miss Dawson, Mrs. Owen, and Martha Bryan, were reported to have "Kopt a good table...maintained the tradition of orderliness, quiet efficiency, and adequate food...."21 Even a rare example of student satisfaction with college dining has survived. John Brown wrote his family in 1779 that, "I have enjoyed a good state of health during my residence here, I board in college, at what rate it is at present uncertain."22

The specific food items which may have been served at a typical college meal during this period is difficult to determine. Only a few oblique references to specific foods appear in the records of the early years at William and Mary. Two things are known. One is that the rate for boarding and lodging remained unchanged from 1778 to 1830 suggesting a lack of inflation, a declining quality level, excellent management, or possibly subsidies of some kind. The other is that where food is mentioned, there is a positive emphasis on meat and a negative one on less identifiable and less solid dishes such as gruel or porridge.

The College's stewardess probably had access to the same kinds of dishes and items available to local merchants, farmers, gentry, and even
slaves. Scholars and masters at the College probably drank tea and watered wine, and their table may have included poultry and fish, some beef and pork, fresh vegetables in season and different breads and muffins. Presumably, even oysters, clams, and more expensive foods were available although it is unlikely that these were regular fare.

Off season dining, as everywhere else, was less appetizing due to poor preservation procedures. Corn cakes, dried and salted meat and fish, eggs, and hard biscuits were probably staples.

The good management and apparently pleasant dining enjoyed by those present at the College of William and Mary during the second half of the eighteenth century, unfortunately, was not to last. Following the resignation of the much praised Martha Bryan in 1761, a woman named Isabella Cocke was retained as housekeeper. In the words of Morpurgo

Disaster entered...Mrs. Cocke did not check the laundry, visit the sick, and did not control the servants, and showed favoritism. Worst offense of all in the eyes of the young, the meals she served were poorly planned, badly cooked, and served in a slovenly manner. That this complaint was more than the timeless grouse against communal catering is borne out by the official comment that the housekeepers culinary shortcomings were well-known to the Visitors and other gentlemen throughout the whole colony."23

As a result of the great dissatisfaction with Mrs. Cocke's gross mismanagement, the president and masters of the College issued to her the following specific instructions.

Madam:
1st That You never concern Yourself with any of the Boys only when you have a Complaint against any of them, and then that You make it to his or their proper Master.
2dly That there be always both fresh, and salt Meat for Dinner; and twice in the Week, as well as on Sunday in particular, that there be either Puddings or Pies beside; - that there be always Plenty of Victuals; - that Breakfast, Dinner, and Supper, be serv'd up in the cleanest, and neatest Manner possible; and for this Reason the Society not only allow, but desire You to get a Cook; - that the boys Suppers be not as usual made up of different Scraps, but that there be at each Table the same Sort; and when there is cold fresh Meat enough, that it be often hash'd for them; - that when they are sick, You Yourself see their Victuals before it be carried to them; that it be clean, decent, and fit for them; - and give their medicines regularly. The general Complaints of the Visitors, and other Gentlemen throughout the whole Colony plainly shew the Necessity of a strict, and regular compliance with the above Directions.

3dly That Phoebe Dwit be kept intirely to her proper Office of attending the sick, and when none are sick, to making the Negro's Clothes, and seeing the Dormitories, and other Apartments kept thoroughly clean; and that she goes round to them all two, or three Times a Day; - that she have Nothing to do with the Keys, Breakfasts, Dinners, and Suppers any more.

4thly That a proper Stocking-Mender be procur'd to live in, or near the College...

5thly That the Negroes be trusted with no Keys; - that a Butcher be agreed with to supply the college regularly, and that his Meat be taken preferable to any other provided it be good; that fresh Butter be look'd out for in Time, that the boys may not be forced to eat salt in Summer.

6thly As we all know that Negroes will not perform their Duties without the Mistress's constant Eye especially in so large a Family as the College, and as we all observe You going a Broad more frequently than even the Mistress of a private Family can do...We particularly request it of You, that Your Visits for the future in Town, or Country may not be so frequent...

...The Housekeeper is to be supply'd with Wood and Candles, and with Tea and Sugar for Breakfast ONLY; that the rest of the Tea and Sugar is to be used for the Sick; - that the Wine is intended wholly and solely for the sick...that the Plumbs, Currants are only to be us'd at the Common-Tables, or for the sick; - that rich Cakes, Preserves must be at Your own Expense; - that if any Master should chance to miss attending the Hall, or Common-Room he may send for what Victuals he pleases is left...24
Evidently the instruction was to no avail, as a mere five months later the president and masters resolved to replace Mrs. Cocke.

Resol, That the majority of this Society are of Opinion that Mrs. Isabella Cocke has behaved much amiss in her Office of Housekeeper, not only in contempt - of the unanimous Resolves of this Society dated February 7th 1763 (see above), but likewise in other Respects; therefore they think proper to desire her to finish her Year, and to provide herself with some other Place.

Resol, That an Advertisement be inserted in the Gazette to desire a Man capable of managing the Housekeeper's business in the College, to apply to the President and Masters.\(^{25}\)

In the words of Morpurgo, "All other instruction given to her, Mrs. Cocke ignored contumaciously. Consequently, when the faculty decided to fire her and to replace her by a man capable of managing the housekeeper's business, there was for once no discord between faculty and visitors, and the students regarded it as a triumph as magnificent as the capture of Quebec."\(^{26}\)

As mentioned in an earlier chapter, the latter part of the eighteenth century was a time of great change, questioning of tradition, and of foment against Britain, and many things British. Additionally, students had changed. By the late 1700's a college education had come to signify a confirmation of the place in life to which a young man may have been entitled by birth. Seen as an important social benefit to a man's future, colleges attracted more students who were older, more mature and self reliant. They were not, perhaps, as much in need of the paternalistic, restrictive way of life to which they were subjected at
college. Certainly, the students were not appreciative of the life style, and the period saw an increase in student resistance to authority and in misbehavior. An amendment to the College's statutes in 1758 appears to react to something of the sort: "VII. That one of the masters...be always present with the Boys at Breakfast and Supper." Morpurgo reports that President Stith "was offended by the sight of boys taking meals in their rooms...to protect his beloved kitchen...."28

The College's presidents and masters appear not to have wavered from their convictions and their commitment to the collegiate way of living believing that "...the essential quality of a William and Mary education was not created by academic studies alone. Time and again in the days before the revolution, the mentors of the College had insisted that it was intended for the 'rearing of gentlemen'."29

One celebrated and much told episode of student unrest involved the college housekeeper. In 1775, six students, among them future President James Monroe, brought the housekeeper, one Maria Digges, up on charges before the faculty. The charges were purported to involve dining and kitchen matters, but some evidence suggests, and J.E. Morpurgo believes, that the scandal was politically motivated.

Maria Digges was a Loyalist and most her friends were Tories. Many students of the 1770's were openly defiant of British authority and their action against Mrs. Digges coincided with acts of vandalism, patriotic graffiti, protests, and violence. It appears likely that Maria Digges and the food service were convenient targets and that the stated charges did not reflect accurately the objections the students had towards her.
In any event, the faculty, after thorough review, found the charges unfair and rejected them as being groundless. (Excerpts from the Digges hearing at the May 1775 meeting of the president and masters are reprinted in the March 31, 1934, *Alumni Gazette* and reproduced in the Appendix).
The College of William and Mary and the City of Williamsburg had little of which to be proud during most of the nineteenth century. Williamsburg, the colonial capital, lost its position to Richmond and suffered as a result, losing population, business, and prestige. The college's losses were in students, faculty, and financial support.

The College was not exempt from a general depression which settled over most of American higher education in the early nineteenth century. Jacksonian ideals of independence, individual self reliance, manual labor, and glorification of the common (uneducated) man conspired with colleges' unwillingness to adjust or respond to new needs, desires, and conditions. The combination produced a national impression of colleges as something less fine and noble than earlier had been the case. The atmosphere at many established colleges appears to have been conservative to an extreme, and the faculties unbending in their resistance to curricular or extracurricular reform.

Some of those students forced to attend William and Mary became unhappy enough to produce adversarial relationships with faculty, and the result was repeated and protracted discussions in faculty meetings of student misbehavior. A faculty report, submitted to the Board of Visitors in 1835 reported "Loud and riotous noises in and about the College, accompanied generally with much profaneness and occasionally reports of pistols...students...having frequent small supper parties...(with)liquor forms a part of these entertainments."
Such descriptions of student behavior appear frequently in faculty and Board of Visitors meeting minutes during the first half of the nineteenth century.

The College's misfortunes seemed to extend to the commons as well. James Madison, President of the College in 1806, attempted to begin the century on a positive note publishing the following.

It is hereby known to the public that there will be established in college a plain, but decent table, upon the lowest terms...all junior students will be compelled to lodge in college, to board at the public table...The object of these arrangements is...to guard...against dissipation and idleness."

President Madison's efforts were largely unsuccessful in attracting students and establishing a thriving college table. In 1825 the Board of Visitors resolved the "establishment of a boarding house for the students so as to reduce the necessary expenses of a student..."32

The boarding house's success appears to have been limited as reported in March of 1827 minutes of a meeting of the Society of William and Mary (the faculty and president) "Students gave unto the Society a remonstrance against the Steward complaining of their food..."33.

On March 4, 1848, the minutes of the faculty meeting report the question, "whether a dining room can be provided in the college?"34

That question was answered the following year by an amendment to the Laws and Regulations of the College of William and Mary in Virginia which stated that the "faculty may elect a Steward, to furnish meals to...undergraduates...in the Brafferton House...He shall preserve order and decorum among his boarders while at his table."35
The College's luck was to worsen. The inability to adjust to the times and to provide good board was overshadowed by the loss, by fire, of the Wren Building during the Civil War and the closing, for seven years, of the College during the immediate post war period.

After considering and rejecting the notion of relocating the College to Alexandria where it might have benefitted by affiliation with the Episcopal Seminary located there, or to Richmond Virginia, the Board of Visitors opened the College in the late 1870's with the assurance of an annual grant of $10,000 from the General Assembly of Virginia to support the training of teachers.
In the early years of the twentieth century, the College officially became a state supported and affiliated institution. Shortly thereafter, it began to accept women. Bolstered by state support and growing enrollment, the College enjoyed improving health and slow but steady growth, and improvement in its faculty, its programs, and its physical plant.

In 1914 an appropriation from the General Assembly in the amount of $14,700 was requested and received by The College of William and Mary for the purpose of constructing a freestanding building dedicated entirely to dining; the first time that dining facilities at William and Mary had not been a part of a dormitory or other building. Before the new facility was constructed, students had dined communally and under supervision, but usually in small groups in the dormitory where they resided.

As in other times and circumstances, food was a topic of considerable interest to students. With a student newspaper (The Flat Hat) at their disposal, student editors often would report on any aspect of the commons which pleased or displeased them as well as make suggestions for improvement. In the January 9, 1917, edition an article appeared supporting a mid-year rate increase in response to rapid inflation in commodity prices. "The aim of the boarding system should be
satisfaction to the largest number, and not board at the lowest rate. 37 The article further recommended that the manager or steward be placed on salary rather than make his living from profits, and that others in the administration help supervise expenditures.

Even the new dining hall (pictured in the appendix) was soon outgrown. By 1919 when Julian Alvin Carroll Chandler became President of the College more of almost everything was needed at William and Mary.

Under Chandler's leadership, the College managed to acquire much land and needed buildings. One of the most significant was the Penniman Building. Bought from the military and moved to the campus site of present day Tyler Hall, the Penniman Building was used as a one hundred fifty seat dining hall and a dormitory from 1921 until 1925 when it burned. 38 Another important building, in use today, was an enlarged dining hall constructed in 1926 on the site of and encompassing the 1914 dining hall. The expansion and new construction cost $150,000, and was named for the former Governor E. Lee Trinkle (photograph of Trinkle Hall in Appendix).

Other buildings were built, razed, or improved during the presidency of J.A.C. Chandler, but perhaps his greatest contributions to the College and the characteristics for which he is best remembered were his vision of growth and improvement for the College and his energy in pursuing that end.

As difficult as it is to identify exactly what Chandler initiated for the first time and what he merely reemphasized, the results were dramatic and memorable. Chandler was a widower with grown children when he came to William and Mary, and his residence in the President's House
kept him well abreast of the round of life at the College. Omnipresent, he took a deep interest in student life and involved himself particularly in the dining component of that life at William and Mary.

Chandler took virtually all of his meals, when in Williamsburg, at the dining hall. He saw to it that Trinkle Hall was constructed with a private dining room where he could entertain guests and friends of the College such as John D. Rockefeller, Lady Astor, and Calvin Coolidge.39

When not entertaining, Chandler often ate with the students. In Chandler's Trinkle Hall students took turns saying grace before the meal. The tables were set to have the meals served family style (all one could eat). 40 All students dressed for dinner, men wearing coats.41

Later President of William and Mary, but then dining hall head waiter under Chandler, Davis Y. Paschall recalls that the "food was carefully chosen and superbly prepared."42 Carefully chosen indeed - it was often planned by Chandler himself, the menu for August 23, 1926 was hand written by Chandler and sent to W.P. Cooke, the College Steward, for implementation.

Breakfast: Orange, cornflakes, chipped beef in cream, fried eggs, wheat muffins, butter, coffee.

Dinner: Hamburger steak, baked potatoes, corn sauté, stewed tomatoes, chocolate pudding, bread, butter, iced tea.

Supper: Stuffed green peppers, string beans, fried green tomatoes, sliced cucumbers, apple pie, hot rolls, butter, coffee.43

Carefully chosen as well were the dining hall waiters. Chandler used waiter jobs as financial aid as well as a reward and punishment system. He, personally, made all waiter selections and contacted each
student individually (see a form letter to students and a list of student waiters in the Appendix).

Careful is an apt term to describe Chandler's oversight of the dining hall finances as well. So concerned was Chandler that he detailed his personal assistant, Max Blitzer, to watch over and report regularly on the cost of raw food, per meal cost, and to explain deviations (see letters from Blitzer to Chandler in the Appendix).

Although a copy of the report is not available, President Chandler's files indicate that he solicited a report on the William and Mary dining operation from Mr. Ralph Blaikie, a food service specialist from New York City. The report was characterized as positive.

Some of Chandler's more progressive and innovative food service accomplishments were in the area of procurement of raw foods. In an article, published in The Alumni Gazette in March of 1934, reviewing food service at William and Mary, mention is made of purchasing staples in a group purchasing arrangement through the good offices of the state.

Several long term William and Mary employees and alumni worked as waiters in the dining hall. Among them were Y.O. Kent (affiliated with the College for forty two years, and Steward from 1932 to 1948), Davis Y. Paschall (Class of 1932 and President of William and Mary from 1960 to 1971), Vernon Nunn (Class of 1925 and Treasurer from 1929 to 1969), and J.W. Lambert (Class of 1927 and Chief Student Affairs Officer from 1935 to 1973).

All remembered, and Paschall worked at, the old College Farm. Located on sixty five acres near the current site of Phi Beta Kappa Hall, the College Farm, according to Paschall, was supervised, personally, by
Chandler. A farmer named Mason worked the farm with student help and produced so much corn, potatoes, and strawberries that Y.O. Kent recalls President Chandler ordering Mason to sell it elsewhere. Paschall recalls that the College raised cattle for meat, but he does not elaborate. This is not confirmed elsewhere.

Food was plentiful and, according to most available reports, good. Recognizing that the memories of the gentlemen interviewed are colored by nostalgia, by long years of service, and by love and loyalty to the College, they remain consistently and impressively positive.

Y.O. Kent recalled a German baker named Reinecke who worked in the College dining hall in the 1930's, and stated that "he could make the best bread, the best biscuits, the best rolls, the best deserts you ever saw." Apparently a love of the food did not extend to all of those individuals who served it. J. W. Lambert recalls a head waiter, named Red King, who was so universally detested that in 1932 he was assaulted by some students and thrown into a fish pond. No minor offense evidently, as three men were expelled following the incident. One can sense Lambert's amusement, even fifty years later and even through a typod transcript, as he recalls how President Chandler (perhaps seeing some merit in the act) subsequently reinstated the men.

Julian Alvin Carroll Chandler's presidency lasted from 1919 to his death in 1934. During this period William and Mary began to reestablish itself as a prestigious, high quality, liberal arts college. Chandler's energy and attention to all aspects of college programs and student life were in no small part responsible for this progress.
What of the collegiate way of living? What of communal dining, paternalism, and education of the whole person?

At the close of Chandler's presidency, the rules governing, and attitudes affecting student life at the College had changed very little from earlier eras. At William and Mary in the 1930's most students, and all women, were required to live in dormitories in supervised, highly regulated fashion. Cutting classes was prohibited, and a dress code was enforced. All resident students were required to dine communally and the President's word was law.

Chandler's time was a time of growth and a time of progress, but not a time of much change in the collegiate way of living. Somehow the College of William and Mary missed a sort of higher education revolution during the late nineteenth century in the United States, when colleges were becoming universities, and graduate study and research were being emphasized. The elective principle, specialization, and academic freedom were issues of the day. Colleges were being built without dormitories and dining halls, and students, even part time and older students, were commuting, and transferring between and among institutions.

William and Mary managed to avoid most of the influence of sentiment for change, and so when a post World War I reaction favoring a return to the collegiate way and the training of gentlemen appeared, William and Mary was once again in step.

The collegiate ideals at William and Mary were never seriously challenged before or during the Chandler period. The College emerged from that period stronger and healthier as a result of growth, development and change in other areas, but also with an unflagging commitment to communal living and dining, and to the education of the whole person.
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CHAPTER 5

THE COLLEGE OF WILLIAM AND MARY:

1975 – 1985
Old Notions - New Words

The most recent (1974) accreditation self-study conducted by the faculty, staff, and students at the College of William and Mary produced a comprehensive publication which makes an effort to describe the mission, goals, and objectives of the College. The self study describes the steps which were being taken to those ends, and makes recommendations on correcting deficiencies or adding enhancements to the faculty, staff, educational programs, and the physical plant. Familiar language appears in the "Statement of Purpose and Aims" (see appendix for excerpts on "Purpose and Aims" and on "Boarding") regarding education of the whole person; now termed liberal education.

Amid general language in the "Statement of Purpose and Aims" is a succinct paragraph regarding the collegiate way of life (residential living).

In its endeavor to develop individual potentialities, William and Mary pursues the goal of excellence. It concentrates its resources in compatible areas, advocates full-time, residential study in undergraduate programs that remain at a moderate size, seeks students who bring a personal initiative to their pursuits, and promotes the growth of teacher and student alike. In all programs and activities it strives to use the most promising means of teaching and learning. In all relationships it seeks a sense of community. It encourages an association of the personal and academic lives of its members and provides the opportunity for each to participate in the governance of the institution.
The prior self study (1964) was even more direct on the subject of student life when it quotes the then current (1963-64) undergraduate catalogue.

As the College is chiefly a resident college, students and faculty comprise a closely knit community in which extracurricular and social activities play a considerable role in the cultural and intellectual development of the individual. The informal relationship between teacher and student serves to encourage the process of living and learning together. The College believes that one of its major purposes should be to inculcate by means of the several phases of college life the ideals of self-responsibility and good campus citizenship.2

The College's chosen way of life for its students appears to retain much of the spirit and many elements of the original charter and statutes, and to have maintained them, with few breaks, to the present. Although the 1984 self study was not available at the time of this writing, the undergraduate catalogue for 1983-84, quoted in chapter one, speaks of the commitment to liberal education and to the education of the whole person within and without the academic process.

In an effort to test the reality behind the official documents, interviews were conducted with some key administrators serving William and Mary in the general area of student life and the extracurriculum. What follows is an attempt to paraphrase and summarize, from interview notes, the opinions, attitudes, and beliefs, regarding student life at William and Mary, of these administrators.

W. Samuel Sadler is currently Dean of Student Affairs. An alumnus (1964) of the College, Dean Sadler has been associated, except for short intervals, with the College of William and Mary for twenty five years.
He believes strongly in the benefits of residential living, dining, recreation and enculturation, and feels that four major potential accomplishments are available to young men and women while living collegiately.

First, is the opportunity to extend existing, and to develop new, social skills. Second, is the potential to learn tolerance of others through exposure to different ideas and people. Third, a protective environment encourages students to experiment and take risks with some confidence that their mistakes will not have unduly dire consequences. Fourth, is the confidence which may be built, and the poise and skills developed cumulatively from all the preceding, which better prepare men and women to enter an adult world.

Sadler speaks of the relational function performed by residential living and communal dining. The informal opportunities to exchange ideas and attitudes are seen as an extension of the classroom. Communal dining is perceived to be a prime opportunity for this type of interaction since it provides the opportunity for contact beyond a student’s immediate residential neighbors during the ritualistic sharing of nourishment, which in western society is typically perceived to be a social occasion.

Dean Sadler analyzes the evolution of the collegiate way and the continued commitment to it at the College of William and Mary as a process of movement from a notion that students required protection and nurturing, and that a college should act as parent and home (in loco parentis) to a notion which recognized greater student maturity and changing needs. This recognition resulted in a vision of living collegiately as an opportunity to enhance the curriculum and a student's
experience during college years. Rather than protecting students from corrupting influences and helping them, through supervision and discipline, to avoid temptation, colleges began to use the environment, which had been created by the collegiate tradition, to expose students to new, additional, and possibly beneficial ideas, experiences and attitudes.

Professionally trained counselor-advisors took the place of live-in masters and their historical successor, the housemother. The new objective was to be proactive, not reactive, and to assist students' growth and development in a milieu specifically designed for that purpose.3

Kenneth E. Smith, Associate Dean for Student Affairs, has responsibility for student organizations and activities, and chairs the College's food service committee. He sees communal dining, particularly in the freshman year, as a vehicle for socialization. Smith believes that bonding with classmates, and with the institution, is facilitated through common experiences beyond the residence hall. Regular opportunities to come together, ritually, in a social setting, are perceived by Smith to be an integral part of the process of adjusting to life at college, away from home and family. Smith feels that the guarantee of adequate nutrition and comfortable lodging, relieving students of the logistical demands of obtaining and maintaining same were they not provided, allows students to concentrate their energies upon academic, social, recreational, and cultural pursuits.4

Sadler and Smith both noted the oft repeated fond memories expressed by alumni of their experiences at William and Mary. Both men sense that many, if not most, of those nostalgic recollections tend to be
of the extracurriculum, dormitory or dining hall pranks, social occasions, or athletic events. The memories seem not to be of the functional purpose of the activity, lodging or dining for example, but of the relational recollection of what happened while in the environment provided just for those kinds of experiences.\

One specific recollection was the speech given by a member of the Board of Visitors at the dedication of the renovated dining facility, Trinkle Hall, which, although used in his student days, had been closed for some years. Mr. Colin R. Davis (1950), spent much of his talk in recollecting pranks, food fights, the initial meeting with his wife to be, and his years as a dining hall waiter.\

Smith and Sadler concur that the future at the College of William and Mary does not appear, to them at least, to hold the likelihood of change in an emphasis on communal living and dining. They believe that students will continue to demand higher quality and more options in living and dining, but that the essential shape of collegiate living will remain unaltered.\

As an afterthought, Mr. Sadler noted the perception of many students and their families that the selection of the right college is of primary importance to one's future. The right college is seen to maximize a student's chances of personal and professional success, not only by virtue of a good education, but through meeting the right people; providing good marriage opportunities and useful future professional contacts. The collegiate way of living is perceived by Sadler to provide an optimum setting for the development of such relationships as well as for the acquisition of knowledge and skills.
Deans Sadler and Smith are enthusiastic and persuasive in their discussion and support of collegiate residential-communal living and of its perceived benefits for those young people who, as students, are fortunate enough to spend some important formative years in that milieu. It is appropriate, however, in striving to present an objective picture, to note that both Sadler and Smith were raised in southern Virginia, are from educated families, and are products of a residential-communal collegiate living experience. Further, both are alumni of the College of William and Mary (from an era prior to much of the relaxation of traditional collegiate lifestyle restrictions and requirements) who give the appearance of having committed themselves to the service of the College and to a profession which would not exist in its present form were it not an outgrowth of the collegiate way of living generally; and specifically at the College of William and Mary.

Sincerity, firmness of conviction, enthusiasm, and even persuasive logic make Smith and Sadler excellent ambassadors for the current version of the collegiate tradition as it is practiced at the College of William and Mary today. Given their backgrounds and personal histories, it would be remarkable indeed were they of any other mind.

Professions, of every kind, strive for status and legitimacy in the public eye and, for that reason, can be occasionally self serving in their descriptions and analyses of themselves. Student affairs, as a profession, has relied heavily on the foundation provided by the tradition of residential-communal living for its reason for being. Competent, committed student affairs professionals would be unlikely to
question or challenge the value of what they help to provide for students. Those that might, in all likelihood, have left the profession.

Professional apology and critical probing aside, the College of William and Mary provides an example of the continued prominence of collegial living and dining in the lives of students, and its importance to them.
Dining - Does Anyone Notice?

One measure of the importance of the dining component of student life at William and Mary is the creation, in 1972, of an association of William and Mary alumni who worked as waiters and waitresses in the college dining hall or in local restaurants in order to contribute to the cost of their educations. The Order of the White Jacket includes many prominent alumni, including one former William and Mary president and several eminent honorary members. The Order of the White Jacket serves a public relations function for the College and raises funds for specific food service related projects and for scholarships. The group meets annually to conduct its business and to regale its membership with nostalgic anecdotes of college life during past eras, naturally with an emphasis on dining.

Consider the statement of "Objectives and Purposes" of the Order of the White Jacket; what it says about collegiate living at William and Mary and what it suggests is memorable about the experience. The objectives and purposes are:

To form a lasting fraternal link between former students who worked as waiters or waitresses at the College or in food services of Williamsburg establishments.

To emphasize and give prominence to the honor and dignity of a student performing menial work as a means of helping to finance a college education.
To serve as an instrument of usefulness to the College by providing grants and financial assistance to deserving students, including scholarships awarded on the basis of need.

To bestow awards, honors and other recognition to an alumnus, student, faculty member or member of the college staff who warrants special commendation for unusual accomplishments reflecting credit to the work ethic in obtaining an education.8

That food service is believed to be important by student life professionals seems clear. That dining halls and dining related experiences occupy a place in the memory of former students also seems clear. What, however, are the opinions of those involved in and affected by the College's dining requirements and program during the period of that involvement?

Interested and involved parties are numerous. Students, parents, administrators, alumni, faculty, Board members, members of the local community, municipal regulating authorities all have expressed repeatedly, in the form of correspondence, documents, and contracts, their intense interest in and concern for the shape and quality of the dining component of student life.

Many examples of the expressed interest of the named constituencies are included in the appendix. One thread which connects all of the documents is the importance, to the involved constituent, of food service (or some component thereof) to them personally, their activity or event.
A review of that representative, but by no means exhaustive, sample suggests a position occupied by food service and food-related events which is very close to the central mission of the institution — education of the whole person.

Food service is treated briefly and, in a superficially positive manner, in official William and Mary publications. Student newspapers, correspondence, minutes of various meetings, etc., demonstrate that the position occupied by students' dining arrangements occupy, in actuality, a larger portion of time and energy than would be suggested by the official record. The gap between official treatment and actuality comes as no surprise. As earlier chapters have indicated that the very same gap has existed, more on than off, for several centuries in Europe, England and America.

In the post World War II period, the College of William and Mary grew from an undergraduate student body of approximately twelve hundred to one in excess of four thousand by the 1980's. Much of the additional construction performed during this period was required to accommodate the lodging and dining needs of increasing numbers of students. New Residence halls were opened in 1954, 1963, 1967, 1972, and 1980. An eight hundred seat dining facility, aptly named The Commons, was opened in 1967 to supplement old Trinkle Hall which had been in constant use since 1926. By the early 1980's, the College consistently housed over eighty percent of its undergraduates, and in 1982 was feeding approximately seventy percent of that group.
The turbulent years proceeding what has been referred to as the current period (1975-1985) resulted in much discussion and examination of college ways. The collegiate way of living, seen by some as overly paternalistic and inappropriate for the age, came under criticism. Ultimately, under a new president (Dr. Thomas A. Graves), academic, social, dress, and living-dining regulations were revised during the early 1970's. The College's commitment to living collegially, however, did not waver.

A recognition of greater student maturity and a commitment to some level of student self-determination emerged. Never once questioning the value and desirability of living collegiately, the College of William and Mary Board of Visitors decided to cease requiring it of the majority of students. The line was drawn, however, at freshmen. Freshmen would continue to be required to live and dine communally for the same expressed reasons as had been provided for many generations of their predecessors.

The relaxation of the requirement to live collegially did not have significant impact on William and Mary's residential character. Student demand for space in residence halls consistently exceeded supply. The college opened six new residence halls in 1980, and leased an apartment complex in 1984 in an attempt to provide housing for all who wished it either on, or at least near, the main campus.

The capacity of the dining service also was strained. In 1977, a new, creative, aggressive food service management company, Shamrock Food Services Inc., began operating William and Mary's dining and catering
service and within five years had tripled voluntary student participation. In 1982 the College's administration feared that meal ticket sales might have to be limited or stopped.

1982 also saw a decision to renovate and reopen old Trinkle Hall (closed since 1974) as a part of a larger project to improve and enlarge the College's Campus Center. College administrators hoped that the additional facility might accommodate, not only some of the students straining the capacity of the Commons, but possibly even more voluntary boarders.

The continued high level of voluntary use of residence halls and the dramatic growth in demand for on campus dining is all the more interesting when seen in the context of local developments occurring during the same years. Williamsburg, during the 1970's, experienced much growth. Its tourist industry was healthy and industries and businesses moved into the area. Of particular significance to the College, however, was the construction of many apartment complexes and many convenient commercial dining alternatives. At a time when William and Mary students had more freedom to choose and more options to choose from than ever before, more chose communal living and dining than college facilities could comfortably accommodate.

Partly, this phenomenon is attributable to quality factors. A new administration, arriving during the early 1970's, committed itself and the College to improving the quality of student life. As mentioned, additional residential space was constructed or leased. In 1972 the College borrowed several million dollars specifically to renovate older
dormitories. The student life branch of the administration was reorganized and reoriented in its thinking to the concept of student life earlier discussed by Deans Sadler and Smith.

The critical change in dining came in 1977 when the College, after a full year of study and having determined precisely what was desired, undertook a thorough and deliberate competitive process for selecting a new professional food service management company to operate the food service program (under contract). The prior contractual relationship had endured twenty eight years, and had increasingly become unsatisfactory. The combination of professional, creative, aggressive management and the college administration's financial commitment to quality programs and facilities produced the dramatic voluntary participation discussed earlier.

The impact of the renovation and opening of Trinkle Hall, now physically incorporated into the Campus Center, has yet to be seen. It does, however, have the potential to enhance collegiate living at the College through its blending and mixing of food service with leisure pursuits, student organizations' offices, and campus events. At least at Trinkle Hall, food service may become inextricably interwoven into the fabric of daily student life much the way it must have been in earlier years when dining was provided in the dormitories themselves rather than in separate dining facilities.

The College of William and Mary's support of and commitment to collegiate living appears to have survived to the present in recognizable form. Although not universally required of its students, the tradition
appears to have an attraction for students beyond the convenient provision of functional needs. Perhaps the pendulum will swing again and students will reject, as is now their option, residence halls and communal dining. For the present, however, students appear to find in collegial living that which interests and pleases them.

In the appendix are included documents of some interest regarding the current state of food service and the management and oversight thereof at the College of William and Mary. Several years' financial statements allow tracking of the growth of dining programs through revenue and expenditure patterns. Consultant reports, committee and administrative reports, and comprehensive detailed contracts demonstrate the time and effort expended to insure the highest quality food service achievable.

Correspondence, internal and external, involving students, parents, administrators, faculty, and others show the breadth of input into the process of providing dining services for students and into the planning and implementation of catered food service at key major college events. The correspondence also suggests that food is an essential component of many of the major events and that the success of those events, or lack thereof, is in part attributable to the success of the food component of that event.

Organizationally, food service at William and Mary is overseen contractually by the Vice President for Business Affairs or his designee (currently the Director of Auxiliary Enterprises). The food service committee, with great programmatic influence, is chaired by the Associate
Dean for Student Affairs. The committee is made up of students, faculty, the food service manager, the Associate Dean, the Director of Auxiliary Enterprises, and the Chief Physician of the Student Health Center.

The shared oversight of dining services and the broad representation on the very influential food service committee is indicative of an institutional recognition of the legitimate interest of many constituencies in what is provided for the college community in the area of food services and in how well it is provided.

One reason for the time and energy expended in oversight of food service and its management is the combination of two factors. First, collegiate dining at William and Mary has become, as it has elsewhere, a highly complex, highly regulated, multi-million dollar per year business. Second, in recognition of the preceding, William and Mary has chosen to contract with food service management firms who hire and train experts in this highly specialized and dynamic service area.
Contract Management:

The nature of the relationship between William and Mary and Shamrock Food Services Inc. (contract in appendix) is one in which the contractor agrees to pay an amount for use of college facilities, based upon sales, at mutually agreed upon rates, and, under contractually specified requirements, attempts to earn a profit. The vast majority of a contractor’s expenses are in labor and in food costs. Anything short of precision in planning and efficiency in usage results either in low profit or compromises in service or food quality (while attempting to insure a profit). In its simplest characterization, the relationship consists of the contractor attempting to provide satisfactory food and service without spending any more than necessary, and the College checking carefully to make sure that all contract specifications and stipulations for food quality, variety, and service are met or exceeded.

There is a cycle in management which appears regularly in food service contract management. Often a new contractor can upgrade a college’s program significantly and hold the improvement for one or two years. The best companies are well aware that the cycle includes a programmatic flattening-out resulting from managerial complacency and exhaustion of creativity. Consequently management companies rotate managers regularly in an effort to avoid the phenomenon. The cycle occurs often enough to be predictable, but managerial changes are fraught with risk and correct timing is difficult to determine with precision.
Upper management of a contract company must weigh the merits of risking complacency and potential client unhappiness against the notion of staying with a good thing (not rocking the boat).

As a complex, specialized industry with a rapid management cycle of creativity to complacency, it is unsurprising that many colleges have opted not to operate their own dining facilities. Bluntly put, college administrators often believe that it is preferable to allow experts to do this difficult and, excepting financially, usually unrewarding job. Further, they recognize that if the management cycle produces complacency, contractual changes are easier and less painful to implement than in-house personnel changes. Additionally, as clients, colleges have the luxury of being able to be highly demanding (knowing the contract management market to be lucrative and competitive) as well as able to channel criticism away from the institution and its administration to an outside contractor when convenient.

Contract as contrasted with institutionally managed dining services has not had substantive impact on the rationale for or commitment to the collegiate way of living at William and Mary, but it may have had an unanticipated benefit. In the effort to relieve itself of a difficult controversial operation, and to have that operation managed well, William and Mary engaged the services of entities which had no tradition affecting their thinking other than that of anticipating and identifying customers needs and desires and attempting to meet them in the pursuit of profit. Perhaps the success and growth of communal dining at the College of William and Mary was achieved, in part, by people who knew nothing of
the tradition of living collegiately at William and Mary and whose successful efforts resulted from altogether different motives.

1985 finds the administration and the food service committee preparing for another process of competition among and evaluation of food service contract management firms each of whom would like to have the opportunity to operate the College's dining facilities. The Commonwealth of Virginia's 1984 procurement legislation requires a formal competitive bid process at the expiration of a service contract and so William and Mary must comply, even if disinclined to consider a change. It is also possible, however, that, notwithstanding the legislation, this effort would have been made depending on how the College perceived the cyclical management phenomenon.

William and Mary, in the 1980's, appears to have successfully reconciled its historical commitment to the collegiate tradition with the needs and desires of a current student population and with present social and economic conditions. Refinements, revisions, and perhaps even compromises have been made in the provision for students of an environment designed to minimize risk of failure and maximize opportunities for growth and healthy development, but the fundamental elements of collegiate living are still very much a part of life at the College of William and Mary. Some elements are no longer mandatory, but only encouraged. Others, such as group worship, are virtually gone. The rationale has been revised, but the tradition continues.
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CHAPTER 6

CONCLUSIONS
The Collegiate Tradition:

The Stable Factor

The history of higher education in the United States gives the appearance of uninterrupted transition. American colleges and universities have seen growth and decline, foundings and failures, reform and reaction, resistance to change and accommodation of change. The adherents of the classical curriculum fought a long hard battle against utilitarianism. The university movement with its graduate study, specialization, and the concepts of lehrfreiheit (freedom to learn) and lehrfreiheit (freedom to teach) borrowed from Germany, were controversial issues. The professoriate as a profession, academic freedom, and tenure were each thoroughly and energetically debated as they emerged as issues and evolved into accepted notions and components of the academy. Clearly, many differing ideas and opinions have existed and do exist now regarding the purposes of higher education in the United States, and how it ought to be, or not be, managed.

The collegiate way of living has been the subject of disagreement and debate throughout the history of higher education in America just as have the other components of college and university life. It has been attacked and defended with great vigor. In some cases institutions have been unbending in their administration of the collegiate tradition to the point of student revolt. Other colleges have dropped the tradition.
altogether, or were founded by people having made conscious decisions not to include residence halls, dining halls, and the other trappings of the tradition. In comparison, however, to curricular development, the emergence of academic life as a profession, specialization, research and community service motivations beyond teaching, living collegiately remains relatively less changed.

Certainly changes exist. Live-in masters and compulsory chapel are rare in the 1980's. Dress codes and highly structured social interaction are only occasionally found on college or university campuses today. The underlying concept of educating the whole person, academically, socially, and culturally, however, is still a common and often stated goal of residential institutions. Rationale for and implementation of the tradition has evolved over the years, often grudgingly, but at the root of the tradition and the key reason for its tenacity is the desire to go far beyond classroom teaching during the critical period between childhood and adulthood.

Probably the most dramatic, and one of the few substantive, changes in the collegiate tradition has been the manner in which it has been added to and expanded into what is now often referred to as the extracurriculum. In the early years of American colleges, communal living, dining, and worship were the extracurriculum.

Literary societies, clubs, Greek organizations, athletics, journalism and many other extracurricular opportunities emerged in the course of the history of higher education in the United States. Each symbolized the students' desire for, or a recognition by a college of the
need for, attention to be paid to a part of education and development
until then not addressed or provided for. Each, when included, added to
the richness of the collegiate tradition as it evolved from a protective
parental environment into one which strives to offer opportunities for
personal development and attempts to enhance the academic experience.

The College of William and Mary is representative of the evolution
of the collegiate tradition in the United States. Although perhaps
slower than some colleges to make the transition from a protectionist to
an opportunistic vision of collegial living, William and Mary followed
the pattern of programmatic growth and evolution of rationale described
above. William and Mary saw some of the earliest Greek organizations
founded on its campus. Literary societies appeared early. Phi Beta
Kappa was founded at the College. The twentieth century saw the
emergence and rapid growth of athletics, student organizations and
publications. It also saw institutional growth and a renewed commitment
to accommodate that growth within the collegiate tradition. Dining halls
and dormitories were built. Gymnasia, infirmaries, and student centers
appeared. William and Mary, like many institutions, evidenced a
recognition of the need for, and a commitment to, providing for the whole
person and the full round of life while that person was at the College.

The rationale for collegial living has changed, of course. Some of
the excerpts from current publications, and the interviews in the fifth
chapter of this paper reveal the distance between current rationale for a
collegial environment and that rationale expressed by Elliot, Sherman and
others in chapter one. Certainly excerpts such as the following from
nineteenth century William and Mary catalogues would be difficult to find
today.
In conferring ... degrees, the strictest regard shall always be had to the moral character of the candidate.\textsuperscript{1}

It is their (the faculty) duty to guard, with utmost care, habits and morals of the students by private counsel and advice.\textsuperscript{2}

The principal object...is to promote the comfort, respectability, and welfare of the students, restraining them from vice and inciting them to industry ...\textsuperscript{3}

Prayers are held daily in the College chapel, which students are required to attend. Students are also required to attend church on Sunday morning.\textsuperscript{4}

Rationale presented today would resemble only slightly those excerpts from publications and interviews referred to earlier in this paper. Included in that language would be optimistic and positive words and terms such as growth, development, enhancement, opportunity, and exploration. This kind of stated rationale, when viewed in the context of the continued adherence to the tradition, suggests that those who state the rationale award to the extracurriculum (which includes the collegiate tradition) a centrality in their vision of the higher education experience. In Robert Merton’s terms perhaps manifest function rather than systems maintenance function status has been awarded to some or all of the non-classroom components of the college environment.

Searching beyond that which was stated, for evidence which would suggest an unstated rationale for living collegiately, was a goal of this research. It would be important to know if some ulterior motive or hidden
agenda underlay the official documents and statements of rationale and commitment to the tradition.

The evidence that presented itself in the course of researching living and dining at the College of William and Mary did suggest some unstated rationale. However, its nature was not only undramatic but predictable. The only unstated rationale suggested by the evidence is that collegial living was an economically sound concept. Simply put, it was cheaper for all concerned. Also having committed resources to facilities designed to accommodate communal living and dining, the College of William and Mary, and certainly other colleges, were reluctant to consider any fundamental change in the institutional character which would obviate the reason for that commitment.

The evidence, rather than suggesting unstated rationale, actually supports the officially stated reasons for emphasizing collegial living and the extracurriculum. The formation of an alumni group (The Order of the White Jacket) to glorify the experience of working in the college dining hall, the nostalgia of a trustee in his dedication speech at the opening of a renovated dining hall and student activity center, the memories (oral and written) of students and former students of incidents and events which almost invariably were set in the dormitory or the dining hall are but a few examples of the impact of the intense and lasting nature of the experience of living collegiately.

The relationships formed during college years, which result in friendships, partnerships, or marriages affect the whole course of an individual's life. The attitudes and values acquired in the process are
often considered by those who acquired them as fundamental to all that followed. It would appear that those who wrote or spoke on the subject of the collegiate tradition of living and dining communally believed that experience to have been valuable and important in their education and development. Perhaps this perception is what has been referred to in the introduction as a social fact, but ultimately if those who experience the tradition believe in it and support it, the value of the tradition is, to them at least, real.
The dining component of the collegiate tradition is interesting in that it appears, at William and Mary and at colleges and universities generally, to be criticized and reviled by students while in attendance at college more than any other component (see appendix). With the perspective of time, however, former students appear to recall more of what Dean Sadler referred to as the relational aspect of dining. Alumni remember what happened in the dining hall beyond the mere consumption of food. The relationships among friends which were initiated and nurtured, the discussions, arguments, and pranks all are recalled more vividly than the food.

James Villas, Food and Wine Editor of Town and Country magazine, comments that

None of the fist raising, the Julia Child T.V. programs, or the heated debates about sugar and cholesterol seems to have had an iota of influence on what goes on in college cafeterias, which means, more than likely, that we can look forward to still another generation of fatsos, anemics, dyspeptics and paranoid organic food freaks.5

Villas, in his article "Triumph of the Swill", recounts an odyssey from college to college, over the eastern half of the United States in search of edible food. College food is described as "...criminal... a mockery of the notion that in recent years considerable progress has been made in overall dietary enlightenment of Americans."6 Ultimately Villas concludes that "the indigestible news from these sanctums of higher learning confirms the academic community's continued lack of concern over what the budding brains of America feed on."7
Despite Villas observations, when alumni recall their dissatisfaction with collegiate dining, it is often with humor and a sense of camaraderie with their fellows. An article in the September edition of The Brown Alumni Monthly described the "Ratty" (refectory at Brown University) as "the nearest thing to a central student center", as a place which: "plays an important role in the social atmosphere at Brown" and that "communication and social interaction take place over meals."8

"It isn't hyperbole to suggest that not one Brown student has walked through the Van Wickle Gates on graduation day without having complained about Brown's food at least once in four years ..." Food service is "the traditional whipping boy on campus, and ... food is the easiest thing to complain about."9

Although communal dining was and may still be at best tolerated and at worst detested by generations of students, it served and serves a purpose in the collegiate tradition. The dining hall provides a medium or a vehicle through which the education of the whole person may be pursued. Regular opportunities, in a social milieu, for individuals to interact and discourse with others contributes to the intellectual, as well as physical, digestion process. If education of the whole person is a part of the mission of an institution, as it is at the College of William and Mary, then dining and living and recreating communally are arguably central to that mission.

William and Mary is, of course, one institution only. It is, however, representative of early American colleges established in the British Oxbridge tradition. It remains at least somewhat representative of a significant and influential group of colleges and universities in
the United States in the 1980's. If speculation or generalization can be done at all, it can only be applied to this group of residential institutions which emphasize the extracurriculum, along with the curriculum, in an effort to provide growth and development opportunities for all facets of an individual's life during his or her college years.

Most importantly, institutions within this group appear to be resolute in their belief in the potential value of the collegiate experience when conducted in an environment designed specifically to maximize the opportunity for individual growth while minimizing the consequences of risk taking and temporary failure. From that group alone then, perhaps some generalizations can be drawn and some speculations made.

To their credit, these institutions appear to recognize that their belief is not enough, and that collegial living must be attractive and preferable to the alternatives if it is to be maintained. It is unlikely that the tradition will be maintained through required participation, and institutions which are adherents of the tradition seem to recognize that commitment of resources, good management, and student involvement are the keys to continued viability of collegial living.

Quality issues aside, institutions seem to recognize that variety and alternatives in the extracurriculum are important. Living and dining options which are flexible and different from one another are appearing at more institutions. Little is required but much is offered in the extracurriculum generally. This is an effort to induce students to voluntarily avail themselves of educational, social, and cultural opportunities.
This recognition of the needs for quality and for choices reflects the change in institutional rationale, from protective to opportunistic, for endorsing the collegiate way of living. To predict or speculate on the futures of the colleges which make up the group under consideration, one must assume a continuation of the trend to improving quality and selection in the extracurriculum. Technology and demographics will have their impact, but less in the institutions here discussed than in community colleges, non-residential universities, or special purpose institutions. The perceived benefits and advantages of the total education concept and the environment designed for it will likely continue to be attractive to those whose families or friends have experienced it and who can afford it.

The College of William and Mary and Brown University are examples of that group of institutions which have similar experience and issues in the area of student dining. Both believe in the value of communality and both strive for the best product they can generate. Brown and William and Mary are similar also in that they are representative of that older group which began as highly selective, liberal arts institutions with a long standing commitment to, and an understanding of, that which they believe may be obtained through the process of living collegiately.

Brown, William and Mary, and other institutions like them probably will not make radical changes in their extracurricular design. This prediction should not, however, be taken as a prediction with implications for higher education generally in the United States. Brown and William and Mary are members of a group of institutions that were
founded on a model (Oxbridge) which developed its traditions in an era during which a college or university education was something to which only the socio-economic elite could aspire.

In America an elite still exists in its present incarnation (elite is understood simply to mean minority), and often the progeny of that elite seek or are sent to the familiar places; places which can be trusted to perform educational and developmental tasks in a certain desired manner. Higher education in America, however, is no longer the sole property of any elite or perhaps even the masses. Americans have described their goal as universal higher education; not a privilege or an opportunity, but a right.

Most of today's college and university students are not members of any subgroup or elite. They are not being held safe and groomed to assume later the positions they were born to. These students, absolutely, are not a homogeneous group. They are old, young, and come from all ethnic backgrounds. They are poor, they are rich, and from urban and rural areas. Many are career oriented or have specific goals which they want higher education to help them achieve.

To many current college students the prospect of collegial living and a structured extracurriculum is irrelevant, and superfluous. They cannot afford it nor does it seem to offer them what they desire (unless what they wish is to become like or a part of the elite).

Colleges like William and Mary consciously have tried to broaden the mix in their student population using various marketing, admission, and financial aid mechanisms, but the great majority of students at such institutions enjoy a high degree of homogeneity among themselves. The best of that group of institutions probably will, not only survive, but
thrive in the service of that segment of American society. They have
their place and it is secure even if it is eventually to be far
overshadowed in numbers by large non-collegial multi-varied institutions
which have much different goals and objectives.

Counsel offered to college presidents might include a suggestion to
be sensitive to the need for collegiate support services to compete with
society at large. Quality is essential of course, but important also is
facility design, audio and visual sensitivity, and variety in product and
program offerings. If presidents, alumni, trustees, and parents believe
collegial living to be beneficial, colleges and universities must attract
students voluntarily to collegial living and to do so the offering must
be attractive.

Excellent students will succeed in virtually any environment,
despite obstacles. Very poor students will likely fail despite conscious
efforts by others to ease their paths. The contribution of any
institution which advocates collegial living may be in improving the
academic and social success rate in the middle or borderline group.
Perhaps if an institution commits to a quality collegial environment it
may aspire to a higher percentage of successes among that group of
students who are vulnerable or whose ability is in question. Conversely,
the absence of such a commitment might result in higher attrition and the
loss or failure of some of that borderline group.

Collegial living can be criticized as artificial. Perhaps so, but
full time intensive study is artificial as well. It may be that
intensive study is best performed in an environment designed to maximize
its benefits and the success of those who pursue it.
Recommendations

In the course of this project some areas of possible additional research have presented themselves. They fall into three categories.

Firstly, additional case studies could be useful. William and Mary may be less representative than it appears to be. Regional differences among institutions as well as urban-rural impact could be examined. Institutional affiliations, ethnic or religious, present possibilities for interesting findings.

Secondly, a need exists for more research in the area of comparing the relative impact and result of a residential/collegial experience with a commuter experience. The total education concept may gain or lose much credibility if a measure of that impact can be devised.

Finally, although difficult to separate, each component of the collegiate tradition has its own history and characteristics. Further research is merited on communal compulsory worship, Greek organizations, literary societies, athletics, and others. Treated most often as a package, these components may, in isolation, present insights into the history of college experience which are not otherwise discernible.

Less important than what is, or might be, proved or what can be argued is that which is believed. For a significant number of those who have experienced the collegiate tradition, in whatever role, there is a belief (social fact) in its value and its benefits. Survey research, using questions designed to test students and alumni attitudes and
feelings about collegial living and its component parts, could prove enlightening.

Beyond the research and the speculation stands the indisputable fact of being. The collegiate tradition has persisted in some form, for whatever reasons, for over eight hundred years through changing circumstances and populations. That is a claim that cannot be made for many of man's institutions.
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KITCHEN AND DINING HALL AT W.&M. ARE MODELS OF CLEANLINESS

W&M. ALUMNI IN N. C. MEET AT RALEIGH AND ELECT OFFICERS

W.M. Alumni in N.C. met at Raleigh and elected officers. A $500 scholarship offered at W&M for next session.

The Alumni of the College of William and Mary have decided to establish a scholarship fund for the benefit of students from that institution. The scholarship will be awarded annually to the student who makes the best record in his or her studies during the academic year. The amount of the scholarship will be determined by the Alumni Association, and it is estimated that it will range from $200 to $500 per year.

The first meeting of the Alumni Association was held on April 30th, at which time the officers were elected as follows:

President: John B. Smith
Vice-President: William H. Anderson
Secretary: Charles R. Miller
Treasurer: James O. Ruff

The Alumni Association plans to hold its first meeting on May 1st, at which time the officers will be installed and the details of the scholarship fund will be discussed.

Here and There In the History of William and Mary College

According to the information received by the Association, the College of William and Mary is the oldest institution of higher learning in the United States. It was established in 1693 and has been in continuous operation ever since.

The earliest record of the institution is a deed of land granted by Sir William Penn to the colonists of Virginia. This deed, dated November 11, 1682, was signed by Penn himself and witnessed by three other gentlemen.

The College was later moved to Williamsburg, where it has remained ever since. The first building on the campus was the library, which was completed in 1718.

The College has been the center of education in Virginia for over two hundred years, and has produced many outstanding graduates. Among these are numerous presidents of the United States, as well as many distinguished statesmen and educators.

The Alumni Association is planning to hold a reunion in the fall of this year, at which time members will be invited to return to the campus and participate in the celebration of the College's bicentennial.

Maria Digges, Housekeeper Tried by Faculty of W.M. & Mary 1775

An England Alumni Effect Organization Adopt Constitution

A constitution, prepared by Charles Duke and Philip B. Randolph, was adopted and the following officers elected: James W. Anderson, President; William H. Anderson, Vice-President; and James O. Ruff, Secretary.

The constitution of the club calls for a minimum of two meetings per year, one to be held in the fall and the other in the spring. The meetings will be held on the campus of the College of William and Mary, and will be open to all students of the institution.

The constitution also provides for the establishment of a scholarship fund, the proceeds of which will be used to support the education of deserving students.

Two Lovers and Six Student Visitors to Alleghany--Eight Complaints Against


The system established the study of a mathematician with higher education. Naturally not all students were selected for the purpose, but those who were should be preserved and that they should receive more attention in the future. A more complete system would be useful to all.

This concluding page contains several short articles concerning housekeeping and many other current topics. It is hoped that these will be of interest to you and that you will find them useful.
Extrocts from Old Faculty Minutes

August 29, 1748

Last week, in the capacity of Librarian of the Library Company of Philadelphia, I was requested by Mr. John Biddle to furnish a list of the subscribers to the Library Company. I have accordingly complied with the request, and the list is enclosed in this letter. The subscribers are arranged in alphabetical order, and the names of the towns or villages where they reside are also given. The Library Company of Philadelphia was established in 1747 by a group of prominent citizens who wished to promote the reading and study of books.

November 27, 1748

Dear Mr. Biddle,

I have received your letter of November 17th, in which you ask me to furnish a list of the subscribers to the Library Company. I have accordingly complied with your request, and the list is enclosed in this letter. The subscribers are arranged in alphabetical order, and the names of the towns or villages where they reside are also given. The Library Company of Philadelphia was established in 1747 by a group of prominent citizens who wished to promote the reading and study of books.

Sincerely yours,

John Biddle

Library Company of Philadelphia
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SIR CHRISTOPHER WYLD BUILDING

Copyright, 1926, by Field & Pond, Inc.

This building was designed and built by Sir Christopher Wyld, the architect of St. Paul's, London. Wyld died in 1812, and the building was completed in 1837. It is one of the finest examples of Gothic Revival architecture in the United States.

The building is constructed of sandstone and brick, and features a central tower with a spire, arched windows, and intricate stone carvings. The interior is equally impressive, with high ceilings, ornate woodwork, and a magnificent collection of stained glass windows.

This building was designated a National Historic Landmark in 1969, and is open to the public for tours and special events.
THE GENERAL COURT IN THE OLD CAPITOL AT WILLIAMSBURG

Mr. Justice was in the chair, and after a brief invocation, proceeded to the reading of the minutes of the preceding meeting. The minutes were then called for, read, and confirmed.

Mr. Justice then called the roll of the House, and ordered all committees to report their papers. The papers were then read, and after due consideration, were ordered to be laid on the table.

Mr. Justice then announced the order of business for the day, and the House adjourned to the usual hour.

The next meeting will be held at ten o'clock, on Monday, the first day of May, 1888.
Miscellaneous Folder

Bursar's Statement on Revenues and Expenditures for the year
"Table Expenses"

1807  $2,836.16
1808  2,165.74
1809  2,213.33
1810  2,209.03
1811  1,770.59

The above figures appear to be the total expenses associated with feeding students and masters at the College of William and Mary during the five year period described - room and board charges at that time was $100 per year/per student. That included laundry, firewood, candles, and the services of a servant.

From William and Mary catalogue's - Cost of Room and Board

1829-30 - $120 year (including fuel, room rent, candles, laundry, etc.)
1836-37 - 1845-46 - $130 year
1855 - $160
1860 - $180
1870 - $195
1874 - $195
1926 - $350
SECOND FLOOR - TRINKLE HALL PROJECTION BOOTH, AC, CRAFT STORAGE,
BASEMENT - STORAGE, PRINT SHOP.

CAMPUSS CENTER - STRONThH TELA
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Student A</td>
<td>125.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Student B</td>
<td>175.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Student C</td>
<td>215.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>J. Johnson</td>
<td>123.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>J. James</td>
<td>123.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>J. Smith</td>
<td>122.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>J. Miller</td>
<td>121.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>J. Peterson</td>
<td>120.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>J. Cooper</td>
<td>119.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>J. Taylor</td>
<td>118.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>J. Brown</td>
<td>117.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>J. Davis</td>
<td>116.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>J. West</td>
<td>115.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>J. East</td>
<td>114.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>J. Green</td>
<td>113.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>J. White</td>
<td>112.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>J. Black</td>
<td>111.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>J. Grey</td>
<td>110.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
February 1910

Boating Department

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Salaries</td>
<td>$10.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cereal</td>
<td>$1.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canned Food</td>
<td>$3.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Groceries</td>
<td>$6.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>$24.70</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Representative Commissions: $15

Carriage: $2 per month

Cabin Canvas: $2 per month

Miscellaneous

Total Expenses: $24.70
Nov. 27, 1931

My dear Dr. Chandler,

Referring to the food bills from November 7th to 14th which you passed to me for investigation, I beg to remind you that November 7th, the largest day of this period was homecoming day which included an alumni banquet, and that the following day was Sunday. I believe you will find some improvement in the week following the period under discussion. The current week will also appear favorably, but next week there will be two functions, the Phi Beta Kappa dinner and the football banquet which will send the curve upward.

I am in touch with Mr. Cook on this matter continuously and a constant effort is being made to keep the food cost figures within reasonable levels without compromising the quality of the meals in the dining hall.

In passing, it may be remarked that the food costs for this session to date compare very favorably with those of the corresponding period of last year. This is of course to be expected in view of the lower level of commodity prices obtaining this year as against last year.

Very truly yours,

Mox Blitzer
Assistant to the President
March 10, 1933

My dear Dr. Chandler,

For your information, the cost of raw food per person per day is 32¢ plus, against an average of 33¢ plus for the last semester.

Commodity prices are lower and it would appear that part of the savings are being put back into the food, which has improved considerably.

The overhead in the dining hall has been reduced in proportion to the reduction in the number of persons certified. The dining hall shows two hands less than work carried last semester. All other overhead items remain practically the same.

Sincerely yours,

[Signature]

Max Elvzer
Assistant to the President
COLLEGE OF WILLIAM AND MARY
FOUNDED IN 1693
WILLIAMSBURG, VIRGINIA
Jan. 25, 1932

My Dear Dr. Chandler;

The following is a list of all students now acting as waiters in the dining hall for this first semester:

Bell, Victor
David, Hadin
Woodward, V.
Allison, R. C.
Balkan, Harold
Barnes, C. H.
Brecken, J. C.
Browne, Morton H.
Breen, Wm. D.
Bridgers, Joe
Christensen, A.
Chalko, Wm. J.
Cifelli, Michael
Collins, Russell
Cox, A. A.
Crowl, Wm. T.
Custis, Carl B.
Davis, C. J. Jr.
Dobson, Wm. T.
Douglas, Otis
Doran, Lax. W.
Dorrill, Graham
Elliot, Norris
Engleburt, E. C.
Franklin, Gabel
Fisher, Geo. B.
Garrett, T. B.
Gill, Chas. B.
Gilly, Jas. B.
Gillis, Robt. J.
Goodrich, E. C.
Grubbs, R. L.
Harper, C. C.

Hemingway, Stan.
Henderson, Robt.
Hill, Sterling
Hillman, Earl B.
Horton, Ernest C.
Husak, Leighton
Jestor, Nelson
Johnson, Emil
Johnson, Loyd L.
Jones, Eppes
Kesy, Roger
Kuhls, William
LaCroz, Airee H.
Lankford, Hans
Lawson, Wm. S.
Leggs, Clayton
Lindsey, Nash
Little, H. M.
Little, G. R. S.
Lynn, Wallace
Litwin, Lester
McLammon, A.
Mertens, L. A.
Maxey, Clarence D.
Pazuello, Frank
Mugnet, Robt.
Palase, William
Penello, John
Phillips, Sam
Reed, John
Renn, Wm. E.
Remmawh, W. W.
Roberts, Addison
Huff, J. W.

Savage, S. B. Jr.
Shaw, Evan
Scarmon, H. K. Jr.
Sterniski, Theo. E.
Scott, Edward
Sorensen, Chris. W.
Stankus, Joe
Starkey, Chester
Stambaugh, Ralph
Suddin, Carlton
Sykes, Binford
Taverner, P. Chester
Turner, Richard J.
Tuck, T. K.
Trow, Walter G.
Upson, Irving
Upson, Reginald
Waffle, Ferris
Wells, William
White, Carter
Whitehead, Frank
Williams, Ashby
Wilson, Lynwood
Yakovonis, W. E.
Belanger, Fergus
Shade, Chas. B.
Thompson, H. E.
Savage, William
Casey, Frank
Talton, W. C.
Marks, T. D.

Also I would like to state that I do not care to recommend Evan Shaw and John Reed for waiters for the second semester.

Yours very truly,

W. P. Cooke
In reply to your request for work at the College of William and Mary for the session 1931-32, I have considered what it is possible for me to offer you in the way of work. I am able to appoint you as waiter in the College dining hall for the session 1931-32, with the understanding that if your scholastic work is not satisfactory at the end of the first semester I will not continue you as a waiter for the second semester, and with the further understanding that if during the semester it appears that your work in the dining hall is interfering with your studies, I shall ask that you give up your work as waiter.

This work will require three hours of your time a day, for which you will be paid $20.00 per month for the calendar month. You will work directly under Mr. W. F. Cooke, the College Steward, and if at any time your services are not satisfactory to Mr. Cooke, he has the authority to ask you to give up the work.

You accept the position with the understanding that any time lost by you in serving in the dining hall will be deducted from your salary, and that you will also pay for any breakage of dishes, etc., by you. Neither can you leave the College at any time, holidays or otherwise, until you make arrangements with Mr. Cooke.

If you accept this position under the terms outlined above, you must be at the College on Monday, September 7, and report to Mr. Cooke by 12:00 o'clock, noon.

I am asking that you let me have your acceptance by Saturday, August 15, 1931. If I do not hear from you by this time, I shall assume that you are not expecting to enter College in September, and shall appoint someone in your place. If you are really planning to enter College in September and have not reserved your room, you should do so at once.

If on account of circumstances it will become necessary to change you to some other work than that of waiter in the dining hall, we reserve the right to make the change.

Assuring you that I am glad to help you, and hoping that the session 1931-32 at the College of William and Mary is going to be a happy and profitable one for you, I am

Sincerely yours,

J. A. C. Chandler,
President
Annual dues ($12.00 Regular Membership; $3.00 Student Associate Membership) entitles members to receive an OWJ patch for Helper membership certificate, the News Letter and ballots for election of Board of Directors. Complete and mail to: Jane S. Kelly, P.O. Box 120, Williamsburg, VA 23187.

Compile a membership form:

Colin R. Davis, President
Deborah S. Dalton, 1st VP
J. Coleman Anthony, 2nd VP
Owen L. Bradford, 3rd VP
James S. Kelly, Sec.-Treas.

Order of the White Jacket, Inc.
Established Oct. 12, 1972
IN THE SERVICE OF THE College of William and Mary
BACKGROUND OF THE ORDER

For more than 200 years (1893 to 1911), students ate their meals at their place of residence in town, in faculty homes or in the refectory of the College located in the Wren Building. Service was always by Black servants, to which students from affluent families were accustomed.

Post-Civil War days, marked by impoverishment of the South, brought changes in the student body. Most of whom were of modest circumstances or even poor. When the College re-opened in 1888, times and customs were changing. Work became both a necessary and honorable way. In 1911, Dr. Lyon G. Tyler, the president, and his faculty decided upon an experiment, allowing students to serve meals in the refectories or even work in the kitchen and wash dishes in return for room and board.

Four young men readily agreed to the offer. Two of them, Arthur W. James ’12 and Dr. Charles H. Hamilton ’14, are still living and recall their experiences with pride.

The refectory of dining halls continued in operation with the student waiter system until 1943 when shortage of manpower and the economic situation forced conversion to a cafeteria system which still employed male students but also opened jobs to women.

An interesting sidelight is that an expanding athletic program in the 1920’s was made possible by giving “scholarships” to athletes. A “scholarship,” was a job in the dining hall!

OUR FIRST DECADE

There has always been an affinity between students and alumni who worked their way through college. One of these, the late Yelverton O. Kent, ’28, remained at the College after graduation, was four years manager of the dining hall and food service, serving later as manager of the Book Store.

Kent long cherished an idea of bringing former waiters into a fraternal organization, being a close friend of three members of the Class of 1927: Arthur A. Matus, Dr. Lee B. Todd and M. Carl Andrews, who by frequent correspondence decided to act. Andrews agreed to undertake the organizational work in 1971 following his retirement as a newspaper editor. Voluminous correspondence together with assistance from the Alumni Gazette led to formation of a temporary board and interim officers, headed by Kent.

Sixty-eight men gathered in the Student Center on October 12, 1972 to launch The Order of the White Jacket. Andrews was elected president but the following three years with Dwight C. Brown ’32 as secretary treasurer for the next four years. Successors presidents have been Dr. Todd, 1976-1977, Walter J. Zable, ’77, 1978-79, Allen C. Tanner, ’80, 1979-81 and Howard M. Smith, ’84, 1981-84.

Andrew C. Christiansen, ’44, served as secretary treasurer from 1977 to 1980. The post is now held by James N. King, ’51, assistant to the President of the College.

In order to avoid becoming a “Last Man” club OWE expanded its eligibility in 1978 to include men who worked as waiters in food establishments of Williamsburg, its fraternity and sorority houses and as substitute waiters. A year later women were admitted, the first being Deborah S. Dalton, ’72, who became first woman board member and then a vice president.

OBJECTIVES AND PURPOSES

• To form a lasting fraternal link between former students who worked as waiters or waitresses at the College or its food services of Williamsburg establishments.
• To emphasize and give prominence to the honor and dignity of a student performing menial work as a means of helping to finance a college education.
• To serve as an instrument of usefulness to the College by providing grants and financial assistance to deserving students, including scholarships awarded on the basis of need.
• To bestow awards, honors and other recognition to an alumni, student, faculty member or member of the College staff who warrants special commendation for unusual accomplishments reflecting credit to the work effort in obtaining an education.

OUR PROJECTS

• The Order of the White Jacket is incorporated under the laws of the Commonwealth of Virginia. It is recognized as an eleemosynary organization by the U. S. Internal Revenue Service so that contributions are tax deductible (IRC section 501 (c)(3)).
• First large project was the raising in excess of $15,000 to refurbish and decorate the Tavern Rooms of Alumni House as OWJ headquarters.
• Each year a number of scholarships are awarded to deserving students engaged in food service, upon recommendation of the College.
• Periodic awards are made to members of the College community whose outstanding services frequently are overlooked.

WHO ARE ELIGIBLE?

• Any former student waiter, man or woman, who has worked at least one semester in the College dining hall, cafeteria or in food dispensing establishments of the Williamsburg area.
• Senior student waiters are recommended by those in charge of food services in the College or town.
• Any faculty or staff member who performed service waiter or related work in food establishments at another college or university.

The Order of the White Jacket welcomes support from other universities or colleges relating to establishment of OWJ chapters. Direct requests to the Secretary.
Interdepartmental Communication

From: LCR (Associate Provost)
To: TAG (President)

Subject: Parents' Weekend

I would like to share with you the observations made by freshman parents at the panel I chaired on October 8. About 175 people were there. As I have often said, there is no way of predicting what kinds of things they will be concerned about. One year it was self-determination, one year it was the condition of the dorms. I try to have people on the panel who can deal with whatever comes up, so Linda D'Orso, Jack Edwards and Amy Jarmon were there. This year's primary concerns were two. One was about the large size of freshman classes and the inavailability of English 101 for some students. Why do we have so many small upper division courses and such packed lower ones? Some rather unfortunate examples were used. Another part of this was the difficulty of scheduling classes for freshmen who entered registration in the last groups. Since I was at registration at the very end, I know there were quite a few students who had serious problems with their schedules, including some of my own advisees. This is not news, of course, but it was brought up in several forms. I think people felt they got answers, so to speak, even if they didn't agree. The really hot item was the food. The discussion derailed on this topic and it was difficult to move them back to something else. Amy is on the Food Service Committee and gave some excellent answers, but the basic answer is that the food is, on the whole, not so good. (I refrained from saying that if Shamrock can't get anything decent to the Board of Visitors why should they treat the students any differently?) After the meeting several parents came up to me to say they were sorry the discussion had taken that turn, and one nice man said that his ex-wife was such a terrible cook that his daughter wouldn't even notice if the food was terrible.

Quite a few comments were made about the positive experience freshmen were having. Orientation was praised. On the whole I gather that it was a very successful Parents' Weekend and a good deal of helpful information was exchanged on both sides.

I am sorry this memo has been so long in being written but I know I don't need to tell you what has gone on in my office these last few weeks.

Linda
Dear Dr. Graves:

My daughter, Linda, is a Freshman at William & Mary and lives in Barrett Hall. Although it is not necessary in Linda's case, I understand why you have the requirement for the 20-meal plan for food service. I am glad that her meals are available at such reasonable costs.

However, when the college forces me to pay for 20 meals per week, I expect my daughter to be able to eat all 20 meals. Such is not the case. She tells me that about half of the meals are one or more of the following: 1) overcooked, 2) not seasoned, 3) unpalatable, 4) tasted of extenders, or 5) cold. Some things are prepared well such as roast beef, chicken, and the salads except when the lettuce is wilted or has the occasional bug in it.

Linda is not a "fussy" eater. Our children have been taught to eat what is served and she will eat anything that is edible. Over the years (due to my travels) we have eaten a lot of "dormitory food" so she is well acquainted with food other than Mom's. She has gotten sick twice on some sort of casserole that was served. I have asked other students about the food and have received similar answers.

We have sent several packages of fresh fruit and vegetables from the garden to help supplement what she can't eat from food service. This is over and above the usual "Mom's Care Packages" and it has been in excess of $100 cost to us. This is an extra expense which we don't need.

I have been in contact with Dean Sadler about the problem and he has been very helpful and agreed to look into it. My problem is that I have to pay next semester's fees before he will have time to resolve the problem. Since Linda is only able to eat about 10 meals per week, that is the meal plan I will purchase. I know it is more expensive on a per meal basis but the total cost is less and that is what I am forced to work with. I cannot afford to subsidize the food service when they provide an inferior quality product. I am sorry to have to do this because I would prefer that Linda be on the 20 meal plan. However, I must consider her health and well being and what we can afford.

Thanks for your time.

Sincerely,

Paul L. Ruszler, Ph.D.

cc: Dean Sadler
    Treasurer - Auditor Office
To whom it may concern:

I recently asked Shamrock Food Services to cash in my 15 meal plan card and was told that I must first talk to the Treasurer's office. In turn, the treasurer's office directed me to your office to receive "permission" to obtain a refund since it is now past a certain date set for refunds. I'm at a loss as to why I must justify my intentions in regards to my money and meals. I realize that Shamrock must gauge its food supply etc., but why then when I had several of my friends call and ask if they could still buy meals plans did Shamrock say, "yes"?

To be perfectly frank the reason I wish to receive a refund is because I am utterly disgusted with the food thrown at me each day by Shamrock. Not only is the food unpalatable but the amount of time needed to even get into the cafeteria has become absurd. I have eaten out or cooked food of a much higher quality for less money per meal than Shamrock offers and it actually takes less time. Has anyone in the administration seen the ridiculous lines forming at the cafeteria? A totally inefficient system is being utilized which wastes incredible amounts of time. Until recently I was unable to get to the store frequently, but now since an upper class friend of mine brought down his car I have the opportunity to buy and eat some quality food.

I am a 19 year old sophomore and I believe that this college should take a long hard look at the food service it is providing. For a college which strives for excellence everywhere else, I find it disheartening that you allow the food and food service to be of such an inferior quality. I have been to several other schools where the system used and food is much better. I realize that it is not easy to please so many people and the restaurant business is not an easy one by nature, but if Shamrock can not do the job, why pretend?

Being on a varsity sport and being pre-med I do not have the time to waste standing in lines for my meals. I might also add that I can directly attribute stomach cramps etc. (!) to
the food served me at the cafe. If the administration would simply ask students, you would find that I am far from alone in my disgust with the food service here at school. I hope that you will not only approve my request for a refund (or at least allow an exchange for punchcards and a partial refund) but you will also do something to rectify the situation at the cafeteria.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Thomas Caffrey

11/14/83 - WSS called him on November 7 and told him could not approve request.
Mr. Thomas Graves, Jr.
President
The College of William and Mary
Williamsburg, Va. 23185

Dear President Graves:

Last spring, my son, Kay, and I visited your campus. We had breakfast at the William and Mary cafeteria. To my shock and distress I found the food unpalatable. No, no, not just mediocre--unpalatable. I tried every single thing that was offered, hoping that something would be tasty enough to eat. The scrambled eggs were awful, the sweet roll terrible, the toasted cheese worse than soggy. I was distressed. My son consoled me saying that it didn't matter.

Now he is a freshman and it does matter. He, and most of his classmates, are very unhappy. He said that food is so bad that not only he, but several others felt nauseated after eating it and got sick in the stomach. He ends up eating a bagel for breakfast. A BAGEL FOR BREAKFAST? Is that a nutritious meal for a young, strong man with a hefty appetite? Had I not tasted your food, I would have laughed it off as the normal reaction of a college student. Had Kay been a finicky eater, I would have said: "What's new?" But Kay isn't. I never had any problem with him eating even things that he didn't like. So his complaint has to be taken seriously and not shrugged off.

Is it too much to ask that the school provide food that is palatable? I am not requesting gourmet food. But when food is offered, it should at least be good enough to eat. The fact that it is prepared in large quantities is no excuse. If the people you are employing now do not know how to cook, then fire them. If the people who supervise the cooks are not doing their job, replace them; or train them properly.

I feel quite indignant that, after paying a hefty price for room and board, my son still has to spend money to buy food on the side because the cafeteria food is so bad. I do hope you will take steps immediately to correct the problem. Campus dining is very important when you are studying.
should be a pleasurable experience—something that the students look forward to as a pleasant break from their studies.

I love William and Mary. I love its campus, its academics, its spirit, its rigorous, demanding standards. My son is proud and very happy to be a freshman at the college. But let’s not forget that while as an institution of higher learning you do have to feed the mind, you also have a responsibility to feed the body. And, in this respect, William and Mary is failing miserably.

Hoping to hear from you soon.

Sincerely,

Rosina L. Kulisch

Rosina L. Kulisch

cc: Mrs. Mia Gardiner, Co-Chairman, Parents Association

P.S. I have just been informed that there are flies where the food is served. My son was served a piece of meat on which a fly had been sitting. As you know, flies are carriers of germs and are considered among the filthiest animals. Please see that the food is prepared and served under more sanitary conditions. Thank you.
To: Mr. Robert B. Bernhard  

From: Thomas A. Graves, Jr.  
President  

Subject:  

Dear Bob:

I believe that it is important that you and your colleagues at Shamrock take steps to remind yourselves that it is essential that Shamrock carry out its duties at various functions in a timely and efficient manner. With the intense activities of Commencement almost upon us, it is important that a better job be done than was evident in the last several days.

Here are three cases in point:

On Friday, April 23, the committees of the Board of Visitors at the Alumni House started their work at 8:30 a.m. Coffee and other arrangements were only just starting to be set up at that time and it was an absolute shambles until 9:00 a.m.

Also on Friday, the Shamrock trucks were all over the place in the back of the Wren Building getting ready to start setting up the Great Hall of the Wren Building for the Beta Gamma Sigma dinner while the reception prior to the dinner had a full view of it from the portico of the Wren Building.

On Monday, April 19, the reception at the House for the Lamplighters was badly marred again by very late and annoying set-ups by Shamrock.

I find this lack of attention to instructions and to appropriate timing unacceptable. I personally believe that this is a matter of supervision or the lack thereof.

Thomas A. Graves, Jr.  
President

TAG:sw

cc: Mr. William J. Carter  
Mr. David H. Charlton  
Mr. James S. Kelly  
Miss Jane Dansard  
Mr. John Rubb
April 29, 1982

Dr. Thomas A. Graves, Jr., President
College of William and Mary
Ewell Hall
Campus

Dear Dr. Graves:

Thank you for your memorandum of April 28 concerning recent catering services.

I assure you that I have noted the problem of timing at these several events, and that the policy of having events ready at least 30 minutes before guests arrive has been reinforced with my staff.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Robert Bernhard
Director of Food Service

cc: Mr. William J. Carter
Mr. David H. Charlton
Mr. James S. Kelly
Miss Jane Densard
Mr. John Robb

RECEIVED
COLLEGE OF WILLIAM AND MARY
MAY 3, 1982
DIRECTOR OF AUXILIARY ENTERPRISES
To: Mr. Robert Bernhard

From: Thomas A. Graves, Jr.
President

Subject:

Dear Bob:

When I wrote you on April 28, I was not aware of the disaster of the public relations event for the Virginia Shakespeare Festival, and I have now seen Jackie Von Ofenheim's memorandum of April 29 to David Charlton.

I repeat that this kind of performance is unacceptable.

I am asking Bill Carter and David Charlton to take strong steps to insure that service is improved.

TAG: ma
cc: Mr. William J. Carter
Mr. David C. Charlton
Mrs. Jacqueline Von Ofenheim
REVENUES:
- Board Fees - Student: $2,742,665.61
- Shamrock System: 130,081.03
- Duplicate Meal Tickets: 546.00
- Other: 100.00

**TOTAL REVENUES:** $2,873,392.64

EXPENDITURES:

**Personal Services:**
- Allocation of Administrative Costs:
  - Salaries: 49,827.33
  - Wages: 1,378.63
  - Fringe Benefits: 8,514.93

**Contractual Services:**
- Equipment Repair and Maintenance: 5,890.00
- Extermination Control: 1,680.19
- Food Service Contracts: 2,537,915.40
- Mechanical Repair and Maintenance: 1,576.00
- Organization Membership: 175.00
- Printing: 567.00
- Recoveries: 5,000.00
- Skilled Services: 60,198.93
- Telecommunications: 259.20
- Travel - Personal Vehicle: 27.00
- Travel - Subsistence and Lodging: 199.71

**Supplies:**
- Building Repair and Maintenance: 236.00
- Food: 14,634.64
- Mechanical Maintenance: 28.70

**Continuous Charges:**
- Allocation of Physical Plant Costs: 57,434.76
- Electrical Services: 121,212.82
- Water and Sewage: 39,123.66

**Equipment:**
- Draperies and Carpet: 6,563.67
- Household: 7,214.26

**NET INCOME (LOSS):** $ (6,995.91)
**Statement of Revenues and Expenditures - Food Service**

For Year Ended June 30, 1962

**Revenues:**
- Board Fees - Student: $2,570,805.95
- Shamrock System: 152,151.12
- Duplicate Meal Tickets: 648.00
- General Auxiliary Enterprise Fee: 58,744.02

**Total Revenues:** 2,782,349.09

**Expenditures:**

**Personal Services:**
- Salaries: 46,173.02
- Wages: 1,766.81

**Contractual Services:**
- General Repairs: 10,255.00
- Maintenance Service Contracts: 4,823.28
- Food Service Contracts: 2,442,694.18
- Electrical: 96,233.53
- Water and Sewage: 17,181.12
- Travel - Mileage: 211.60
- Printing: 504.65
- Allocation of Physical Plant Cost: 51,332.62
- Other: 59,766.92

**Supplies:**
- Food: 14,621.79
- Food Service: 1,314.69
- Housekeeping: 247.00
- Building Materials: 515.65
- Purchases for Resale: 28,739.29
- Other: 174.80

**Equipment:**
- Draperies and Carpets: 1,409.09
- Household: 5,652.57
- Other: 23,593.21

**Current Charges and Obligations:**
- Rental of Equipment - Students: 1,100.86

**Staff Benefits:**
- F.I.C.A.: 2,819.89
- Employer Retirement Contribution: 1,939.53
- Group Insurance: 122.81
- Employee Health Care Insurance: 1,531.76

**Total Expenditures:** 2,782,349.09

**Net Income:**

$0
STATEMENT OF REVENUES AND EXPENDITURES - FOOD SERVICE

For Year Ended June 30, 1981

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>REVENUES:</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Board Fees - Student</td>
<td>$2,435,893.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shamrock System</td>
<td>142,070.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duplicate Meal Tickets</td>
<td>846.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Debt Fee</td>
<td>49,174.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL REVENUES</strong></td>
<td><strong>2,628,084.41</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EXPENDITURES:</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Contractual Services:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Repairs</td>
<td>1,799.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintenance Service Contracts</td>
<td>5,297.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food Service Contracts</td>
<td>2,318,451.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electrical</td>
<td>111,909.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water and Sewage</td>
<td>16,824.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Travel (mileage)</td>
<td>148.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Printing</td>
<td>406.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allocation of Physical Plant Cost</td>
<td>40,619.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>58,892.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL EXPENDITURES</strong></td>
<td><strong>2,554,349.87</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Supplies:</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Food Service Supplies</td>
<td>1,087.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building Materials</td>
<td>2,926.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>355.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL EXPENDITURES</strong></td>
<td><strong>4,369.20</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Equipment:</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Household</td>
<td>8,886.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>36,887.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL EXPENDITURES</strong></td>
<td><strong>45,773.69</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ST INCOME:</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>APPROPRIATION:</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Renewal and Replacement Fund</td>
<td>(23,591.65)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>APPROPRIATED BALANCE</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$ -0-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# Statement of Revenues and Expenditures - Food Service

For Year Ended June 30, 1980

## Revenues:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Board Fees - Student</td>
<td>$2,096,520.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shamrock System</td>
<td>$125,556.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duplicate Meal Tickets</td>
<td>$757.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Debt Fee</td>
<td>$47,601.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Auxiliary Enterprise Fee</td>
<td>$162,748.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Revenues</strong></td>
<td><strong>$2,433,184.70</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Expenditures:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Contractual Services:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Repairs</td>
<td>$3,044.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintenance Service Contracts</td>
<td>$5,253.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food Service Contracts</td>
<td>$2,000,737.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Service (other)</td>
<td>$4,738.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Media</td>
<td>$78.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electrical</td>
<td>$104,990.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water and Sewage</td>
<td>$13,912.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Travel (mileage)</td>
<td>$46.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Printing</td>
<td>$357.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allocation of Physical Plant Cost</td>
<td>$35,180.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Contractual Services</strong></td>
<td><strong>$2,216,402.40</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supplies:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food</td>
<td>$1,952.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food Service Supplies</td>
<td>$151.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linen</td>
<td>$450.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building Materials</td>
<td>$2,330.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Supplies</strong></td>
<td><strong>$4,864.03</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equipment:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Draperies and Carpets</td>
<td>$1,143.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Household</td>
<td>$580.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Books</td>
<td>$16.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Equipment</strong></td>
<td><strong>$18,589.86</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current Charges and Obligations:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest and Principal Payments on Bonds</td>
<td>$49,390.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Service Charge</td>
<td>$789.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Current Charges and Obligations</strong></td>
<td><strong>$50,179.41</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Expenditures</strong></td>
<td><strong>$2,290,055.70</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Net Income

$143,129.00

## Less Appropriation:

Renewal and Replacement Fund

$(143,129.00)

## Unappropriated Balance

$0
# Statement of Revenues and Expenditures - Food Service

For Year Ended June 30, 1979

## Revenues:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Board Fees - Students</td>
<td>$1,826,009.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shamrock System</td>
<td>118,585.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duplicate Meal Tickets</td>
<td>622.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Debt Fee</td>
<td>57,931.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Auxiliary Enterprise Fee</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Revenues</strong></td>
<td>$2,111,287.17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Expenditures:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Contractual Services:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Repairs</td>
<td>17,418.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintenance Service Contracts</td>
<td>4,381.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food Service Contracts</td>
<td>1,748,695.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electrical</td>
<td>47,838.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water and Sewage</td>
<td>11,195.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freight</td>
<td>34.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allocation of ADP Service Cost</td>
<td>54.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allocation of Physical Plant Cost</td>
<td>25,155.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>73,895.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Contractual Services</strong></td>
<td>1,928,669.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supplies:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food</td>
<td>(241.61)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food Service Supplies</td>
<td>2,434.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housekeeping and Maintenance</td>
<td>184.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building Materials</td>
<td>595.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electronic</td>
<td>260.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>733.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Supplies</strong></td>
<td>3,966.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equipment:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Draperies and Carpets</td>
<td>11,539.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Household</td>
<td>19,800.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>5,581.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Equipment</strong></td>
<td>36,921.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current Charges and Obligations:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest and Principal Payments on Bonds</td>
<td>50,930.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Service Charge</td>
<td>789.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Current Charges and Obligations</strong></td>
<td>51,719.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Expenditures</strong></td>
<td>$2,021,277.08</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Net Income

90,010.09

## Less Appropriation:

Renewal and Replacement Fund

(90,010.09)

## Unappropriated Balance

$0
The College of William and Mary in Virginia

Statement of Revenues and Expenditures - Food Service

For Year Ended June 30, 1978

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>REVENUES:</th>
<th>$</th>
<th>EXPENDITURES:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Board Fees - Students</td>
<td>$1,466,466.00</td>
<td>Contractual Services:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shamrock System</td>
<td>90,914.90</td>
<td>General Repairs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duplicate Meal Tickets</td>
<td>222.00</td>
<td>Maintenance Service Contracts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Debt Fee</td>
<td>57,430.02</td>
<td>Food Service Contracts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Auxiliary Enterprise Fee</td>
<td>32,361.00</td>
<td>Professional Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL REVENUES</td>
<td>$1,647,393.92</td>
<td>Utilities</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EXPENDITURES:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Contractual Services:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Repairs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintenance Service Contracts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food Service Contracts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Travel - Mileage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freight</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highway and Bridge Repairs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Printing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allocation of Physical Plant Cost</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL EXPENDITURES</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Supplies:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Food</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housekeeping and Maintenance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landscape Materials</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supplies:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equipment:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Household</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equipment:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current Charges and Obligations:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dues and Subscriptions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest and Principal Payments on Bonds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Service Charge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL EXPENDITURES</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| NET LOSS | (21,134.09) |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PLUS APPROPRIATION:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>From Renewal and Replacement Fund</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| UNAPPROPRIATED BALANCE | $0 |
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February 12, 1982

Miss Jane Dansard
Shamrock Food Services
The Commons

Dear Jane:

Charter Day Weekend, with President's Day, Chancellors Hall Dedication, President's Council Dinner, the Convocation, and the attendant receptions and luncheons, all together make the sort of big event that definitely requires a team effort to make everything work. That weekend everything worked exceedingly well, due to the dedicated and conscientious efforts of a great many people, yourself included.

Among the many things you did, your efforts to ensure that the President's Day lunch, the President's Council Dinner, and the Honorary Degree Recipients' Luncheon went as smoothly as they did, contributed greatly to creating a very pleasant setting for our many guests, and left them with a most favorable impression of the College.

I would like to thank you, for myself, and on behalf of the Board of Visitors and the entire College family, for having done such an excellent job. We are glad you are part of our team, here at William and Mary.

Sincerely,

Thomas Skipper, Jr.
President
To:  Mr. Dan Look, Shamrock Systems  

From:  Chairman, Commencement  

Subject:  Commencement 1982  

Dan:  

Thank you for a job well-done! The events Shamrock catered for the Commencement Committee were all done professionally and tastefully. I cannot imagine how you and the staff of Shamrock here at William and Mary could have been any more helpful or could have provided any better service. The arrangements I requested were all provided and were all done extremely well. Your ability to handle the larger crowds than we had anticipated, your willingness to help us out of a tight spot with the dance, all contributed to the great success of the weekend. You and your staff made it look very easy indeed but I know how much effort went into both the production and the presentation of the food you served for us on four separate occasions. Please pass on my deepest appreciation to Marty, Jane, and all the others who contributed to the success of the 1982 Commencement activities.

cc: Jim Armstrong  
David Charlton  

Samuel Sadler  

RECEIVED  
WILLIAM & MARY  
2-1-1982  
DIRECTOR OF AUXILIARY ENTERPRISES
Dear Bob,

On behalf of the Wellness Committee and personally, I'd like to thank you for all of the time, energy, and support you and Shamrock gave to the "Week of Wellness". The week of activities was a huge success and we feel very rewarded for our efforts. Many people gave so generously of their time which proved instrumental to our success. We are indebted to them all.

We were so very thrilled by all of the active involvement on the part of Shamrock. The nutritional information on the tables, the availability of a dietician during meals, the "Wellness Buffet", calorie counts, special vegetarian subs and blender juice at the Wig, all contributed in large measure to our program. The Commons and the Wig are a wonderful way to reach a large number of students. One week cannot do justice to such an all encompassing concept but we feel as though we have been successful in raising student, staff, and community awareness to the importance of the collective "wellness" of the body, mind, and spirit. We can only hope that this immediate impact will have a more far reaching effect and contribute to the development of a better lifestyle.

If you would like to share your feelings about the various activities which Shamrock planned and implemented, your evaluation would be valued by our committee as we prepare for next year. Your input would be greatly appreciated.

Again, thank you for all of your assistance and support. I look forward to working with you in the future.

Sincerely and in good health,

Sue Pleasants
"Wellness Committee"

Office of Residence Hall Life
Telephone: (804) 253-4314
253-4319
The College of William & Mary
Interdepartmental Communication

To: Mr. Robert Bernhard
Shamrock System

From: Dean of Students

Subject: Proposed Soul Night - January 27, 1982

Bob:

Friday afternoon, I talked with both Carroll Hardy and Beth Young (President of the BSO) about the concern they have shared with you over the proposed Soul Night at the Commons on January 27th. I understand from them that you have agreed not to play any form of special music, have staff members dressed in any special attire, or present any other form of display. Their understanding is that the meal will now simply feature traditionally Southern food and I know they feel somewhat relieved.

On the other hand, from my conversation with them, I know that there is still an underlying concern about the entire matter. They expressed to me their appreciation for your meeting with them and certainly in no way feel that you or your staff intended to propose a function which would be inappropriate. On the other hand, they continue to feel that events such as Soul Night perpetuate a stereotype of the taste and interest of Black people. As you know, Bob, it is impossible to generalize about what Black people like to eat, what kind of music they enjoy hearing, or what their interests are yet our society continues to perpetuate images of them. An event like Soul Night, therefore, is seen as reflecting an insensitivity to their basic longing to be viewed as individual human beings, no different from any of the rest of us and each holding their own preferences, interests, and particularities.

While I know that Soul Night was well-intentioned, frankly I would hope that we would not sponsor such an event again in the future. It would be one thing to focus on Southern or "homestyle" cooking and I know that Black students would in no way oppose such an evening. If for some reason you and your staff felt that you did want to sponsor some special event that might relate to Black culture, I would urge you to first contact Carroll and the Black Students Organization in order to seek their response and their full participation in the planning.

I will try to call you this week to see if there is any further way that I might be of help as you implement the evening you have planned on the 27th and plan for the future. Knowing you as well as I do, Bob, I know how sensitive you are to these matters and I have reassured Carroll Hardy and the students both about what I know your intentions were in this matter and the level of understanding you will have of their concerns in these matters.

Thank you for meeting with them and discussing the issue so openly.

W. Samuel Sadler

cc: Alaud Charlie
NUTRITIONAL GUIDELINES TO PROMOTE WELLNESS

1. Little or no added salt

2. Minimal fat intake. (Vegetable oil better than animal fat). Two tablespoons of fat daily is adequate for nutritional needs.

3. Minimal or no refined sugar, white flour, refined cereals.

4. Use abundant natural, complex carbohydrate: whole grain cereals and bread, potatoes, legumes.

5. Eat no manufactured, pre-prepared food. Eat no artificial food substitutes. Eat no chemical additives.

6. Do not overcook fruits and vegetables. Eat raw when appropriate.

7. De-emphasize red meat. Substitute poultry, seafood or high protein vegetables, nuts and seeds, and/or dairy products.

8. Increase fiber: bran, wheat germ, raw fruits and vegetables, whole grain cereals and breads, legumes, nuts and seeds.

RECOMMENDED DAILY INTAKE:

Complex carbohydrate—60% of daily calories
High protein foods—30% of daily calories
Fats and oils—10% of daily calories

This means for a 2,000 calorie diet, one should eat 1,200 calories from items 4 and 8 above, 6 to 8 ounces of meat or appropriate high protein substitute to total 600 calories and two tablespoons of butter, oil or salad dressing.
The listed Contractors have expressed an interest in providing food service management to William and Mary.

ARA FOOD SERVICES CO.
7122 Forest Hill Ave.
Richmond, Va. 23225

CINI-GRUSSOM ASSOC. INC.
11325 Seven Locks Rd.
Potomac, Md. 20854

ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH ASSOC.
6806 Chippawa Dr.
Baltimore, Md. 21209

EPICURE MGMT. SVC.S, INC.
P.O. Drawer 631-CSS
Rock Hill, S.C. 29730

GOURMET SVCS., INC.
10 Marietta Tower #3618
Atlanta, Ga. 30303

MARRIOTT CORP.
Marriott Drive
Washington, D.C. 20058

MORRISON'S MGMT. SVC.S., INC.
430 Wellington Dr.
Charlottesville, Va. 22901

R.D. PRODUCTS, INC.
Victor, N.Y. 14564

SAGA CORP.
7112 Darlington Dr.
Baltimore, Md. 21234

ALADDIN FOOD MGMT.SERVICES
21 Armory Dr.
Wheeling, W.Va. 26003

AMERICAN FOOD MGMT.
P.O. Box 160
Marshall, Mo. 65340

CLEAVES FOOD SVC. CORP.
6405 Ramsey Ave.
Silver spring, Md. 20910

CUSTOM MGMT. CORP.
844 Market St.
Kingston, Pa. 18704

DAKA
5 Lakeside Office Pk.
Wakefield, Mass. 01880

HALLMARK MGMT. CORP.
2375 E. Main St.
Columbus, Ohio 43209

MACKE CO.
3302 Croft St.
Norfolk, Va. 23513

SERVOMATIC CORP.
803 Glenaigles Ctr.
Baltimore, Md. 21204

THERAPEUTIC DIETARY SYSTEMS
6 Curtiss Parkway
Miami Springs, Fla. 33166
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From: David C. Healy
To: Food Service Committee Members
Subject: Food Service

As a preliminary guideline you probably can eliminate the following firms from future consideration for the reasons noted:

1. Mark IV - Their financial corporate information indicates that they are in questionable financial condition. Furthermore, our account would represent a 20% increase in sales. I am not sure if they could adjust given their financial constraints.

2. Saga - Besides their poor meeting with us, and the lack of professionalism in the report, there are some contract specifications with which the College simply would not comply. (Prepayment, $144,000 credit line, etc.)

3. Macke - The two references I contacted were not very laudatory of the firm. Spokesman for both Case Western Reserve, and Mansfield State indicated considerable dissatisfaction.

Further notes:

1. Of the references I have contacted to date, Marriott, Custom, and Servomation receive high marks. I've been unable, at this point, to contact Shamrock references. The spokesman for Lake Forest College (Szabo contract) indicated they had good local managers, adequate food, bad merchandising, and poor corporate support (Sound familiar?).

2. Servomotion's Plan II seems preferable on first review to Plan I. Further, they are allowing higher yields on some sales than the specs detailed.

3. ARA/Slater's price quotes are subject to certain assumptions they know are perhaps faulty (payment of inherited personnel), and the quotes are, therefore, subject to further negotiation. They anticipate, however, no more than a 20% increase, if any, for the final quote.

4. I think, after preliminary review, that the fee system should be avoided. It puts too much constraint on the College, particularly during a high inflation period.

5. Shamrock's quote does not apparently include cost of trash removal and extermination service. These costs were designated as attributable to the contractor in our "specs".

More Later!

DCII/pao
**COLLEGE OF WILLIAM AND MARY**

**INTERDEPARTMENTAL COMMUNICATION**

*From:* David G. Healy

*To:* Food Service Committee Members

*Subject:* Food Service Company References

Below please find various quotes from each of the references I contacted by phone regarding the various food companies in which we are interested:

### I. Company: SERVOMATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>College</th>
<th>Contact</th>
<th>Number of Boarders</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. East Carolina University</td>
<td>Mr. Wainwright, Business Manager</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>Some shortcomings - particularly in sanitation (although they maintain a N.C. &quot;A&quot; rating) Good corporate back-up Good attention to merchandising Willing to invest and contribute far more than the contract requires Good quality food</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Gettysburg College</td>
<td>Mr. Hoffman, Business Director</td>
<td>900</td>
<td>Have had Servomation for 25 years - rebid every 4 years - but never seen any reason to change Good quality food and menu Catering very good Corporate back-up - particularly last two years - very good Very good food Overall: &quot;Quite satisfactory&quot;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### II. Company: SHAMROCK

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>College</th>
<th>Contact</th>
<th>Number of Boarders</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. Xavier University</td>
<td>Mr. Stratmiller, Business Manager</td>
<td>900</td>
<td>Very satisfactory Catering - outstanding Good Managers Corporate support is very good Very reliable and &quot;personable&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Bluffton College</td>
<td>Mr. Amstutz, Business Manager</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>&quot;Couldn't be much better&quot; Use a lot of students Great corporate support Good managers Food: very high quality</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
III. Company: ARA/Slater

A. College: Wake Forest
   Contact: Mr. Holder, Controller
   Number of Boarders: 1300 - all optional
   Comments: With Wake Forest for 10 years
   Very pleased - no reason to change
   Good corporate back-up
   Very acceptable to suggested change
   Catering is well done
   Overall: "Much more than adequate"

B. College: Richmond University
   Contact: Feamster, Director of Student Services
   Number of Boarders: 1650
   Comments: Outstanding
   "A" rating
   Took over a real "mess" and established an
   outstanding food service
   Food is excellent
   Catering is excellent
   Sanitation - Improving but still needs improvement

IV. Company: Szabo

A. College: Lake Forest College
   Contact: Mr. Carlus, Business Manager
   Number of Boarders: Approximately 800
   Comments: Used for 3 years
   Ups and downs with service
   Managers are cop notchin
   Lack of imaginative corporate support - have had
   to pressure for better merchandising - no response
   Food is adequate

B. College: Concordia College
   Contact: Earl Brewer, Business Manager
   Number of Boarders: 440 (all required)
   Comments: Outstanding local manager - who has been very
   co-operative
   Good food
   Merchandising problems - food committee meets
   weekly to "push" Szabo on some matters, but local
   manager is very responsible
   Good catering - but not much demand
   Will continue contract
   Overall: "More than adequate"
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V. Company: MARRIOTT

A. College: George Washington
   Contact: Mr. Catherwood, Business Manager
   Number of Boarders: 1000 +
   Comments: Very pleased - board usage increased 10%
   "Real flair to service"
   Catering - very high quality
   Work well with students
   Innovative merchandising - particularly cash operations
   Good corporate back up
   Management present on the floor all the time

B. College: Gallaudet College
   Contact: Mr. Paul Name
   Number of Boarders: 1000
   Comments: Very good local manager
   A good contractor - see no reason to change
   Better than most corporate support
   Some problems at one time with sanitation
   Good catering
   Overall: "More than adequate"

VI: Company: CUSTOM

A. College: Marshall University
   Contact: Mr. Morris, Student Director
   Number of Boarders: 2000
   Comments: Well pleased, would like to retain (State of W. Va.
   wants them to rebid - they don't want to)
   Had ARA prior to that - dramatic improvement
   Central offices respond well
   Extremely good with their employees

B. College: Bridgewater State
   Contact: Mr. Chiccarrell: Director of Administration
   Number of Boarders: 1400
   Comments: "Very good ... on the ball ... no complaints"
   "Fantastic" corporate back-up
   Sanitation level is very high
   Good managers
   Small size of firm does present some problems - but
   nothing major
   Overall: "Much more than adequate"
VII. Company: MACKE

A. College: Case Western Reserve
   Contact: Mr. Bettendorf
   Number of Boarders: 1000 +
   Comments:
   - Big turnover in managers
   - Less-than-adequate corporate support
   - Dimishing services
   - Good merchandising

NOTE: Case Western is reviewing its food services and will drop Macke. They had visited more than twenty colleges in their search for a new contractor - and had considered Szabo until they visited W & H. They considered our operation a "disaster", "worst they'd ever seen", "bad food", etc., etc. They dropped Szabo from any consideration.

B. College: Mansfield State
   Contact: Mr. Kelchum, Dean of Students
   Number of Boarders: 1000 +
   Comments:
   - Poor management
   - Insensitivity
   - Generally dissatisfied
Subject: Food Services

I would like to provide for the Committee's benefit some background information on our food services. This information should be beneficial to our task of analyzing the food program.

I. Food Service Contractors

There are essentially five food service operations available on campus (not including the various fraternity and sorority food programs which are private functions): the Commons dining hall; the Wigwam cafeteria and snack bar; the Hoi Polloi pub; the vending service, and the catering and banquet service. All of these operations are performed by outside contractors (with the exception of the Hoi Polloi which is a cooperative venture between the Student Association and Crotty/Szabo).

All of the services, with the exception of the vending program, are contracted to the Crotty/Szabo Corporation which is headquartered in Boston with regional offices in Winston-Salem. The vending service is contracted to Ogden Food Services which has regional offices in Norfolk. Crotty/Szabo (Szabo corporation recently acquired Crotty) had held the dining contract since the late 1940s. Ogden has held the vending contract since July 1, 1976.

The Crotty/Szabo and Ogden contracts are attached for your confidential review. My particular feeling is that these contracts, particularly Crotty/Szabo's, are rather broad and unspecific in nature. To a certain degree such contracts have to be general, but the lack of specificity in the Crotty/Szabo contract has lead to problems of uncertainty as to responsibility and control between the two parties. On our own accord, and also at the advice of our food service consultant, we have insisted on greater detail in the contract. The results, however, have been less than desirable. It was, for example, only this year that the College was provided food quality purchasing standards by Crotty/Szabo, and we still lack a complete menu rotation schedule as part of the contract. A problem that must be addressed, therefore, regardless of the contractor, is the need for an improved contract agreement.

The financial arrangements of the contracts are rather straightforward. In the vending contract, Ogden Food Services returns to us the indicated percentages of sales receipts. Similarly, as noted, Crotty pays the College 6% of the sales for all functions except the Wigwam and Hoi Polloi where 4% of the sales is returned. Both firms keep their records subject to our inspection.
II. Food Service Fees

Board fees are essentially proposed by Crotty/Szabo corporation which presents the proposed fees to the College for agreement. The College and Crotty/Szabo then negotiate over any differences, and, once settled, a contract is signed. This contract indicates the amount the College will pay Crotty/Szabo for each boarding student. (Boarding students pay the fees to the College which in turn pays Crotty.) In addition, the College adds in its fee to the students a charge to cover the College's overhead, funded depreciation, equipment purchase, and equipment repair costs. For 1976-77, these rates are per semester:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Payment to</th>
<th>Charges to</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Crotty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 Meal Plan</td>
<td>$370</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 Meal Plan</td>
<td>$296</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Meal Plan</td>
<td>$216</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There are, for the current semester: 1403 persons contracting the 21 meal plan; 324 persons with the 15 meal plan; and 90 with the 10 meal (Total: 1817). During the fall semester of 1975-76 there were: 1395 under the 21 meal plan; 346 with the 15; and 46 with the 10 (Total: 1787).

The board fees for William and Mary when compared to other institutions tend to be high:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>20-21 Meal Plan Fee per Year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>William and Mary</td>
<td>$766</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Longwood</td>
<td>$630</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Madison</td>
<td>$568</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VPI</td>
<td>$690 (1975-76)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ODU</td>
<td>$650</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary Washington</td>
<td>$762</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hampden-Sydney</td>
<td>$700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNC - Greensboro</td>
<td>$590</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VMI</td>
<td>$780</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The purported reason, according to Crotty/Szabo, for the high fees at William and Mary is that because we do not feed that many students, Crotty/Szabo cannot benefit from economies of scale. Given the range of fees noted above, however, from essentially peer institutions, we should investigate this rationale.

III. Facilities and Operations

The basic agreement between Crotty/Szabo and the College regarding facility use is that the College provides the facilities, furnishings, equipment, and the repair thereof, to Crotty/Szabo. In return, Crotty/Szabo operates and maintains the facilities, furnishings, and equipment. This implies, for example, that although Crotty/Szabo operates and maintains (cleans, etc.) the kitchen equipment, the
equipment is owned and repaired by the College. As is often the case with outside contracts, this type of contract agreement can lead to problems over responsibility and accountability regarding use, loss, damage, and quality levels for maintenance.

As for the type of facilities, furnishings, and equipment presently provided by the College, there is no question that some are less than adequate. We have begun to correct this situation. For example, in the past year at College expense: the Commons has been painted; curtains have been provided for the Commons; additional serving equipment has been provided; and the Ho! Pollo! floor has been refinished. In addition, the College has commitments to provide new chairs and some new tables for the Commons (due in December or January), and provide utilities and space for a new trash compacter to be leased by Crotty. Further, there are plans or proposals for remodeling the Wig Breezeway, as well as refurbishing the Wigwam. Long range needs include new dishwashing and cooking equipment for the Commons.

Needless to say, such improvements require considerable sums of money. Given the self-supporting requirement of the food services as an auxiliary enterprise, and the relatively small amount of funds that can be generated, the needed improvements unfortunately will take considerable time. The approximate cost for the new chairs and tables, as an example, is $28,000.

As for the operation and maintenance of the facilities by Crotty/Szabo, some problems do exist. As we are all aware, for example, Crotty/Szabo can “lay-out” the facility as it sees fit. (This responsibility has lead to the "medieval-maze" traffic flow of the Commons and the Wigwam).

In addition, Crotty/Szabo is responsible for maintenance and cleaning standards. In my opinion, they have consistently been below standard. Our facilities are periodically subject to state health inspections, and we have consistently received demerits for a variety of reasons. State codes, however, are only minimum standards, and it is my feeling that we must continue to urge even more strongly for improved standards.

Crotty/Szabo did agree about one year ago to increased standards, and they agreed to provide their own inspection reports to my office. To this date, we have received only one. Inspection has become a requisite by my office.

IV. Specific Concerns

In addition to the general information provided above, there are some brief, specific points of information on the food services which are perhaps best enumerated for your benefit:

1. Crotty/Szabo holds exclusive rights to operation of the banqueting services on campus. This service, as well as the Commons operation, are, reportedly, their best profit centers. The Wigwam is, for Crotty, a loss operation.
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2. Although the contract stipulates the College should be consulted on price changes and food selection; our advice has not been ardently sought. At the same time, incremental price changes have not been so major as to warrant major action on our part.

3. A report on the food services was prepared by a professional consultant approximately one-and-a-half years ago. That report is on file in my office for your confidential review. Its major concern, as is mine, is a need for specificity in the contract.

4. Financially, for the College, operation of the food service program has been a marginal endeavor. During the 1975-76 year, the operation did not break even.

5. The estimated maximum capacity of the Commons is 2200 boarders. There are no sufficient funds available to expand the facility.

6. The reporting mechanism between the College and Crotty/Szabo is primarily between the Food Services Director, and my office. At the same time, there is frequent contact between Mr. Carter and myself, and the regional vice president, Mr. Plante, and regional supervisor, Mr. McGowan, for Crotty/Szabo. Mr. O'Doherty reports to Mr. McGowan.

7. If the committee wishes to consider another contractor, the College is not confronted with a lack of supply. We are badgered constantly by salespersons for other contractors.

8. The vending operation, although still going through an implementation shake-down, presents no major managerial problems for the College.

9. The vending "profits" are used by the students for various educational programs.

10. The alcohol serving license is held by Crotty/Szabo, not the College.

V. Conclusion

Our goal and task is to seek methods and means of improving our food services both in the short run, in terms of improved day-to-day services, and the long run, in terms of improved contractual agreements and facility management. I trust this preliminary report has provided you at least some sufficient background data with which better to address the task. Much of this information can be, by its format, only briefly descriptive. But, I am more than willing to provide any amplification of the information you may desire.

DGH/pao
CC: Mr. William J. Carter, Vice President for Business Affairs
Mrs. Carolyn Moseley  
Associate Dean of Students  
William and Mary College  
Williamsburg, Virginia  23185

Dear Mrs. Moseley:

I enjoyed meeting with you and your Committee. Thank you for your welcome and hospitality. I regret that my visit was during the period of finals when students were not as available to talk as otherwise and when some operations were closed. I would like an opportunity at some time in the future to meet with the students on your Dining Hall Advisory Committee.

I will minimize my observations since we have already discussed them and they are generally self-apparent, and I will use them in support of recommendations where appropriate. From eating in the Dining Hall and talking to students, I judge the quality, presentation, and merchandising of the food to be average. The helpfulness and cheerfulness of the regular employees was slightly below average and almost no student employees were in evidence. The Food Service Director, Mr. O'Doherty, obviously works hard and does a splendid job of public relations. This is an essential and important part of the management function of any food service operation, but of course should not be allowed to outweigh serious disadvantages in quality or presentation of food.

The Dining Hall is essentially a good, efficient design but has been allowed to run down in decor and equipment over the years. I will divide my recommendations into four groups. The first group of recommendations should be accomplished regardless of the style of management adopted at William and Mary.

I. General Recommendations

A. Ongoing Consulting Assistance

Many colleges retain or employ on a periodic basis professional food service management consultants who evaluate their food services, make recommendations for change, and assist top management in implementing these changes. An
ongoing consultant can become familiar with the particular problems of a college and food service and yet offer an outside perspective and bring professional knowledge to the task of advising. There are individuals and firms that make their living exclusively from this area of endeavor; for example, Ted Minor, retired Food Service Director from Duke University or John Amacker, former Assistant Food Service Director at the University of Virginia.

B. My second recommendation is that William and Mary join the National Association of College and University Food Services.

This Association is made up primarily of colleges and universities who operate their own food service, but membership is available to all schools that are interested in improving their food service. Members are assisted by receiving publications and professional journals, attending seminars, and periodic regional and national conferences. I have found that members of this Association have given unselfishly in time and expertise to fellow members to help them solve problems in food service.

C. Necessary Equipment Changes

The most urgent equipment needs are for changes that would allow your food service to take advantage of a concept that is about 20 years old but has come into widespread use in the last ten years; that is, the use of convenience foods. Convenience foods is a term that can be applied to any food that is close to the condition in which it is served. For example, 20 years ago many large food services made their own mayonnaise. Now, it is unheard of and food services universally buy mayonnaise and other such products. Recently this concept has been applied to every area of food service with available frozen entrees (main dishes) available from reputable manufacturers. To improve the general quality of food served in the William and Mary Dining Hall, only convenience foods from these manufacturers should be purchased. These convenience foods are in general of superior quality and consistency when presented to the student. They are certainly superior to foods prepared in the average kitchen from scratch of which William and Mary is fairly typical.

The second and overriding reason to equip for this style of service is that it can drastically lower labor costs. This is particularly important in the Williamsburg area because it can lower the necessary skill levels of Cooks and Bakers; therefore, both eliminating the high cost of these skilled employees and the competition with Colonial Williamsburg for these employees. With convenience foods, increased percentages of lower paid employees and student employees can be used in food service operations.
Two changes are essential before convenience foods can be used to a large enough extent at William and Mary to effect operations. One is the construction of a large freezer. One of 500 to 1000 square feet would be required. Possible locations in the basement of the Dining Hall for this freezer are the areas labeled in the original blueprint as dry storeroom, employee cafeteria and future dry storeroom. The best location depends on underfloor plumbing and drain lines in each of these locations. The best functional location is that labeled the dry storeroom on the original blueprints.

The second necessary change to effectively use convenience foods is the installation of adequate ovens. Convection ovens are recommended, since they provide maximum heating space per floor space occupied. Presently, there is one rotating oven capable of accepting seven 18" x 26" baking pans. This would accommodate hopefully 14 12" x 20" pans of convenience food. The original blueprints of the kitchen show a 7-pan rotating oven and a space beside it for a future rotating oven which has never been purchased. Eight convection ovens could be easily fitted into this space providing cooking facilities for 80 pans of convenience foods.

Another obvious need is that of a new dishwashing system. After studying it, I would not recommend a change in location of the dishwashers, but a more modern machine of the Adamation type as we have at Madison College. Because of your layout you could take full advantage of conveyor movement of trays, the operation could be much quieter, save considerable labor, and yield tremendous amounts of space in the present dishwasher area for the storage area of clean dishes, silverware, and trays.

Next in priority, I would consider replacing some of the compartmented steamers with high pressure steamers which are capable of cooking frozen vegetables very quickly in small batches and yielding a better product than the present steamers. I would also recommend the adoption of tilting braising pans replacing the flat top ranges or located elsewhere in the kitchen. Further equipment recommendations would need more detailed study as well as careful study of menus. Mr. O'Doherty has promised me copies of a cycle of menus, but I have not yet received them.

D. Changes in Decor

Some changes in the environment of the customer would be helpful to help him enjoy his dining experience. As soon as possible carpeting should be considered for the dining area. One factor that contributes to noise is not only the design of the chairs, but the fact that the floor seems abrasive due to sand carried in on the feet of students who have walked over
the long sandy approaches to the Dining Hall. If these walks could be replaced with permanent material, such as bricks or concrete, and shortcuts are prevented by appropriate shrubbery, this would be helpful in maintaining a better surface in the Dining Hall and reducing noise if carpet cannot immediately be installed. Also important psychologically to any diner, even though it may be subconscious in its effect, are the dishes, glassware, and silver with which and on which food is served. An immediate change to china is recommended. China is more sanitary, can be more easily cleaned and dried, and certainly would enhance the presentation of food. Plastic glasses should not be tolerated, particularly in such small sizes. I noted that students were taking 3, 4, or 5 of these small glasses, whereas a larger glass might be given to the student on the cafeteria line which he could refill from beverage stations in the dining room. If extra makeshift cafeteria lines cannot be eliminated, I would suggest that they be made attractive by the purchase of permanent mobile equipment that is design coordinated to blend with the surroundings and other pieces of equipment. I feel, however, that these extra serving lines could be eliminated. At Madison we have fed in excess of 4,600 students through four lines. Typical choices are preplated and placed under heat lamps during rush hours. All possible food stuffs that a student selects himself are dispersed mostly into the dining room areas with a salad bar, beverage station, and milk station being completely away from the serving lines. If these steps could be followed at William and Mary, two lines should be more than adequate for the numbers served. Of course, consideration should be given to extended serving hours when considering these changes.

E. I recommend that the College accept a stabilization of the Dining Hall population at or near its current level.

With a seating of 504 for a population of 1,800 compared to 1,390 for a population of 4,500, the capacities of the dining hall at William and Mary in terms of seats per customer have been stretched beyond that of Madison College. Quick calculation reveals approximately three and one-half uses for each seat, which is really stretching capacities to the maximum. The basic preparation space is adequate to support a much larger population but limitations in kitchen space and dining space preclude expanding the population base. Doing so, would require very expensive building programs which I presume are beyond the available resources of the College at the present time.
F. Control System

I recommend that the College investigate the adoption of an electronic control system such as Validine or Identical. Control devices could be placed at the ends of passageways just before the student enters the dining hall. These control devices could speed up the movement of the lines as well as yield control data to the food service and to the College. Another benefit of these systems is the availability of optional meal plans such as any 12 out of 21 meals with electronic devices automatically keeping track of meals eaten. Even if the present manual checking system in makeshift extra lines is retained, the checking station should be moved to the end of the hall. Then, students may move directly into the dining area after being checked and make their choice of the style of service or line.

G. Reduced Emphasis on Catering

I recommend that Catering activities be de-emphasized if judged practical and political in the William and Mary environment. There is a possibility that Catering activities distract management from their essential tasks of feeding students. There is also a possibility that highly skilled cooks and bakers are being maintained to provide for the few occasions during the year when their level of achievement is needed for catering functions. Perhaps the college should allow caterers from the community to provide services in college buildings on occasion and should consider employing caterers or restaurants from Colonial Williamsburg for part of their catering service. I presume this would improve community relations as well as removing the necessity of food service maintaining a group of highly skilled expensive cooks and bakers to support this area of endeavor.

As a long range plan, I recommend that consideration be given to building or renovating an existing building for a combination restaurant with meeting rooms in the same building for in-house catering. There are many interior design firms specializing in the design of public spaces that can serve very well for a luncheon trade and as a student gathering place in the evenings in the same room. Meeting rooms adjacent to the kitchen of this combination facility would allow small group college catering to be done on a routine basis with much higher efficiency than at present and without disrupting essential contract student feeding. Examples of the types of events that might be held in these rooms would be sorority meetings, faculty-student dinner meetings, Board of Visitors or Directors meetings, and other events of this type.
II. Provision of Meals For Athletes

I recommend that since the area where meals are provided for the training table for athletes is makeshift and could well be used as basic production space that athletes be served in the Main Dining Hall. It has long been recognized by nutritionists and is beginning to be recognized by coaches that high protein intake is not essential to athletic endeavors. More than necessary protein is available in the average college diet. High carbohydrate is now recommended and is readily available from the regular menu. Pre-game meals could still be provided since these are usually not during regular hours of service and would not conflict with other dining hall use. Since the quality of athletic meals has been universally praised, I recommend that it be adopted as the standard for meals provided to all food service customers and the necessary adjustments in board rates be made if necessary.

I. Student Labor

As a last recommendation, I urge the increased use of student labor. Student laborers can be valuable in that they are intelligent, easily trained, and responsive to management. They can work when needed and are not on the payroll during vacation and summer periods. At Madison College, with a beginning wage rate of $1.90 per hour, over 50% of our production man hours are supplied by students. I believe this contributes substantially to our overall efficiency.

II. Recommendations for Specific Short Term Options

A. College-Operated Food Service

I believe it is desirable for the college to move into the area of self-operated food service as soon as practical. Of course, the overriding reason for this change is financial. The present catering company is deriving an income of at least 4% and up to 9% of the gross revenue. With a self-operated food service, all of this money would stay on campus for improved equipment, reduction in the board rate, improved food, or profits to be diverted some other area where needed on campus. Self-operation would also eliminate the possibility of rebates paid by suppliers to somecontract dining companies which are paid to central offices and not recognized in the profit and loss accounting procedure presented to the College. Any rebates would be paid directly to the college or taken as reduced costs on food items purchased. Independent operation allows the college to select a manager who wants to work in this particular field and in the local area. He can give
undivided loyalty to the college and expect to serve for an extended period of time if this service is satisfactory. For example, I think an independent college employed food manager would have recognized deficiencies in the William and Mary Dining Hall long ago and brought these to the attention of management where they would have been corrected since all college management can work as a team under the self-operated concept. A good college employed manager could benefit the college by running concessions operations and vending operations at no additional cost to the college.

The timing of this move should be as follows: completion of all necessary planning at once. Beginning in the second semester of the 1976-77 school year, purchase of equipment necessary to support a convenience food concept, a freezer, and convection ovens. These would best be installed in the Summer of 1977. Approximately January 1, 1978, application should be made to the State Personnel Department to establish the necessary positions to operate food service. At this time a budget should be developed and charges for board established. As soon as the position is established, a director of food service should be selected and employed.

I recommend retention of the present company for an additional year, since the disruption caused by employing a new company could seriously reduce the quality of the food and service offered. I would, however, renegotiate the contract as outlined in Section C.

B. Operation by a Director as a Single Account Catering Company.

I recommend that if college management feels they cannot at the present time make necessary changes in equipment and philosophy to operate food service that rather than employing an established contract company, the college recruit a food service director. This individual could then operate the food service as an independent company. This would effect substantial savings over the cost of employing a major food service company. An administrative fee could be paid to the individual which would be less than half of that presently paid and still compensate him very adequately. Employing an individual would give the college better control since this would be his only account, and if he was satisfactory a long period of service could be guaranteed. Large food service contracting firms routinely move their good managers and directors on about a three year basis. This prevents the development of divided loyalty between the company and the college.
Completely open and honest accounting could be established. The college with assistance from a continued consultant and NACUFS could establish board rates that would be as low as possible but preclude the possibility of losing money. I would recommend that to maximize incentive for an optimum profitability level of 5%, a bonus be paid of 20% of the fourth, fifth, and sixth percentage points of profit after all expenses are paid. I would in addition as incentive to improve the quality of food and service recommend paying a bonus of 2% of the revenues from all voluntary contracts. These two bonus plans would give the individual who operated this company a tangible financial reward for achieving a reasonable profit goal for the college and inspire him to improve the quality of the dining service to attract more voluntary customers.

C. Management by Major Catering Company

If for some reason the College feels it is essential to select an established food service contractor, I recommend the following parameters be established. One, that the firm pay the true expenses of operating the building. The present rate of 6% seems rather low. Many restaurants who operate in rented premises pay 12 1/2% of their revenue for the space, equipment, and utilities. A contracting firm should pay for equipment in the following manner. A capital inventory should be established listing each piece of equipment with its original price, date of acquisition, and expected life. Sources exist; for example, the Internal Revenue Service where lives have been assigned to most types of equipment. Annually, this equipment should be depreciated with the depreciated value serving as a basis for fire insurance. The amount of depreciation should be included in each year's budget as an operating expense. The food service company should be, with approval of the College, allowed to spend up to this amount for new equipment which would then belong to the College. The College could make additional purchases of equipment with the operating firm sharing in the expense through this depreciation formula.

All maintenance performed for food service should be charged on an hourly basis. This would provide an incentive for the contractor to maintain equipment in good operating condition through a preventative maintenance program and generally better treatment. If the firm felt that it was more economical to employ full time mechanics to perform this maintenance, it would be their option. With the increased cost of electricity, natural gas, coal, and oil used to generate steam, it is reasonable that meters should be installed to
measure the use of these utilities in the contracting firm charged accordingly. Naturally, charges should be made for services provided such as garbage collection, police protection, and grounds care should be charged on a pro-rated cost basis.

These recommendations would naturally hold true for an individual company operated as outlined above. A negotiated contract with the existing or new major contracting firm should provide for open and complete accounting. All wage rates should be continuously provided to the college with changes on a monthly basis. Payrolls showing hours worked should be provided monthly. A report of the number of meals served should be rendered weekly. A monthly report should be made to the College, giving a breakdown of raw food costs, revenue, labor costs, and supply costs with division at least into the areas of dining hall, student center, food service, pub, and catering.

As an incentive to optimize the profit level at 5%, I would recommend profit sharing with a firm in the following manner. Of the first percentage of profit, 20% to the company and 80% to the college. Of the second percentage of profit, 40% to the firm and 60% to the College. Of the third percentage, 60% to the firm and 40% to the College. Of the fourth percentage, 80% to the firm and 20% to the College. Of the fifth percentage, 100% to the firm. Of the Sixth percentage, 80% to the firm and 20% to the College. Of the seventh percentage, 60% to the firm and 40% to the College. Of the eighth percentage, 40% to the firm and 60% to the College. Of the ninth percentage, 20% to the firm and 80% to the College. Of the tenth and all above, 100% to the College.

Contractual assurances should be insisted upon by which no rebates would be paid to the contracting firm by suppliers, even to the extent of providing for substantial cash penalties in lieu of damages, if this occurs.

In conclusion, I hope these thoughts will be helpful to you. I am available if you wish further visits, additional information, or advice. I am available as a paid consultant to your architects, if they desire my services in equipment layout and specification writing.

Thank you for the opportunity to visit your Campus. I remain,

Yours truly,

ROBERT D. CRIFFIN
Food Service Director
June 8, 1977

Mr. Kenneth E. Smith, Jr.
Associate Dean of Students
for Activities and Organizations
Campus Center
College of William and Mary
Williamsburg, Virginia 23185

Dear Ken:

Hallelujah! The final decision has been reached and SHAMROCK has been awarded the contract for the College's food service for the coming year. You will be pleased to know that the selection was virtually unanimous, making the anticipated improvement even easier to achieve.

Along with this letter, I am including several enclosures for your information so that, whether or not you participated in the food company interviews and the concluding deliberations of the Committee, you may be updated on the completion of our assigned task.

And now, I wish to thank you wholeheartedly for your work -- effort, time, interest -- and your concern -- cooperation, faithfulness, congeniality -- as a member of the Food Service Liaison Committee this year. We were charged with a difficult undertaking, and the group tackled it with determination, patience, and dedication. I can assure you that, in my experience on committees here, your diligence has been unmatched and your commitment unexcelled. I am grateful to you for your service and for your contribution to the achievement of the purpose and goal of the Committee. Congratulations on a job exceptionally well done!

Most cordially yours,

Carolyn Moseley
Associate Dean of Students

CM:sp

Enclosures
It appears that the decision to accept the recommendation of the Food Service Committee to award the new contract to Shamrock System of Atlanta, Georgia, has been received very well by most everyone concerned. As you know, the decision was very difficult, given the quality of the alternatives available. I think all of us are firmly convinced that this decision will bring new quality to our food service program and to overall student living conditions at the College. Certainly this is a primary goal for the joint efforts of the offices of Business Affairs and Student Affairs.

In view of the major preparation work for the decision, a large part of the credit for this decision must be given to you and your committee. I am sure that none of us realized the enormity of the task when the committee was formed as an advisory body to this office more than a year ago. The sincere resolve of yourself and the members of the committee in totally addressing your responsibility has been outstanding, and you have made the final decision far easier and less controversial. Based on travel and time invested to see firsthand the food services at comparable colleges and to study the reports of the three consultants, I have placed the utmost confidence in the recommendation of the committee.

Now, we must concern ourselves with implementing the decision. This summer will find much of David Healy’s and my time centered on assuring a successful transition to the new program. I hope that you and several members of the committee will be available for advice during this transition. As you know, one of the most important decisions to be made now is the appointment of a Food Service Director. David Healy and I plan to seek the advice of the committee, as we consult with the management of Shamrock, who must make the final decision. We are also planning for the committee to continue to serve as the chief advisory body on a continuing basis for the food service program.

Thank you and each member of the committee for the extraordinary job you have done. I have never witnessed a more dedicated or responsible committee and I know this opinion is shared by many members of the College Community. I hope you will feel free to share this memo in thanking the members of your committee.

Carolyn, I also want to thank you personally for your work as Chairman. I, like so many others, am very sorry to see you leave William and Mary. Your impressive work in chairing this committee has been a good example but is only one of the many lasting contributions you have made to the student living conditions at the College.
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cc: President Thomas A. Graves, Jr.
    Dean W. Samuel Sadler
    Dean James C. Livingston
    Mr. David G. Healy
Mr. James F. Armstrong, President
Shamrock System
3375 Northeast Expressway, Suite 169
Atlanta, GA 30341

Dear Jim:

As we discussed in our telephone conversation, I am pleased to inform you that the College's food service contract will be awarded to Shamrock System, effective no later than August 21, 1977. As you are aware, we have arrived at this decision after long and careful consideration by many members of the College community. Although the decision has been difficult, your firm was the virtually unanimous choice of those consulted.

We are naturally pleased to award this contract to Shamrock, but I am sure you share with us some concern as to the challenges confronting both the College and your firm in providing a new food service program. We are confident of your organization's ability to meet the program needs we have entrusted with you. We realize that the new program will require considerable and immediate effort for both parties, and we stand ready to assist you in every way.

Immediate concerns are, of course, the final terms of the contract, the selection of the director, and the implementation of the transition program. As you know, David Healy is your organization's primary contact on these matters, and I am sure that representatives of your firm and he will begin work almost immediately. I am available, of course, to meet with you at any time, and I would suggest a meeting here in the near future to ensure full agreement and the most effective communication in planning for the immediate future. We are not asking that Phil O'Doherty receive any preferential treatment in the selection of a director, but we are encouraging him to apply for the position. Of course, it will be essential for the final selection of the director to be a mutually agreeable one.

We look forward to the vigorous and enthusiastic approach you personally demonstrated in your meetings at the College. The challenges are considerable. The consensus of the Food Service Committee throughout their deliberations was that a better, more innovative and responsive food service program of higher quality could be provided at a lower cost. David Healy and I concur with that consensus. Certainly, we have resolved the cost issue. It is now up to us, and Shamrock System particularly, to prove that we can meet all of the basic objectives reasonably expected.
We welcome you to the College of William and Mary and pledge our personal support to you and the Sheenock organization for the difficult but promising year ahead of us.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

William J. Carter
Vice President for Business Affairs

[CC: President Thomas A. Graves, Jr.
Mr. David G. Healy

NCC: Dean Carolyn L. Moseley]
From Carolyn Moseley

To Vice President Carter

Subject: Supplementary Report from the Food Service Liaison Committee

Now that the final conferences have been held with the three food service companies recommended by the Committee (+ Szabo), the Food Service Liaison Committee has selected the following order of preference for the company to be awarded the contract for the College's food service for 1977-78:

1. SHAMROCK
   (unanimous vote of the members present)

2. Servomation

3. Marriott
   (One member reversed the order of choice between #’s 2 and 3.)

Once again, Crotty-Szabo presented no reasonable or convincing argument for further consideration.

When you visited the Committee yesterday afternoon, at its request, you must have been impressed by the enthusiasm of the Committee as a whole for Shamrock as the top preference for the College's food service contractor. In the preliminary consideration of the nine companies to be interviewed, the Committee members assumed that Shamrock was probably too small and the first visit was more or less a courtesy to the company. The personnel team quickly gained the attention of the Committee and convinced the members, then and throughout the remaining deliberations concluding yesterday afternoon, that Shamrock was clearly the first and best choice for the William and Mary food service.

The Committee weighed very carefully the size of the company and the resulting limitations in corporate management personnel, but each presentation of information from the company decidedly convinced the Committee that Shamrock has the most promising possibility for the College to achieve its goal of a better quality of food at equal or lower cost and on a continuing high level basis. Further, the Committee expects that, in time, Shamrock will enable the College to point with pride to its food service operation and to regard it as a means of enhancing the educational experience of the student body and, indeed, of the campus community.
Perhaps it would be helpful to you to have the following summary of the Committee's conclusions regarding the selection of Shamrock:

1. Impression of honesty -- most straightforward, dependable company

2. Desire to please William and Mary so very evident, giving promise of steadfast concern -- small size an advantage -- keeping our interest at heart -- sincere effort to make this operation an "exhibit" of their service (or, to use your phrase, a "flagship")

3. Thorough, business-like approach -- responsive to the needs of this campus -- the supplementary proposal of the "Master Plan" presented yesterday

4. Obvious concern for company personnel -- employee morale

5. Commitment to sanitation and personal cleanliness

6. Anticipation of going "out of the way" to accommodate students at "special" times such as examinations, holiday periods

7. Realistic price -- protecting assurance of high quality merchandise

8. Dedication to continuing improvement

9. Taking own initiative in the operation of the service -- actively engaging in their own goal setting

10. Direct line of communication between the involved administration on campus and the corporate management in Atlanta

After a year of hard work, serious consideration, and sincere concern, the Committee is proud and confident in presenting you with this concluding recommendation related to the food service contract, fully expecting that it will contribute to our original charge to affect the optimum improvement in the food service at reasonable cost.

Carolyn Soseley
Associate Dean of Students
June 6, 1977

Mr. David Hass — Student Safety Director
Camp Deer Valley
Route 1
Fort Hill, Pennsylvania 15540

Dear Dave:

I am sorry I could not be more responsive to your telephone queries of Tuesday afternoon but I am sure you understand why I was obliged to be reticent at that point. I am pleased to inform you now that, after considerable discussion and deliberation, I have agreed with the almost unanimous recommendation of those involved in the review process that the contract be awarded to Shamrock System of Atlanta, Georgia.

Shamrock has been chosen for a variety of reasons. Their quoted rate for the board plan, for example, will enable us to charge a board fee $30 less than we would have been required to charge if Szabo had been retained. This cost difference will be reflected in the student billing for the fall, and will enable us to have only a 1% increase in the board rate for 1977-78. This small increase is gratifying for two reasons. On the one hand, although the fee will increase only 1%, the new contract specifications call for considerably improved quantities and qualities of food. We have therefore been able to achieve our objective of an improved food service program at a more attractive cost. In addition, this 1% actual increase is considerably below the 5% projected increase which was tentatively agreed to by the Board of Visitors at their March meeting.

Cost, however, was not the only determinant in choosing Shamrock. I firmly believe that this new organization will bring a new concern for quality and innovativeness to our program. These traits of the firm should impact beneficially on the operation of the Pub, which I know is a particular concern of yours. Although the contract has not yet been signed, and although Shamrock will not officially take over until August 20, David Healy and a team of Shamrock representatives will be at work throughout the summer on the new program. I would suggest you contact him as soon as possible regarding your desires for the operation of the Pub. We are as concerned as you regarding the development of the Pub, and I am sure Mr. Healy and yourself, working together, will realize a dramatically improved Nol Pollof under the auspices of Shamrock System.

We are very enthusiastic about Shamrock and we are certain that you will be too. It was a very difficult decision. However, I concur fully with all of us involved in the process that the interests of the College are best served by this needed change. Thank you for your timely and effective expression of support and for your interest regarding the food service program. We will work together to see that our objectives for the new program are met.
If you have any questions on this matter, please let Dave or me know. I look forward to working with you again in the fall. In the meantime, you have my best wishes for a good summer.

Sincerely,

William J. Carter
Vice President for Business Affairs
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cc: President Thomas A. Graves, Jr.
    Dean W. Samuel Sadler
    Mr. David C. Healy
    Dean Carolyn L. Moslely
    Dean Kenneth E. Smith
August 10, 1977

Mr. William J. Carter  
Vice President for Business Affairs  
The College of William and Mary  
Williamsburg, Virginia  23185

Dear Mr. Carter:

This is to certify the fact that Shamrock System, Inc. guarantees the contract between  
The College of William and Mary in Virginia and Shamrock Food Service, Inc. dated  
August 10, 1977.

Sincerely,

J. Armstrong
Because the College of William and Mary in Virginia (hereinafter cited as "College") desires to provide its students, faculty, and staff with nourishing, palatable food served in an appealing atmosphere, and

Because the Shamrock Food Services, Inc. (hereinafter cited as "Shamrock") has the organization and capability to provide such a food service program:

The two parties for and in consideration of the mutual covenants herein contained mutually agree:

I. Term of Agreement

This agreement is to be effective beginning August 10, 1977, and extending through August 9, 1980. The agreement may be cancelled by either party with or without cause upon ninety (90) days' written notice to the other. The agreement will be annually reviewed for any and all mutually agreed changes to the agreement. (Rates will be reviewed on such an annual basis and will be adjusted, if mutually agreed, to reflect changes).

II. Grant

The College grants Shamrock the right to provide manual food services for students, faculty, staff, and visitors upon the College premises. Shamrock, in turn, agrees to provide nourishing, palatable food in accordance with the specifications of the College as presented in the attached addendum to the contract, or as may be mutually agreed. College also grants Shamrock the right to serve beer, but no other alcoholic beverages, at places and times designated by the College.

III. Operational Responsibilities

1. Shamrock shall be responsible for the following:

   a. The cost of food
   b. Maintain an adequate supply of chinaware, glassware, small pots and pans, and silverware, and will replace all such items lost, broken or stolen. (Plus furnishing of complete glass glassware inventory by January 1, 1978). It is understood that final title to all such supplies is to the College and that Shamrock will turn over all such supplies to the College if and when this agreement is rescinded, excluding catering equipment.
   c. Maintenance and repair of office equipment as supplied by the College (desks, chairs, and files are provided by the College).
   d. Cost of labor (wages, salaries, etc.), labor relations, and fringe benefits.
   e. Management salaries and fringe benefits
   f. Laundry, paper, kitchen supplies, etc.
   g. Janitorial supplies
   h. Telephone expenses
   i. Complete insurance coverage
   j. Centralized purchasing of food and supplies, discounts are to be credited to each operation
III. Operational Responsibilities (Continued)

k. Personnel and training departments
l. Research and development (equipment, food and supplies)
m. Menu planning by professional dietitians
n. Test kitchens and recipes
o. Training managers and, when transferred, expenses until permanently settled
p. Financial reporting
q. Legal and professional advice
r. Subscriptions and donations, general
s. Field audits to check daily records and controls
t. Periodic visits by officers of the company
u. Monthly financial reports providing both monthly and year-to-date information
v. Garbage and trash removal
w. Pest control service
x. Custodial upkeep of all facilities to standards satisfactory to regulatory agencies and the quality requirements of the College

y. All Federal, State, and Local licenses, permits, and fees required for the operation of the food service program

2. The College shall be responsible for the following:

a. Provision of adequate kitchen storage, service and dining facilities, equipped and ready to operate, together with such heat, refrigeration, and utilities services as may be required.
b. Painting and redecorating of food service facilities when deemed necessary by the College.
c. Repairs and maintenance of kitchen and dining room equipment
d. Replacement of equipment which is determined to be no longer satisfactorily serviceable as determined by the College.
e. Collection and billing of payments for students subscribing to the board plan.

IV. Personnel Responsibilities

1. Shamrock agrees to:

a. Grant the College the right to approve the employment by Shamrock of its Food Service Director.
b. Insure that management personnel are on premises during all hours of operation.
c. Outfit, at its own expense, all of its employees in proper and mutually acceptable food service uniforms.
d. Have physical examinations performed annually at its expense for all food-handling employees. The examination will include TB test, chest X-ray, stool culture, and VDRL.
e. Employ such number of College students as in the contractor's discretion and judgment are necessary and who are in need of employment. The students' need of employment shall be determined by the Director of Financial Aid of the College, and these selected candidates shall be recommended to the contractor for employment. The students employed shall perform necessary kitchen and dining help functions and shall be employed for a
total compensation package consisting of any combination of allowance of free board, and/or direct reimbursement, and/or direct wage payments at a rate at least equal to the legal minimum wage (presently $2.30 per hour). The contractor shall have the right to discharge any student employee if the service of the student is unsatisfactory or unnecessary.

f. Be prepared to offer the right of first refusal employment to those employees of the present contractor who have more than five years’ satisfactory service. Due to the longevity of the contract maintained by the College's present contractor, many non-management food service employees have provided long and valuable service to the College. The College will not overlook the contribution of these employees. Once hired, these employees shall become subject to the personnel policies of Shamrock.

g. Certify itself as an Equal Opportunity Employer having a declared policy on non-discrimination, and both parties to this agreement, covenant that they will take affirmative action to maintain and promote non-discrimination as to race, color, religion, national origin, sex or age in all phases of employment, including use of facilities, in accordance with law.

2. Shamrock and the College agree to:

a. Respect existing employment contracts. Shamrock and College agree that for a period beginning the date of this contract and extending two years after the termination of this agreement, neither party will hire or attempt to hire any employee of the other party, where the primary duties as a result of said employment significantly involve the food service program to be provided by Shamrock under this agreement, without prior consent.

V. Inventories and Equipment Return

Shamrock agrees to:

1. Purchase from the present contractor the existing inventories of food and supplies of usable quality, unless the present contractor should choose to remove the food supplies rather than to sell them. The price paid shall be equal to that price paid by the current contractor.

2. Purchase and pay for all food products and related supplies. Shamrock, during the term of the agreement will retain ownership of all food and related supply inventory for which it has paid. In the event of termination of services by Shamrock, College agrees to purchase (or have purchased by successor company), Shamrock's inventory of such food and supplies, the price to be the price paid by Shamrock for such food and supplies. An exception to this
V. Inventories and Equipment Return (Continued)

agreement is the purchase of expendable kitchen equipment (china, glassware, small pots and pans, trays, and silverware) (see item III-1-b). For such items, Shamrock will utilize the original inventory of such equipment provided by the College, and, in addition, purchase and pay for all items required to maintain an adequate supply of such material. All such equipment shall be the property of the College, and will be retained by the College in the event of termination of services by Shamrock, excluding catering equipment.

3. Return to the College at the expiration of the agreement the food service premises and all equipment furnished by the College in the condition in which it was received, except for ordinary wear and tear, and except to the extent that said premises may have been lost or damaged by fire, flood, or other such unavoidable occurrence, and except to the extent that said equipment may have been stolen by persons other than employees of Shamrock without negligence on the part of Shamrock or its employees.

VI. Insurance Requirements

1. Shamrock agrees to provide certification of the following coverage:

   a. Workmen’s Compensation - Statutory limits of liability
   b. Employer’s Liability, including Occupational Disease Employer’s Liability, $100,000 minimum
   c. Comprehensive General Liability Insurance
      (1) Bodily injury liability: $300,000 per person
         $5,000,000 per occurrence
      (2) Property damage liability: $50,000 per accident
         $100,000 per aggregate
   d. Food Product and Premise Liability
      (1) Food Product: $300,000 per person
         $5,000,000 per occurrence
         $200,000 per person

2. Waiver of Subrogation:

College and Shamrock agree that in the event the facilities utilized by Shamrock or their contents are damaged or destroyed or use of the premises is lost, by fire, extended coverage, sprinkler leakage, or other insured casualty, the rights, if any, of either party against the other with respect to such damage or destruction are waived for loss or damage arising out of any insured peril up to but not in excess of the amount reimbursable from the insurer, and that all policies of fire, extended coverage, sprinkler leakage or other insurance covering the demised premises or its contents shall contain a clause or endorsement providing in substance that the insurance shall not be prejudiced if the assured have waived right of recovery from any person or persons prior to the date and time of loss or damage if any.
VI. **Insurance Requirements** (Continued)

3. **Hold Harmless Clause:**

Shamrock agrees to protect, save harmless, defend, and indemnify the College as a result of bodily injury, including personal injury, to any person including students and employees of Shamrock, and for damages to any property, real or personal, including loss of use, arising out of the operations of Shamrock as within the tenets of this agreement, and arising out of actions of Shamrock, its agents, servants, and employees.

4. **Compliance with Law:**

Shamrock agrees to comply fully with all state, local and federal health regulations, and to provide, where needed, all licenses and permits.

VII. **Financial Requirements**

1. It is understood and agreed that the regulations set forth in the College catalogue relating to students eating in the College Commons will apply.

2. College agrees to collect from each student such board charges as may be established and to pay Shamrock normally in ten days, but not to exceed twenty-five days, of weekly billing period. The College will furnish Shamrock a list of students entitled to receive residence meal service, and the College will advise Shamrock weekly as to additions and deletions to the list. Students entitled to receive resident meal service will be provided by the College with adequate identifications so that Shamrock will be able to identify students entitled to resident meal service.

3. Shamrock agrees to pay College rent equal to six percent (6%) of net sales from the: (1) Student Contract Board Plan (2) Casual Meal Sales in the Commons (3) All Special Function and Catered meals. Shamrock further agrees to pay rent equal to four percent (4%) of net sales at the Wigwam and Old Wigwam (HoI PolloI). For the purpose of this agreement Net Sales means Gross Sales less sales tax, where such taxes are applicable. Shamrock agrees to pay such rental payments monthly to the College within twenty-five (25) days of the end of the monthly billing period.

4. Shamrock is entitled to retain annually, if earned, an amount equal to three percent (3%) of total net annual sales (as defined in VII -3) from all operations at the College for cost of its administration and supervision. Shamrock is also entitled to retain annually, if earned, an additional five percent (5%) of total net annual sales from all operations as its profit allowance. Any receipts in excess of those annual allowances, if earned, on a consolidated basis including the operations of the Commons, HoI PolloI, Wigwam, and Special Functions will be returned to the College within thirty (30) days of the end of each contract year.

5. Shamrock agrees to keep accurate and complete records of all transactions and all monies it receives in connection with the operation of the food service, and to make available to the College,
VII. **Financial Requirements** (Continued)

or its agent, the contractor's books of account, all invoice expenses to the Operator, and other records at any reasonable time for the purpose of auditing the periodic statements to be rendered by the Contractor to the College, as provided, and to credit the College for all trade, cash and quantity discounts, and advertising allowances where taken. Such records shall be retained and available for two years. Also, the contractor's purchasing department shall make available to the College upon request, all national and local negotiated price information.

6. Shamrock agrees to provide the College with profit and loss statements within a reasonable time, not to exceed 20 days, following the close of each month. These statements shall show profit and loss for each of the four separate operations (Commons, Ho! Pollo!, Wigwam, Special Functions).

7. That under no circumstances shall Shamrock cater special functions or provide special program meals for which the price charged does not fully cover the cost of operation.

8. That all prices for cash operations are subject to mutual agreement between the College and Shamrock.

9. The student contract board plan payments by the College to Shamrock for this agreement are:

- 20 meal plan: $372 per student per semester
- 15 meal plan: $296 per student per semester
- 10 meal plan: $216 per student per semester

(All rates, for billing purposes, are pro-rated upon a weekly basis)

Casual meal sales: $1.60 - breakfast
$1.90 - lunch
$2.15 - dinner

VIII. **Sanitation**

Shamrock will be responsible for all cleaning and housekeeping in the manual food preparation, service, and storage areas. Shamrock will also be responsible for cleaning of tables, chairs, and floors (buffing, waxing, sweeping) in manual food service areas. The College has the right to inspect the premises at any time, and to require compliance with the College's accepted standards of custodial upkeep.

IX. **Miscellaneous Tenets**

1. **Severability:**

In the event any portion of this agreement shall be adjudged invalid or unenforceable, such adjudication shall in no manner affect the other portions of this agreement, which shall remain of full force and effect, as if the portion so adjudged invalid or unenforceable were not originally a part thereof.

2. **Entire Agreement:**

The terms and conditions of this agreement, as set forth herein, constitute the entire contract and agreement between the parties. No
IX. Miscellaneous Terms (Continued)

representations or promises other than as set forth between the parties, and each party affirms that in entering into this agreement it has relied on no promises or representations other than those expressly set forth herein. No amendments to this agreement, verbal or otherwise, shall be of any force or binding effect upon either party, unless first duly approved, confirmed and ratified by Shamrock and College in writing.

3. Time of Essence:

Time is of the essence in this agreement.

4. Non-Waiver:

No delay or failure by Shamrock to exercise any right herein or to insist upon strict compliance with the terms and provisions hereof shall constitute a waiver of any right thereafter to insist upon strict compliance with this agreement.

5. Virginia Law:

This agreement shall be construed in accordance with the laws of the Commonwealth of Virginia.

6. Notice:

All notices, demands and other communications required or permitted herein shall be in writing and shall be deemed to have been duly given if delivered or mailed (by certified first class mail, return receipt requested, postage prepaid), to the parties at the following address or to such other address as either may hereafter designate in writing,

a. Shamrock: 3375 Northeast Expressway
   Suite 169
   Atlanta, Georgia 30341

b. College: Director of Auxiliary Enterprises
   College of William and Mary in Virginia
   Williamsburg, Virginia 23185

IN WITNESS WHEREOF the parties have executed this agreement in duplicate this ______ day of ________, 19____

SHAMROCK FOOD SERVICE, INC.

BY: [Signature]
TITLE: Chairman of the Board

THE COLLEGE OF WILLIAM AND MARY IN VIRGINIA

BY: [Signature]
TITLE: Vice President for Finance
As noted in Section II, the minimal requirements of the College board program are:

1. Shamrock agrees to:

   a. Provide 20 meals per week during the period the College is in session. Monday through Saturday, breakfast, lunch and dinner, and, on Sunday, brunch and dinner.

   b. Offer a minimum of three board plans:
      (1) 20-meal plan (required of all resident freshman by the College)
      (2) 15-meal plan (student may select any meal)
      (3) 10-meal plan (student may select any meal)

   c. Offer a minimum of one special or festive event meal each month (Christmas feast, spring cook-out, Easter banquet, etc.).

   d. Provide steak at least once every two weeks (minimum standard: one 6 oz. choice, top butt steak per student)

   e. Provide seconds on all food stuffs except for steak, shrimp, and quality cuts of roast beef.

   f. Provide no reconstituted food stuffs or any meats with additives or extenders.

   g. Offer the following menu schedule:
      (1) Breakfast

         Assorted fruit juices, including fresh frozen orange juice
         Assorted fruits, including one fresh
         Assorted cereals, including one hot
         Choice of two entrees with eggs always available
         Breakfast meat daily
         Potato three times per week
         Assorted pastries, minimum of two choices
         Toast, butter
         Assorted beverages, including hot chocolate, whole, skim, and chocolate milk; coffee and tea
         Selection of carbonated beverages
         Condiments as listed

      (2) Lunch

         Soup
         Choice of two or more entrees and sandwich table
         Choice of two vegetables, including potato or substitute
         Choice of five salads, including one vegetable, one fruit, one protein (other than cottage cheese), and other; at least four of these salads must be different each meal.
         Choice of five desserts, including ice cream, one fresh fruit, one canned fruit, one pastry or baked dessert, and others. The selection of fresh and canned fruit shall vary.
         Assorted bread and butter
         Assorted beverages, including whole, skim and chocolate milk, coffee and tea
         Selection of carbonated beverages
         Condiments as listed
(3) Dinner

Soup or other appetizer
Choice of two or more entrees, including one whole (solid) meat
Choice of three vegetables, including potato or substitute
Choice of five salads ... (same as lunch)
Choice of five desserts including ice cream, one fresh fruit, one canned fruit, one pastry (pie, tart, turnover, etc.) and others. The selection of fresh and canned fruit shall vary
Assorted breads, rolls and specialty breads, such as biscuits, muffins, etc., and butter
Assorted beverages, including whole, skim and chocolate milk, coffee and tea
Selection of carbonated beverages
Condiments as listed

(4) Sunday Brunch

Choice of four fruits, including two fresh
Assorted fruit juices, including fresh frozen orange juice
Assorted cereals, including one hot
Choice of two breakfast entrees with eggs always available
One luncheon-type entree
One dinner-type entree
Breakfast meat, minimum of two choices
Toast, butter
Assorted beverages, including hot chocolate; whole, skim, and chocolate milk; coffee and tea
Selection of carbonated beverages
Condiments as listed

(5) Sunday Dinner

Choice of two or more entrees, one of which must be baked chicken, roast beef or steak
(Other specifications, same as regular dinners)

Condiment Selection:

Minimum condiment selection required. The College reserves the right to make changes or additions.

Breakfast:
- Syrups
- Jam or Preserves
- Jelly
- Apple Butter
- Raisins

- Brown Sugar
- Honey
- Butter
- Cinnamon
- Catsup

Lunch:
- Peanut Butter
- Jam or Preserves
- Jelly
- Apple Butter

- Salad Dressings (minimum of four choices - choice should vary)
- Onions, relish, tartar sauce - as needed
ADDENDUM (Continued)

Condiment Selection:

Lunch (Continued):

Croutons  
Mayonnaise  
Catsup  
Light and Dark Mustard  

Dinner:

Peanut Butter  
Jam or Preserves  
Jelly  
Apple Butter  
Croutons  
Mayonnaise  
Catsup  
Light and Dark Mustard  

Assorted crackers and saltines  
Butter  
Grated cheese, hot peppers, soy sauce and other appropriate condiments - as needed  

Butter  
Onions, tartar sauce, cocktail sauce, etc., as appropriate  
Salad Dressings (minimum of four choices - choices should vary)
President Thomas A. Graves, Jr.  

August 21, 1980

William J. Carter

I have just returned from my annual visit to Atlanta to review with Jim Armstrong and his colleagues at Shamrock the food service operations at William and Mary over the past year and plans for the coming year.

The 1979-80 College year was a success for both Shamrock and William and Mary. The confidence of the Food Service Committee in recommending renewal of our three-year contract with Shamrock, after careful review of their performance in the Commons, the Vignan, the Pub, and in Catering Operations was certainly reassuring to me. I hope you have the same general impression.

In discussing the strengths and weaknesses of Shamrock's performance, I discussed with Jim Armstrong and his staff your concerns on the shortcomings in Catering and in the Vignan and Pub operations. David Charlton is working closely with Sam Sadler, Jack Morgan, Ervin Farmer and John Bond to eliminate the problems you brought to my attention about the Vignan, the Pub and the Campus Center in general.

Jim Armstrong and his staff have assured me of their renewed best efforts in correcting the shortcomings in catering operations and have shared with me some of their most gratifying commendations during the past year. I thought you might like to see these for reassuring evidence. In addition, Jim shared with me a listing of the accomplishments of Shamrock over the past three years and the August 1980 edition of the Commons Comments, which may be useful information.

I am pleased and reassured that the Shamrock organization understands our expectations at William and Mary for the coming year in all areas: the Commons, the Vignan, the Pub and especially in Catering, which has been the weakest division, as you know. It will be interesting to see how these rededicated efforts result in actual performance.

I am confident that Student Affairs, Business Affairs and Shamrock will be working closely with the Food Service Committee to ensure that there is convincing evidence of an effective, professional relationship in food service operations at William and Mary for the coming year. You have our promise!

William J. Carter
Vice President for Business Affairs

Enclosures

cc: Dean Sam Sadler  NSO w/enc1.  NSO:AM/Tag
    Dean Jack Morgan  "
    Mr. David H. Charlton  "
    Mr. James F. Armstrong  w/o enc1o.
A SELF-STUDY
of
THE COLLEGE OF WILLIAM AND MARY
IN VIRGINIA

Williamsburg, Virginia
April, 1964
As an educational institution conscious of its public responsibilities, the College stands ready to provide leadership and cooperation, as it has in the past, in the development of needed regional services. It does not follow, however, that the College must or should continue indefinitely to administer such services once they have been developed. As the College brought the Norfolk and Richmond divisions to the point where they might be made independent, it stands ready to relinquish such services when they can adequately be performed by other institutions and agencies in the area. These regional services cannot be allowed to overshadow or detract from the fundamental character of the College as primarily a residential college of liberal arts and sciences. This function is its distinctive service to the Commonwealth of Virginia and to the nation, a function which the College cannot compromise.

To make this contribution and to achieve a condition of excellence measured by national standards, the College must maintain a faculty which understands the nature of liberal education and which itself exhibits the highest qualities of scholarship and teaching both in liberal and special disciplines; it must have a cosmopolitan student body able enough and properly prepared to benefit from such an education; it must have resources in library, laboratories, and other physical facilities commensurate with excellence; it must fix the size of the College, in terms of numbers as related to space and organizational structure, so as to permit recognition of the individual, an indispensable condition of liberal education; and it must cultivate a climate of opinion, an intellectual atmosphere, conducive to the attainment of its purposes.

A Proposed Statement

We believe that a comprehensive statement of the College's purposes and aims, condensing the spirit of the foregoing discussion into terms suitable for publication in the catalogue, will be useful in several ways. By defining the objectives of the College, it will help to further understanding and cooperation on the part of all concerned with the educational enterprise. It will clarify the image of the College in the eyes of prospective students, their parents, and the public generally. It will serve as a guide and reference point in the future development of the College and as a standard by which performance can be measured and the relevance of current and proposed activities evaluated.

The Steering Committee therefore recommends that the following statement of purpose and aims be approved as the official educational policy of the College:

The College of William and Mary is a coeducational and residential college of liberal arts and sciences. Its primary purpose is to educate men and women whose particular individual skills and abilities will derive meaning from a broad vision of the good life and the good society. In the pursuit of this culture, believing that the pursuit of knowledge leads to the realization of their possibilities as possible citizens, they seek to become free and creative, that perennially the ideal of the ultimate man is the life of the mind, where capable values by everyday

Within the special studies in the University of the highest, does not attempt all men. It is particularly among the special studies in the practical, graduate student history, ethics. To accomplish the vision understanding, cooperation on the part of all concerned with the educational enterprise. It will clarify the image of the College in the eyes of prospective students, their parents, and the public generally. It will serve as a guide and reference point in the future development of the College and as a standard by which performance can be measured and the relevance of current and proposed activities evaluated.

The Steering Committee therefore recommends that the following statement of purpose and aims be approved as the official educational policy of the College:

The College of William and Mary is a coeducational and residential college of liberal arts and sciences. Its primary purpose is to educate men and women whose particular individual skills and abilities will derive meaning from a broad vision of the good life and the
good society. Liberal education is concerned with the pursuit of truth: truth about the nature of man, his culture, and the universe in which he lives. Believing that the richest fulfillment of human potential depends upon this pursuit of truth in its full range, the College attempts to guide all of its students into some understanding of each of the great basic disciplines of human learning. Only those who possess a measure of such understanding can hope to realize their fullest humanity and to become responsible citizens in a complex world. Therefore the College seeks to foster among its students a spirit of free and creative inquiry into the fundamental questions that perennially challenge man. It strives to uphold the ideal of excellence and truth as the only standard ultimately worthy of free men. It endeavors to provide in the life of the College community an environment where capable young men and women will learn these values by example and experience as well as by precept.

Within the context and on the basis of a liberal and humane education, the College offers undergraduate and graduate programs designed to prepare students with the special skills and knowledge necessary for a variety of careers in the contemporary world. The College does not attempt to provide training of all kinds for all men. It concentrates its efforts, rather, on those areas where by its traditions and special resources it is particularly competent to offer educational programs of the highest quality. Besides advanced undergraduate studies in the liberal arts and sciences, these areas include the professional fields of law and teaching and graduate studies in several disciplines, notably American history, the physical and life-sciences, and mathematics.

To accomplish its purpose of providing an education of unqualified excellence, the College seeks to maintain a faculty which exhibits the highest qualities of scholarship and teaching both in liberal and special disciplines; to attract a cosmopolitan student body able enough and properly prepared to benefit from such an education; to maintain resources in its library, laboratories, and other physical facilities commensurate with excellence; to design its physical campus and its organizational structure, in relation to the size of its student body, so as to permit the fullest recognition of the individual; and to cultivate, in the life of the College community, an intellectual atmosphere conducive to the attainment of its purposes.
SeveraI broad areas of student life and activities outside the
formal academic program comprise together with that program the whole
educational experience of a residential college. These areas are (1)
student living conditions—housing, food services, health and medical
care, and recreational facilities; (2) discipline and student govern-
ment; (3) institutional relations between students and the College—
their orientation, the keeping of records, scholarship aid, student
employment, placement services, and alumni affairs; (4) intercollegiate
athletics; and (5) cultural and recreational opportunities offered
through publications, performing groups, social organizations, and
the like.

This College has no "program" and no over-all administrative or-
ganization for these areas. They are the responsibilities of various
agencies and offices of the administration, the faculty, and the stu-
dents themselves. The maintenance and operation of buildings and the
handling of cost funds are functions of the bursar's office, which also
supervises the operation by an independent contractor of the food ser-
dices. Student personnel administration as such is headed by the dean
of students (who is also the registrar) and includes the deans of men
and women with their assistants, the college physician, and the direc-
tor of counseling. Matters of student aid, employment, scholarships,
and placement are handled by a director of student aid and placement.
Intercollegiate athletics fall under a director of athletics, and in-
tramural athletics under the departments of physical education. Some
groups, such as the William and Mary Theater, are largely independent.
Various faculty and student committees or other agencies are involved
in most areas either directly or as advisory bodies.

Although the College has no official policy on student life and ex-
tracurricular activities, the following statement from the catalogue is
a fair indication of the attitude which the college intends toward the
whole matter:

"As the College is chiefly a resident college, students and
faculty comprise a closely knit community in which extra-
curricular and social activities play a considerable role
in the cultural and intellectual development of the indi-
vidual. The informal relationship between teacher and stu-
dent serves to encourage the process of living and learning
together. The College believes that one of its major pur-
puses should be to inculcate by means of the several phases
of college life the ideals of self-responsibility and good
campus citizenship."
This attitude is reasonable and appropriate for this college and its spirit provides a criterion for measuring how well the College meets in fact its responsibilities to its students in the several extracurricular areas which are examined below.

1. Student Living Conditions

Housing

Most undergraduates, except those coming daily from their homes, are required to live in the residence halls. Senior men, with the permission of the dean of men, may reside in approved off-campus housing. Married students may not live in residence halls. Graduate and law students normally make their own living arrangements. The residence halls, including dormitories, sorority houses, and fraternity lodges are described in the section of this report dealing with physical plant. Information as to price ranges, physical conditions, and planned capacity and actual tenancy will also be found there.

Only a few of the residence halls for men justify the catalogue claim that "At William and Mary, residence life is particularly attractive." The newest men's dormitory, Yates Hall, has separate lounges and study rooms with individual cubicles on each floor and a recreation room. Yet there are complaints that, though of modern construction, it is insufficiently sound-insulated. Bryan, Camm, Madison, and Stith Halls, relatively new units of more traditional design and construction, are attractive but some of their facilities intended for study and recreation are now taken up by the School of Law or used as classrooms. Of the other men's dormitories, Tyler and Taliaferro Halls and the Morris House do not have lounge or study areas. The Morris House, an antiquated frame building, has long been a candidate for demolition. Old Dominion is overcrowded and badly in need of renovation, has inadequate study facilities and almost none for recreation; its fourth or attic floor more closely resembles a hutch than a home. Monroe Hall is almost equally in need of renovation. Brown Hall needs attention to floors and painting, shows signs of overcrowding, and presents an odd assortment of cheap and ancient furniture.

Women's dormitories are on the whole more satisfactory. All have lounge or study areas, or both. Though to a lesser extent than in the men's dormitories, there is however some overcrowding. The most serious problem is Ludwell, six units of an apartment building about a mile from the campus leased on a "temporary" basis quite a few years ago. In location and design these units are unsatisfactory as a dormitory. Although plans have been announced to abandon this arrangement when a new women's dormitory is constructed, one new dormitory has already been completed without affecting the use of Ludwell and there is some justification for scepticism whether it will be given up the next time.

All residence halls, except the eleven fraternity lodges which house three men each, have some supervision. Each men's dormitory
is supervised by a resident counselor, who is a graduate or law student, assisted by one or more dormitory managers appointed by the dean of men. Each women's dormitory and sorority house is supervised by a housemother (two larger dormitories have two) assisted by the house president. Because of its divided units, Ludwell requires three housemothers and six house presidents. The subject of dormitory supervision will be discussed later under the topic of discipline and student government.

Recommendations on Housing

We believe that the College needs to bring its existing residence halls up to acceptable standards at least as urgently as it needs to add more. New dormitories, because they are financially self-liquidating and appear to accommodate more students seeking an education, are relatively easy to obtain. But we suggest that the easy course in this matter is deceptive and unwise. The College needs, first, the classrooms and other facilities properly to educate its students and, before it admits more, the facilities to house properly those it already admits.

The School of Law should be moved out of the Bryan complex. Ludwell Apartment should be abandoned as a women's dormitory. The Morris House should be demolished. The infirmary building can be converted into a men's dormitory, when provision is made for a needed new infirmary. Old Dominion, Monroe, and Brown need renovation in greater or less degree. We urge that these projects be given priority over new construction of residence halls, except as new buildings may be necessary to permit the overhaul of existing ones. In effect, this will require a moratorium on increases in enrollment until the residential facilities are what they should be.

Food Service

College dining halls are operated on a contractual basis by Crotty Brothers of Boston under the general supervision of the bursar. A ruling of the State Council of Higher Education prohibits state colleges from engaging directly in the preparation and sale of food. The College provides facilities and equipment but the contractor buys all food, hires and supervises employees, and plans, prepares, and serves all meals. The dietician gives the bursar a weekly menu in advance. A supervisor from the Boston office meets with the bursar weekly. Crotty Brothers pays the College a percentage of gross receipts.

All freshmen and sophomore students must buy meal tickets each semester and eat in the college cafeteria; juniors and seniors may do so. Approximately 3,200 meals are served daily to 1,240 ticket holders.

The main cafeteria has two food counters serving a large dining hall seating 525 and a smaller one seating 204. The kitchen and bake shops are adjacent to the serving counters, and the basement which provides space for storage also includes a refrigerated storage, a refrig-
erated garbage room, an office, one shower for white employees and
only four restrooms for more than 100 employees. An elevator declared
unsafe for personnel conveys food and garbage between the kitchen and
the basement, which floods during heavy rains. The board of health, in-
urance company representatives, and building inspectors periodically
inspect the building, equipment, and food.

The fare served in the cafeteria is generally considered to be
good and varied although some students complain that the meals are
stale and uninteresting. The dining rooms are overcrowded and are
neither attractive or convenient as they should be. If plans for
remodelling the cafeteria are followed and if the proposed new dining
hall is completed near the new dormitories, students entering William
and Mary will be able to eat under more attractive and civilizing con-
ditions.

The contractual services of Crotty Brothers are available to the
College and to college groups, and they prepare and serve food for nu-
umerous teas, receptions, dinners, and picnics. In the cafeteria building
there are five small dining rooms seating from 10 to 48 people
which are used for dinners and luncheons. Crotty Brothers also operates
an eating place in the Campus Center called the Wigwam, a large and at-
tractive room where many faculty members as well as juniors and seniors
have meals. The small number of girls living in sorority houses main-
tain their own dining rooms.

Health and Medical Care

Although the catalogue outlines a rather formal and comprehensive
"health service," the health and medical care of the college community
is a function of several different agencies both within and outside the
College. Central is the David J. King Infirmary operated by the college
physician, who is nominally responsible for the entire "health service.
Actually, however, the departments of physical education through their
instructional programs and individual counseling take care of many as-
pects of general student health and its improvement. Sanitary inspec-
tions of the residence halls (including off-campus housing) are made
by housemothers, resident counselors, and the dean of men.
Dining halls and kitchens are inspected by the local health officials
and insurance company representatives. Swimming pool conditions are
tested by the physical education staffs.

In evaluating the health and medical services of the College, it
should be borne in mind that they operate in the context of facilities
available in the community. Williamsburg has a modern and ample com-
munity hospital to the construction of which the College, as a corporate
citizen, by special appropriation, contributed $50,000. Quite near the
campus is the Tidewater Mental Health Clinic, and a few miles away
are the psychiatric staff and facilities of Eastern State Hospital. Be-
sides local physicians and surgeons, specialists and special medical
facilities are available in Richmond and Newport News. The existence
of these services which it
Statement of Purpose and Aims

The College of William and Mary is a small university, supported by the Commonwealth of Virginia and operated under the general supervision of a Board of Visitors appointed by the Governor.

The basic goal of the institution and the heart of its mission in serving the Commonwealth is the development of individual capabilities through liberal education. By liberal education is meant an introduction to those areas of inquiry which heighten one's ability to cope with his environment and to modify his behavior in order to accomplish his objectives, familiarity with a broad range of knowledge and skills which improve one's decision-making abilities, exposure to a range of value systems and encouragement to construct a personal system of beliefs as a foundation for personal happiness, and provision of a variety of experiences which improve one's ability to make and to communicate intellectually and aesthetically defensible discriminations based upon personally examined grounds. William and Mary seeks to develop independent, responsive, and responsible individuals.

The aims of liberal education are pursued in all areas and on all levels of study. The fullest expression of this concern is the undergraduate arts and sciences program which has a long tradition and broad endorsement. Undergraduate professional programs combine liberal education with the development of more specialized professional competencies. In areas where appropriate strengths exist, academic and professional graduate programs prepare students to contribute at the frontiers of their fields and add to the cultural and intellectual opportunities for everyone. For residents of the peninsula area of Virginia the College of William and Mary provides imaginative educational and cultural opportunities. The commitment in all programs to liberal education is the source of institutional coherence.

In its endeavor to develop individual potentialities William and Mary pursues the goal of excellence. It concentrates its resources in compatible areas, advocates full-time, residential study in undergraduate programs that remain at a moderate size, seeks students who bring a personal initiative to their pursuits, and promotes the growth of teacher and student alike. In all programs and activities it strives to use the most promising means of teaching and learning. In all relationships it seeks a sense of community. It encourages an association of the personal and academic lives of its members and provides the opportunity for each to participate in the governance of the institution.

The College of William and Mary is a university of unusual strength and promise. It is large enough to provide a diversity of opportunities and interactions, yet small enough to be humane, responsive, and innovative. Its engagement in the creation, criticism, and sharing of knowledge, art, and values provides the setting for a variety of activities that embody the spirit of liberal education.
the inefficiency and overlap in responsibilities that cause some of the present difficulties. He could use available information more efficiently, and there might be a better correspondence between students who want to live in dormitories and those who are able to obtain dormitory housing. This administrator should consider students' wishes when making plans for present renovations as well as any short-term plans for changes in the future. By trying to meet the wishes of students the College can avoid the problem of not having enough students to fill the dormitories.

At present the basic need in off-campus housing is a service that would list housing available in the Williamsburg area so that students and prospective students can know what sort of housing there is and how much they will probably have to pay for it. Of the students surveyed 97% expressed a desire for such a service.

In long-range planning the College should consider the needs of married students. The present dormitories are not suitable for housing married couples, but apartment buildings such as Ludwell are structurally adequate and could feasibly be set aside as housing for married students. For many couples the high cost of housing in the Williamsburg area constitutes a great hardship; college housing would be a great benefit to these students.

II. Boarding

The College's main boarding facility is a large cafeteria located on the new campus next to William and Mary Hall. Opened in 1967, the Commons has a seating capacity of 800. Any student may buy a semester meal ticket for $275 or may purchase meals individually at the Commons; resident freshmen are required to eat there. In a recent semester approximately 1550 meal tickets were sold. Since the captive market is approximately 1200, the freshman enrollment, it seems clear that students do not typically choose to eat at the Commons regularly.

Another cafeteria that provides complete food service for the college community is the Wigwam located in the Campus Center. The Wigwam dates from 1960; it has a seating capacity of 350 and serves approximately 900 people each day. A student's semester meal ticket, referred to in the College's catalog as a dining hall card, is good only for meals in the Commons; it cannot be used in the Wigwam.

Limited food service—hamburgers and other sandwiches—is available at the college pub known as Hoi Polloi. Hoi Polloi is adjacent to the Campus Center and is open on Monday through Saturday from 7 p.m. to 1 a.m.

The College is responsible for providing and maintaining the food service equipment at the Commons, the Wigwam, and Hoi Polloi, but the operation of these facilities is contracted to Crotty Brothers of Virginia. The contract between the College and Crotty Brothers can be terminated on 60-day written notice by either party, and it explicitly provides that the operating policies of Crotty Brothers are subject to the approval of the College.

A professional food services manager employed by Crotty Brothers personally supervises the purchase, preparation, and serving of food.
and maintains strict control over these operations. The facilities are subject to an unannounced monthly check by an inspector from the Williamsburg Health Department: his inspections have uncovered no problems that have not been immediately corrected.

A few years ago the student newspaper reported instances of roaches found in the food served at Trinkle Hall, a 46-year old building. Although the dining hall in Trinkle is no longer in operation, the roach problem has resurfaced at Hoit Polloii, which is in the same building. Spraying is currently keeping the roach population at a countable number.

In addition to the campus food services just described, all of the nine sororities serve the evening meal to their members, and four of the twelve fraternities provide varying degrees of food service for their members.

The quality of the food at the Commons is not bad, but the menu tends to be weighted rather heavily toward starches, particularly at the evening meal when the student is limited to one portion of the meat course. If this one portion is not ample, the student then has to fill up on starches. Perhaps a nutritionist on the staff--at present there is not one--would help, or perhaps the problem is mainly financial. The manager of the food services maintains that a nutritionist is not needed. The present daily menus provide the minimum daily nutritional requirements, but neither the manager nor a nutritionist can ensure that the students will in fact eat the nutritionally balanced diet which is served. The manager further states that on most occasions he cannot afford to provide seconds of the main course at the evening meal.

Regardless of the merits of the manager's position, it is a common--and justified--complaint of students that not enough meat is served at the Commons. One possible solution is to include in the menu health foods which are a low-cost source of protein. The inclusion of health foods could also be justified as increasing the choice available to the students. Another possible solution is to increase the boarding fee with the understanding that the additional funds will be used to buy more meat for the Commons' menus.

A more basic criticism of the Commons concerns its atmosphere. If it is crowded, it is noisy and hectic; if it is not crowded, it is depressingly big and empty. Given the decision to build a big barn of a dining hall, its unhappy atmosphere is perhaps unavoidable, but some modifications can make it a quieter, more congenial place in which to eat. Possibilities presently being explored include carpeting, sound-absorbent paneling for the walls, and partitioning to create small dining areas. These possibilities should be considered seriously and, if necessary, professional advice should be sought. Meanwhile, colorful posters would relieve the monotony of the bare walls, and cleaner floors would also help.

Despite these criticisms, there are reasons to be optimistic about the future of food services at the Commons. There has been improvement in the past couple of years, and there are indications that the improvement will continue. Since the present manager of food services took charge a year ago, he has initiated a number of individually minor but cumulatively important changes. The hours of
operation have been extended so that meals are available at the Commons any time between 7 a.m. and 7 p.m., there is a salad bar, steak is served every other Friday, there is a choice of main course at dinner, on occasion the food is served buffet style, and, in an effort to improve the atmosphere, the color of the walls was changed from prison gray. If they do nothing else, these changes indicate a willingness to try to please the students.

Another reason for optimism is a new vice-president for business affairs who represents a tenured interest in and concern about the quality of food services at the College. Still another reason for optimism is the appointment of the Student Association food services committee. This committee is in its formative stages, so it is not yet clear what its structure or specific duties will be, but its general goal is to serve as a vehicle for continuing student evaluation of food services. One of its first activities will be to sample the food services of neighboring Virginia colleges.

In sum, the present state of food services is acceptable, but there is room for improvement. New people in the two positions that determine the quality of food services, the vice-president for business affairs and the Crotty Brothers’ manager, as well as a new conduit for student opinion give cause to believe that the improvement will occur.

Given the projected stable enrollment of the College, there will be no need for expanding the present food services. As indicated above, the current effort is to improve quality, not to increase quantity. However, if the quality is improved and the Commons becomes more popular with the students, the present facilities might be hard pressed to meet the demand. The vice-president for business affairs does not see this as a likely possibility. He believes that the projected improvements will be necessary to maintain the present demand. Further, if there should be greater demand, existing facilities at the Wigwam and Hoi Polloi could be used. Finally, if increased use of all of the existing facilities should prove them inadequate, there is a contingency request for funds for additional food service facilities.

III. Health

In May of 1972 the President of the American College Health Association presented a report on the condition of the William and Mary Health Services. The report was generally critical of what it found, but it presented many useful recommendations for improvement. The major recommendations are sound and sensible and call for a thorough overhaul of policies and procedures in order to establish a first-rate health service. These recommendations may be summarized as follows:

1. The first concern is the enlargement of the staff beyond the two local physicians who serve only part-time. And the present staff of six nurses should be augmented so that the 11-1/2-hour night shift (in which nurses are allowed to sleep) can be eliminated. A laboratory technologist should be added.

2. Regular staff meetings should be held. In the past, staff
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The purpose of this dissertation was to examine the collegiate way of living: how it began, how it developed and changed, and why institutions have adhered to it. Communal dining was emphasized in an attempt to determine why colleges have believed it to be important enough to require it of differing student populations, under widely varying circumstances, over a period of at least four hundred years.

The College of William and Mary in Virginia was selected as a case study for this project. One of America's earliest colleges, William and Mary was founded on the British (Oxford) model, and has required its students to live collegially throughout its history.

Official rationale for an emphasis on collegial living is contrasted with the available evidence (or non-official rationale). An attempt was made to learn how or if the rationale changed with the evolution of society in general and higher education in particular.

It was concluded that while official rationale has evolved somewhat, it consistently has emphasized the development of the whole person. That official rationale is accompanied, however, by unofficial supporting evidence suggesting that collegial living was financially attractive and that viable alternatives often were limited.
Additional institutional case studies would be useful, as would studies which concentrate on different components of collegial living. Examination of commuter versus residential college experience also would be of value in considering this topic.