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CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

The purpose of this dissertation was to study the development and growth of Tidewater Community College during its first decade. Tidewater Community College is a multi-campus institution and the second largest comprehensive community college in the twenty-three-member state community college system. It is hoped that examination of those major forces and influences that led to its particular physical, administrative, organizational, and curricular characteristics would contribute valuable insights and would expand knowledge of the functions and operations of an essentially urban, multi-campus community college. Consideration was made of such matters as why Tidewater Community College was established as a multi-campus college rather than a single-campus institution, and the factors that ultimately determined the locations of the four campuses and central office that made up the institutional structure of the college. An effort was made to determine whether state and/or local government leaders played a more significant role in the location of Tidewater Community College or whether the primary thrust came from influential individuals or groups in the community who may have recognized or assumed economic, political, social or other possible advantages to be gained from the presence of a community college campus in their geographic area. Also considered important to the total study was analysis of the interrelationships that may have existed between Tidewater Community College and Norfolk State College, Old Dominion University and Virginia
Wesleyan College, all located in the same geographic area and drawing from the same general population, and the possible impact or influence that the existence of these three institutions had on the development of the campuses of Tidewater Community College. This aspect of the study was thought to be particularly cogent in the context of the attempts made by representatives of the Virginia Community College System, Tidewater Community College, the city of Norfolk, and concerned citizens to form a campus in Norfolk.

In order to establish a logical time perspective and scope for this study, it was decided that it should extend from July, 1968 when Tidewater Community College was organized, to July, 1978. This period may not establish definitive trends, but perhaps may indicate directions for the purpose of this study.

During the examination of the administrative, organizational, and curricular characteristics of Tidewater Community College, attention also was directed to staffing, physical facilities, funding, programs, and to one of the most important elements of the college, its students. It is realized that many essential similarities in administration, organization, curricula, and student profile may be found among the twenty-three state comprehensive community colleges. For this reason, and to avoid unnecessary duplication of data, it was thought that it probably would be more appropriate to concentrate this study primarily on those unique administrative, organizational, curricular and student body characteristics that distinguish Tidewater Community College and its campuses from other community colleges in the Virginia system.

While the administrative and organizational aspects of Tidewater Community College were considered important and were stressed in detail
throughout this dissertation, it was recognized that the college developed within the confines of political, economic, social and related demographic elements. To assist in exploring these elements, a number of tables and figures reflecting various data were included.

In the course of this study certain terms were used concerning the Virginia Community College System which are found in common usage in four-year institutions and which should not require special definition. The following terms are those that may be used in a unique sense when applied to the organization of the Virginia Community College System.

The Virginia Community College System is organized with central administrative offices in Richmond and consists of twenty-three geographical regions, each containing a comprehensive community college. There are five multi-campus colleges to be found in the System: J. Sargeant Reynolds Community College; Northern Virginia Community College; Rappahannock Community College; Southside Virginia Community College and Tidewater Community College. The entire system embraces thirty-four campuses.

The chief executive officer of the Virginia Community College System carries the title of chancellor. The chancellor is appointed by the State Board for Community Colleges and also serves as secretary to the board.

The chief administrative officer of each community college bears the title of president and is appointed by the State Board for Community Colleges upon recommendation of the individual local community college boards. As chief administrative officer of the community college, the president is responsible to the State Board for Community Colleges through the chancellor of the Virginia Community College System and to the local community college board for all operations of the institution.
Each campus of a multi-campus community college is headed by a campus administrative officer known as the provost. The campus provost is directly responsible to the president for administration and operation of the campus. The provost also serves as the dean of instruction in a multi-campus community college.

A multi-campus community college has a central office located on one of its campuses. The central office houses the president and staff that may include a dean of instructional and student services, a dean of financial and administrative services, a director of institutional research, and an administrative assistant. These relationships are illustrated and clarified by a series of figures and charts throughout this study.

While secondary source materials are practically non-existent as revealed in the review of the literature, there is a wealth of original sources. On review of the literature concerning the Virginia Community College System it was found that a detailed historical-developmental study of a Virginia multi-campus community college apparently does not exist. Primary sources of data for this study, therefore, included consultant reports prepared at the request of the governor, and master plans that dealt with the total Virginia Community College System and its future development. Valuable information also was available in the minutes and notes that resulted from meetings of the State Board for Community Colleges and of the Tidewater Community College Board. This material was especially helpful in establishing the sequence of events used in detailed planning. Additional primary sources of data were self-studies prepared as part of the process for obtaining the original accreditation
of Tidewater Community College from the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools.

Census data and various demographic reports were examined in order to obtain official and verifiable data used by the Virginia Community College System planners to help determine the locations and curricula for Tidewater Community College. Enrollment projections, capital outlay projections and instructional program planning studies were valuable sources of data for this dissertation.

Interviews with former and current state and local governmental officials associated with the establishment of the Tidewater Community College were important primary sources of information. Helpful contributors of data to this study were the president of Tidewater Community College, his administrative staff and the campus provosts.

In order to provide the historical background against which Tidewater Community College developed, it was considered appropriate to present a broad overview of the establishment of the Virginia Community College System. Details of the legal action that gave birth to the Virginia Community College System may be found in the Code of Virginia, chapter 679.

In 1966 the General Assembly of the commonwealth of Virginia approved a system of publicly-supported comprehensive community colleges. The legislation defined a comprehensive community college as

...an institution of higher education which offers instruction in one or more of the following fields: (1) freshman and sophomore courses in arts and sciences acceptable for transfer to baccalaureate degree programs, (2) diversified technical curricula including programs leading to the associate degree, (3) vocational and technical education leading directly to employment,
and (4) courses in general and continuing education for adults in the above fields.

The enabling legislation for the establishment of the comprehensive community college system was contained in the Community College Act of 1966, section 23-214 through 23-231 of title 23, chapter 16, Code of Virginia.

George B. Vaughan, former president of Mountain Empire Community College and currently the president of Piedmont Community College, writing in the Educational Resources Information Center, Topical Paper Number 19, comments on the slowness of the move toward the democratization of higher education in Virginia. The slow rate of change is particularly noteworthy considering the fact that Virginia is the home of the College of William and Mary, second oldest English-speaking institution of higher education in America, and of Thomas Jefferson, a leader in the movement to democratize public education in America.¹

Vaughan suggested that the broader base of higher education in Virginia as represented by the community college system was relatively slow in emerging due in part to a tradition of maintaining selective admissions programs which encompassed only about 25.2 per cent of Virginia's total college-age population in 1964, while the same average selection for colleges was 32.4 per cent for the South, and 43.7 for the nation.²

Members of the General Assembly created the legal basis in 1966 for the establishment of a comprehensive community college system in the commonwealth of Virginia. Governor Mills E. Godwin, Jr., in support of this action, outlined his plan for extending the base of higher education in Virginia in his first major policy address to the General Assembly in 1966. Godwin, seeking sources of income for a comprehensive community college system, called for a statewide sales tax that would generate the
primary sources of revenue for universal higher education in Virginia.\(^3\)

Godwin, in proposing a statewide system of community colleges, defined the comprehensive community college as follows:

It is a varied and flexible institution, tailored to community needs and designed to serve every citizen within commuting distance.

It offers universal admission to high school graduates, weighs their potential through extensive guidance and testing, and directs them to their proper field of study.

It relieves the pressures on our four-year resident institutions at a fraction of their cost per student.

It substitutes informed choice for the guesswork that so often selects a college for the high school graduate.

It minimizes the heartache and provides new opportunity for the amazing number of four-year college freshmen who are unable to complete their first year, despite the best admissions machinery.

It offers a second chance to high school graduates who have been refused admittance to the college of their first choice, as well as to those who could have little chance of enrolling in any four-year college.\(^4\)

Governor Godwin, it would seem, gave high priority to the development of a statewide system of comprehensive community colleges. At the same time he recognized that the technical colleges and branches of the major institutions provided the intermediate steps in his plan for comprehensive community colleges.

On May 9, 1965 Governor Godwin named Dana B. Hamel as chancellor for the new system of community colleges which would go into operation on July 1, 1966. From the beginning Hamel believed that higher education in Virginia should move in the direction of a comprehensive community college system. Governor Godwin described Hamel by saying he "has a tremendously distinguished record in the liberal arts and is one who
also now is making a tremendous record in technical education." Hamel himself was unwilling to settle for a system of technical colleges; he favored a more comprehensive approach to post-high school education. Thus, Hamel played a major role in developing the comprehensive community college system rather than technical schools.\(^5\)

The Virginia Community College System appears to have evolved through a process of converting existing technical colleges and of transferring two-year university branch institutions, in addition to developing new campuses to meet the need for facilities.

Accomplishments of the new comprehensive community college system are reflected in the enrollment statistics: in the 1966-67 college year the system served over 7,000 full-time and part-time students; a decade later the system enrolled over 138,000 students. An additional 51,625 students were enrolled in community services, non-state funded courses and programs. Hamel reported in 1976-77 that over 200,000 individuals benefited directly from the community college system.\(^6\)

In the 1966 enabling legislation for the community colleges, authorization was made for the establishment of a State Board for Community Colleges. The state board was responsible for the establishment, control and administration of all comprehensive community colleges in Virginia. The board consists of fifteen members appointed by the governor and subject to confirmation by the General Assembly. Authority to confer associate degrees, diplomas and certificates is vested in the State Board for Community Colleges. In addition to the state board, local community college boards were authorized to act in an advisory capacity to the state board. The local boards also were delegated various responsibilities, including: (1) selection of the presidents of the community
colleges, (2) approval of college curricula, and (3) participation in development of the college budget. The State Council of Higher Education in Virginia has responsibility for the coordination of higher education in Virginia. This includes the approval of programs, budget review, establishment of consortia, and determination of campuses.

Basic financial support for each community college in Virginia is provided by the General Assembly through the Virginia Community College System. These funds are used for maintenance and operation and for capital outlay such as buildings and equipment. In general, local funds are not used for maintenance and operation expenditures.

Local political subdivisions furnish funds for the site and for site development, including roadways, parking lots, outdoor lighting and landscaping. Most of the local political subdivisions also provide special funds to support community service programs, scholarships and local board operating expenses. In some cases, the local political subdivisions have contributed funds to supplement capital outlay projects approved by the state.7

In order to establish a planning guide for organization of the comprehensive community college system, provision was made to devise a master plan through use of consultants. The basic plan drawn by Eric Rhodes, consultant to the Department of Community Colleges and Director of the Educational Services Bureau, Inc., was accepted by the State Board for Community Colleges in 1966.8

In the master plan it was recommended that the state be divided into twenty-three community college regions. Several of the regions would have two or more campuses because they were in high density urban
regions with heavy concentrations of prospective students, or in low-density rural regions where long distances dictated multi-campus colleges. One region was recommended for two community colleges.

Each region was delineated so that it normally could be expected to have a minimum of 100,000 population and 1,000 high school graduates annually. The twenty-three regions were planned so that practically every Virginia resident could be within thirty to forty-five miles of a community college campus.9

A third element in the community college bill of 1966 was that of instruction. There is evidence to suggest that the community college system would offer instruction in arts and sciences courses, technical curricula, vocational-technical and/or general and adult continuing education.10

Strong guidance and counseling programs were considered essential to the community college system because of the open door admissions policy basic to the Virginia plan for comprehensive universal higher education. Included with the guidance and counseling programs was a broad spectrum of student services ranging from placement testing to career and personal crisis consultations.

Occupational-technical curricula usually were developed only after close coordination with local citizens' advisory committees. This approach helped to ensure the eventual employability of the students. Cooperative efforts with community groups also were a source of valuable guidance in the selection of appropriate and high-priority training programs.11

In addition to the variety of programs offered by the community college system, an important factor in the planning of the community college
system was the decision by the State Board for Community Colleges to keep tuition costs at the lowest possible level consistent with the availability of funds. It should be recognized, however, that even minimal tuition charges have the effect of closing the open door for many students. Even so, as in many states, community college fees in Virginia were low compared to other public and private Virginia institutions of higher education.12

Charles R. Monroe, in his book Profile of the Community College, outlined three significant objectives for a community college: comprehensive curricula, open door admission principle, and community orientation.13 These objectives have been characteristic of the philosophy that formed the foundation for the Virginia Community College System.

The principle or objective of the open door policy, as has been stated, was to permit the greatest number of Virginians to attend institutions of higher education. The policy may be found in Virginia Community College System catalogs and indicates that "Any person who has a high school diploma or the equivalent, or who is eighteen years of age, and in any case, who is able to benefit from a program at the college, may be admitted to the college as a regular student or as a special student."14 The phrase, "...and in any case, who is able to benefit from a program at the college, may be admitted to the college as a regular or special student," represents the open door policy making it possible for thousands of Virginians to pursue post-secondary educational goals.

From its early historical beginnings, the Virginia Community College System stressed utilization of funds primarily in support of academic programs. This position, for example, led to the prohibition of
intercollegiate athletics for the system. In spite of opposition from a number of community college presidents, the State Board for Community Colleges resolved in 1967 to prohibit intercollegiate athletic competition. The board action was supported by Chancellor Hamel and became policy for the system.\textsuperscript{15}

Members of the State Board for Community Colleges asked that the board, rather than the governor, be given authority to appoint the chancellor. In April, 1970 the General Assembly granted the request for appointive authority and also authorized a change in title for the chief administrator from "Director" to "Chancellor." In May, 1970 the state board, by unanimous vote, appointed Dana B. Hamel as the first chancellor of the Virginia Community College System, effective July 1, 1970.\textsuperscript{16}

During the decade under study, space utilization was a problem. Hamel faced challenges in carrying out his mission to form a viable comprehensive community college system from institutions located in facilities that included renovated military installations, warehouses, office buildings and various configurations of rented quarters. In 1966, two-year colleges represented only two per cent of the total educational and general facilities in use by public institutions of higher education. Two-year colleges averaged 55.3 square feet per full-time equivalent student in 1966. By 1975 only 50.8 square feet was available for each full-time equivalent community college student. This meant that the community colleges were educating more students in less available and often unsuitable space.\textsuperscript{17} The chancellor had to manage a community college system that more often than not occupied space that never was intended as educational facilities.
The enabling act of 1966 emphasized the importance of highly qualified faculty to serve the community college student. Strict guidelines for the selection and promotion of teaching and administrative faculty were included in the legislation. In general, a master's degree with eighteen semester hours in the discipline to be taught was the minimum qualification for teaching with the faculty rank of instructor. Occupational-technical courses included specific instructor qualifications in the various skills areas.

Growth in the number of full-time community college faculty occurred as a result of the growth in student enrollment. In 1966-67, with only eight community colleges, there were approximately 210 full-time equivalent faculty in the system. Throughout the decade there was growth of faculty, so that by the end of the period there were approximately 2,818 full-time equivalent faculty employed, a 1,244 per cent increase in full-time equivalent faculty.\textsuperscript{18}

As the decade 1968-78 drew to a close, it was found that there had been a steady increase in the proportion of part-time students attending the community colleges. Part-time students appeared to possess distinctive characteristics: they usually were older, often employed, and frequently were re-entering education. All of these characteristics may be factors leading to changes in future community college curricula. The percentage of part-time students probably will continue to increase in the future due to the necessity for re-training for different jobs. This will be true especially for community colleges serving urban areas where enrollments include larger numbers of employed students.

 Concurrent with the increase in part-time students during the mid-seventies was an increase in the numbers of minority students attending
community colleges. The expansion of minority enrollments between 1969, the first year these data were available, and 1976 was dramatic. For example, in 1969 there were 1,391 minority students reported. In 1976 there were 13,219 headcount minority students enrolled, representing an 830 per cent increase. Women also have found the community college to be an effective institution for post-secondary education. The number of women enrolled in two-year institutions grew from 9,699 in 1970 to 41,473 in 1976, a 328 per cent increase (all enrollment figures were computed on the basis of headcount rather than full-time equivalent students).\textsuperscript{19} The 1977-78 \textit{Virginia Community College System Annual Report} disclosed that the trend of increasing enrollments of minority students, women and part-time students had continued throughout the period considered by this study.

Reviewing the positive economic impact of the Virginia Community College System on the state, the 1977-78 \textit{Virginia Community College System Annual Report} provided data demonstrating that the system returned more to the state in business volume, personal income and in employment than it received from the state budget during the period 1966-74. In addition, according to the \textit{Report}, the system drew new money into the state through private and federal grants to the colleges.

During the 1966-74 period cited by the \textit{Virginia Community College System Annual Report}, the state general fund appropriation for the system was $156 million. These expenditures generated $387 million in business volume or 242 per cent of the appropriation. The \textit{Annual Report} also noted that the rate of growth in personal and per capita income in Virginia increased at a greater rate than the national average. These significant economic gains of the state during 1966-74 can be attributed
in part to the continuous growth of the Virginia Community College System from its inception in 1966.20

This examination of the development and growth of the Virginia community College System suggests that the goal of universal higher education available to the majority of Virginians has been realized to a significant extent. The rapid expansion of the system to twenty-three community colleges located where people may be best served and where adults of all ages are attracted by a diversity of programs, low tuition, flexible class schedules, open admissions and qualified faculty and staff, could not have been accomplished without the cooperation of local and state government officials and the support of the public. There are indications which suggest that political self-interest on the part of those leaders in positions to influence the community college concept was more often than not of minor importance. The reaction of the public to the growth of the system appeared to be supportive when the enrollment statistics that affect budgets, employment of faculty and staff and construction of facilities were considered. As a result, during the decade under study, the system became a major force in the Virginia educational enterprise.

In an interview with George B. Pass, president of Tidewater Community College, it was indicated that the initiative for establishment of a community college in a particular geographic area usually appeared to come from leadership exerted by the Virginia Community College System rather than from local jurisdictions. He also pointed out that with few exceptions, the local government jurisdictions cooperated with the leadership of the Virginia Community College System, supported the
creation of a community college, and provided the site and planning money required to construct the facilities.²¹

From this broad overview of the Virginia comprehensive community college system, the focus of the current study will be placed on the second largest of five multi-campus community colleges in the system, Tidewater Community College.

To gain a better understanding of the characteristics that make Tidewater Community College unique among the twenty-three state community colleges, it was considered helpful to discuss a number of demographic and socioeconomic factors of the region allocated to the college. The service area or region of Tidewater Community College includes the major cities of Chesapeake, Norfolk, Portsmouth, Virginia Beach and parts of Suffolk and Isle of Wight County. Altogether the region covers approximately one thousand square miles, with a 1977 population of over 763,000.²² The population growth for this area from 1970-74 was 4.3 per cent, or slightly above the national average. Norfolk currently is the most populous city in Virginia, and while now third, Virginia Beach is projected to succeed Richmond as the second most populous city in Virginia, probably in the next decade.

Following national trends, population shifts have occurred from inner city to rural or suburban areas. From the data in Appendix 1 it appears that the majority of the decrease in the total population of Norfolk and Portsmouth may be explained by residential migration to Virginia Beach and Chesapeake. The populations of Chesapeake, Virginia Beach and Suffolk are projected to expand because of existing accessible land available for residential and commercial development. Because of their proximity, the populations of Chesapeake and Virginia Beach are expected
to increase as a result of migration from neighboring cities rather than an influx of people from out-of-state areas.

Age distribution of the 1977 population for each city is outlined in Appendix 2. From this data it can be seen that almost one-third of the residents of the college service area are fifteen years of age or younger. In addition, residents twenty-one years of age or younger account for slightly less than 50 per cent of the service area population. Norfolk, followed by Virginia Beach, has the largest percentage of residents between the ages of sixteen and twenty-one. Norfolk and Portsmouth have relatively high percentages of youth and prime-age working groups due to the presence of military installations that attract these groups to the area. Suffolk has the largest percentage of fifteen-year-olds or younger, followed by Chesapeake and Virginia Beach. Examination of these data suggests that a sizeable market of potential students exists and mostly likely will continue to exist within the region served by the college.

Females make up about 48 per cent of the total residents within the Tidewater Community College region. Norfolk and Virginia Beach have proportionately fewer female residents than any of the other cities. As was expected, the percentages of minority residents is higher in the inner cities of Norfolk and Portsmouth. This may be explained, at least in part, by the need for these individuals to live close to employment opportunities, lack of adequate public or private transportation, shortage of affordable housing and higher costs of suburban living. Since 1960, population shifts in Norfolk and Portsmouth resulted in more minority residents, while Chesapeake and Virginia Beach experienced growth primarily in Caucasians.
Prospects for employment are of particular importance to Tidewater Community College because of the large numbers of students enrolled in career-oriented occupational-technical programs. It is of some importance, therefore, that consideration be given to economic indicators that could help predict the areas of best employment opportunities and determine the development and placement of curricula.

At the present time there are about 250,850 non-agricultural workers employed in the college service area. Employment opportunities have increased in transportation equipment, communications, transportation, utilities, trade, finance, insurance and real estate and services. Construction appears to be expanding, especially in Virginia Beach. Since 1970, increases in employment by local government agencies have had a significant influence on the economy of the service area. Government and light manufacturing companies are also of importance as potential employers. The military bases, which employed residents with various skills and were major consumers of services, were essential to the health of the region's economy in the early part of the decade under study.²⁴

As was indicated, the Virginia Community College System Master Plan included a multi-campus community college to serve the Tidewater area. President Pass explained that because of the diverse demographic characteristics of the region, it was thought more practical to have a multi-campus college. Also, Pass said that it was considered more economical to operate the four campuses with a central office and one chief executive officer than as four independent colleges to serve the same region. In addition, the Tidewater Community College President believed that undesirable competition would be minimized by a multi-campus configuration and that more diversified programs could be offered by having a broader
choice of curricula spread over the total region with a minimum of duplication of programs.

President Pass, in discussing the three existing campuses, stated that each campus served a somewhat different consumer. Frederick Campus was geared to serve a heavily industrialized urban environment. Virginia Beach was not extensively industrialized, but required public service offerings related to an extensive tourist business. In addition, large active-duty and retired military populations, local governmental offices and health agencies in Virginia Beach required various specialized programs. Chesapeake was in a state of transition from rural to industrial and required a variety of curricula that included occupational-technical and horticultural courses. The president emphasized that in the formative days of the college, programs had to be adapted to physical facilities available at the time, as was the case of the nursing program at the Frederick Campus. At the present time, capital outlay expenditures are planned on the basis of suitability for the programs to be offered at a specific campus. As an example, the Virginia Beach Campus may be able to accommodate a nursing program in the future.25

In order to discuss the growth and development of Tidewater Community College, and in light of Pass' indications of service to a pluralistic population with diverse needs, it seemed necessary to consider each campus of the Tidewater Community College system. In chapter two, consideration will be given to the development of the Frederick Campus, the first of four planned for Tidewater Community College. The events that led to the establishment of Tidewater Community College and the Frederick Campus were so inextricably related that it was considered logical to discuss them together.
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Tidewater Community College was designated by the State Board for Community Colleges as a multi-campus comprehensive community college because of forces that included diversified demographic characteristics, economy in both administration and operation, and control of undesirable competition between campuses. The state board also approached the challenge of obtaining appropriate sites for establishment of the four campuses and for the location of the central administrative staff.

While planning was in progress to determine the location for a site for the first Tidewater Community College campus, Charles L. Downs, currently provost of the Frederick Campus, said in an interview that Portsmouth business executive Fred W. Beazley and the Beazley Foundation offered to donate over 700 acres of land and more than sixty buildings of Frederick College to the Virginia Community College System to be used as a community college.¹ Frederick College at that time was a small, private four-year liberal arts college that was organized by Beazley in 1961. The college occupied land and facilities that were purchased by Beazley from the federal government. The property was a former military ammunition storage depot constructed during World War I. The area also was used as a naval and Marine Corps installation during World War II and the Korean conflict.

According to information from Downs,² Beazley was concerned about broadening the educational opportunities available to potential students
with limited financial resources and believed that the goal would be better accomplished if Frederick College were part of the Virginia Community College System. There were some who thought that Beazley's decision may have been influenced by the high operating costs of Frederick College and by the potential difficulty Frederick College would have in competing with the low tuition costs of a community college. Regardless of the motivation behind the Beazley offer, donation of the property apparently provided a ready-made solution for a community college site.

Beazley's unexpected offer of the Frederick College facilities to the Virginia Community College System evidently focussed the attention of the state board on the Portsmouth area for development of the Tidewater Community College multi-campus system. On March 15, 1968 the State Board for Community Colleges unanimously accepted the gift of Frederick College from the Beazley Foundation.3 Hamel reported to the State Board for Community Colleges that in addition to the land and buildings, Beazley also had presented a check for $1 million to help with the initial operating costs. Thus, on July 1, 1968, Tidewater Community College was launched in the makeshift facilities of a former military barracks, ammunition dump, and warehouses that housed Frederick College. These types of facilities seem to be typical of those utilized as the original plants of many community colleges established within the Virginia Community College System.

Meeting in August, 1968, the State Board for Community Colleges recommended that Tidewater Community College be organized as a multi-campus institution with a single local board and one chief executive officer, the president. This action on the part of the State Board for
Community Colleges was in keeping with the basic concept for the Tidewater area contained in the Rhodes Master Plan.⁴

To continue the transition from Frederick College to a comprehensive community college, the State Board for Community Colleges approved community college curricula that, according to the 1968-69 Tidewater Community College catalog, included programs leading to associate in arts degrees with a major in liberal arts; associate in science degrees with business administration, pre-teaching education, and science majors; and courses in accounting, business management, drafting and design technology, and secretarial science that would permit students to earn associate degrees in applied science.⁵ With the inception of these programs in the fall quarter of 1968, approximately 650 students enrolled for classes. Of this number, 60 per cent were enrolled in college transfer curricula and the remaining 40 per cent in occupational-technical programs. This breakdown of student enrollment gave further insight into the problems of converting the liberal arts, four-year Frederick College to a comprehensive occupational-technical-oriented community college.⁶

Of particular interest and importance was the placement of the Tidewater Community College nursing program which was established at the Frederick Campus because it was the only campus in existence. Another factor was the proximity of hospitals that were willing to form cooperative agreements with Tidewater Community College for the training of nurses. The retention of this program at the Frederick Campus represents a community college policy to permit specialization of programs at the various campuses rather than attempting to duplicate all curricula throughout the Tidewater Community College service region.⁷
Following official designation as a community college by the State Board for Community Colleges, approval of the Tidewater Community College curricula and admission of students, the next move was establishment of a local community college board as directed by the 1966 enabling legislation. Early action to create the board was important because functions such as selection of the president, preparation of the college budget, and approval of curriculum offerings could not be accomplished effectively without local board participation. For these reasons and others, Hamel, as acting president, set administrative machinery in motion to form a twelve-member Tidewater Community College Board consisting of representatives from the four principal cities of Chesapeake, Norfolk, Portsmouth and Virginia Beach.

The Tidewater Community College Board held its first meeting on February 18, 1969 at the Admiralty Restaurant in Norfolk. Among its first official acts was designation of Beazley as an honorary member of the board in recognition of his contribution to higher education in the Tidewater area. In terms of the relationship between the president and the college board, it was necessary to establish a mutually cooperative attitude. According to George Pass, the second Tidewater Community College president, the role of president was characterized as a positive and aggressive working relationship. He indicated that the role of the president should be flexible to accommodate changing situations at any given period. Additionally, for a young and undeveloped institution such as Tidewater Community College, Pass saw his role to be one of working with the board, both to introduce and to sell a number of basic community college concepts to the community. Describing the functional
organization of the Tidewater Community College Board, Pass indicated the desirability for organizing the board into committees and his willingness to work closely with the respective committee chairmen so that policies would be cooperatively developed. He considered that in the final analysis it was the president's responsibility to recommend to the board courses of action on any issue or policy. It was his conclusion that this type of philosophy undergirding president-board relationships provided an atmosphere of maximum cooperation.9

Recognizing the need for permanent leadership and that the Rhodes Master Plan recommended that there be one chief executive officer for Tidewater Community College, the college board set up a search committee for the purpose of selecting a president for the college in July, 1969. After several interviews and negotiations, Douglas M. Montgomery, president of Blue Ridge Community College, was unanimously recommended by the search committee. The college board and State Board for Community Colleges accepted the nomination and Montgomery assumed the position as first president of Tidewater Community College.10

With the selection of the chief executive officer accomplished, the college board, with the approval of the State Board for Community Colleges, officially adopted the name of "Tidewater Community College" in October, 1969. In announcing the approval granted by the State Board for Community Colleges, Chancellor Hamel commended the Tidewater Community College Board for selection of what he thought to be a highly appropriate name for the college. Although a number of names had been suggested, it was the opinion of the college administration and board members that "Tidewater Community College" was descriptive of the total area that comprised the service region of the new institution.11
Prior to this decision, Tidewater Community College was referred to as "Region 22 Community College" in accordance with the numbering procedure utilized in the Rhodes Virginia Community College System Master Plan. Tidewater Community College also was known unofficially as "Frederick Community College" for a brief period following the donation of Frederick College to the Virginia Community College System. This may have been done in deference to and recognition of Frederick Beazley as the college benefactor.

After "Region 22 Community College" was renamed "Tidewater Community College," the former Frederick College was officially designated the Frederick Campus of Tidewater Community College. In this manner the identity of Tidewater Community College as a permanent multi-campus institution was accomplished and the first of four campuses scheduled for Tidewater Community College was founded. It would be appropriate for the purposes of this study to examine the forces that influenced the organization of the Tidewater Community College central offices and also the organization of the Frederick Campus as the first campus of the multi-campus structure.

According to Tidewater Community College Board minutes, several board members, accompanied by the chancellor, visited Northern Virginia Community College, the first of five multi-campus colleges in the Virginia Community College System, in order to observe the management and operation of a multi-campus college. In the planning of the central offices and Frederick Campus organization, the college administration incorporated some features of a multi-campus institution drawn from the Northern Virginia Community College multi-campus experience.
In the organization of the Tidewater Community College central office, as seen from an examination of Figure 1, the president as chief executive officer of the college is directly responsible to the chancellor of the Virginia Community College System. The president also is responsible to the college board and to the State Board for Community Colleges through the chancellor. The president is assisted by a dean of instructional and student services, a dean of financial and administrative services, a director of informational services, and an administrative assistant. In addition, each campus is assigned a business manager who is directly responsible to the dean of financial and administrative services. These individuals are in staff relationships to the president and to campus administrations and usually have no line authority.

Following the Virginia Community College System multi-campus organization model, the flow chart (Figure 2) of the Frederick Campus administration shows that the provost is directly responsible to the president. The provost has an administrative staff that includes a dean of student services, director of continuing education, director of learning resources, and three division chairmen: business and public service technologies; humanities and social services; and mathematics, natural sciences and technologies. The directors and division chairmen in turn have their support staffs. With the establishment of the Frederick Campus organization based on the Virginia Community College System multi-campus organization model, staffing of the Frederick Campus gained momentum.
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In February, 1970 Harold J. McGee was selected by the college board, with the approval of Montgomery, as the first provost to lead the Frederick Campus. McGee served as provost until July, 1971 when he accepted the position of president of Piedmont Community College. To fill the campus leadership gap, Montgomery served as acting provost in addition to president. Approximately six months later, Charles L. Downs was named as the Frederick Campus provost. Downs evidently was able to maintain the delicate balance between the president, the college board, and several remaining Frederick College faculty members who apparently had not accomplished a full transition from the private paternalistic liberal arts institution to the more professionally demanding environment of a publicly-supported community college. Following the organization and staffing of the central office and Frederick Campus, an apparent controversy concerning the appropriate permanent location of the central offices and staff developed between the college administration, college board, city of Portsmouth and the State Board for Community Colleges officials. Montgomery, several board members, and Portsmouth City officials seemed to favor an off-campus site, preferably in Portsmouth, for the central offices. This position was evident as expressed in several sets of Tidewater Community College Board meeting minutes. The State Board for Community Colleges and the chancellor favored keeping the central offices on the Frederick Campus.

Chancellor Hamel discussed the question of the central office location with Montgomery in February, 1971 and told him that the State Board for Community Colleges had expressed without equivocation its desire that the administrative offices of the colleges within the community
college system be situated on a campus site. Hamel informed Montgomery that although the Northern Virginia Community College was authorized to have its central offices off campus, it was understood that the arrangement was on a temporary basis only, and that the central offices would be placed on the campus as soon as capital funds were available for construction of facilities.

The chancellor evidently found it necessary to clarify the position of the State Board for Community Colleges in order to preclude planning by Montgomery and others associated with the college for establishment of the Tidewater Community College central offices at an off-campus location. The issue apparently was resolved when, according to the April 22, 1972 State Board for Community Colleges minutes, Chairman of the Board Daniel C. Lewis informed the chancellor, Tidewater Community College Board and administration at a special called meeting, that the state board was opposed to moving the district offices and staff away from the Frederick Campus. Lewis explained that this policy was made in the interest of the most economical approach for maintaining the administrative offices of the colleges of the Virginia Community College System.

During this April, 1972 meeting, Lewis announced that Montgomery had decided to resign as president of Tidewater Community College effective July, 1972. In his letter of resignation, Montgomery cited personality conflicts with certain college board members as the reason for his decision. There was recurring evidence that misunderstandings existed between Montgomery and the college board. This situation may have reached a final crisis when the college board employed the Virginia Beach Campus provost and the dean of student services in February, 1972 without
the support, consent, approval or assistance of Montgomery. Commenting on the situation, the chairman of the college board ad hoc personnel committee expressed regret that these personnel appointments were made without the total input of the president and hoped that in the future a better working relationship could be attained without action contrary to desirable protocol.22

Following Montgomery's departure in July, 1972 Hamel again became the acting president. After six months without permanent leadership, George B. Pass was recommended by the Tidewater Community College Board and approved by the State Board for Community Colleges as the second Tidewater Community College president on January 15, 1973.23 Pass formerly was the Executive Vice President of Jacksonville (Florida) Junior College, and brought not only a broad and varied community college background and experience to the college, but also knowledge of the Florida community college system. In less than three years, Tidewater Community College had been served by three chief executive officers: Hamel as acting president on two occasions, Montgomery, and currently, Pass. Resolution of these two potentially divisive issues was followed by recognition of the college administration for a need to devise a master plan for purposes of the orderly governance and development of the Frederick Campus.

Commenting on the Frederick College facilities that led to the establishment of Tidewater Community College and the Frederick Campus, President Pass explained that since all the buildings were designed as military warehouses and barracks and not intended to serve educational purposes, most of the buildings were of limited usability and eventually will have to be demolished. Those buildings that were being used,
according to Pass, required extensive and expensive maintenance and renovation.24

According to college board minutes of October, 1973 the board recommended that a master plan of the Frederick Campus property be prepared. The board also agreed that permission would be requested from the State Board for Community Colleges to permit Tidewater Community College to solicit funds from the city of Portsmouth to subsidize the master plan project. Moreover, the city of Portsmouth was to be reimbursed by the state for the cost of the master plan.25 In January, 1974 the Tidewater Community College administration and board were informed by the chancellor that the State Board for Community Colleges had approved funding for master planning of the Frederick Campus.26 This announcement was followed by employment of Service, Hargrove and Flora, Architects, Engineers and Planners to prepare the Frederick Campus Master Plan. In December, 1974 the consultants presented their plan to Tidewater Community College President Pass. Highlights of the Frederick Campus Master Plan are presented since the plan appeared to reflect forces and influences that impacted on management decisions concerning the future of the Frederick Campus.

Two alternatives emerged from an analysis and evaluation of data by the consultants who produced the Frederick Campus Master Plan. Alternative #1 included maintaining the Frederick Campus on approximately 200 acres of the Frederick Campus tract; making a portion of the property available for the proposed Hampton Roads sewage treatment plant; reserving part of the property for highway purposes; and developing the remaining acreage industrially. Alternative #2 envisioned a plan that would move the
Frederick Campus to another location; make a portion of the property available to the Hampton Roads Sanitation District; reserve a segment for highway purposes; and develop all remaining land industrially.

In arriving at their final conclusions, the consultants evidently favored alternative #2, with strong emphasis on using the Frederick Campus site for industrial development, construction of the Hampton Roads sewage treatment plan on eighty acres of property, reservation of right-of-way for the proposed third tunnel crossing of Hampton Roads, and for moving the Frederick Campus to a new location somewhere in Portsmouth. In explaining their rationale, the consultants indicated that the Frederick Campus site already was surrounded by existing and proposed industrial zoning. It is a site which does not have large residential subdivisions which could suffer from incompatible uses. The site has excellent water accessibility, bordered as it is on two sides by the James and Nansemond Rivers. Utilities are available to the site from public agencies. Adequate rail and highway facilities also exist to serve the site. The consultants also pointed out that with the General Electric plant already in the area and with acquisition and rezoning of other land for construction of a proposed oil refinery, other industry also would be attracted to the area. Discussing the proposed move of the Frederick Campus, the consultants indicated that in their opinion infusion of heavy industry would put the campus into conflict with its environment. Industrial traffic was predicted to increase to unacceptable levels for campus operations. The socialization of the area would not be expected to develop along lines conducive to educational purposes and prospective students probably would be hesitant to attend classes, especially at
night, because of the industrialization of the area. The consultants described the Frederick Campus as becoming "a small island in a sea of industry from which neither would derive any noticeable benefit."

In summarizing their findings, the consultants expressed the viewpoint that the Frederick Campus land was not being used to its highest potential, the educational goals of the community college program could be better met if the facilities were located in areas more accessible to the people, the existing campus could better serve Virginia's citizens by providing an employment and tax base for industry whose choices of places to locate were limited and, finally, that the city of Portsmouth was reportedly willing to make a new site available.27

The consultants' report was reviewed by the college administration and it was decided that the eighty acres of land should be made available for development of a regional sewage treatment facility. This tract of land eventually was sold to the Hampton Roads Sanitation Commission and the funds allocated by the state to be used for renovation of Frederick Campus facilities. Immediate action was not taken, however, on the recommendation that the land be reserved for a third Hampton Roads tunnel crossing, although the matter was under consideration. Relocation of the Frederick Campus to a Portsmouth site did not receive a favorable response from the chancellor, members of the college board, or the president.28

In a position paper prepared in October, 1975 by President Pass, he outlined the campuses' needs, plans and construction priorities and suggested that the Tidewater Community College Board recommend to the city of Portsmouth that the Frederick Campus be permanently located on the existing site.29 According to the Tidewater Community College Board
minutes of November, 1975 it was recommended and subsequently approved by the board that the Frederick Campus be permanently situated on the existing original site.\textsuperscript{30} Thus it appears that, at least from the perspective of the college administration and board, there was no ground-swell of support for the consultants' recommendation that the Frederick Campus be moved to another Portsmouth location. A potential political issue developed during 1975-76 when the section of Nansemond County that included the Frederick Campus was merged with the city of Suffolk. This action meant that the Frederick Campus was located technically in the city of Suffolk. In accordance with the Tidewater Community College service boundaries, a portion of Suffolk was the responsibility of the Frederick Campus and a portion was assigned to another community college.

This situation evidently was resolved in February, 1976 through an agreement between the Virginia Community College System, Tidewater Community College and the city of Portsmouth, that the Frederick Campus would serve the city of Portsmouth and her community college educational requirements. Confirmation of the agreement was made in March, 1976 by a resolution adopted by the Portsmouth City Council acknowledging the designation of the Frederick Campus of Tidewater Community College as the primary campus for the city of Portsmouth.\textsuperscript{31} The Frederick Campus land holdings again became the center of attention when representatives of the state Joint Legislative Audit and Review Commission, in their March, 1977 report to the Virginia Community College System, apparently questioned the effectiveness of the utilization of the total acreage that was part of the donation by Beazley to the state for a community college. The report suggested that a possible surplus of land existed at the Frederick Campus.\textsuperscript{32}
In his formal response to the Joint Legislative Audit and Review Commission report, Chancellor Hamel presented what constituted a Frederick Campus site utilization plan and supporting data to refute the Joint Legislative Audit and Review Commission finding that the Frederick Campus had potentially surplus acreage. Hamel indicated that the location was excellent for the permanent campus serving that part of the Tidewater Community College. This declaration, the consultants' report notwithstanding, underscored the determination of the Virginia Community College System not to move the Frederick Campus. Hamel emphasized that the Frederick Campus was in the middle of population growth areas in the corners of Portsmouth, Chesapeake and Suffolk. The chancellor again referred to the permanency of the present Frederick Campus location and to future planning which envisioned utilization of all the acreage.

Hamel referred to the projected third crossing of Hampton Roads, which would be linked with the proposed Eastern Freeway and the Bowers Hill-Belleville commuter road, as providing ideal student access to the Frederick Campus. Hamel also mentioned the State Highway Department plan to build an interstate highway across the property with access in the immediate vicinity of the Frederick Campus, permitting additional student accessibility to the Frederick Campus.

The chancellor reviewed the plans for the sale of approximately eighty acres of the property to the Hampton Roads Sanitation District Commission. He stated that this sale of land would provide vital space for essential utility services to the community. Continuing with his response, Hamel discussed master planning of the Frederick Campus.
Hamel informed the Joint Legislative Audit and Review Committee that master planning of the remaining Frederick Campus acreage included the development of one-of-a-kind programs requiring more open space than was generally available to the other colleges in the system. This appeared to be another example of adapting a program to available physical facilities. In this case the Frederick Campus was ideally endowed with the required land. Hamel explained that programs were under development at the Frederick Campus to meet statewide need for formal programs for tractor-trailer drivers, heavy equipment operators and emergency vehicle drivers. These programs obviously demanded open spaces and Frederick Campus qualified.

In his final argument, Chancellor Hamel indicated that the campus site was a unique natural resource with potential for ecological use of the various water and marsh areas. He anticipated the use of this resource in the form of credit courses and community service activities that could capitalize on the natural setting of the Frederick Campus.

In summarizing the position of the Virginia Community College System concerning the perceived threat to retention of the Frederick Campus acreage, Hamel declared that the Virginia Community College System rejected the Joint Legislative and Audit Review Committee contention that there was potentially surplus acreage at the Frederick Campus site. All of the property, except that required for the interstate highway and sanitation treatment facilities, was considered essential to the further development of the facilities and educational programs of the Frederick Campus and the college. Taking a firm stand against a move by any state agency to appropriate college land as being surplus, Hamel,
leaving no doubt of his position, stated that it would not be in the best interests of the citizens of Tidewater or the commonwealth to make a short-sighted judgment that any portion of the Frederick Campus property was not essential to the needs of Frederick Campus. Judging from subsequent events, the chancellor evidently was able to ward off encroachment on the property occupied by the Frederick Campus. Questions concerning the status and utilization of the Frederick Campus property, however, continued to surface.

In April, 1977 Tidewater Community College President Pass advised the Frederick Campus provost of the importance of keeping Portsmouth City officials informed concerning the position taken by the chancellor, the Tidewater Community College Board, and the president in respect to the Frederick Campus. Pass' statement of the Frederick Campus situation included:

1. The Frederick Campus of Tidewater Community College is permanently located on the existing site. We have approximately 200,000 square feet in the Technical Building which is to be used as the main building of the campus. We have forwarded a Capital Outlay Form which will be submitted in the coming Session of the Virginia General Assembly. This Capital Outlay Form requested approximately $6,000,000 for renovation of this facility.

2. The Technical Building with its 200,000 square feet could not possibly be replaced at any other location even in the distant future.

3. The Frederick Campus was donated by the late Mr. Frederick Beazley to be used as the Portsmouth Campus of Tidewater Community College. The Portsmouth Campus is in the Community College Master Plan as a Suburban Campus. We have ample acreage for a suburban campus on the existing site. As you know, the basic guideline for a suburban campus is that the campus must have at least 100 acres, but in this case, we plan to make full use of the remaining acreage with the exception of right of way which may be used for I 664. The only so called urban or downtown campus which is planned for the Tidewater area is in Norfolk.
4. The College is not in a financial position to be committing itself to any renovation expenses in downtown Portsmouth, and the College is not in a position to be leasing any additional facilities in downtown Portsmouth. If facilities other than the Naval Hospital and the Norfolk Naval Shipyard, for example, are to be used in downtown Portsmouth, this will be on a quarter by quarter arrangement with no permanent or annual lease in mind and with no commitment for any kind of capital outlay expenditures of any nature.34

Following this action by the president, the Frederick Campus provost conducted a series of meetings with Portsmouth and Suffolk officials in order to clarify the relationship of the Frederick Campus to their cities and the purpose and mission of Tidewater Community College. Approval by the General Assembly for the renovation of classroom facilities on the Frederick Campus would appear to have effectively eliminated any doubt that the Frederick Campus would remain on its current site.

In a review of the major forces and influences that had a significant impact or contributed to the development of Tidewater Community College and the Frederick Campus as the first of four campuses planned to serve the Tidewater Community College region, it seems valid to assume that the initial force was the responsiveness of the Virginia General Assembly to the expressed need of the commonwealth of Virginia for a comprehensive community college system which would provide maximum opportunities for post-secondary education to the greatest number of prospective students. The mood of the General Assembly took concrete form in the enactment in 1966 of the legislation that authorized a comprehensive community college system. This was followed by dedication on the part of Governor Godwin and succeeding governors to support the concept with appropriate legislation and funding.
Dana B. Hamel, first chancellor of the Virginia Community College System, provided strong leadership in implementing the legislation which authorized the development of community college master plans and the ultimate establishment of twenty-three comprehensive community colleges to serve the people of the commonwealth.

Priorities recommended by the chancellor in conjunction with those found in the Virginia Community College System Master Plan provided impetus to the planning for Tidewater Community College. The donation of the Frederick College property and land resulted in the establishment of the first permanent campus of Tidewater Community College within two years following the 1966 community college enabling legislation.

Community participation and support as an influencing factor apparently was assured by formation of the Tidewater Community College Board with representatives selected by the local political jurisdictions in the Tidewater Community College service area. Positive, aggressive leadership as practiced by George Pass, the second Tidewater Community College president, served as a major force in establishing cooperative, productive relationships with college board members who often represented diverse interests and priorities. Pass’ style of leadership and his professional ability were said to have made possible the welding together of a close partnership between college and board, which permitted both to grow according to a balanced plan.

Pressures from college officials, certain college board members and Portsmouth city representatives to move the Tidewater Community College district offices from the Frederick Campus to a Portsmouth location may have had political motivation and were successfully resisted by positive
direction and influence from the leadership of the Virginia Community College System. Physical changes in the community such as construction of a sewage plant, potential highway location and prospective influx of industry to the Frederick Campus area generated consideration by college and Portsmouth City officials to move the Frederick Campus. This drastic action was prevented by the influence of the chancellor, college president, and a number of board members, with the exception of the decision to sell eighty acres of property to the Hampton Roads Sanitation Commission. Through intercession of the chancellor and president, funds from the sale of the Frederick Campus property reverted to the college for improvements on the campus.

What appeared to be a state Joint Legislative Audit and Review Commission movement to declare large tracts of Frederick Campus land surplus and force sale of the property was successfully resisted by the combined influence and efforts of the chancellor and president. General Assembly authorization of $2.5 million to renovate Frederick Campus classroom facilities underscored the strong possibility that the first Tidewater Community College would remain on its current site, and illustrated the force and influence that dedicated leadership and sense of purpose and mission had on college and campus.

As has been indicated in chapter one and chapter two, each of the Tidewater Community College campuses serve different populations with different educational needs. Chapter three will examine the forces influencing the development of the next campus, Virginia Beach, to determine if they were the same or different from those that influenced development of the Frederick Campus.
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CHAPTER III

VIRGINIA BEACH CAMPUS

With the final decision that the Tidewater Community College central offices and the Frederick Campus would remain on the property donated by Beazley accomplished through the combined force and influence of the State Board for Community Colleges leadership, the chancellor, president and members of the college board, emphasis shifted toward establishing the second Tidewater Community College campus, to be located in the city of Virginia Beach. When reviewing the data regarding development of Tidewater Community College campuses, it was interesting to note that although the city of Virginia Beach, with its fairly large population did not have a public institution of higher education within its boundaries, it was not the first area to receive a campus. In addition, in apparent sharp contrast to the establishment of the Frederick Campus and subsequent campuses, city of Virginia Beach officials aggressively took the initiative with the Virginia Community College System to express in concrete terms their desires for the expeditious organization of a Virginia Beach Campus.

Approximately six months after the General Assembly passed the 1966 legislation authorizing the Virginia Community College System, E. E. Brickell, division superintendent of the Virginia Beach public schools, presented a report to the newly-organized community college committee of the city of Virginia Beach that was intended to familiarize members of the committee with the origins, purposes and goals of a community college, as well as with the requirements for participation in the Virginia Community
College System. Brickell informed the committee that a master plan study for the commonwealth of Virginia regarding future placement of community colleges was being readied. He indicated that the study would be completed by December, 1966 and it was expected that immediate action would be taken to identify as quickly as possible the community colleges that would make up the system.

Superintendent Brickell urged that the Virginia Beach local governing body invite Chancellor Hamel to Virginia Beach to discuss in detail the Virginia community college program. He emphasized the need for positive action to ensure inclusion of Virginia Beach into the community college system.¹

In a special report prepared in 1966 by officials of the city of Virginia Beach for the section of the Virginia Beach Master Plan dealing with education, it was disclosed that a city community college committee had been appointed by the Virginia Beach City Council. This committee evidently met regularly with officials of other city agencies and, according to this report had secured a pledge for the necessary acreage for the location of a community college campus in the city. In discussing the prospects and desirability of a community college campus, it was stated that the community college was the most dynamic unit in the American educational system. It was declared in the report that two-year academic and technical programs had flourished in recent years and as the need for more basic general education was felt, the community college would assume a larger role in semi-professional, technical and professional-support occupations. Toward the close of the report, statements were made to the effect that location of a community college campus in Virginia Beach
would prove to be a great asset to the community and that interested citizens were making efforts to secure such an institution for the area.\(^2\)

There were indications that officials of the city of Virginia Beach offered a 100-acre site to the Virginia Community College System for organization of the first Tidewater Community College Campus in Virginia Beach as early as 1967. The location of the site was said to be in an area now known as College Park. This name was assigned to the district because of the evident expectations that a campus eventually would be established there.\(^3\) State officials apparently did not react favorably to the offer of the College Park site by the city of Virginia Beach representatives. According to President Pass, the rejection of the College Park site may have been due to its proximity to populated areas of the other principal cities that eventually were scheduled for future Tidewater Community College campuses. Additionally, the College Park location did not appear to have optimum accessibility for the maximum number of residents of the city of Virginia Beach.\(^4\)

The surprise donation of the Frederick College property and the subsequent establishment of the Frederick Campus in 1968 prompted a reappraisal of the College Park site by officials of the city of Virginia Beach and of Tidewater Community College. The closeness of the Frederick Campus to the proposed Virginia Beach Campus site in College Park apparently necessitated reassessment of a Virginia Beach location in order to avoid eventual undesirable competition between the campuses. Under the leadership of Superintendent Brickell, an alternate site consisting of approximately 115 acres was designated in 1968 by officials of the city of Virginia Beach for the second campus in the Tidewater Community College System.
The projected site for the Virginia Beach Campus was located in the Green Run Farm area of Virginia Beach and had been purchased from the city of Norfolk for $640,800 in 1967. According to Brickell, the site was situated in the geographic center of the city of Virginia Beach where future development was scheduled. It was indicated that in spite of the potential value of this property for development of commercial enterprises, with significant income from taxes and other sources of revenue for the city, there was no community opposition to reserving this area for a future community college campus.5

There were certain restrictions imposed by the city of Norfolk as a condition of sale of this Green Run property to Virginia Beach, as suggested by correspondence from the Norfolk City Manager to the Norfolk City Council in 1972. The city manager reminded the Norfolk council that in 1967 the city of Norfolk had sold to the city of Virginia Beach property known as Green Run Farm. He indicated that the deed of conveyance to Virginia Beach at the time of the sale contained a "municipal purpose" clause which required that the land be used for municipal purposes and if it was not, the city of Norfolk had the right to reacquire the land. The Norfolk City Manager presented the request of the city of Virginia Beach that it be released from this clause for the purpose of conveying the land to the State Board for Community Colleges, and recommended approval of the request. Thus the way was cleared for the city of Virginia Beach to meet the State Board for Community Colleges requirement for a suitable site for a campus.6

Efforts by officials of the city of Virginia Beach to establish a permanent community college campus, however, continued to be frustrated.
In this instance it was the decision by the General Assembly in 1970 not to appropriate funds for the construction of a permanent Virginia Beach Campus. During a meeting of the Virginia Beach City Council in February, 1970, disappointment in the development was evidenced by a resolution unanimously adopted that stated:

WHEREAS, there has previously been approved the construction of a community college in the City of Virginia Beach; and

WHEREAS, the need for such an institution is critical; and

WHEREAS, a site has been made available by the City of Virginia Beach for such college.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED BY THE COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF VIRGINIA BEACH, VIRGINIA:

That it is with grave concern that the Council finds that House Bill Number 120, the proposed budget for the State of Virginia, fails to include any funds for the commencement of this much needed construction.

AND BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the Council strongly urges delegates and senators elected from this area to exert their utmost efforts to obtain the funding essential for the start of construction for the community college in Virginia Beach.

Herein was demonstrated again the strong sentiment that evidently existed among both the leadership and the people of the city of Virginia Beach to achieve their goal of establishing a community college campus. There appeared to be no doubt that the Virginia Beach community was united in its determination to overcome any obstacles that developed. This positive attitude manifested itself in efforts on the part of city officials to establish a temporary site to meet the need for higher educational facilities for Virginia Beach. In a letter from the college president to the chancellor in May, 1970, the president stated that the college board during its April meeting urged the State Board for Community Colleges to authorize
the opening of the Virginia Beach Campus. The resolution presented to the state board indicated that a temporary site for the Virginia Beach Campus was available and could open July 1, 1970 if funds were available.

It was decided by members of the Tidewater Community College Board at its April meeting that the building and sites committee headed by Brickell would investigate the possibility of utilizing the Camp Pendleton facilities, which belonged to the Virginia National Guard, as a suitable site for a temporary campus for Virginia Beach. Following a visit to Camp Pendleton by Brickell's committee in June, 1970, the college board voted to express to the state board their continued support for use of the Virginia National Guard facilities as a temporary campus site.

According to comments in various Tidewater Community College Board minutes, negotiations with Virginia National Guard officials continued throughout 1970. It was indicated in the college board minutes of May, 1971 that although the governor had not made a public announcement, he had given approval for use of the Camp Pendleton facilities as a temporary Virginia Beach Campus. In June, 1971 Virginia Community College System officials submitted a request to the governor for approval to award a contract to W. B. Meredith, II, Inc. authorizing renovation of Camp Pendleton facilities for the temporary Virginia Beach Campus and indicated that classes would begin in September, 1971. Realization of the hoped-for temporary Virginia Beach Campus drew closer with the drafting of a formal agreement on July 1, 1971 between officials of the Virginia National Guard and of the Virginia Community College System for use of the Camp Pendleton reservation.

Following approval by the governor and Virginia National Guard officials, renovation of eleven barracks was begun and plans undertaken
for classes to start during the fall, 1971 quarter. Equipment and furnish­nings were ordered and a faculty and staff of twenty-eight was employed. Students were registered during August and September, 1971 and it was antici­pated that approximately 700 students would attend during the first year of operation. In less than three and one-half months following the governor's approval, renovation was largely completed, faculty and staff employed, classrooms equipped and students registered for classes. So it was that the Virginia Beach Campus became a reality as the second Tidewater Community College campus in September, 1971, notwithstanding the fact that it was in temporary facilities. With an operating location assured, immediate interest shifted to the selection of curricula to be offered.

It was decided by the Tidewater Community College administration that the Virginia Beach Campus would offer associate degree programs to be used in college transfer and occupational-technical curricula as well as one-year certificate programs. College transfer programs included liberal arts, business administration, pre-teacher education and science. In its occupational-technical program would be included accounting, business management, drafting and design technology, hotel-restaurant-institutional management, insurance, merchandising management, police science, real estate management, and secretarial science. Offerings in the one-year certificate program included clerk-typist, general merchandising, industrial management, law enforcement, and mechanical drafting. Because of certain demographic and commercial characteristics of the Virginia Beach area, the hotel-restaurant-institutional management curriculum was restricted to the Virginia Beach Campus, as were the fire and police science programs. Not only was this done to serve the specialized
interests of Virginia Beach, but also to minimize expensive duplication of offerings and undesirable competition between campuses within the Tidewater Community College system.

The demographic differences between the area served by the Virginia Beach Campus and the area served by the Frederick Campus was a significant force in determining the placement of curricula. It appears that there were more demands for college transfer programs at the Virginia Beach Campus while occupational-technical programs were more popular at the Frederick Campus. This could be explained by the middle class status of many of the students of Virginia Beach and their traditional emphasis on attending college, also the fact that the Virginia Beach area did not have a four-year liberal arts institution.

Significant to the establishment of the programs of instruction for the Virginia Beach Campus was the influence of Virginia Beach officials in ensuring that articulation between the public school system and Tidewater Community College was emphasized. As attention continued to be focussed on Virginia Beach, the Tidewater Community College Board formulated priorities for campus development.

According to Tidewater Community College Board minutes of September 15, 1971 recommendations were to be made to the State Board for Community Colleges as to the priorities that seemed best suited for the development of the campuses. It was evident that the Tidewater Community College Board had decided that the first priority should be a permanent Virginia Beach Campus. There also were indications that the State Board for Community Colleges had approved this priority rating for Virginia Beach. Thus it would seem that Virginia Beach would be considered as the site of the second Tidewater Community College campus. Throughout the history
of Tidewater Community College, facilities appeared to be a perennial problem. The temporary Virginia Beach campus was no exception to this dilemma.

Less than thirty days following the opening of the temporary Virginia Beach Campus, the campus dean of student services presented to President Montgomery an urgent request for additional facilities. The dean indicated that the students had voiced their need for facilities to support activities such as a Student Government Association, newspaper, lounge, snack bar, social and religious clubs and other functions. The additional facilities eventually were approved and demonstrated the involvement of students in the affairs of the campus. In addition, since state funds were not available to renovate the building to be used for the student activities, authorization was given by the Virginia Community College System officials to expand college resources to accomplish the work.

The issue of facilities surfaced again in February, 1972 when the chancellor was informed by the Tidewater Community College administration that the shortage of classroom space would be a negative influence on enrollment. Since student admissions form a vital link in the budget-making cycle of the college, the request was assured consideration. Within three months the mechanism to obtain the classroom space was activated and successful results assured. As enrollment and activities continued to grow and expand, the pressure for additional facilities at Camp Pendleton intensified and persisted to the time that the Virginia Beach permanent campus finally was constructed on the Green Run Farm site in 1974, and continued through the decade of this study. While aggressive activity was in progress to establish a viable temporary Virginia Beach Campus on
the Virginia National Guard installation, the Tidewater Community College administration and board apparently were mapping strategy and planning courses of action to obtain appropriate funding from the General Assembly to construct the permanent Virginia Beach Campus.

According to Tidewater Community College Board minutes of February 18, 1970, President Montgomery and a member of the State Board for Community Colleges presented plans for the permanent Virginia Beach Campus to the joint Senate Finance and House Appropriations Committee on February 4, 1970. This action was taken at the request of the governor and illustrated the level of influence and interest that existed for the establishment of the permanent Virginia Beach Campus. At a subsequent Tidewater Community College Board meeting held in January, 1971, interest in a permanent campus again was evident when the board directed Montgomery to prepare a resolution requesting that capital funds already designated by the General Assembly for the Richmond-Henrico campus be diverted to Tidewater Community College for the purpose of establishing a permanent campus at the Virginia Beach Green Run Farm site.

The Tidewater Community College Board took the initiative and authorized local funds for a Green Run Farm site survey and test borings. President Montgomery also was directed to ask for state funds for a master site plan for Virginia Beach. The president reported to the board in January, 1972 that the transfer of the 115-acre Green Run Farm site for the permanent Virginia Beach Campus had been made from the city of Virginia Beach to the commonwealth of Virginia. The campaign to obtain state funding for construction of the permanent campus gained momentum as was indicated in February, 1971 when the college board wrote to selected
members of the General Assembly soliciting their support for the $3.7 million that was included in the governor's budget for the Virginia Beach Campus. The effort produced results, because during the March, 1972 Tidewater Community College Board meeting, Montgomery announced that the General Assembly had approved the amount requested for construction of the permanent Virginia Beach Campus. The action climaxd a six-year campaign for a public institution of higher education in Virginia Beach. A month later the chairman of the Tidewater Community College Board building and site committee reported that a contract had been signed with the architects for purposes of development of the permanent Virginia Beach Campus. The report was approved by the Tidewater Community College Board for the Virginia Beach Campus Master Site Plans and recommended to the State Board for Community Colleges in June, 1972. In addition to the funds approved by the General Assembly for construction of the campus, the city of Virginia Beach pledged in excess of $1 million over a period of time to help defray the cost of establishing the permanent facilities. Prepara­
tions for the actual bidding for construction contracts were underway and the important role of Chancellor Hamel and Virginia Beach officials was evident.

Apparently in response to a request by a Tidewater Community College Board member for establishment of a procedural program leading to the site development for the campus, Chancellor Hamel proposed the following agenda in July, 1972:

1. The Building and Site Committee review the time schedule which (the architect) is preparing

2. The Building and Site Committee recommend to the Local Board the acceptance of the site development plan and the cost for recommendation to the Virginia Beach City Council
3. The Board assign to the Virginia Beach Board delegation the prime responsibility for working with the City Council.

4. The Building and Site Committee and the delegation from Virginia Beach on the Tidewater Board meet with the professionals in community services and planning and the City Manager of Virginia Beach, prior to any contact with the Council.

5. The Chancellor and the College Board, especially the Virginia Beach group, meet with City Council to give them a progress report on Tidewater Community College and particularly the Virginia Beach campus.

6. The Virginia Beach delegation make individual contacts with City Council members.

7. Appear before City Council to request funds.

The significance of the schedule seemed to be the creation of a device to indicate the importance attached by the Virginia Community College System leadership to organizational planning in order to gain the participation and support of those in positions of influence in the Virginia Beach project. Also, it may be noted that the chancellor stressed the delegation of certain responsibilities to various agencies in a planned and organized manner to ensure maximum efficiency and cooperation between state and local offices. In May, 1973, George Pass, who had been selected by the college board as the second president of Tidewater Community College following the resignation of Montgomery, informed the Virginia Beach City Manager that the firm of W. B. Meredith, II, Inc. was the low bidder for construction of the Virginia Beach Campus. With the bidding process scarcely completed, the problem of classroom space at the Pendleton site again emerged.

President Pass informed the chancellor of the need to retain the Camp Pendleton facilities because of the approximate timetable of twenty-three months required for completion of the first phase of the permanent
campus. Pass also informed Hamel that not only were the Virginia National Guard facilities required for the short term, but it also would be necessary to retain the buildings for an extended period of time. Pass explained that, based on projected enrollment, the Virginia Beach Campus at the Green Run Farm site would exceed its designed capacity when completed. The influx of students in subsequent months proved the validity of the president's observation and required further negotiations with the Virginia National Guard for the purpose of retaining the facilities.24 Recognizing the dilemma faced by Tidewater Community College in accommodating the increasing number of students enrolling at the Virginia Beach site, the president of W. B. Meredith, II, Inc., informed President Pass in October of 1973 that the large enrollment increase had been noted and for an additional $60,000 the construction project could be completed by September, 1974 rather than May, 1975. This was almost one complete academic year ahead of the original schedule.25 Considerable interest in the construction company's offer was apparent, as indicated by the chancellor, who informed Pass that representatives of the Virginia Community College System were seeking funds necessary to implement the early completion date for the Virginia Beach Campus.26 The chancellor was able to locate a source for the $60,000 bonus to be paid to the contractor for early completion of the campus. According to the college board minutes of January 16, 1974, $60,000 had been allocated as payment to W. B. Meredith, II, Inc., provided the campus was completed by September 25, 1974. Construction delays that seemed inevitable, however, did occur.

Chancellor Hamel informed President Pass in April, 1974 that considerable concern was being expressed by members of the State Board for
Community Colleges over the apparent slippage in the scheduled completion time for the Virginia Beach Campus and the effect on instructional programs. Hamel contacted Pass and directed him to work personally with the contractors in order to eliminate or at least to reduce the delays. In May, 1974 Pass advised Hamel that the basic contract for the Virginia Beach Campus had called for a completion date of April 29, 1975. A change order was approved which provided a bonus incentive to the contractor if he finished the project by September 25, 1974. Pass indicated that the construction was ahead of the scheduled basic contract and marginal on the early completion date. He estimated the status of the project to be about 60 per cent complete. In an apparent effort to reassure the chancellor, Pass pointed out that the project had been underway for ten months and early completion was approximately five months away. Given good weather and maximum effort, Pass told the chancellor he thought the phase-one construction would be completed by September 25, 1974 despite the fact that the contractor was slightly behind the early completion schedule.

According to the college board minutes of October 16, 1974, the Virginia Beach Campus was completed on September 25, 1974 and classes began on September 30, 1974 as planned. Formal dedication ceremonies for the permanent Virginia Beach Campus were held on April 6, 1975 with Governor Godwin and other dignitaries in attendance. Increasing numbers of students again created a demand for action to be taken to obtain additional classroom space to supplement the permanent campus.

To accomplish the goal of relieving to some extent the pressure for facilities, Virginia Community College System officials were contacted by the president of Tidewater Community College in 1976 with a request for the installation of five temporary buildings that would provide 6,720
square feet of usable space. In addition, in April, 1976 Pass asked the chancellor to use his authority to obtain additional buildings at the Camp Pendleton site in order to accommodate the increased enrollment projected for the fall, 1976 term. The 1976 request for temporary buildings was followed again in 1978 by justification for facilities to house needed classrooms and administrative offices. The number of faculty and staff grew significantly from the twenty-eight people employed for the 1971 temporary campus location at Camp Pendleton to approximately 400 during the period covered by the study. The organizational structure began to take shape and reflected the basic multi-campus organizational structure as established by the Virginia Community College System.

The first permanent provost for the Virginia Beach Campus was Michael F. La Bouve, who previously held the position of dean of student services at the Camp Pendleton facilities. The unilateral action by the Tidewater Community College Board in the selection of La Bouve as provost may have been a contributing factor which finally led to the decision by Montgomery, the first president of Tidewater Community College, to resign. There were no indications that Montgomery was directly involved in the employment of the provost or of other principal Virginia Beach Campus personnel.

Following the Virginia Community College System multi-campus organizational model, the flow chart of the Virginia Beach Campus administration as shown in Figure 3 depicts the provost, as the chief executive officer of the campus, reporting directly to the president. The provost's administrative staff consists of the dean of student services, director of continuing education, director of learning resources, and four division chairmen: business; humanities and social sciences; industrial and public
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service technologies; and natural sciences and mathematics. The directors and division chairmen also have their supporting staffs. In order to provide a more comprehensive insight into the demographic characteristics of the area served by the Virginia Beach Campus and statistics related to the student population, Appendices 3 and 4 are included with data relative to these subjects.

In reviewing the forces and influences that contributed significantly to the development of the Virginia Beach Campus, it appears that the major force that served as the primary unifying element was the aggressive leadership by city of Virginia Beach officials, particularly the division superintendent of the Virginia Beach public school system, the chancellor of the Virginia Community College System, and the president of Tidewater Community College. Although occasionally there were what appeared to be perceived differences of opinion as the establishment of the permanent Virginia Beach Campus evolved, all were evidently united in their single-minded purpose to do what was required to achieve the common goal. As with the establishment of the Frederick Campus, community leadership seemed to be an emerging dynamic force in establishment of community colleges.

The support of the city council members, representing as they were the people of Virginia Beach, was a strong influence as exemplified by the positive reaction to the designation of campus sites and the allocation of appropriate city funds. The same dedication was evident at the state level by members of the Virginia General Assembly in the backing of Governor Godwin's budget for construction of the Virginia Beach Campus. Along with leadership, cooperation by the community is a necessary
component for establishment of a community college as was well documented in relation to the Virginia Beach Campus.

Significant also was the fact that in the drive to obtain the first public institution of higher education within the city of Virginia Beach, it seemed that the influence and initiative flowed from the local area to the state rather than vice versa. Again, this seems to be a design similar to that used to establish the Frederick Campus viz. the local initiative exerting pressure on state leaders.

Selection of a final site for the Virginia Beach permanent campus also was influenced by the development of the Frederick Campus. The proximity of the Frederick Campus to the proposed College Park site was partially responsible for the designation of the Green Run Farm property as the site of the permanent Virginia Beach Campus to prevent unnecessary competition between campuses and to assure maximum accessibility for the residents of Virginia Beach. In turn, the requirement to change the permanent site necessitated negotiations between the city of Norfolk and city of Virginia Beach in order to obtain the concurrence of the Norfolk City Council for a change in the terms that governed the original sale of the Green Run Farm land.

An additional force or influence that contributed to the development and expansion of the Virginia Beach Campus was the consistent pattern of growing student enrollment from the time the temporary campus was opened at Camp Pendleton. This was in contrast to the initiation of the Frederick Campus where student enrollment did not reach levels requiring augmentation of classroom space until later in its development.

Another major force in the development of the Virginia Beach Campus was the cooperation by agencies in the community such as the Virginia
National Guard, which responded to the request from leaders of the city of Virginia Beach and Tidewater Community College for facilities that made possible the initial opening of the Virginia Beach Campus in temporary quarters. Not only did the National Guard authorize the use of its buildings in the formative period of the Virginia Beach Campus, it also allowed Tidewater Community College to continue to occupy space throughout the period of this study in order to accommodate the overflow of students from the main Green Run Farm campus.

In chapter four this study will examine the development of the Chesapeake Campus and will attempt to identify the major forces and influences that seemed to be operational in its establishment.
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CHAPTER IV
CHESAPEAKE CAMPUS

Following establishment of the Frederick Campus to serve the Portsmouth area as the first of four permanent campuses planned for the Tidewater Community College multi-campus system, and the Virginia Beach Campus to serve the residents of the city of Virginia Beach as the second campus, increased attention was centered on Chesapeake as the city where the third campus would be established. In contrast to the events that led to the development of the Frederick Campus, including donation of the Frederick College site to the state, and to leadership of the city of Virginia Beach which took the initiative in obtaining a campus of Tidewater Community College, Virginia Community College System officials made the preliminary moves that resulted in a Chesapeake Campus.

In February, 1972 Chancellor Hamel wrote to the city manager and the mayor of Chesapeake requesting that a site for the Chesapeake Campus be designated. At the same time, Tidewater Community College Board Chairman Eberwine wrote letters to the legislators of the Tidewater Community College region and to the presidents of Chambers of Commerce asking for their assistance in obtaining $1.8 million in funding for a Chesapeake Campus that apparently had been deleted from the budget under consideration by the General Assembly. The effort failed, however, and capital outlay funds were limited to those for construction of the permanent Virginia Beach Campus. During a March, 1972 meeting of the Tidewater Community College Board, several members indicated their concern that certain moves
to obtain a campus in Norfolk might have a negative effect on the work in progress to create the Chesapeake Campus. President Montgomery attempted to calm the concern of the board members and gave his assurances that the Chesapeake Campus activity would in no way be jeopardized.\(^2\) This was followed by the recommendation of Tidewater Community College Board members that city of Chesapeake officials be given an orientation to acquaint them with their responsibilities in relationship to the Virginia Community College System.

The Tidewater Community College Board met with the mayor and council of the city of Chesapeake in July, 1972. During this meeting Chancellor Hamel, who also was serving as the acting president of Tidewater Community College following Montgomery's resignation, reviewed the history of the Virginia Community College System. Hamel also described the role that the city of Chesapeake and a Chesapeake Campus would have in the Virginia Community College System. The chancellor pointed out that Chesapeake probably could be funded for a permanent campus of Tidewater Community College when a suitable site was made available by city of Chesapeake officials.\(^3\)

In September, 1972 Chancellor Hamel informed the Tidewater Community College Board that he had learned that the Chesapeake City Council was interested in acquiring the Chesapeake College property and additional facilities as needed as a possible site for the Chesapeake Campus.\(^4\) Hamel indicated that the Chesapeake City Council was waiting for an appraisal of the Chesapeake College property before making a concrete offer to the commonwealth of Virginia for a Chesapeake Campus site. The chancellor also advised the Tidewater Community College Board that he had been
authorized by the State Board for Community Colleges to explore the possibilities of procuring the Chesapeake College property.5

Chesapeake College was a small, private two-year liberal arts institution founded by Thomas E. Russ and the Chesapeake College Foundation in 1961. Chesapeake College consisted of three buildings with 13,000 square feet of space and approximately seventeen acres of land. There were indications that the apparently financially troubled college was having difficulty maintaining student enrollment as well as acquiring the funds necessary to function effectively. Chesapeake College officials thought this situation may have been due in part to the opening of the Frederick and Virginia Beach Campuses with their low tuition rates and comprehensive academic programs.

The Chesapeake College administration evidently viewed the efforts by the Virginia Community College System to establish a Chesapeake Campus as a possible solution to their dilemma of mounting debts, loss of students and difficulty in competing with Tidewater Community College.6 It seems plausible to assume that these influences combined to motivate the Chesapeake College administration to offer to negotiate the sale of the land and facilities to the city of Chesapeake. The possibility of acquiring Chesapeake College was received by some Tidewater Community College Board members with less than total enthusiasm, as was indicated by a call for caution by the Board members in accepting Chesapeake College with its limited facilities and outstanding financial obligations.

The seriousness of the intent of the Chesapeake College administration to sell the property was indicated by a letter written in August, 1972 by Harry R. Dudley, Jr., chairman of the Chesapeake College Educational
Foundation, to Chesapeake City Manager Durwood S. Curling in which Dudley confirms a discussion that evidently took place between the two officials concerning the offer to sell the Chesapeake College property and land to the city of Chesapeake for the sum of $275,000. Dudley stated that about $107,000 of the sale price was represented by a deed of trust held by a Chesapeake bank and that he thought the note could be renegotiated with terms more favorable to the city. In his correspondence, Dudley pointed out that the offer was being presented with the understanding that the Chesapeake College property subsequently would be deeded to the Virginia Community College System to be used as the Chesapeake Campus of Tidewater Community College.  

Chancellor Hamel, continuing his personal negotiations with officials of the city of Chesapeake, reported to the Tidewater Community College Board in October, 1972 that he and the representatives from Chesapeake who were members of the Tidewater Community College Board had met with Chesapeake City Manager Curling to discuss acquisition of Chesapeake College as the site of the future Chesapeake Campus. Hamel explained that the appraisal of the college property requested by the Chesapeake City Council had not been completed. He indicated that in order to be prepared if and when the transfer took place, he planned to request funds from the General Assembly to operate Chesapeake College as a community college campus on a temporary basis. This action suggests that Chesapeake City Manager Curling had reacted favorably to the offer made by Chairman Dudley of the Chesapeake College Board of Trustees. An additional indication of the interest expressed by officials of the city of Chesapeake was correspondence from Hamel to Curling advising him of the
procedures to be followed in presenting the Chesapeake College property to the commonwealth of Virginia in the event the purchase was consummated.

Apparently responding to a letter written by President Mitchell of Chesapeake College, Chancellor Hamel advised City Manager Curling in January, 1973 that if they decided to purchase Chesapeake College and present the property as the Chesapeake Campus, an official statement of intent to make the presentation should be made to the Tidewater Community College Board and to the State Board for Community Colleges. Following this action by city of Chesapeake officials, Hamel stated that the State Board for Community Colleges then would have to accept officially the offer of the city of Chesapeake and thereby make Chesapeake College a part of the Tidewater Community College multi-campus system. Hamel touched on the subject of arrangements for deeds and transferral of property, but evidently expected no difficulty with these administrative matters.  

Acquisition of Chesapeake College as the forerunner of the third Tidewater Community College campus drew closer to reality when Thomas E. Russ, founder of Chesapeake College, informed Chancellor Hamel by telegram on January 23, 1973 that the Chesapeake City Council had voted that night to transfer the existing Chesapeake College property and land to Tidewater Community College as the Chesapeake Campus, effective February 1, 1973. Russ expressed both his and President Mitchell's approval of the decision made by the Chesapeake city officials.

Speaking for the Chesapeake City Council, City Manager Curling informed Chancellor Hamel on January 24, 1973 that the city council had voted unanimously on January 23, 1973 to request the State Board for Community Colleges to establish a Chesapeake Campus of Tidewater
Community College at the site of the Chesapeake College. Curling further advised the Chancellor that the action of the city council was taken with the understanding that the city of Chesapeake would acquire all of the holdings of Chesapeake College, including buildings, land, equipment and books, and that the facilities would be deeded to the commonwealth of Virginia. In addition, Curling went on to say that the city of Chesapeake would obtain additional land acceptable to the State Board for Community Colleges in order to meet the requirement for a site of approximately eighty acres. Curling advised Hamel that he was negotiating with owners of the property adjoining Chesapeake College to acquire the additional acreage.

City Manager Curling provided Chancellor Hamel with a certified copy of an extract from the Chesapeake City Council minutes of January 23, 1973 which stated:

Councilman Forehand, on a substitute motion, seconded by Councilman Clarke, moved that the City Council request the State Board of Community Colleges that they establish for Region 22, the Chesapeake campus of the Tidewater Community College at the present site of Chesapeake College on Cedar Road in Chesapeake, and that notification to the State Board be made immediately so that transition may take place on or before February 1, 1973, and that the City close negotiations with adjacent property owners, where agreement has been reached, and continue its negotiations with those property owners where agreement has not been reached, and if we are unable to acquire the property on negotiations, that the City Manager report back to Council at a later date with his recommendation.

Chancellor Hamel, reporting to the Tidewater Community College Board, apprised them of the action taken by the Chesapeake City Council both to acquire Chesapeake College and to purchase additional land for the Chesapeake Campus. Hamel indicated that site consultants of the commonwealth of Virginia had approved the location for the Chesapeake
Campus. In addition, he informed the Tidewater Community College Board that the Virginia Division of Engineering and Buildings had recommended that the existing structures eventually be demolished and a new facility constructed. Following Hamel's recommendation to accept the city of Chesapeake's offer of Chesapeake College as the Tidewater Community College campus, the Tidewater Community College Board approved the acquisition. It was stipulated that Chesapeake College would be administered as it was for the remainder of the scholastic year ending July 1, 1973. This provision probably was made to minimize the disruption of classes then in session, and any adverse effects on the students. The chancellor advised the Tidewater Community College Board that the Virginia Community College System would assume ownership of Chesapeake College on February 1, 1973.

Chancellor Hamel further informed the Tidewater Community College Board that the incumbent faculty and staff of Chesapeake College would be placed on the state payroll as of February 1, 1973 with a pay increase of approximately 12 per cent which would absorb retirement and insurance costs. There was no obligation to employ the Chesapeake College faculty and staff beyond July 1, 1973, and all employees would be evaluated on the basis of state personnel guidelines concerning eligibility for permanent employment. The transition from private college to comprehensive community college campus was not without its problems, especially when it became necessary to terminate several Chesapeake College faculty and staff who did not meet the state personnel criteria for permanent employment with Tidewater Community College.
Continuing with the administrative procedures to obtain ownership of Chesapeake College, Chancellor Hamel expressed his approval to Chesapeake City Manager Curling of the unanimous decision made by the City Council to establish the Chesapeake Campus of Tidewater Community College on the site of the Chesapeake College. Hamel informed Curling on January 30, 1973 that the Virginia Community College System Building and Site Committee would make appropriate recommendations to the Executive Committee of the State Board for Community Colleges. Assuming positive action by the State Board for Community Colleges, the entire proposal for transfer of the Chesapeake College property would then be presented to the governor for his consideration.

Simultaneously with this approval process, the chancellor, acting in the role of president of Tidewater Community College, advised City Manager Curling that officials of the city of Chesapeake were expected to take the necessary legal steps to have the properties transferred to the State Board for Community Colleges. Curling was informed that if students were to be registered for the spring, 1973 term, and if the Virginia Community College System and Tidewater Community College were to assume responsibility for the operation of Chesapeake College, the transfer of the Chesapeake College property with the seventeen acres of land must be completed by the city of Chesapeake prior to February 5, 1973. Referring to the agreement by the Chesapeake City Council to furnish a site of approximately eighty acres, Hamel indicated that the State Board for Community Colleges required notification of the date when the land acquisition would be completed.¹⁴
In January, 1973 George B. Pass was appointed as the second president of Tidewater Community College and immediately entered into the negotiations, thus ending Hamel's direct role as negotiator. Subsequent to the final transfer of Chesapeake College to the Virginia Community College System as the Chesapeake Campus of Tidewater Community College in February, 1973, President Pass assigned central office administrative personnel to Chesapeake College on a temporary basis. This was done to provide Tidewater Community College with representation and to administer its activities in accordance with the policies and guidelines of the Virginia Community College System during the period of transition. Attention of the officials now focussed on selection of instructional programs to be offered by the Chesapeake Campus.

The administration of Tidewater Community College apparently decided that instructional programs for the Chesapeake Campus would include associate degree programs to be applied to college transfer, occupational-technical curricula, and one-year certificate programs. During the transitional period from the semester system used by the Chesapeake College to the quarter system used by the community college system, initial offerings were restricted to liberal arts, business administration, business management and law enforcement curricula. Also, in keeping with the Tidewater Community College president's policy that academic programs would be placed on the basis of demographic characteristics, community needs and employment prospects of the area served by the individual campus, it was determined that the Tidewater Community College horticultural program would be located at the Chesapeake Campus.
Following registration of students in February and March, the spring, 1973 term began with 300 students attending classes at the Chesapeake Campus. The Chesapeake College staff, along with new Tidewater Community College personnel, selected the academic programs. The first classes initiated the first quarter session in the spring of 1973. Officials of the Virginia Community College System and Tidewater Community College concentrated their efforts on planning of the permanent Chesapeake Campus and on procuring of funds for construction of facilities. In order to obtain insight into some of the forces that appeared to exert influence on these efforts to expedite construction of the permanent Chesapeake Campus, it was considered appropriate to discuss negotiations between the commonwealth of Virginia, Tidewater Community College and Chesapeake City officials concerning the acquisition of land and funding of the construction projects.

Apparently the chancellor's efforts to procure initial funds for the planning of the permanent Chesapeake Campus from the Virginia General Assembly during its 1973 session were successful. Hamel authorized President Pass to inform the Chesapeake City Manager that planning funds for the Chesapeake Campus in the amount of $68,000 had been approved by the State Board for Community Colleges. Pass also advised City Manager Curling that the State Board for Community Colleges had approved the initiation of planning for construction of the permanent Chesapeake Campus. Pass indicated that the architectural firm of Shriver and Holland had been employed to prepare the drawings for construction of the campus facilities.

The Tidewater Community College president told Curling that in the initial planning stages of the permanent campus, topographic survey data
and information relating to the plans of the city of Chesapeake for sewage and water at the campus site was needed. Pass further explained that since the state assumed financial responsibility for the construction of all buildings and related facilities up to five feet outside the buildings, and the city of Chesapeake was responsible for the cost of certain on-site and off-site improvements, no plans could be made for the essential sewage and water installations until the plans of the city of Chesapeake were furnished to Tidewater Community College officials. In an effort to emphasize the urgency of furnishing the planning data, Pass advised Curling that in order to meet the schedule for completion of the Chesapeake Campus Master Plan and Schematic Drawings, it was imperative that the city of Chesapeake provide the material pertinent to the survey data and to the sewage and water system at the earliest feasible time.17

Following the request for information made by President Pass, a conference was held in mid-May, 1973 between City Manager Curling, Chesapeake City Director of the Department of Public Utilities Allen, and representatives of the Virginia Community College System and of Tidewater Community College. Curling and Allen were informed by the Virginia Community College System representatives that the state was prepared to follow any reasonable course of action proposed by the city of Chesapeake in order to meet the requirements for sewage and water by the estimated construction completion date of September, 1975. Curling and Allen reviewed the long-range plans for installation of sewage and water in the city of Chesapeake, including the area containing the Chesapeake Campus site, and concluded that the planning scheduled called for water and
sewage facilities to be installed at the community college site during 1976-77.

City Manager Curling explained that there were certain political considerations involved in the construction of city water and sewage facilities to serve the Chesapeake College area. Curling cited the results of a 1969 referendum in which the final site was selected. Opponents of the development of the area that included the community college charged that the choice was made in response to pressure from certain special-interest groups that were supporting the development of adjacent property for commercial purposes. Curling evidently thought that it would be difficult to convince the city council to change the installation schedule from 1976-77 to the 1975 period which was mandated by the Virginia Community College System. He also was concerned about justifying an expenditure of an estimated $200,000 for sewage and water plants for the interim period of approximately two years, and suggested that as an alternative, other sewage disposal procedures be investigated.\(^1\)

The problem was resolved by a Chesapeake Department of Public Utilities plan. Director Allen indicated that since the city of Chesapeake sewer system that would provide connections to the Chesapeake Campus site was not scheduled for construction until 1977, the proposed alternative of septic tanks and of tie-ins to existing sewage facilities was considered adequate for the interim period.\(^2\)

Also during the May, 1973 conference, members discussed the need to purchase the additional land in order to supplement the original seventeen acres of Chesapeake College for purposes of meeting the Virginia Community College System acreage requirement for the permanent Chesapeake
Campus. Curling evidently pointed out that a parcel of property that was to make up part of the approximately eighty acres had not yet been purchased and that he preferred to delay acquisition in order to determine whether that parcel of land was needed. Virginia Community College System officials informed City Manager Curling that limiting the permanent campus acreage could impose restrictions on construction of facilities envisioned in the master plan prepared for the Chesapeake Campus. The problem of acquiring suitable land for the permanent Chesapeake Campus site evidently continued to persist and threatened to influence adversely the timely completion of site preparation and of the first phase of construction.

President Pass informed the Chancellor in September, 1973 that according to the architects, excessive costs would be incurred if an attempt was made to develop a portion of land described by the architect as unsuitable for construction. A parcel of land adjoining the original Chesapeake College property was recommended by the architects as a feasible alternative. Pass indicated that city of Chesapeake officials favored the purchase of the alternate site suggested by the architects if this action was acceptable to the State Board for Community Colleges. The apparent concern for the change in the site configuration on the part of the Chesapeake City Council was that the total acreage would be reduced from 76.6 acres to 70 acres. Pass explained to the chancellor that although the proposed site was smaller, there actually would be more usable land available.

Demonstrating the influences that impinged on the development of the permanent Chesapeake Campus, President Pass alerted the chancellor
that all work on the Chesapeake Campus was at a standstill pending resolution of the land acquisition problem. Additionally, Pass indicated that further delays would mean slippages in the planning schedule for the campus. The president furthermore stated that it was imperative that the State Board for Community Colleges move forward with the approval for purchase of the site recommended both by the architects and by members of the Chesapeake City Council because the price of land was rising rapidly in Chesapeake. Apparently the price escalation was due in part to an announcement that a European automobile manufacturer had decided to establish its operations in the Chesapeake area. In addition, several other industries had plans for location or for expansion in Chesapeake that would have an influence on the cost of property. In a final word of urgency, Pass advised the chancellor that the city of Chesapeake did not have an official option on the property that was needed for the Chesapeake Campus, although an unwritten agreement with the owner was said to exist. The dilemma evidently was resolved when the State Board for Community Colleges approved in October, 1973 the purchase of the acreage recommended by the architects and by members of the Chesapeake City Council. After the approval, officials of the city of Chesapeake indicated in January, 1974 that they were ready to proceed with the site work for the permanent campus.

Despite the resolution of the problems associated with acquisition of land for the permanent Chesapeake Campus, difficulties continued which delayed the actual construction of the Campus. A major force in the delay seemed to be the fact that the Virginia General Assembly did not appropriate the capital outlay funds essential for first-phase
construction. Chesapeake City Manager Curling reported to Chancellor Hamel in August, 1974 that the Chesapeake City Council had asked that he be invited to brief members of the city council on the prospects of state funding for phase-one construction of the Chesapeake Campus. Curling informed the chancellor that he was uncertain how long he could hold in reserve local funds which had been set aside for site work at the campus.24

Chesapeake City Manager Curling's appeal to the chancellor for a meeting with the city council resulted in a presentation by Hamel in September, 1974 concerning the prospects of state funding for construction of the permanent Chesapeake Campus. The chancellor, however, was unable to make an immediate commitment or to obligate the state for specific funding of the campus construction.25 Writing both to Chesapeake Mayor Whitehurst and to City Manager Curling, Hamel reaffirmed the position of the Virginia Community College System to make every effort to see that the Chesapeake Campus of Tidewater Community College would have top priority in the State Board for Community Colleges' request for capital funds. The chancellor, however, expressed his doubt that capital funds would be available in the short session of the General Assembly beginning in January, 1975.26 Following Hamel's presentation, the Chesapeake City Council reportedly voted unanimously to continue obligation of the existing financial commitments for site preparations at the Chesapeake Campus.

The concentrated activities of the combined leadership of the Virginia Community College System, Tidewater Community College, city of Chesapeake and the legislators who supported formation of the Chesapeake
Campus through receipt of the essential commitment of state funds met with little success and their efforts apparently were frustrated throughout 1975 and 1976. It was not until November, 1977 when an educational bond referendum initiated by the commonwealth of Virginia was approved by the people, that a firm commitment was made for a permanent Chesapeake Campus. Following the referendum, $2 million was allocated for first-phase construction at the Chesapeake Campus site.

Chesapeake City Manager Curling reported to the city council in January, 1978 that local fiscal arrangements had been made to build the Chesapeake Campus and that these arrangements were made possible through the bond referendum. Curling reminded the city council of its responsibility for various site improvements and that the city's share would be approximately $600,000.

Following approval of the 1977 educational bond referendum, events developed rapidly in the direction of the construction of the permanent Chesapeake Campus. President Pass and Chesapeake City Manager Curling met on January 18, 1978 and discussed the bidding process for selection of a construction company. Evidently the bid was to be advertised on January 29, 1978, the contract awarded by February 15, 1978, and the first-phase construction of the campus expected to be completed by September, 1979. According to Tidewater Community College Board minutes of May 17, 1978, the contract for phase-one construction was signed on April 24, 1978 by representatives of the Commonwealth and the Meredith Construction Company. Groundbreaking ceremonies took place at the Chesapeake Campus permanent site on April 27, 1978.
Meanwhile, by April, 1974 a shortage of classroom space became apparent and requests were made by Chesapeake Campus administrators for assistance in procuring portable buildings and renting facilities from other Chesapeake City educational institutions. Three portable buildings for classroom space were installed.

While efforts were underway to obtain construction funding from the commonwealth of Virginia by the leadership of the Virginia Community College System, Tidewater Community College and the city of Chesapeake, the need for additional classrooms intensified. As a result, approval was received by Tidewater Community College in January, 1976 to purchase five temporary relocatable buildings to supplement the three original temporary facilities obtained in 1975.

As physical facilities for classroom space were expanded to accommodate the growing student enrollment, the number of faculty and staff also increased from a total of twenty-six during the 1973 fall quarter to a total of 52 during the period covered by this report. The organizational structure following the conversion of the Chesapeake College to the Chesapeake Campus followed the Virginia Community College System multi-campus organizational model.

The first permanent provost for the Chesapeake Campus was Timothy H. Kerr, who previously had held the position of dean of student services at the Virginia Beach Campus. The flow chart of the Chesapeake Campus administration as depicted in Figure 4 shows the provost as the chief executive officer of the campus, reporting directly to the president. The provost's administrative staff consists of the director of continuing education, coordinator of admissions and records, director of
Figure 4

TIDEWATER COMMUNITY COLLEGE
ORGANIZATION CHART - CHESAPEAKE CAMPUS ADMINISTRATION

PRESIDENT
TIDEWATER COMMUNITY COLLEGE

PROVOST
CHESAPEAKE CAMPUS

BUSINESS MANAGER*

DIRECTOR CONTINUING EDUCATION

COORDINATOR
ADMISSIONS & RECORDS

DIRECTOR LIBRARY RESOURCES

CHAIRMAN
DIV. HUMANITIES & SOCIAL SERVICES

CHAIRMAN
DIV. MATHEMATICS,
NATURAL SCIENCES & TECHNOLOGIES

EFFECTIVE JULY 1978
*CLASSIFIED POSITION
library resources and the division chairmen: humanities and social services, and mathematics, natural science and technologies. The directors, coordinators and division chairmen have their supporting staffs. Since the Chesapeake Campus has the smallest enrollment, it also has the least complex organizational structure. In order to provide a more comprehensive insight into the demographic characteristics of the area served by the Chesapeake Campus and statistics related to the student population, Appendices 3 and 4 are included containing relevant data.

In reviewing the forces and influences that contributed significantly to the development of the Chesapeake Campus, it appears that a major force was the initiative of the leadership of the Virginia Community College System, particularly Chancellor Hamel, who aggressively led the way for the ultimate establishment of the Chesapeake Campus as included in the Virginia Community College System Master Plan. In contrast to the Frederick and Virginia Beach Campuses, the impetus for the Chesapeake Campus came from commonwealth of Virginia officials to the local governmental agencies rather than vice versa. The influence of the Chesapeake City Manager and members of the city council was vital to the implementation of the state plan. The local leaders represented the people of Chesapeake, and their continued interest and support was enhanced by Hamel and the Tidewater Community College President serving as the motivational forces.

The establishment of the Frederick and Virginia Beach Campuses evidently exerted a significant negative force and influence on the ability of the Chesapeake College to sustain its activities as a viable private institution. It was apparent that Chesapeake College was unable
to compete effectively with the developing Tidewater Community College campuses. Financial problems and diminishing enrollment finally led to the decision to liquidate the Chesapeake College for settlement of debts and other obligations. The impact of the forces in play which were generated by the presence of Tidewater Community College ultimately resulted in the Chesapeake College property becoming the third comprehensive community college campus. It appeared that the influence exerted by the chancellor served as a force that stimulated negotiations for the Chesapeake college property and that led to a successful conclusion of the bargaining process.

The forces and influences operational in the case of Chesapeake College were dissimilar to the events that resulted in the assumption of ownership of Frederick College facilities by the state. Chesapeake College administrators were influenced by their inability to maintain a private institution of higher education in a competitive environment created, at least in part, by the Tidewater Community College multi-campus system. The force and influence of the chancellor in approaching the city of Chesapeake for a campus site provided an opportunity for the Chesapeake College administration to resolve its financial difficulties. At the same time, Hamel's initiative focussed the attention of the leadership of the city of Chesapeake on the possibility of acquiring a community college campus and of obtaining a ready-made campus site at Chesapeake College.

Frederick College, on the other hand, was not faced with the immediate competition of a public institution of higher education in its area since the Tidewater Community College had not as yet been established.
High operating costs may have been one of the contributing influences for the decision of the Beazley Foundation to donate Frederick College and $1 million to the State Board for Community Colleges. Regardless of the motivation, the Beazley donation both of Frederick College and of partial operating funds served as an example of community leadership and community involvement as a powerful force in the formation of the Tidewater Community College multi-campus system.

A negative influence that delayed the establishment of an acceptable physical facility for the Chesapeake Campus was the fact that the General Assembly did not appropriate the necessary funding for construction of permanent facilities for several years.

Another major force and perhaps the most significant influence that resulted in the establishment of the permanent Chesapeake Campus was the action of the concerned citizens of Virginia in supporting their educational institutions and needs by approving a multi-million-dollar educational bond referendum. It is significant that the people voted overwhelmingly to approve the bond proposal, thereby leaving no doubt of their dedication to the concept of universal opportunity for higher education in Virginia.

In chapter five this study will examine efforts by the leaders of the Virginia Community College System, Tidewater Community College and the city of Norfolk to establish the fourth and last campus in Norfolk. An attempt will be made to identify the major forces and influences that prevented the development of a permanent Norfolk Campus.
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CHAPTER V
NORFOLK CAMPUS

Tidewater Community College entered the 1970's with one permanent comprehensive community college campus established, one under construction, and one in the planning stages. The forces and influences that resulted in the formation of the Frederick Campus in 1968 on the site of the former Frederick College as the first of four campuses projected for the Tidewater Community College multi-campus system were examined. The study of the founding of the first campus was followed by an examination of those forces and influences that permitted construction of the second campus, to begin in 1971, which would serve the city of Virginia Beach on the Green Run Farm site. In 1973 a third campus was established in Chesapeake on the property of the defunct Chesapeake College.

It was noted that among the forces and influences that led to the development of the Frederick Campus was the community spirit that motivated the Beazley Foundation to donate the land and buildings of Frederick College to the commonwealth of Virginia. This was in contrast to the founding of the Virginia Beach Campus where the city of Virginia Beach officials took the initiative by offering a site and partial funds for site development to the Virginia Community College System. The examination of the forces and influences that contributed to the establishment of the Chesapeake Campus disclosed that state leadership in cooperation with city of Chesapeake representatives was a primary factor for the success of the venture.
Norfolk, the city designated for a fourth Tidewater Community College campus, remains one of the few areas in the commonwealth of Virginia that was scheduled by the Virginia Community College System Master Plan for a comprehensive community college campus that has not been implemented. It appears that political forces and influences were effective in preventing the creation of a campus designed to meet the needs of the people for additional educational services. The best efforts of the leadership of the Virginia Community College System, Tidewater Community College and the city of Norfolk, plus the support of concerned Norfolk citizens, have failed to produce a permanent campus. It was considered appropriate, therefore, for this study to identify and to examine the forces and influences that were so effective in frustrating the effort to establish a community college campus in Norfolk. This phase of the study was considered especially significant in view of the fact that opponents of the establishment of the permanent Norfolk Campus included officials of the two four-year institutions located in Norfolk, executives of the Norfolk Chamber of Commerce, owners of proprietary schools operating in Norfolk, officials of the Norfolk City Council, certain delegates to the Virginia General Assembly, and leaders of several state agencies. Also of major importance in this regard was the long-range effect of various legislative restrictions imposed on the development of the permanent Norfolk Campus. These restrictions may well have been the most significant force in precluding the realization of a permanent campus in Norfolk that had been approved earlier as part of the Virginia Community College System Master Plan.

There are indications that the leadership of the Virginia Community College System and Tidewater Community College leadership took the initiative
in an effort to establish a Tidewater Community College campus in Norfolk. As early as 1969 there was discussion among Norfolk City and state officials concerning a possible name for a Norfolk Campus. It appeared that in these early efforts, obtaining of federal funds to finance construction of a campus was envisioned. According to the Tidewater Community College Board minutes of February 23, 1972, President Montgomery indicated that he had been in contact with the Virginia Community College System Director of Federal Programs Gilliatt, who was also a member of the state Model Cities Task Force. Montgomery approached Gilliatt about the possibility of making the development of a Norfolk Campus a project under the sponsorship of the Model Cities Program. Following a discussion of the possible location, type of structure, consideration of the reactions of the leadership of Old Dominion University and Norfolk State College and available transportation, Montgomery was encouraged to pursue the establishment of the fourth Tidewater Community College campus as a part of the Model Cities Program. The evident concern about the impact that a community college would have on the two four-year Norfolk educational institutions seemed to be a major force that consistently operated throughout the years of campaigning for the approval of the Norfolk Campus.

Virginia Community College System Vice-Chancellor Burnette informed Norfolk City Manager G. Robert House on March 15, 1972 of the mutual areas of interest that existed between the community college system and that of the Model Cities Program. He explained that the educational programs that were available and that would be provided by a community college campus would satisfy the vocational-occupational-developmental needs of a large market which was a primary thrust of the Model Cities Program. Burnette explained that the Norfolk Campus would
be one of the four Tidewater Community College campuses. He also outlined the policy of the State Board for Community Colleges regarding the provision of a campus site and the funding of site development. Burnette indicated that the availability of federal funds would bring about a college available to the community much earlier than would be possible if state funds were the only source of revenue for construction. The vice-chancellor also expressed his opinion to Norfolk City Manager House that a cooperative effort between the city of Norfolk, Tidewater Community College officials and other state agencies could result in a mutually beneficial project. Burnette's statement was followed by Montgomery's presenting a review of the concept of a Model Cities-funded Norfolk Campus to the members of the Tidewater Community College Board.

President Montgomery informed the Tidewater Community College Board members on March 22, 1972 that preliminary discussions of the plan had been held with Virginia Community College System officials. Montgomery, in response to a question regarding federal funding of the Norfolk Campus and its impact on construction of the Chesapeake Campus, assured the board member that federal funding of the Norfolk facility would in no way affect or deter plans for the Chesapeake Campus. The question suggests that not all Tidewater Community College Board members shared the same sense of urgency or priority for establishing a Norfolk Campus. This attitude subsequently was found to be shared by influential members of the Virginia General Assembly, who evidently were determined to prevent construction of a Norfolk Campus.

Activities to establish a Norfolk Campus continued as was indicated by a letter from Chancellor Hamel to Norfolk City Manager House on April 24, 1972 wherein he expressed his hopes for the possibility of the early
establishment of the Norfolk Campus. In the correspondence it was indicated that President Montgomery was scheduled to meet with Norfolk Model Cities Program Director Mendelsohn to examine the educational programs that might be offered in Norfolk and also to explore funding, facilities and related matters. On April 26, 1972 the Tidewater Community College Board approved the plan to open a temporary Norfolk Campus as a part of the Model Cities Program. Included in this action was board approval for use of Tidewater Community College funds, both for operations and for staffing. Approximately one month later, President Montgomery informed the Tidewater Community College Board members that the Norfolk Model Cities Commission had approved the Tidewater Community College Norfolk Campus proposal as a part of the Model Cities Program, and that the project would be forwarded to the Model Cities Governing Board for final approval.

The expectation of approval apparently was high, as indicated by Montgomery's estimate that the temporary Norfolk Campus possibly could open in September, 1972. There were no positive indications discernible in the records at this point as to where the temporary campus would be housed, since a permanent campus obviously could not be constructed in that short period of time. The subject of Old Dominion University and Norfolk State College was raised again by Tidewater Community College Board members and by Chancellor Hamel, who was acting as interim leader of Tidewater Community College following Montgomery's resignation. Hamel indicated that he planned to meet with Old Dominion University President Bugg and Norfolk State College President Brooks in early July, 1972 to discuss the establishment of a temporary Norfolk Campus as part of a Norfolk Model Cities Program project.
Chancellor Hamel continued his active role in the drive for a Norfolk Campus. This was exemplified by Hamel's informing a Tidewater Community College Board member representing the city of Norfolk in August, 1972 of his desire to work closely with city of Norfolk officials to accomplish the goal of a permanent campus for Norfolk. Hamel mentioned to the Tidewater Community College Board member the possibility of setting aside some acreage for a high-rise campus structure in the East Ghent redevelopment area of Norfolk.8

A significant development a few months later was the installation of George B. Pass as the second president of Tidewater Community College in January, 1973. President Pass immediately became directly involved in the search for a viable approach to establishment of a Norfolk Campus.9

Chancellor Hamel, during a special Tidewater Community College Board meeting on January 23, 1973, reviewed the efforts of officials of the Virginia Community College System and others to establish a temporary Norfolk Campus. He indicated that Tidewater Community College had budgeted $100,000 to be matched by $100,000 from the Norfolk Model Cities Program. It was interesting to note that the vacated Cavalier Ford building in Norfolk apparently was under consideration by Virginia Community College System officials and representatives of the city of Norfolk as a temporary location for the Norfolk Campus. Meanwhile, the Norfolk members of the Tidewater Community College Board reported that the city of Norfolk was prepared to donate a site for a permanent Norfolk Campus. The site evidently was in the East Ghent area referred to earlier by the chancellor as a desirable location for the fourth Tidewater Community College campus. The Tidewater Community College Board voted to accept the proposed site from the city of Norfolk.10 The importance of the reaction to the site
offered by the city of Norfolk was underscored by a discussion held between Chancellor Hamel and President Pass.

The chancellor informed President Pass on March 5, 1973 that during a meeting held in Norfolk on February 1, 1973, the Building and Site Committee of the State Board for Community Colleges visited the proposed East Ghent site for the Norfolk Campus. Hamel stated that the Building and Site Committee unanimously recommended that this site be acquired for the Norfolk Campus of Tidewater Community College if possible. Hamel advised Pass that the city of Norfolk should be encouraged to obtain this parcel of land and transfer it to the State Board for Community Colleges. Pass reacted to the chancellor's suggestion and contacted Doyle E. Hull, who represented the city of Norfolk as a member of the Tidewater Community College Board, on March 13, 1973. Pass informed Hull of the chancellor's encouragement to proceed with the acquisition of the property for the permanent Norfolk Campus and expressed his understanding that Hull would contact Norfolk City Manager House. While negotiations were in progress for a permanent site for the Norfolk Campus, efforts evidently continued by Tidewater Community College officials to locate a site for a temporary Norfolk Campus operation. At one point it appeared that Tidewater Community College was prepared to lease the facilities of the Roughton Pontiac Company in downtown Norfolk, the cost of which was to be partially offset with federal funds from the Norfolk Model Cities Program. Following the discussion with Pass, Tidewater Community College Board member Hull was in contact with Norfolk City Manager House on March 23, 1973.

Hull reminded Norfolk City Manager House that he was appointed by the Norfolk City Council to represent Norfolk on the Tidewater
Community College Board which also represented Chesapeake, Portsmouth and Virginia Beach. Hull explained that each of the cities had obtained a Tidewater Community College campus and that appropriations had been or were being requested in connection with facilities. At this point, Hull indicated to House that Norfolk was the only city in the Tidewater Community College system that had as yet to select and donate a permanent campus site. Hull went on to explain that the requirements of the state program were that the site and certain site improvements be contributed, after which the state would appropriate the construction budget. Operating costs were subsidized through the state budget and through tuition.

Building a case for a permanent campus site, Hull advised Norfolk City Manager House that in reviewing the unique problems that existed in Norfolk and the need to serve its potential student body, he believed that the Norfolk Campus would be best situated near the downtown area. Hull then recommended that the city manager consider dedicating a section of the East Ghent property to the State Board for Community Colleges. This was the site that Chancellor Hamel and the State Board for Community Colleges had recommended earlier for the Norfolk Campus. Hull indicated further that the site would enable students to make maximum usage of the public transportation system. In a further effort to convince House of the desirability of a Norfolk Campus, Hull pointed out that this location would be a direct complement to the proposed downtown development, in that the campus would not only train permanent employees for business and industry, but would provide shoppers, residents and part-time employees from among the faculty and students.

Hull referred to the action by members of the State Board for Community Colleges and Tidewater Community College Board to approve the East
Ghent location. He explained to the city manager that although the thirty-six-acre site was less than the minimum requirement of eighty acres generally required by the State Board for Community Colleges, the commonwealth of Virginia was willing to accept the location if it was offered by the city of Norfolk. As his final point, Hull advised City Manager House that a Carnegie Foundation research study reported Norfolk as being one of thirteen major cities which was deemed unlikely to meet the higher educational needs of its population. Hull indicated that he had little doubt that the community college concept would do a great deal to overcome the adverse publicity and implications for the future suggested by the Carnegie study. Following Hull's correspondence relating to the need for a site for a permanent Norfolk Campus, the Norfolk City Manager evidently directed that a study be conducted of potential campus locations in the city of Norfolk.

The study of the various sites presented on May 1, 1973 by the Norfolk Department of City Planning Director Philip A. Stedfast to the city manager included a background paper on the establishment of a Norfolk Campus. Director Stedfast indicated that basically the position Norfolk should assume supported the concept of a permanent Tidewater Community College Norfolk Campus.

Explaining a portion of the rationale for recommending his position regarding the permanent Norfolk Campus, Stedfast indicated that one of the main areas considered in developing his position was the documented need for serving the continuing educational needs of the people of Norfolk. Stedfast explained that the enrollment projections for Old Dominion University, Norfolk State College, Virginia Wesleyan College and Tidewater Community College for 1980 were analyzed and evaluated in terms of anticipated
population growth and movement. It was concluded in the study that the pool of prospective students was large enough to support all institutions of higher education in Norfolk. Preparers of the study expressed concern about the effect of a Norfolk Campus on the occupational-technical training available at Norfolk State College. According to Stedfast, it was concluded that although the position of Norfolk State College had to be protected in this respect, the projected need for occupational-technical training was great enough and the involvement of Norfolk State College in occupational-technical training low enough, that its position was in no immediate danger from competition by a Tidewater Community College Norfolk Campus. In addition, Stedfast suggested that Norfolk State College should devote more time and resources to expanding and upgrading its role as a four-year institution and to developing its growing post-graduate resource capability.

The examination of twelve possible sites was included in the Stedfast study along with three sites that would require further evaluation. Included in these top three selections was the East Ghent site originally identified by the Virginia Community College System and by Tidewater Community College representatives. By this time, however, the acreage of the site had been reduced from the thirty-six acres envisioned by officials of the Virginia Community College System to approximately eight acres as recommended by the Stedfast study. Commenting on findings of the Stedfast report, Tidewater Community College Board member Hull indicated to President Pass on May 10, 1973 that it probably would not be productive to press for the total East Ghent acreage since there were apparently restrictions imposed by the city of Norfolk that the area be developed for replacement housing. Hull further informed Pass that there appeared to
be no basic problem with the willingness of the city of Norfolk officials to proceed with the designation of a location except that they desired to negotiate for a smaller site in order to stay within the limits of their financial contributions.\textsuperscript{15}

Following this discussion, President Pass apprised members of the Tidewater Community College Board on May 31, 1973 of the site study done by Stedfast. Pass indicated that consultants would be assigned from the Virginia Community College System and from the State Board for Community Colleges to view the sites recommended by the city of Norfolk. Pass also explained that after the consultants made their report, the next step would be to have the Tidewater Community College Board Building and Site Committee members study the findings. After the Tidewater Community College Board had made known its priorities, the information would be transmitted to Norfolk City Manager House, and to the State Board for Community Colleges.\textsuperscript{16} In addition, Pass appointed several members of the Tidewater Community College staff in July, 1973 to prepare a study of the twelve potential permanent Norfolk Campus sites listed in the Stedfast report. The Tidewater Community College study committee arranged the twelve sites in order of priority.

It appeared that neither substantial gains nor significant progress was made toward the acquisition of a permanent site for a Norfolk Campus by the city of Norfolk. It was disclosed in the Tidewater Community College Board minutes of October 17, 1973 that the various proposed permanent sites had been discussed and that no apparent firm commitment had been reached. It evidently was decided by members of the Tidewater Community College Board that a request for a permanent Norfolk Campus site should be prepared and presented to the Norfolk City Council prior to the meeting
of the 1974 Virginia General Assembly. On November 2, 1973, the Tidewater Community College Board members decided that both the Building and Site Committee and the Norfolk representatives on the Tidewater Community College Board would meet to draft a site proposal which would be submitted to Norfolk City Manager House. A major shift in the campaign to obtain commitment of a permanent site and funding from the city of Norfolk for the Norfolk Campus surfaced and constituted a major force in the future direction of the negotiations for a Norfolk Campus facility.

Norfolk Model City Program Director Martin Mendelsohn contacted President Pass on November 26, 1973 and informed the president that the city of Norfolk planners were initiating a comprehensive review of an occupational-technical skills training center to be located in the downtown area of Norfolk, with the intent of formulating a concrete plan for the operation and administration of the skills center after a period of renovation. The skills center evidently was to be renovated through a federally-funded Model Cities Project. Mendelsohn asked Pass to respond to a number of questions, among which was the potential role of Tidewater Community College in the planning, administration and operation of the skills center, manpower training programs planned for the center, supportive manpower service agencies other than those directly involved in training that were to be housed in the facility, and what agency should be responsible for the day-to-day operation, programmatic planning and coordination of the facility. Mendelsohn cautioned Pass at this point that his request for data was not to be interpreted as a commitment by the Model Cities Program to Tidewater Community College for operation of the future skills center. This was followed by a response from Pass on December 13, 1973 that outlined both the role and the assets that Tidewater
Community College could contribute to the Norfolk skills center project development. In essence, the emphasis of the Tidewater Community College plan was to offer occupational-technical skills training that would permit students more immediate entry into the job market and, in addition, could furnish career training for students who desired to pursue long-range educational goals.20 Signaling the interest of the Norfolk Model City Program in obtaining the participation of Tidewater Community College in the skills center project, Director Mendelsohn advised Pass on December 20, 1973 that the Tidewater Community College plan would be considered in terms of meeting manpower training needs of the city of Norfolk through utilization of the skills center facility.21

Meanwhile, with the convening of the 1974 General Assembly imminent, President Pass provided Chancellor Hamel on January 2, 1974 with a background study of the educational activities conducted by Tidewater Community College at its various off-campus locations. Apparently the study was to be used by the chancellor in his discussions with committees and members of the General Assembly. Pass indicated to Hamel that enrollment, program projections, and educational needs assessments of Norfolk reinforced the plans for a permanent Norfolk Campus as originally conceived in the State Master Plan for Community Colleges.22

On January 2, 1974, evidently in response to a request from a member of the Virginia Senate for information about the Virginia Community College System, Chancellor Hamel indicated the extent of the educational services offered by Tidewater Community College to the people of Norfolk through what were essentially storefront operations. Hamel informed the senator that the State Board for Community Colleges had given high priority in its 1974-76 biennium for funds to construct a permanent Norfolk
Campus. The chancellor referred to comments that apparently had been made about the availability of excess classroom space at many of the four-year colleges across the state and that these classrooms should be put to use before additional classrooms were built. Hamel indicated to the senator that if there actually was excess classroom space available, it generally was in the wrong place and of the wrong design to provide occupational-technical education to the people of the commonwealth. The chancellor stressed that the vacant classroom space could not be adapted readily to provide the occupational-technical programs required by prospective community college students nor was the vacant classroom space accessible to the students seeking such training.

The concerted drive by the leadership of the Virginia Community College System, Tidewater Community College, city of Norfolk representatives and supportive legislators failed to convince members of the 1974 General Assembly that funds should be appropriated for a permanent Norfolk Campus.

President Pass discussed with Chancellor Hamel on January 25, 1974 the fact that capital outlay funding for first-phase construction of facilities for the permanent Norfolk Campus with an estimated cost of over $7 million had not been recommended by Governor Holton. In addition, planning funds for the proposed Norfolk Campus also had been denied by members of the General Assembly. Evidently the officials of the Virginia Community College System and the State Board for Community Colleges were planning to recommend that these funds be included in the 1974-76 biennium budget. According to Pass, this would mean $201,000 for master planning of the permanent Norfolk Campus. Hamel instructed Pass to prepare justification for the required planning funds, although it seemed apparent that
funds were more urgently needed for the construction of the Norfolk Campus facilities.24

Summarizing the Norfolk Campus situation, President Pass advised Hamel that from studies of area educational needs prepared by Tidewater Community College and other agencies of the Norfolk community, a comprehensive community college was justified. He indicated that the secondary schools and the institutions of higher learning in Norfolk were not meeting the occupational-technical needs of the community which are served by a community college campus. Describing pertinent Norfolk demographic factors, Pass informed Hamel that in the age group of persons twenty-five years and older, there were 143,000 individuals. Seventy-five thousand of these persons had less than a high school education, i.e., 52 per cent of these individuals twenty-five years and older had less than a high school diploma. Pass stated that there were over 22,000 persons in Norfolk's underutilized labor force, and that with community college training these individuals could elevate themselves to the level of job entry or they could begin working full-time jobs which would place them above poverty level incomes. Manpower needs in Norfolk included bookkeepers, clerk-typists, electronic technicians, mechanics, nurses, secretaries, shipfitters, truck drivers, welders and others. Considering the economic effect of a permanent campus in Norfolk, Pass advised Hamel that an anticipated opening enrollment of 2,500 students could bring to the city of Norfolk at least $5,750,000 in faculty, support staff and student earnings. This estimate was based on the assumption that at least 80 per cent of the student body would be working an average of twenty hours per week while attending classes at the Norfolk Campus.
President Pass informed Chancellor Hamel as part of the justification for a request to the General Assembly for Norfolk Campus planning monies, that Tidewater Community College was offering twenty-two courses in six different locations in Norfolk and there were 540 students enrolled in these credit courses. Pass indicated that during the fall, 1973 quarter, 1,075 Norfolk residents were enrolled in credit programs on the three existing campuses of Tidewater Community College. Students who were presently residing in the population center of Norfolk were traveling an average of thirty-six miles per day if they were attending classes on one of the established campuses of Tidewater Community College. Transportation costs, including tolls, amounted to over $4.00 per day for these students. The president concluded his remarks by saying that the Norfolk Campus was an immediate need and without planning funds the project would be delayed well into the 1976-78 biennium. Subsequent community influences beyond Pass' control continued to prevent the establishment of a fourth permanent Tidewater Community College campus.

Norfolk City Mayor Roy B. Martin, Jr., on February 7, 1974, expressed his concern to Governor Godwin over the action of the General Assembly concerning funding for a Norfolk Campus. Martin indicated to Governor Godwin that in the curriculum that was proposed for a Norfolk Campus, there was no conflict with existing state-supported institutions in Norfolk. In addition, Martin disclosed the desire of the city of Norfolk to sell to the commonwealth for approximately $3 million the facility which was being renovated by the Model Cities Program as a skills training center. Martin described the skills center as suitable for the Norfolk Campus and compared this price for the facility with that of the estimated cost of $7 million to build a permanent Norfolk Campus. Mayor
Martin reminded Governor Godwin that the city of Norfolk officials had agreed that it would be appropriate for Norfolk to be the last site established in the Tidewater Community College system. This was done, the mayor explained, so as not to engage in competition with nor to damage the efforts by Old Dominion University and Norfolk State College to establish budget patterns in their formative years. Martin added that the two institutions were now firmly established and that a Norfolk Campus would not constitute a threat to Old Dominion University nor to Norfolk State College. Godwin's response to Martin's appeal consisted essentially of an expression of his regret that the current unsettled economic situation precluded approval of the funds for a Norfolk Campus. There was no indication that the governor acknowledged at that time the Norfolk City Mayor's offer to sell the skills center property to the state.

Evidently Martin's expression of concern to Governor Godwin about the inaction of the Virginia General Assembly in appropriating funds for a permanent Norfolk Campus contained a potential solution in the offer to sell the skills training center property to the commonwealth of Virginia at what appeared to be an attractive price when compared to the cost of building a Norfolk Campus. Martin's proposal was reinforced by Norfolk City Manager House contacting Tidewater Community College President Pass on February 8, 1974 and indicating that the Norfolk City Council had authorized him to negotiate with state representatives for the possible purchase of the skills training center property to be used as a potential site for the Norfolk Campus. House also advised the president that the city of Norfolk would consider providing educational equipment in accordance with the programs that were to be offered at a Norfolk Campus.
Pass replied to the proposal made by City Manager House on February 13, 1974 by informing him that appropriate Virginia Community College System and Tidewater Community College officials had been advised of the offer of sale made by the members of the Norfolk City Council. The president explained to House that there were several levels at which the matter would have to be studied before recommendations could be made and before state representatives could enter into negotiations with officials designated by the city of Norfolk. Pass also indicated that the proposed Norfolk offer of the site for a Norfolk Campus must be considered by the Tidewater Community College Board, the chancellor, and the State Board for Community Colleges. Additionally, Pass stated that it would be necessary to engage the services of a consultant to study the facility and to make recommendations accordingly. Finally, Pass assured the Norfolk City Manager that he would do everything possible to expedite the matter and that he also would prepare possible alternatives which would include interim plans for utilization of the skills center. Thus it appears that although there was interest on the part of the leadership of Tidewater Community College, Pass' comment concerning alternative usage of the facility suggested that options were kept open for future negotiations.

Several activities followed this exchange between President Pass and Norfolk City Manager House concerning the acquisition of the skills center that served to illustrate what may have been politically-motivated forces or influences related to the establishment of a permanent Norfolk Campus. Chancellor Hamel evidently met with several members of the Virginia General Assembly on February 13, 1974 and discussed the Norfolk City Council members' interest in the possibility of Tidewater Community
College's using the skills center facility for the Norfolk Campus of Tidewater Community College. Hamel mentioned the concern of the Tidewater Community College president about the suitability of the skills center as the Norfolk Campus site in view of its location and limited potential for expansion of the physical facilities. The chancellor also referred to the possibility suggested by Norfolk City Mayor Martin that Tidewater Community College operate the facility on an interim basis pending final negotiations. Perhaps to avoid the impression that officials of the Virginia Community College System and Tidewater Community College had no further interest in obtaining funds for a permanent Norfolk Campus, Hamel indicated that if state revenues permitted, it might be possible to obtain funds for construction of a Norfolk Campus at the next session of the General Assembly.30

This was followed on February 19, 1974 by Tidewater Community College Board members recommending to the State Board for Community Colleges that the proposal from the city of Norfolk to purchase the skills center be rejected. According to the Tidewater Community College Board minutes, the board members apparently did not consider the skills center facility a suitable site for the permanent Norfolk Campus. The board members, however, evidently were willing to consider leasing the skills center as a temporary Norfolk Campus location, providing that operating funds were allocated by the state. As an additional prerequisite, the city of Norfolk was expected to provide appropriate equipment for the facility.31 On February 21, 1974 Norfolk City Manager House took another step in the move to obtain favorable support for the turning over of the skills center facility to Tidewater Community College as the Norfolk Campus location.
Norfolk City Manager House prepared a detailed report for several members of the Norfolk delegation to the Virginia General Assembly in which a review of the history of the efforts by the city of Norfolk to obtain a Norfolk Campus were presented. House, among other things, outlined the rationale of the members of the Norfolk City Council for their apparent commitment to officials of Chesapeake, Portsmouth and Virginia Beach that establishment of Tidewater Community College campuses in these cities prior to a campus in Norfolk was appropriate in light of the existence of two institutions of higher education in Norfolk. House emphasized that this position did not negate the need for a community college campus in Norfolk. The city manager added that it was the desire of the city of Norfolk to concentrate its local state support for the developing Old Dominion University and Norfolk State College in their struggle for funds. House also referred to a commitment of city council members to ensure that the offerings of the educational institutions were in no way duplicative. The city manager pointed out that the state had delineated the specific academic roles for each institution.

The Norfolk City Manager continued his report to the members of the Norfolk delegation to the Virginia General Assembly by listing the reasons why the proposed East Ghent site and various other locations had not been approved the Norfolk City Council for a permanent Norfolk Campus location. Among these reasons was the concern of members of the Norfolk City Council that Norfolk City property was already more than 48 per cent tax exempt, and therefore, available land should be designated for purposes that would provide tax revenues for the city. House disclosed that in an effort to explore other options for a Norfolk Campus site, he inspected the skills center facility on January 13, 1974. This was followed on
January 15, 1974 by a visit of state officials to the skills center, evidently prior to a presentation concerning a Norfolk Campus that was to be made by Chancellor Hamel to the Norfolk City Council on January 22, 1974. According to House, the Norfolk City Council leaders indicated their reluctance to House to commit a site and directed the city manager to explore the possibility of the utilization of the skills center as an alternative. The Norfolk City Manager concluded his report by informing the members of the General Assembly that in his opinion, the skills center was the proper place to start a Norfolk Campus of Tidewater Community College.

Progress toward the finalizing of a decision by the officials of the Virginia Community College System, Tidewater Community College and the city of Norfolk concerning the feasibility of using the skills center as a Norfolk Campus was discernible with the completion of the consultant's report prepared by Eric Rhodes on March 13, 1974. The principal conclusion of the report was that the skills center should be considered a temporary and not a permanent solution to the problem of a Norfolk Campus site because of its location and its space limitations, and also that the facility should be leased for a nominal rental fee rather than purchased from the city of Norfolk. Following analysis and evaluation of the Rhodes report by President Pass and members of the Tidewater Community College Board, a conference was held with the assistant city manager of Norfolk in order to determine more precise data for possible acquisition of the skills center. The information was transmitted by Pass to the chancellor on May 2, 1974.

In President Pass' report concerning the skills center, it was disclosed that the facility was owned by the city of Norfolk and was valued
at approximately $2 million. It was situated on three and one-half acres of land in the downtown Norfolk area and consisted of three buildings with a total of 70,000 square feet of space. The city of Norfolk estimated that the renovation of the facility would be completed by July, 1974. President Pass advised the chancellor that the city of Norfolk officials had asked Tidewater Community College to operate the skills center on the basis of a lease agreement with virtually no strings attached. Pass also indicated that the skills center would be operated as a temporary facility with the possibility that this status could exist for several years. Looking to the future, Pass informed the chancellor that after a permanent campus was constructed, Tidewater Community College probably would need to continue operating technical skills programs in the skills center. The president estimated that classes could begin in the skills center by September, 1974.34

The acquisition of the skills center drew closer to reality as was suggested by President Pass' informing Norfolk City Manager House on September 24, 1974 that oral permission had been received from Chancellor Hamel to accept the offer of the city of Norfolk to lease the skills center to Tidewater Community College for a nominal fee of one dollar per year. Pass indicated it was understood that Tidewater Community College and the Virginia Community College System would have maintenance and operational responsibility for the skills center facilities. The president explained that the commitment to accept the facilities did not become official until a lease agreement had been executed and had been approved by all principals, including the attorney general.35 On October 16, 1974, the Tidewater Community College Board members recommended acceptance of the Norfolk
skills center arrangement offered by the Norfolk City Council members on the basis of a one-dollar annual lease.\textsuperscript{36}

Following the action by the Tidewater Community College Board, the president forwarded a draft copy of a proposed lease agreement to the chancellor. Pass indicated that curricula offered at various locations throughout Norfolk would be consolidated in the skills center facilities.\textsuperscript{37}

The chancellor then notified the director of the State Council of Higher Education for Virginia on December 30, 1974 that the State Board for Community Colleges intended to lease the skills center facilities for Tidewater Community College. After a period of further negotiations and modifications reflecting the recommendations of state and local officials, a one-year lease agreement was signed on July 1, 1975, thereby providing a facility that evidently was considered by officials of the State Board for Community Colleges, Virginia Community College System and Tidewater Community College to be the temporary location of the Norfolk Campus.

While final negotiations for leasing the skills center were in progress between representatives of the city of Norfolk and Tidewater Community College, the assistant to the Norfolk city manager suggested obtaining federal money through the Comprehensive Employment and Training Act for occupational-technical skills training for economically disadvantaged students, to be provided at the skills center by Tidewater Community College. This prospect was pursued for several months and eventually resulted in a contract of approximately $265,000 between Tidewater Community College and the Southeastern Tidewater Area Manpower Authority, effective October 1, 1975. Not only was this a significant development that permitted Tidewater Community College to participate in a much-needed skills training program, but the contract also helped
fund certain operational costs related to the skills center. Tidewater Community College continued to qualify for Comprehensive Employment and Training Act contracts throughout the decade. With the Norfolk operations consolidated in the Norfolk Skills Center, attention apparently was directed again to the development of political and fiscal support for a permanent Norfolk Campus.

President Pass and Norfolk members of the Tidewater Community College Board met with the Norfolk City Council on September 2, 1975. The purpose of the meeting was to discuss a commitment by the Norfolk City Council to acquire a permanent Norfolk Campus site and to fund site preparation. Firm commitments by the council evidently were not received by Tidewater Community College representatives.

On October 9, 1975, representatives of Tidewater Community College, Old Dominion University, Norfolk State College and the Norfolk public schools met with Norfolk City Manager Hirst and members of his staff to discuss the coordinative functions of higher education in Tidewater and the location of a proposed Norfolk Campus of Tidewater Community College. Later, in his report to the Norfolk members of the Tidewater Community College Board, Pass indicated that the Norfolk Campus proposal was supported by the Norfolk public schools representatives and opposed by the Norfolk State College representatives. The Old Dominion University representatives apparently took the middle ground and recommended involvement of the State Council of Higher Education for Virginia. The Tidewater Community College president also reported that the Norfolk State College official had requested that he, the official, be allowed to express his opposition to the Norfolk Campus proposal before the members of the Norfolk City Council. Norfolk City Manager Hirst presented a comprehensive
report to the Norfolk City Council on November 25, 1975 wherein he recom-
mended that the council members consider a specific site that had been
selected by Norfolk City officials as a possible location for a permanent
Norfolk Campus. The Norfolk City Manager, in his remarks to the city
council, expressed the need for state monies for a permanent Norfolk
Campus, the need for selection and approval of a permanent site, and the
need for maximum interim utilization of the Norfolk skills training center
by Tidewater Community College. 40

The Norfolk City Manager's recommendation and comments evidently
did not succeed in obtaining the approval of a permanent Norfolk Campus
site. In addition, further resistance to the establishment of a Norfolk
Campus was expressed by members of the Norfolk Chamber of Commerce on
January 6, 1976. In a presentation to the Norfolk City Council, the
chairman of the Norfolk Chamber of Commerce subcommittee to study the
feasibility of a Tidewater Community College Norfolk Campus stated that
sufficient unused or underutilized potential classroom space existed in
Norfolk to preclude the construction of a permanent Norfolk Campus. In
addition, the report cited concern by members of the subcommittee regarding a decline in student enrollments projected over a period of years
that would add surplus classroom space. 41

Activity by the leadership of the Virginia Community College Sys-
tem, Tidewater Community College and concerned members of the Norfolk
City Council representing citizens who had voiced their need and support
for a comprehensive Norfolk Campus continued throughout the period of time
considered by this study. Their best efforts, however, proved to be fu-
tile in accomplishing the goal of establishing the fourth campus of
Tidewater Community College as provided for in the Virginia Community
College System Master Plan. Meanwhile, efforts were directed at expanding educational programs offered at the Norfolk Skills Center, and at procuring equipment to support the occupational-technical skills training and staffing for effective administrative and instructional services.

President Pass established an administrative organization for the Tidewater Community College Norfolk Skills Center that included an acting director, division chairman of public service technologies, and student services support as indicated in Figure 5. Curricula ultimately designated for the Norfolk Skills Center were centered around occupational-technical skills areas that would lead to associate in applied science degrees and certificates. The occupational-technical skills curricula included data processing, secretarial science, community and social service, automotive analysis and repair, drafting, and welding. The enrollment grew from a total of approximately 250 in the fall quarter of 1975 to more than 900 in the fall of 1977.

The failure of successive sessions of the General Assembly to approve funding was certainly a major force exerting effort against the establishment of the permanent Norfolk Campus. The opposition by representatives of four-year higher educational institutions, from other agencies in Norfolk, and from officials of local jurisdictions concerned about the status of campuses under development in their areas, also were contributing influences in the opposition to the permanent Norfolk Campus concept. However, the action by certain local delegates to the General Assembly and members of the Appropriations Committee to insert language in the appropriation bills restricting and controlling expenditure of Tidewater Community College funds for providing those educational programs demanded by Norfolk City residents was perhaps the most significant force noted throughout this study.
During the 1974 session of the General Assembly, the restriction that was placed in the appropriations bill on February 25, 1974 indicated that

No expenditure shall be made out of any appropriation in this Act for the purpose of planning or creating a campus of Tidewater Community College in the city of Norfolk; provided that funds may be expended to finance educational programs currently being furnished by Tidewater Community College in the city of Norfolk....

According to the sponsors of this restriction, they considered it essential that the limited funds available for educational purposes be given to the existing campuses of Tidewater Community College for construction, renovation and equipment prior to any outlay of capital for a Norfolk Campus site.

In response to an appeal from Norfolk City Mayor Martin on February 28, 1974 to reconsider the language of the appropriations bill that would have a direct impact on the development of the Norfolk Campus, one of the sponsors of the amendment reviewed the status of each Tidewater Community College campus. He concluded his comments to Mayor Martin by indicating that the operational funds of the three campuses of Tidewater Community College needed to be protected so that they were not depleted by using them for a new and unfunded campus operation.

Following a concentrated combined effort by representatives of the Virginia Community College System, Tidewater Community College, supportive legislators and heads of state and local agencies, the language of the 1974 appropriations bill was modified by the legislators of the 1976 General Assembly so that occupational-technical courses could be offered, but prohibition against establishment of liberal arts programs was included. President Pass, in a discussion with Norfolk City Manager Hirst,
indicated that it was not the intention of Tidewater Community College to open a liberal arts campus in Norfolk. Pass informed the Norfolk city manager that the only intention of Tidewater Community College was to offer post-secondary comprehensive community college programs in which occupational-technical courses and programs would be emphasized. The modification of the restriction permitted Tidewater Community College to expand its occupational-technical programs leading to associate in applied science degrees and certificates. College transfer programs were not offered to avoid violation of the limitations imposed by the General Assembly.

The success of the efforts by Tidewater Community College to respond to the growing demands of the people of Norfolk for occupational-technical training apparently attracted the attention of neighboring higher education institutions and concerned leaders of various state agencies, and resulted in their questioning whether or not Tidewater Community College was observing the provisions of the legislative restrictions. The concern of these leaders apparently led to the issuance of a directive from officials of the Virginia Community College System on September 3, 1976 to officials of Tidewater Community College to avoid use of the word "campus" when referring to the Norfolk Skills Center and to review educational programs in order to assure compliance with the regulations governing the operation of the Norfolk Skills Center.

In a letter to the director of the State Council of Higher Education for Virginia, Chancellor Hamel succinctly summarized the situation concerning the Norfolk Campus:

Four campuses were planned for the Norfolk area. One in Norfolk, one in Virginia Beach, one in Portsmouth, and one in Chesapeake. I worked with the respective City Councils and
City Managers and each agreed that they wanted a campus of the college and that each of them would meet the State Boards (sic) requirement for site provision, utilities, parking lots, and landscaping.

Down through the years it was agreed that Norfolk would be the last campus to be implemented for Tidewater Community College by everyone including Norfolk City. During the past three biennium the City of Norfolk has become more active in pursuit of their campus. Sites have been presented and considered but the lack of State Capital Outlay funds delayed the selection of a final site for the Norfolk Campus.

During these discussions with the City Council, they asked the Tidewater Community College to assume the responsibility for the operation of the Skill Center offering occupational/technical programs and made the facility available to the college.

We have been offering courses in many locations in Norfolk since as early as 1971; The Naval Shipyards, in store fronts, The Jewish Center, and other locations.

The offer of the Skill Center afforded us an excellent opportunity to consolidate our offerings at one site and after appropriate correspondence in 1974 with your office and the Budget Office, we proceeded to operate the Norfolk Skill Center as a part of the Tidewater Community College.

We also assume that the State Council and its staff agreed with our master plan when they have supported our Capital Outlay request for a Norfolk Campus, indeed, as recently as the June 24, 1975 State Council's Capital Outlay recommendation for the 1976-78 biennium recommending construction of Phase I basic facility, Norfolk Campus, Tidewater Community College....

The State Board and everyone involved has never had any reason whatsoever to think that the master plan was not accepted and included the Norfolk Campus....

We have 800 + students enrolled at the Norfolk Skill Center and incidentally, approximately 1,500 additional students from Norfolk who are commuting daily, at great expense, to the other campuses of the Tidewater Community College and we haven't even begun to meet the Community College needs of this city.
Growing support for the establishment of a permanent Norfolk Campus was discernible in the early part of 1978. The support was due in part to the modification in 1976 of the earlier appropriations restriction by the General Assembly that permitted Tidewater Community College to expand its offerings within the occupational-technical areas, but also to the realization on the part of the residents of the city of Norfolk that quality post-secondary education could be obtained at the Tidewater Community College Norfolk Skills Center. This significant change in attitude was exemplified by the action of the Chamber of Commerce in its legislative request to the 1978 General Assembly that the restriction imposed upon the establishment of a Norfolk Campus be removed. Growing support also was to be noted by members of the General Assembly who had opposed a Norfolk Campus in the past.47

A significant development during the period of this study was the establishment of the Tidewater Study Advisory Committee composed of representatives from Norfolk State College, Old Dominion University, Christopher Newport College, Thomas Nelson Community College and Tidewater Community College by commonwealth officials in the spring of 1978. Among the purposes of this committee was included identifying possible unnecessary curriculum duplication by Tidewater institutions of higher education.48 Norfolk State College offers two-year associate degree programs and it is possible that the findings of this committee could have an impact on the future of two-year curriculum programs of Norfolk State College and Tidewater Community College. The findings of the committee may also have implications for closer articulation between Norfolk State College and Tidewater Community College that could benefit both institutions.
Demographic characteristics of the area served by the Tidewater Community College Norfolk Skills Center and studies related to the student population are included in Appendices 3 and 4 in order to provide a more comprehensive insight.

In reviewing the forces and influences that contributed to delaying the development of a Norfolk Campus, it was evident that a major force was the disapproval by successive sessions of the Virginia General Assembly of planning or construction funds for a Norfolk Campus. The efforts by the leadership of the Virginia Community College System, Tidewater Community College, certain legislators and supportive members of the Norfolk City Council to overcome the opposition to a Norfolk Campus in the General Assembly were generally unsuccessful. Although certain concessions were gained such as acquisition of the Norfolk Skills Center for occupational-technical training, sufficient force to achieve the goal of authorization for a permanent Norfolk Campus was not realized. The refusal of funding by the Virginia General Assembly also was noted in conjunction with the establishment of the three campuses of the Tidewater Community College multi-campus system, but the influence of strong opposition from forces internal and external to the Virginia General Assembly was not apparent and funds ultimately were approved.

The federally-funded Comprehensive Employment Training Act program, which provided for skills training for economically disadvantaged students by Tidewater Community College at the skills training center, was a significant influence, not only because the program provided an opportunity for the officials of Tidewater Community College to demonstrate their ability to provide effective training, but because the infusion of federal monies helped defray certain authorized operational expenses of the skills center.
Another important force that influenced the development of a permanent Norfolk Campus, in contrast to the forces that impacted on the Frederick, Virginia Beach and Chesapeake Campuses, was the presence of two state-supported institutions of higher education, Old Dominion University and Norfolk State College, in Norfolk. The combined leadership of these two institutions apparently was able to exert sufficient force and influence to effectively curtail any effort by the advocates for construction of a community college campus for Norfolk.

Although there was at times apparent opposition by the members of the city councils of the areas served by the other three campuses of Tidewater Community College, in the final analysis support generally was unanimous for designation of permanent campus sites. In the case of the Norfolk Campus, however, the members of the Norfolk City Council did not appear to have total solidarity in support of a Norfolk Campus. This was evident to some degree in the lack of a unanimous vote for the designation of a location for a permanent Norfolk Campus. As a matter of fact, a permanent site was not designated during the period of time covered by this study.

The apparent agreement by leaders of Norfolk to wait until the cities of Portsmouth, Virginia Beach and Chesapeake had Tidewater Community College campuses established in their areas may have had a negative effect on their later efforts to obtain a campus of Tidewater Community College in Norfolk. This is significant in view of the ultimate direction taken by Norfolk State College and Old Dominion University in their growth patterns that included curricular offerings that, to an extent, were duplicative of those of a community college.
With the exception of certain individuals committed to the community college concept, Norfolk City officials apparently were unwilling to seriously challenge the opposition of the leaders of Norfolk State College and Old Dominion University in spite of the fact that the two institutions were able to preclude establishment of a community college campus that appeared to be needed by the people of Norfolk.

The forces and influences of the opposition to a Norfolk Campus probably reached the highest level during the period covered by the study when direction was given that the term "campus" could not be applied to the Norfolk facility occupied by Tidewater Community College, and that the title of "provost" would not be the designation for the chief executive of the Tidewater Community College Norfolk operation.

A major force, and perhaps the most significant, was the opposition to a Norfolk Campus by members of the Virginia General Assembly. This opposition crystallized in the restrictive amendments which were attached to several appropriations bills that either prevented the expenditure of funds for construction of a Norfolk Campus by Tidewater Community College, or severely limited the curricular offerings to specific disciplines.
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CHAPTER VI
SUMMARY

As was discussed in chapter one, the purpose of this dissertation was to study the development and growth of Tidewater Community College and to identify those significant forces and influences that provided Tidewater Community College with its unique physical, administrative, organizational and curricular characteristics. Recognition of the forces and influences that were important to the ultimate design of each campus as it evolved during the decade suggests a conclusion that, although there were in fact agreements as well as differences among the significant factors, the final configuration of the campuses was attributable to the varying degrees of the fusion of these forces and influences. Although an effort was made to identify the major forces and influences that created the eventual character of Tidewater Community College, the possibility is recognized that certain factors either were not perceived or were not of sufficient importance to have affected significantly the development of the Tidewater Community College complex.

The initial force and influence which was to determine the primary character of Tidewater Community College was the concept expressed in the Virginia Community College Master Plan that Tidewater Community College be a multi-campus comprehensive community college. According to President George Pass of Tidewater Community College, the multi-campus format was approved by the State Board for Community Colleges as the
design for Tidewater Community College for reasons that included economy of administration and operation, such as one president rather than four, the diversified demographic characteristics of communities, the capability to provide a broader offering of curricular programs than would be feasible on a single campus, and the reduction of the competition for students that four separate community colleges might have experienced. It was largely a recognition of the pluralistic needs of the people in the area served by the institution that led in part to the decision by the Tidewater Community College leadership to place selected, highly specialized programs at designated campuses.

The force and influence that was common not only to the development of Tidewater Community College but to the total Virginia Community College System was the responsiveness of the Virginia General Assembly to the perceived need of the people of the commonwealth for a comprehensive community college system that would provide maximum opportunities for post-secondary education to the greatest number of prospective students. Enactment of the 1966 legislation that authorized the community college system, and the support of the community college concept by state and local political and community leaders is reflected in the attitude of the General Assembly.

While the General Assembly was perceptive of the peoples' educational needs, the legislature did not consistently mirror this perception in terms of support. For example, the development of the Tidewater Community College system experienced the usual struggle for appropriation of funds by the General Assembly and appropriations were especially significant in the often abortive attempts to procure funds for capital outlay for construction of physical plants and for equipment. Fiscal matters
influenced the formation of each Tidewater Community College campus where, as was noted in the study, the physical facilities were often unsuitable, limited, or nearly non-existent. Consequently, the delivery of optimum educational services to the prospective student was seriously handicapped. The failure of the General Assembly during successive sessions to allocate funds for planning or construction of a Norfolk Campus during the decade studied exemplified, in part, such a negative force.

On the other hand, the initiative and dedication to a comprehensive community college system by leaders in the state such as members of the General Assembly, of the State Council of Higher Education for Virginia, of State Board for Community Colleges, of Virginia Community College System, of Tidewater Community College, and of the local political jurisdictions provided a notable force in the development of the Tidewater Community College multi-campus system. The operational effects of these influences were discernible throughout the Tidewater Community College area and served to foster the accomplishment of educational goals and objectives.

The initiative of leaders from agencies at the state level, while often having a positive impact on the establishment of the various components of Tidewater Community College seemed at times to exert a restraint on the growth of the institution as a whole, particularly in relation to the Norfolk situation. Disapproval by the General Assembly of capital construction funds contributed to the recurrent delay of campus planning or construction activities as was indicated previously. The force and influence of several members of the General Assembly resulted in restrictions on the nature of expenditures of funds appropriated for Tidewater Community College which effectively prevented or curtailed the
designation of funds for curricular programs or facilities in Norfolk during much of the period of this study.

In a more positive frame of reference, leadership by members from the state agencies and from the General Assembly resulted in approval of funding for the first-phase construction of the Virginia Beach Campus, renovation of facilities for the Frederick Campus, and planning funds for a Chesapeake Campus. Of particular importance to the development of Tidewater Community College was the positive thrust by members of the General Assembly in its approval of the 1977 bond referendum that culminated in the citizens of Virginia authorizing capital outlay funds for first-phase construction of the Chesapeake Campus.

A force visible throughout the development of Tidewater Community College was the leadership exercised by the chancellor of the Virginia Community College System. The chancellor frequently was directly responsible for expediting the combining of divergent forces and influences directed at achieving commonly established goals and objectives in the Virginia Community College System. A conviction held by the chancellor to form a viable comprehensive community college system stands out as probably the single most effective element in the formation of Tidewater Community College. The chancellor served in the capacity of acting president of Tidewater Community College at two critical points in its development.

Both the initiative and dedication held by the officials of local political jurisdictions and communities was an essential common force, albeit observed in uneven levels in the major cities served by Tidewater Community College. It is suggested in the findings of this study that the force and influence generated by these local officials and individuals
toward the development of a campus in their community ranged from the enlightened aggressiveness of officials and citizens in Virginia Beach to establish a community college campus to the relatively uncertain involvement of some officials and citizens in the city of Norfolk. In Chesapeake, local officials and individuals were interested, but it seemed from an evaluation of the data available for the study that the primary force and influence that eventually established the basis for a Chesapeake Campus emanated from leaders of the Virginia Community College System and from leaders of Tidewater Community College.

Individual dedicated members of the communities within the region to be served by Tidewater Community College were capable of producing a level of force and influence that appeared to be out of direct proportion to their number. Similarity of the influences by concerned citizens on an individual rather than on a collective basis was observed as a variable phenomenon in the various segments of the Tidewater Community College district. An example of the force and influence of the concerned citizen was the donation of Frederick College, plus $1 million by Frederick Beazley to the commonwealth of Virginia for the purpose of establishing a community college to serve the area.

The Tidewater Community College multi-campus structure had its beginning in the facilities received from Beazley. The donation was a unique occurrence when compared with the establishment of the subsequent campuses and educational centers in the Tidewater Community College system. In Chesapeake another concerned resident sold land at a price below market value to the city of Chesapeake for construction of a permanent Chesapeake Campus.
As disclosed by the study, one unique force in the development of the complete Tidewater Community College system was negative impact from the presence of two state-supported senior institutions of higher education in Norfolk. The leadership of these two institutions apparently was able to marshall enough political resources to frustrate efforts made by advocates of a Tidewater Community College campus in Norfolk. Although a cooperative relationship between officials of Norfolk State College, Old Dominion University and Tidewater Community College to develop non-duplicative or non-competitive curricula apparently was mandated by officials of the State Council of Higher Education for Virginia and officials of the Virginia Community College System, an undercurrent of opposition by officials of the two Norfolk four-year institutions was said to block the optimum development of a Norfolk Campus. Opposition to inclusion of the Norfolk Campus in the Tidewater Community College system by officials of the private Virginia Wesleyan College was not perceived during the period of this study.

Support of positions held by leaders of Norfolk State College and Old Dominion University was reinforced by some organized community leadership which served to stimulate wider opposition in Norfolk. The opposition included influential citizens such as isolated officials of the Norfolk Chamber of Commerce, members of the Norfolk City Council, delegates to the General Assembly, owners of proprietary schools, and other representatives of business, industry and political organizations. In general the leaders working to establish the Norfolk Campus could not, as in the other communities, exercise sufficient power to offset the negative factors for fear of placing the Tidewater Community College system concept in jeopardy.
Although the force and influence exerted by state and local governmental agencies often was significant either in its positive or in its negative effects on the development of Tidewater Community College, the federal agencies, particularly the Department of Health, Education and Welfare and the Office of Civil Rights were notable in the drive to establish a Norfolk Campus. While the federal influence was restricted to the Norfolk situation, it evidently spread to some degree to the total Tidewater Community College operation. The pressure from officials of the Department of Health, Education and Welfare and the officials of the Office of Civil Rights to implement affirmative action programs for more extensive racial integration of the Norfolk State College and Old Dominion University student bodies may have motivated, in part, the leaders of the other two Norfolk higher education institutions as well as some officials of the commonwealth to avoid confrontation with the federal agencies and to withhold support for the Norfolk Campus concept regardless of the extent of demonstrable need.

The combined force and influence of the leadership of the Virginia Community College System, Tidewater Community College, and supportive city of Norfolk representatives eventually was instrumental in the leasing of a city of Norfolk-owned occupational-technical training facility known as the Skills Center to be used by Tidewater Community College for educational purposes. This force and influence was not considered to be unique necessarily, since it possibly could be categorized as a local-level political leadership element. However, from the operational standpoint, the force and influence apparently had two unique outcomes: (1) establishment of a Tidewater Community College presence in a Norfolk facility that for a time was viewed, especially by Norfolk City officials
as the site for the Norfolk Campus, and (2) the infusion of significant federal funds that permitted the leadership of Tidewater Community College to establish occupational-technical training programs in Norfolk and also provide certain operational and administrative costs to support the Norfolk Skills Center facility. It appears from a review of the data that the force and influence of the federal funds was more extensive in Norfolk during the period covered by this study than on the other campuses.

The combined force and influence of the presence of the Frederick and Virginia Beach Campuses apparently was among the causative factors that led to the decision by the officials of the Chesapeake College to sell the institution to the city of Chesapeake, thereby leading to the eventual development of the Chesapeake Campus. The Chesapeake College administration was said to be unable to locate sufficient funding to continue to operate a viable privately supported institution of higher education in the face of the lower tuition and comprehensive programs of the Frederick and Virginia Beach Campuses.

The leadership and professional ability of the incumbent president as the chief executive officer of the multi-campus institution was a significant stabilizing force leading to the development of the Tidewater Community College complex. The leadership of the president apparently was responsible for establishing a cooperative relationship among the diverse and potentially divisive forces of the political and community leaders in the region served by Tidewater Community College. In order to bring together the diverse interests of the area and to work toward a cohesiveness of purpose, a twelve-member Tidewater Community College Board was organized, consisting of appointed representatives from the four principal cities of the Tidewater Community College district. The
This action helped ensure the realization of the college mission through community involvement. The president further involved the community through formation of curriculum advisory committees which gave direction in the development of educational programs. Further, the president encouraged the Tidewater Community College campuses to become actively engaged in community activities in order to make full utilization of the forces and influences available in the communities. He encouraged the optimum participation of the central administrative staff and the campus administrators, faculty and staff in the activities of the communities served by the individual campuses.

Communications also were considered by the administration to be a vital influence for the success of the total institution. The president, therefore, stressed the promotion of close working relationships with representatives of the media, including the press, radio and television in order to achieve the support of the significant force and influence inherent in the communications industry. To this end, representatives of the media were invited to attend Tidewater Community College Board meetings, conferences, workshops and other appropriate functions.

Internally, the chief executive officer fostered the organization of governance systems to help assure the concentration and direction of the force and influence of administrative and faculty personnel on the common goal of serving the educational needs of the community. Inter-campus activities also were encouraged as a means of maintaining a college-wide focus on the operational mission of the institution as a whole.

The most important resource of Tidewater Community College, and indeed the reason for the existence of the college, is the student. The
common educational needs expressed by the student body were observable throughout the course of this study. In the final analysis, it seemed that the influence of the student body helped to determine to a significant extent the ultimate direction of Tidewater Community College and its survival as an institution. Patterns concerning the physical configuration of the campuses, the funding of the institution, the equipment to support the educational programs, the number and categories of administrative and faculty personnel, curricular offerings, scheduling of classes and hours of operation were the result to a great extent of student expression of needs. Thus it would appear that the student had the potential force and influence to contribute significantly to the success or failure of the institution.

After a comprehensive review and analysis of the significant forces on the formation of Tidewater Community College, it was apparent that a remaining force and influence should be considered. The legislation that provided the legal basis for the establishment of a system of twenty-three comprehensive community colleges which would bring higher educational opportunities within commuting distance of the majority of the people of Virginia provides room to develop strong institutions within the highly centralized pattern of administrative and operational control reflected in the Virginia Community College System.

Subsequently the concept of centralized administrative and operational control is found not only in practice but also in legislation. Growing centralization served as a powerful force and influence that was evident in the development and growth of each of the twenty-three comprehensive community colleges. The centralization of control and authority was translated into policy that was a determining force and influence on
the organizational structure of the individual colleges. Personnel staffing, including the number, category and level of each position were to a significant extent predetermined by policies of the Virginia Community College System. Salary levels and the minimum and maximum remuneration for the various faculty ranks apparently were established by the Virginia Community College System. Curricular guidelines likewise were finalized and approved at a centralized level, with the designation of selected community colleges authorized to offer specific programs of instruction.

Although the individual community colleges were required to submit detailed budget proposals, directions and instructions from the centralized authorities apparently established the parameters within which the biennial fiscal calculations were prepared.

The community college presidents are directly responsible to the chancellor of the Virginia Community College System. The Chancellor represents the Virginia Community College System in official relationships with the governor and with the members of the General Assembly. It appears that in this manner the potential force and influence of the individual community colleges is focussed and exercised as necessary through a centralized level of authority. Evidently the centralized control of the Virginia Community College System has proven to be an effective method of administration and organizational management.

It appears that the forces and influences that led to the establishment of Tidewater Community College included the leadership of federal, state and local agencies, appropriations from the legislature, support from prominent community leaders, philanthropically-oriented local citizens, and the presence of four-year institutions of higher education. These forces were at play in establishing the Tidewater Community College
campuses during the past decade. Will these same forces influence or
determine curricular directions for the next ten years?
Appendix 1
Tidewater Community College
Service Area Population, 1960-1974

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SERVICE AREA</th>
<th>ACTUAL</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1960</td>
<td>1970</td>
<td>1974</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chesapeake City</td>
<td>66,447a</td>
<td>89,580</td>
<td>101,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norfolk City</td>
<td>304,869</td>
<td>307,951</td>
<td>289,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portsmouth City</td>
<td>121,973a</td>
<td>110,963</td>
<td>109,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virginia Beach City</td>
<td>85,218a</td>
<td>172,106</td>
<td>209,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suffolk City&lt;sup&gt;C&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>21,986a</td>
<td>22,512b</td>
<td>23,750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Isle of Wight County&lt;sup&gt;C&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>8,582</td>
<td>9,143</td>
<td>9,750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>609,075</td>
<td>712,255</td>
<td>743,200</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PERCENT CHANGE</th>
<th>AVERAGE RATE OF CHANGE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chesapeake City</td>
<td>34.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norfolk City</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portsmouth City</td>
<td>-9.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virginia Beach City</td>
<td>102.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suffolk City&lt;sup&gt;C&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Isle of Wight County&lt;sup&gt;C&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>6.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


<sup>a</sup>The 1960 population figure has been adjusted to reflect annexation activity and the creation of independent cities during 1960 to 1970 period.
Appendix 1 (cont'd)

Tidewater Community College

Service Area Population, 1960-1974

\[\text{The 1970 population figure has been adjusted to reflect annexation activity during 1970 to 1974 period.}\]

\[\text{One-half included in service area.}\]
Appendix 2
Age Distribution of
Tidewater Community College
Service Area Population, 1977

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SERVICE AREA</th>
<th>14 and Under</th>
<th>15-24</th>
<th>25-44</th>
<th>45 and Up</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chesapeake City</td>
<td>27,722</td>
<td>21,015</td>
<td>31,755</td>
<td>28,849</td>
<td>109,341</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norfolk City</td>
<td>63,393</td>
<td>69,317</td>
<td>74,433</td>
<td>72,278</td>
<td>279,421</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portsmouth City</td>
<td>26,824</td>
<td>20,771</td>
<td>25,816</td>
<td>33,529</td>
<td>106,940</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virginia Beach City</td>
<td>59,152</td>
<td>55,249</td>
<td>74,147</td>
<td>44,649</td>
<td>233,197</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suffolk City&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>5,980</td>
<td>4,343</td>
<td>6,189</td>
<td>7,740</td>
<td>24,251</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Isle of Wight County&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>2,584</td>
<td>1,846</td>
<td>2,734</td>
<td>2,967</td>
<td>10,131</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>185,655</td>
<td>172,541</td>
<td>215,074</td>
<td>190,012</td>
<td>736,281</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


<sup>a</sup>One-half included.
Appendix 3  
Tidewater Community College  
Region Population

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Chesapeake</th>
<th>Norfolk</th>
<th>Portsmouth</th>
<th>Suffolk</th>
<th>Virginia Beach</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>89,580</td>
<td>307,951</td>
<td>110,963</td>
<td>17,424</td>
<td>172,106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White*</td>
<td>68,582</td>
<td>215,069</td>
<td>65,997</td>
<td>8,728</td>
<td>154,823</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black*</td>
<td>20,669</td>
<td>87,261</td>
<td>44,320</td>
<td>8,655</td>
<td>15,693</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Black</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Region Total: 698,024

% White 70
% Black 30


*Figures for other racial categories not included.
## Appendix 4
### Tidewater Community College Region
#### Educational Level
(People Twenty-five Years Old and Over)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Chesapeake</th>
<th>Norfolk</th>
<th>Portsmouth</th>
<th>Suffolk</th>
<th>Virginia Beach</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>45,486</td>
<td>143,358</td>
<td>57,861</td>
<td>9,400</td>
<td>78,557</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>No School Years</strong></td>
<td>614</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>809</td>
<td>270</td>
<td>596</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Elementary</strong></td>
<td>14,978</td>
<td>37,372</td>
<td>18,493</td>
<td>3,675</td>
<td>12,591</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>High School</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-3 Years</td>
<td>12,877</td>
<td>35,301</td>
<td>16,515</td>
<td>2,191</td>
<td>16,160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Years</td>
<td>11,437</td>
<td>40,619</td>
<td>13,716</td>
<td>1,761</td>
<td>27,904</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>College</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-3 Years</td>
<td>3,149</td>
<td>14,546</td>
<td>4,712</td>
<td>730</td>
<td>10,506</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Years or more</td>
<td>2,431</td>
<td>13,515</td>
<td>3,616</td>
<td>750</td>
<td>10,800</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| % High School Graduates | 37 | 48 | 38 | 39 | 63 |
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The purpose of this dissertation was to study the development and growth of Tidewater Community College and its campuses from 1968 to 1978 and to examine the forces that led to their physical, administrative, organizational and curricular characteristics. Primary sources included correspondence, interviews, minutes, self-studies and reports.

The Frederick Campus and central offices of Tidewater Community College were co-located on Frederick College property donated in 1968. Forces that influenced development included legislative authorization of the community college system, support by state and local leadership and concerned citizens, appropriation of federal and state funds, and donation of property.

The Virginia Beach Campus was established in 1971 as the second campus. Major forces in its development were enlightened aggressive leadership by city officials, chancellor of the community college system, and president of the college; support by city council and community leaders and provision of construction funds by the General Assembly.

The Chesapeake Campus was established as the third campus in 1973 in facilities of Chesapeake College, purchased by the city and donated to the state. Major forces impacting on development of the Chesapeake Campus included initiative and leadership of college and state officials. Major impetus came from sources external to the city, but local leadership was also significant. Approval of the bond referendum was one of the most significant forces.

Norfolk was projected as the last area for a campus. Negotiations for establishment of the campus extended over the period of this study, but failed to produce agreement. However, a skills training facility was leased to the college by the city to provide occupational-technical programs. Major forces that prevented establishment of a Norfolk Campus included legislative action restricting use of funds and opposition from officials of Norfolk's two four-year colleges, local community and business leaders and some members of the city council. Uncertain support and lack of solidarity among proponents of a Norfolk Campus were also significant.

Through an examination of those forces leading to the particular characteristics of each sector of the Tidewater Community College system, it was found that with the exception of Norfolk, state and local leadership played a significant role in the establishment and development of Tidewater Community College. In the case of Norfolk, it was discovered that local and state leaders tended to exert a negative influence on the development of the Norfolk Campus.

Identification of the forces and influences important to the development of each campus suggests that although there were similarities and differences among the factors, the final configuration of Tidewater Community College was attributable to the fusion in varying degrees of the forces and influences discussed in this study.