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CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

The Norfolk Division, The College of William and Mary, held its first classes on 12 September 1930. As early as 1919, The College of William and Mary in Virginia, Williamsburg, Virginia, through its Norfolk Extension Division, offered extension courses in Tidewater, Virginia. Eventually, community leaders requested that The College of William and Mary establish a two year, junior college in Norfolk. By September 1931 The Virginia Polytechnic Institute collaborated with The College of William and Mary to add education in engineering subjects to the liberal arts offerings already established by The College of William and Mary. The first class of vocational training was organized in February 1939. In September 1945, in cooperation with the State Board of Education, the college organized a regional, vocational trade school, which served the people of the Tidewater, Virginia, Area.

From 1930 to 1962 the Norfolk Division, The College of William and Mary grew. It weathered the Great Depression, and in 1951, as The College of William and Mary and the Virginia Polytechnic Institute in Norfolk, became accredited as a junior college by the Southern Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools. Among the
reasons for the rapid growth of the Norfolk Division, The College of William and Mary were involved the war-time training programs of 1941-45. Another reason for growth was economic. Many students were unable to obtain employment and elected instead to go to college. Because it was not possible for them to attend a residential institution, they enrolled at the Norfolk Division, The College of William and Mary.

By 1954 and subsequent to five name changes, The College of William and Mary in Norfolk had developed into a four-year institution, accredited by the Southern Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools. Three basic programs were developed to meet the community's needs: the first was a four year collegiate program, leading to a bachelor's degree; the second was a junior college and a terminal collegiate program, leading to an Associate of Arts diploma; and the third was a technician's program of a vocational nature, leading to an Associate of Science diploma. The technician's program was not a collegiate program but was intended to develop skilled technicians. It was organized as a technical institute and offered two-year and three-year post high school courses of instruction. By 1962 the four-year institution had developed into independence from The College of William and Mary in Virginia, Williamsburg, Virginia. At the same time, Virginia Polytechnic Institute's affiliation ceased with the emergence of the independent, four-year college. In September 1963, an independent four-year engineering school became part of Old Dominion College. The newly
independent, four-year school was given the name, Old Dominion College, in August 1962 by its own Board of Visitors.15

Need for the Study

Few, if any, studies have been done regarding those forces which led to the rapid growth of the Norfolk Division, The College of William and Mary and Old Dominion College from 1930 to 1962. To commemorate the occasion of Old Dominion University's fiftieth anniversary of the establishment of the Norfolk Division, The College of William and Mary, a popular history of Old Dominion University, during its first fifty years, was done in 1980 by the University Archivist, Dr. James R. Sweeney.16

A need appears to exist to examine and analyze the forces involved during the formative period of Old Dominion College from 1930 to 1962. In addition, a need exists to study the problems involved with the development of Old Dominion College, in order to understand the reasons for the rapid growth of an institution of higher learning. Such a study might well provide insight into reasons for the rapid growth of other urban institutions of higher education.

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study was to identify and analyze those forces, which were operational themselves from 1930 to 1962, and led to the development of Old Dominion College in 1962, as an
Independent, four-year, degree granting institution, with its own Board of Visitors. Identification and analysis helped to identify the forces contributing to this development over a period of thirty-two years from a dependent, two-year, junior college status in 1930 to an independent, four-year, degree-granting, senior college in 1962.

The present study, therefore, was concerned with identifying and examining those political, educational, and economic factors that led to the rise of Old Dominion College in 1962. It was hypothesized that political factors were primarily the reason for the development of Old Dominion College from 1930 to 1962. Since Norfolk was a metropolitan area, its leaders wanted to have an accredited, four-year institution separate from that of the Norfolk Division, Virginia State College, which, at that time, enrolled only Black students.

Limitations and Scope of the Study

This study was limited to the identification and analysis of those political, educational, and economic factors that led to the establishment of Old Dominion College. It was not concerned with the daily governance of the institution or with changing admission policies, financing, changing curricula, and plant construction. Only external, not internal, policies and procedures were examined.

The scope of the study includes that period of time from the beginning of Old Dominion College as the Norfolk Division, The
College of William and Mary to the establishment of Old Dominion College in 1962.

Definition of Terms

For the purpose of this study, there were certain terms which were commonly used in this paper. Most of the terms related to influence which was exerted by both the individuals and groups who participated in the process of establishing Old Dominion College.

These terms were as follows:

1. Politics: "...is the process, a means by which the conflicting demands and aspirations of individuals are reconciled; it is the method by which social needs are translated into public policy." Secondly, "it is the process by which power and influence are acquired and exercised." Thirdly, "it is an attempt by man to use the various means at his disposal to convert others to his point of view and relates to the process of making significant community-wide decisions".

2. Power: "the ability to influence people by persuasion or compulsion." "An aspect of a relationship between people not an attribute of a single person to get another to do something that he otherwise would not do".

3. Authority: "is the power to act officially within the scope of one's delegation".

4. Influence: "is the formal power based on the ability to affect collective decisions without resorting to compensation, manipulation, or threats".

5. Leadership: "that which avoids direct confrontation and is based upon the interpersonal skills required to move persons and groups towards goals without interactions that make evident power or status differentials".

6. Economics: "that which is of or pertaining to the activities of producing and consuming." "It is the science of the administration of scarce resources in human society."
7. Education: "embraces not only the formal academic curricula, classes, and laboratories but also all those influences upon students flowing from association with peers and faculty members and from varied experiences of school life." Additional terms were appropriately identified within the context of their use in the body of the study.

**Methodology**

Research procedure employed the historical-documentary method, subjecting all sources of collected data to internal and external criticism, to determine authenticity, validity, reliability, and accuracy. Sources were compared to discover bias, motive, or self-interest. This study identified and analyzed the forces which led to the development of Old Dominion College in 1962.

Primary and secondary data sources utilized include:

1. Annual reports
2. Official and private correspondence
3. Official records
4. Minutes of governing boards
5. Legislative acts
6. Interviews with faculty, administrators, and alumni
7. Bulletins
8. Catalogues
9. Periodicals
10. Schedules
11. Calendars
12. Announcements
13. Newspaper reports
14. Newspaper editorials
15. Library collections
16. Memoirs and reminiscences
17. Local histories

Review of Related Literature and Research

A review of related literature and research revealed a paucity of such literature and research dealing with the development of a junior college into a four-year college. The terms, "junior college," "community college," and "two-year college" were used interchangeably in this review. No attempt was made to distinguish between the three institutional descriptions.

This finding is reinforced by Gott, who observed:

While upward extension of academic programs has been a major characteristic of American higher education, at least since the introduction of the German university concept, there is a singular dearth of published material about this transition.

Schultz and Stickler have pointed out that the process of vertical extension was a phenomenon of major proportion in American higher education. One would expect it had been systematically studied and analyzed or at least widely discussed in the professional literature. Such, however, was not the case. Literature on the topic was limited and fragmentary.

Gott again asserted:
Vertical extension, or expansion of academic programs in institutions of higher education, is a continuing phenomenon in the United States. . . . Expansion is generally accomplished by making more student positions available in existing programs (horizontal expansion) or by adding advanced programs (vertical extension). . . . The junior college has also proved susceptible to the phenomenon of vertical extension. While it has generally responded to the increased demand for higher education by making more student positions available, there have been some significant exceptions. 30

He further noted that Schultz and Stickler recorded:

From 1953 through 1964 some 72 two-year colleges became four-year institutions, 61 of these under private and/or denominational control and 11 under public control. 31

Riesman has stated:

The upgrading of . . . institutions toward the model of the liberal arts colleges and universities has been a persistent tendency in American higher education and is still going on. 32

Gott pointed out:

McConnell has also noted the tendency of American colleges and universities is to imitate more prestigious models but theorized that for junior colleges it was the prospect of soaring enrollments that probably lay behind their desire to become four-year institutions. 33

Gott also noted that:

During the years immediately following World War II there was a strong drive in California to transform junior colleges into four-year colleges, primarily in order to make it possible for returning veterans to complete baccalaureate programs without incurring the expense of living away from home. 34

Horn stated that:

One should also mention a pressure of another kind operating to transform junior colleges into senior colleges. That is the pressure from junior college faculties to acquire a more assured status, to achieve greater academic respectability. Too many junior college faculty members have
some feeling of inferiority in comparison with their colleagues in the senior colleges. 33

Beals and Martona noted that:

From time to time . . . educational leaders and others have said that the junior college is a very unstable institution, that it is transitional in character, and that it is eager to transform itself into a 4-year college granting the baccalaureate degree. 34

Gott categorized that:

The largest number of all types of junior colleges that become four-year colleges was found in the eastern and southeastern states. They tended to be denominationally controlled and, not accredited by national and regional associations. 35

Gott also stated that:

Morrison noted that the criteria for changing private junior colleges are probably different and revolve around issues of adequate potential enrollment, faculty, facilities, and finances. 36

Gott further emphasized that:

It is well recognized that the status and economic needs of a junior college faculty are enhanced by the upward extension to a four-year college and that many faculty members would prefer to teach at this level. 37

Medsker spoke of faculty attitudes toward two-year and four-year colleges and the reference group theory:

According to this theory, a person may not be identified primarily with the occupational, social, or economic group of which he is a member. Instead, he may more readily adhere to the views of another group, presumably a group to which he aspires to belong or one with which he wishes to be identified in his own mind or in the minds of others. Certain junior college staff members may identify themselves with groups outside the college. More particularly, the attitude of junior college teachers may reflect the educational values or attitudes of teachers in four-year colleges and universities. 38

Finally, Gott concluded that:
It seems reasonably clear that the immediate reasons for upward extension . . . were related to rapidly growing populations, increasing demands for additional four-year college opportunities, and the educational needs of young people who, for financial reasons, needed four-year college facilities within community distance. Important but nominally secondary considerations for upward extension involved the status and prestige needs of both the community and the college, the need for advanced training in such fields as technology and teaching, and political pressure. . . . Once a movement for upward extension begins, it evidently becomes self-accelerating unless the conditions under which it arose are altered. . . . When the need for a four-year college in a given area is clearly demonstrable, and the state lacks a master plan to provide such facilities, the local pressures exerted to extend academic programs in a two-year college may become overwhelming.

Beeler stated that Brumbaugh wrote in a 1966 research monograph that:

The reasons for the changes from junior junior college status have not been studied systematically. Beeler contended that Brown, in writing about the manpower outlook for the 1960s, and Hollis, in speaking of facilities for higher education, both supported the idea of vertical extension of community colleges on the grounds of national needs, while Smith felt that two-year institutions make the change in order to better serve the educational needs of their students.

Published articles by both Parker and Eells contained no dissertations addressing the evolution of two-year colleges into four-year institutions. All of the dissertations discussed in this section, except that of Ancelet, concerned themselves with the development of a two-year, normal school into a four-year college. A two-year, normal school's mission was different from that of a
typical junior college; nevertheless, the development into a four-
year college provided insight into those found in this study.

With the exception of the Whalen and Ancelet dissertations,
each dissertation in this section provided background information on
the development of a two-year college into a four-year institution
but did not provide insight into the role played by political factors
in that development.

Despite the overall, severely limited number of dissertations
concerned with the evolution of two-year colleges into four-year
institutions, several dissertations were reviewed during the
preparation of this study. Those that were related to or provided
assistance for the study were included in this review of related
literature and research.

Mr. John Edward Hubley's dissertation, published in 1963,
addressed the transition of Cumberland Valley State Normal School (a
two-year, public college) into the State Teachers College,
Shippensburg, Pennsylvania (a four-year, public college). 48

At the conclusion of the period of this study from 1871 to
1960, The College of William and Mary, Norfolk Division (1930) and
the State Teachers College, Shippensburg, Pennsylvania (1871), were
both alike, in that they (1) were coeducational, 49 (2) conferred
baccalaureate degrees, 50 (3) were public colleges, 51 (4) sponsored
an intercollegiate sports program, 52 and (5) used Scholastic Aptitude
Test (S.A.T.) scores, as part of the admission process. 53

The College of William and Mary, Norfolk Division differed
from the State Teachers College, Shippensburg, Pennsylvania, in that
it (1) provided a comprehensive educational service to all mature
residents of Tidewater, Virginia, (2) was accredited by the
Southern Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools and the Board
of Education of the Commonwealth of Virginia, (3) was staffed by
112 full-time faculty, of whom 23 were Ph.D. degree, or equivalent,
holders, (4) was located in a large metropolitan area, consisting
of 6 municipalities, with a total population of 518,507, (5) was a
product of a different socio-economic environment, in that it was
located in the South Atlantic Region (comprised of Del., D.C., Fla.,
Ga., Md., N.C., S.C., Va., and W. Va.), (6) had a campus of 8
principal buildings situated on 23 acres of land, (7) had a library
of 35,000 volumes and 350 periodicals, (8) was non-residential,
(9) had an enrollment of 6,437 full and part-time students, of whom
at least seventy percent of the full-time students were from
Virginia, (10) administered a Greek letter system of fraternities
and sororities, (11) offered a four-year, liberal arts
curriculum, (12) charged in-state tuition of $180 (12+ semester
hours) for liberal arts students and $120 (12+ quarter hours) for
engineering students, (13) operated on a semester system for
liberal arts students, (14) operated on a quarter system for
engineering students, (15) operated a summer session, designed to
enable students to make up time lost during the regular session or to
accelerate their respective programs, (16) admitted high school
graduates, ranking in the upper fifty percentile of their respective
classes,\(^6\) (17) administered an honor system,\(^7\) (18) operated a junior college program, both terminal and pre-professional in scope,\(^8\) (19) operated a technical institute, designed to develop technicians at a sub-engineering level, to fill the technological gap between the graduate engineer and the journeyman mechanic,\(^9\) (20) carried out a social work program, which offered the first year of a two-year program (the second year, to be completed at the Richmond Professional Institute, Richmond, Virginia),\(^10\) (21) conducted, in cooperation with the Virginia Polytechnic Institute, Blacksburg, Virginia, a two-year engineering program (the last two years to be completed at V.P.I. or some other engineering school),\(^11\) (22) administered an evening college, designed for work in the regular college program; work of a special vocational nature, to enable an employed person to increase his efficiency in his job and make himself more eligible for promotion; and work of a recreational nature, such as to occupy in a worthwhile fashion the leisure time of people who are regularly employed,\(^12\) (23) operated an evening division, technical institute which offered a program of supplementary trade and industrial courses,\(^13\) (24) awarded non-baccalaureate degrees to graduates of the junior college and the technical institute,\(^14\) and (25) was governed by the Board of Visitors of its parent institution, The College of William and Mary in Virginia.\(^15\)

The State Teachers College, Shippensburg, Pennsylvania, differed from The College of William and Mary, Norfolk Division, in
that it (1) served the primary purpose of educating teachers and other professional personnel for the State of Pennsylvania, (2) was accredited by the Middle States Association, the National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education, and the National Association of Business Education, (3) was staffed by a faculty of 172 full-time personnel, of whom 44 were Ph.D. degree holders, (4) was located in a largely populated rural area of 6,138, (5) was a product of a different socio-economic environment, in that it was located in the Middle Atlantic Region (comprised of N.J., N.Y., and Pa.), (6) had a campus of 15 buildings situated on 155 acres of land, (7) had a library of 100,000 volumes and 900 periodicals, (8) provided residential facilities for a segment of its student body, (9) had a full-time enrollment of 661 (extrapolated from Hawes and Fine) students, of whom at least ninety-eight percent were from Pennsylvania, (10) administered a Greek letter system of fraternities only, (11) offered a four-year, teacher training curriculum, (12) charged in-state tuition of $300 for a two-semester academic year, (13) operated on a semester system for all students, (14) admitted high school graduates, ranking in the sixty percentile of their respective classes.

Hubley's dissertation placed particular emphasis on the use of newspaper articles, official institutional records, minutes of meetings, letters, reports of evaluating committees, catalogues, class records, student publications, scrapbooks, yearbooks, and handbooks, all of which paralleled those used in this study.
Sister Mary Giles Whalen's dissertation, published in 1966, used data from the Marian College Archives in the form of reports, records, catalogues, minutes of meetings, letters, documents, handbooks, programs, and student publications. Other primary data came from the offices and archives of the Sisters of St. Francis, Oldenburg, Indiana. Secondary sources included newspaper articles about the college, books on higher education, teacher education, education in Indiana, and studies of Catholic colleges and universities. All of the foregoing research tools paralleled those sources of data and methods of research used in this study.

At the conclusion of the period of this study from 1937 to 1962, Old Dominion College (1930) and Marian College (1937), Indianapolis, Indiana, were both alike, in that they (1) were coeducational, (2) offered a four-year, liberal arts curriculum, (3) conferred baccalaureate degrees, (4) sponsored an intercollegiate sports program, (5) offered a summer session, (6) used Scholastic Aptitude Test (S.A.T.) scores, as part of the admissions process, and (7) were each governed by its own governing body.

Old Dominion College differed from Marian College, in that it (1) was a public college, (2) provided each student an opportunity to equip himself with the knowledge and understanding necessary to meet the issues, problems, and advantages of life, to the best of his ability, (3) was accredited by the Southern Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools and the Board of Education of the Commonwealth
of Virginia, was staffed by 165 full-time faculty, of whom 52
were Ph.D. degree, or equivalent, holders, (5) was located in a
large, metropolitan area, consisting of 4 municipalities and 2
counties, with a population of 655,488 (Norfolk and Portsmouth =
419,496 [extrapolated from the 1960 and 1970 U.S. Censuses] and
Virginia Beach, Princess Anne County, Norfolk County, and South
Norfolk, 235,992 [extrapolated from the 1960 and 1970 U.S.
Censuses]) (6) was a product of a different socio-economic
environment, in that it was located in the South Atlantic Region
(comprised of Del., D.C., Fla., Ga., Md., N.C., S.C., Va., and W.
Va.) (7) had a campus of 8 principal buildings situated on 23
acres of land, (8) had a library of 70,000 volumes, with 500
periodicals, (9) was non-residential, (10) had an enrollment of
8,665 full- and part-time students, of whom at least seventy percent
of the full-time students were from Virginia, (11) administered a
Greek letter system of fraternities and sororities, (12) charged
in-state tuition of $120 (12+ quarter hours), (13) operated on the
quarter system for all students, (14) gave admission preference to
high school graduates, ranking in the upper fifty percentile of their
respective classes, (15) administered an honor system, (16) operated a junior college program, both terminal and pre-
professional in scope, (17) operated a technical institute,
designed to develop technicians at a sub-engineering level, to fill
the technological gap between the graduate engineer and the
journeymen mechanic, (18) conducted an evening college, designed
specifically to offer educational opportunities to men and women
whose occupations or other considerations made it impossible for them
to attend day classes,\(^{112}\) awarded non-baccalaureate diplomas to
graduates of the junior college\(^ {113}\) and the technical institute,\(^ {114}\)
and (20) operated a School of Engineering.\(^ {115}\)

Marian College differed from Old Dominion College, in that it
(1) was a private college, (2) provided each student with a liberal
arts education within the framework of Catholic philosophy and
theology, (3) was accredited by the North Central Association and the
American Library Association, (4) did not operate a Greek letter
system (5) was staffed by a faculty of 40 full-time members,\(^ {116}\), (6)
was located in a large, metropolitan area, with a population of
977,557 (extrapolated from the 1960 and 1970 U.S. Censuses),\(^ {117}\) (7)
was a product of a different socio-economic environment, in that it
was located in the East North Central Region (comprised of Ill.,
Ind., Mich., Ohio, and Wis.),\(^ {118}\) (8) had a campus of 9 buildings
situated on 64 acres of land, (9) had a library of 35,692 volumes and
253 periodicals, (10) provided residential facilities for a segment
of its student body,\(^ {119}\) (11) had an enrollment of 585 full-time
students,\(^ {120}\) of whom at least eighty-four percent were from Indiana,
(12) charged tuition of $500 for two semesters, (13) operated on a
semester basis, and (14) accepted all high school graduates, ranking
in the upper fifty percentile of their respective classes, with at
least an academic "C" average or better.\(^ {121}\)

Whalen's historical dissertation traced the development of
Marian College and examined pertinent data, indicating that the college was founded in response to a need for Catholic education for women and later expanded its services to men when that need became evident. Marian College evolved from academy and normal school beginnings. Political factors were involved in this transition from an academy to an accredited, four-year, coeducational institution.\textsuperscript{122}

Mr. LeRoy Ancelet in his dissertation, published in 1971, emphasized that the history of Southeastern Louisiana College was deeply influenced by politics. Every school administration attempted to steer clear of partisan politics, but Louisiana's all-encompassing political maelstrom continually tugged at the college.\textsuperscript{123} The college was established in 1925 as Hammond Junior College and became Southeastern Louisiana College in 1928.

At the conclusion of the period of this study from 1925 to 1967, Old Dominion College (1930) and Southeastern Louisiana College (1925), Hammond, Louisiana, were both alike, in that they (1) were coeducational,\textsuperscript{124} (2) offered a four-year, liberal arts curriculum,\textsuperscript{125} (3) conferred baccalaureate degrees,\textsuperscript{126} (4) administered a Greek letter system of fraternities and sororities,\textsuperscript{127} (5) sponsored an intercollegiate sports program,\textsuperscript{128} (6) offered a summer session,\textsuperscript{129} (7) provided residential facilities for a segment of its student body,\textsuperscript{130} (8) were each governed by its own governing body, (9) were public colleges,\textsuperscript{131} (10) operated on the semester system,\textsuperscript{132} (11) maintained a graduate program of study,\textsuperscript{133} and (12) offered graduate degrees.\textsuperscript{134}
Old Dominion College differed from Southeastern Louisiana College, in that it (1) aimed to enrich the life of the Tidewater, Virginia, Community, the State of Virginia, and the United States, by seeking to develop in its students the imagination, intelligence, and awareness of values which would enable them to assume places of leadership in a rapidly expanding society.\(^{135}\) (2) was accredited by the Southern Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools and the Board of Education of the Commonwealth of Virginia,\(^{136}\) (3) was staffed by 257 full-time faculty, of whom 79 were Ph.D. degree, or equivalent, holders,\(^{137}\) (4) was located in a large, metropolitan area, consisting of 6 municipalities, with a population of 649,953 (extrapolated from the 1960 and 1970 U.S. Censuses),\(^{138}\) (5) was a product of a different socio-economic environment, in that it was located in the South Atlantic Region (comprised of Del., D.C., Fla., Ga., Md., N.C., S.C., Va., and W. Va.),\(^{139}\) (6) had a campus of 18 principal buildings\(^{140}\) situated on 73 acres of land,\(^{141}\) (7) had a library of 700 periodicals and an ultimate capacity of 150,000 volumes,\(^{142}\) (8) had an enrollment of 10,640 full- and part-time students, of whom at least seventy percent of the full-time students were from Virginia,\(^{143}\) (9) charged in-state tuition of $200 (12+ semester hours for undergraduate instruction and up to $200 for graduate instruction)\(^{144}\) (10) gave admission preference to high school graduates, ranking in the upper fifty percentile of their respective classes, with an academic "C" average or better,\(^{145}\) (11) administered an honor system,\(^{146}\) (12) operated a community college
division, including a technical institute and semi-professional education, designed to meet the needs of students who have neither the resources nor the desire for a four-year degree or whose career requirements do not require a baccalaureate program, administered a division of continuing education, which conducted an evening college program, leading to undergraduate and graduate degrees, and a non-degree program, designed to offer stimulating courses for those who desired to keep abreast of the times and continue learning in a college atmosphere, without formally seeking a degree, awarded non-baccalaureate diplomas to graduates of the Community College Division, operated a School of Engineering, and used Scholastic Aptitude Test (S.A.T.) scores, as part of the admissions process.

Southeastern Louisiana College differed from Old Dominion College, in that it (1) was accredited by the Southern Association, the National Council for the Accreditation of Teacher Education, and the National Association of the Schools of Music, (2) was staffed by a faculty of members, (3) was located in an urban area, with a population of 11,907 (extrapolated from the 1960 and 1970 U.S. Censuses), (4) was a product of a different socio-economic environment, in that it was located in the West South Central Region (comprised of Ark., La., Okla., and Tex.), (5) had a campus of approximately 30 permanent buildings and 20 temporary buildings situated on the main campus of 375 acres of land and an agricultural plant situated on approximately 700 additional acres of land, (6) had
an enrollment of 3,221 (extrapolated from Hawes, and Fine), full- and part-time students, of whom ninety-five percent were from Louisiana, charged in-state tuition of $40 for two semesters, and accepted all high school graduates from approved high schools. Despite no stated historical research method, Ancelet’s study, nevertheless, provided some indication of historical methods used.

Mrs. I. Patricia Jones Anglin’s dissertation, published in 1983, presented a history of Bowie State College, from its beginnings to a private, normal school (two-year college) to a multi-purpose, state college (four-year college). The study focused upon the changes that occurred in the administration, curriculum, faculty, student body, and physical plant in relation to the institution’s purposes. In addition, attention was also given to the roles the local community, the state, and the nation played in the growth of the institution.

At the conclusion of the period of this study from 1910 to 1965, Old Dominion College (1930) and Bowie State College (1867), Bowie, Maryland, were both alike, in that they were coeducational, offered a four-year, liberal arts curriculum, conferred baccalaureate degrees, sponsored an intercollegiate sports program, were each governed by its own governing body, were public colleges, operated on the semester system, were located in a similar socio-economic environment, in that they were located in the South.
Atlantic Region (comprised of Del., D.C., Fla., Ga., Md., N.C., S.C., Va., and W. Va.), and (9) used Scholastic Achievement Test (S.A.T.) scores, as part of the admissions process.

Old Dominion College differed from Bowie State College, in that it (1) aimed to provide the opportunity for higher education at a reasonable cost while developing educational programs which best met the needs of the Hampton Roads, Virginia, Community, (2) was accredited by the Southern Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools and the Board of Education of the Commonwealth of Virginia. (3) was staffed by 165 full-time faculty, of whom 47 were Ph.D. degree, or equivalent, holders, (4) was located in a large, metropolitan area, consisting of 6 municipalities, with a population of 630,017 (extrapolated from the 1960 and 1970 U.S. Censuses), (5) had a campus of 21 principal buildings situated on 66 acres of land, (6) had a library of 500 periodicals and an ultimate capacity of 150,000 volumes, (7) had an enrollment of 12,292 full- and part-time students, of whom at least seventy percent of the full-time students were from Virginia, (8) administered a Greek letter system of fraternities and sororities, (9) charged in-state tuition of $200 (12+ semester hours) for undergraduate instruction and $200 (7+ semester hours) for graduate instruction, (10) gave admission preference to high school graduates, ranking in the upper fifty percentile of their respective classes, with an academic "C" average or better, (11) administered an honor system, (12) operated a junior college program, both terminal and
pre-professional in scope, operated a technical institute, designed to develop technicians at a sub-engineering level, to fill the technological gap between the graduate engineer and the journeyman mechanic, conducted an evening college, leading to undergraduate and graduate degrees, and a non-degree program, designed to offer stimulating courses for those who desired to keep abreast of the times and continue learning in a college atmosphere without formally seeking a degree, awarded non-baccalaureate diplomas to graduates of the junior college program and the technical institute, operated a School of Engineering, maintained a graduate program of study, offered graduate degrees, and operated a summer session.

Bowie State College differed from Old Dominion College, in that it was an institution operated for the preparation of teachers for the public schools, was accredited by the Middle States Association and the National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education, was staffed by full-time faculty, of whom 10 were Ph.D. degree holders, was located in a rural area, with a population of 18,047, had a campus of principal buildings situated on 187 acres of land, had a library of 31,000 volumes, with 275 periodicals, had an enrollment of 550 full-time students, of whom at least eighty percent were from Maryland, had no Greek letter system, charged no in-state tuition for those students in the Teacher Education Program, gave admission preference to high school graduates, ranking in the upper fifty
percentile of their respective classes, with an academic "B" average or better, and (11) used American College Test (A.C.T.) scores, in addition to those of the Scholastic Aptitude Test (S.A.T.), as part of the admissions process. 191

Anglin's historical study included college catalogues, student newspapers, newsletters, letters, biographical accounts, minutes, state records, newspapers, histories of Black higher educators, and histories of education in Maryland and the United States. 192 Anglin's historical research paralleled that of this study.

The foregoing illustrated the similarities and differences between Old Dominion College and the State Teachers College, Shippensburg, Pennsylvania; Marian College; Southeastern Louisiana College; and Bowie State College, at the conclusion of studies ending in 1960, 1962, 1967, and 1965, respectively, for each of the last four schools.

Historically, other differences existed between Old Dominion College and the above four schools. Old Dominion College began as a southern, white, junior college in 1930, in response to the needs of the citizenry of Tidewater, Virginia, to have an institution of higher learning of their own. The people of Tidewater, Virginia, turned to the administration and the Board of Visitors, The College of William and Mary in Virginia, Williamsburg, Virginia, for assistance in establishing the junior college. The junior college, located in a large metropolitan area, with a population of 231,354
Norfolk and Portsmouth = 175,414; Norfolk and Princess Anne Counties = 46,364; and Virginia Beach and South Norfolk = 9,576, had an essentially urban character. Composed of 206 students, its initial mission was to prepare young people for transfer to The College of William and Mary in Virginia, Williamsburg, Virginia, and to the Virginia Polytechnic Institute, Blacksburg, Virginia. In addition, the junior college later became terminal in nature and even later pre-professional in scope. From the junior college, including its V.P.I.-sponsored engineering program, evolved (1) vocational training in 1939 and a vocational trade school in 1945, which later became the technical institute in 1947 and the Evening Division Technical Institute in 1950, (2) civilian pilot training program in 1940, (3) a defense training program in 1941, (4) an evening college program in 1942, (5) a University of Virginia extension program in 1950, (6) a four-year, degree granting program in 1954, (7) a southern institution open to all races, beginning in 1954, (8) a social work program in 1956, (9) independent status in 1962, (10) a graduate, degree granting program in 1964, (11) a community college, embracing the old junior college and the technical institute in 1966, and (12) a division of continuing education, embracing the old Evening College and the Evening Division, Technical Institute in 1966. This extensive evolvement was in response to the ever-growing needs and aspirations of the people of the Tidewater, Virginia, Metropolitan Area.
The State Teachers College, Shippensburg, Pennsylvania (1971) evolved from the Cumberland Valley State Normal School (a two-year college), founded in rural Pennsylvania in 1871 and open to all races, in response to a need to serve teacher education in the area and the state. Cumberland Valley State Normal School was established with the assistance of the State of Pennsylvania. The school's primary objective throughout the period of the study from 1871 to 1960 was the preparation of teachers only.\textsuperscript{211} Whereas, Old Dominion College's predecessor, the junior college of the Norfolk Division, The College of William and Mary, offered a liberal arts curriculum, the Cumberland Valley State Normal School's non-liberal arts curriculum devoted itself exclusively to teacher training. While the State Teachers College, Shippensburg, Pennsylvania, had evolved into a four-year institution, it was still a teacher education institution, although placed on a fully collegiate basis.\textsuperscript{212}

Marian College in 1962, located in the large, metropolitan area of Indianapolis, Indiana, evolved in 1954 into a coeducational institution from the women's college of the same name established in 1937. Marian College was founded, as a midwestern institution open to all races, in response to the needs of the citizens of the Indianapolis, Indiana, Metropolitan Area for Catholic higher education for women and the teacher education needs of the Sisters of St. Francis, Oldenburg, Indiana.\textsuperscript{213} Marian College was established with the assistance of the Sisters of St. Francis. Whereas the
Norfolk Division, The College of William and Mary had no competitors in the Tidewater, Virginia, Metropolitan Area, except for Atlantic University, a four-year, coeducational institution which was in existence for only a brief period of time from September 1930 to December 1931. Marian College had to compete for students with several other institutions of higher education in the Indianapolis, Indiana, Metropolitan Area. In addition, Marian College began as an academy and normal school, with a non-liberal arts curriculum devoted exclusively to teacher training, while the junior college in Norfolk offered a liberal arts curriculum, both for transfer purposes, as well as being terminal in scope. Furthermore, Marian College began under the auspices of a religious congregation of women while the Norfolk Division, The College of William and Mary's junior college was under the control of its parent institution, The College of William and Mary in Virginia, Williamsburg, Virginia.

Southeastern Louisiana College (1925) and Old Dominion College (1930) were both founded as junior colleges. Hammond Junior College offered a liberal arts curriculum, as did the Norfolk Division, The College of William and Mary. In addition, Hammond Junior College offered a two-year curriculum in teacher education, making it not only a junior college but a normal college, as well. Whereas Hammond Junior College's facilities were located in Hammond High School, Norfolk's junior college facilities were in the old Larchmont Elementary School leased by the City of Norfolk.
schools were founded as southern, white institutions of higher learning. Assistance for the establishment of Hammond Junior College was from the Tangipahoa Parish School Board. In 1928 the State of Louisiana absorbed the junior college into its state supported system of higher education. In the same year Hammond Junior College acquired a campus of its own and became Southeastern Louisiana College. While Hammond Junior College became Southeastern Louisiana College in 1928 and granted its first baccalaureate degrees in 1939 (fourteen years after its founding), Norfolk's junior college did not receive authority to become a four-year, degree-granting college until 1954 and did not award baccalaureate degrees until 1956 (twenty-six years after its founding). Also, while Southeastern Louisiana College was authorized in 1961 (thirty-six years after its founding) to establish a degree-granting, graduate program, Old Dominion College was not authorized until 1963 (thirty-three years after its founding) to offer a degree-granting, graduate program.

Bowie State College (1867) evolved from a small, private, normal school established in 1857 to its present status as a state funded, multi-purpose college. While the school is now open to all races, it was founded as a Black institution of teacher training. While Norfolk's junior college offered a liberal arts curriculum, Bowie State College's predecessor's curriculum was non-liberal arts in nature and devoted exclusively to teacher training. Both schools were founded in a large, metropolitan area. The Norfolk
Division, The College of William and Mary served the needs of the white population of the Tidewater, Virginia, Metropolitan Area while Bowie State College's predecessor served the needs of the Black population of the Baltimore, Maryland, Metropolitan Area. Bowie State College today is located in a rural area some thirty miles from Baltimore.229

Organization of the Study

In Chapters II, III, and IV of this study there was an examination of the factors affecting the growth and development of the Norfolk Division during its first (1930-40), second (1940-50), and third and beyond (1950-62) decades as a junior college, then as a four-year, degree-granting, senior college, and finally as an independent, four-year, degree-granting, senior college with its own governing board. As part of this study the views of certain leading citizens, college administrators at The College of William and Mary and the Norfolk Division, the Board of Visitors of the College of William and Mary, the State Council of Higher Education, and the state legislature were reviewed and analyzed to determine their relevance to the evolvement of Old Dominion College.

Chapter V included summaries of the study, conclusions that were drawn from the study, and implications for future research.

Institutional Name Changes

During the period of this study from 1930 to 1962, the
Norfolk Division had twelve names, namely, (1) the Norfolk Division, The College of William and Mary (1930-37),\(^{230}\) (2) The College of William and Mary in Virginia, Norfolk Division (1937-40),\(^{231}\) (3) The College of William and Mary in Virginia, Norfolk, Virginia (1940-42),\(^{232}\) (4) Norfolk Division of the College of William and Mary and the Virginia Polytechnic Institute (1942-43),\(^{233}\) (5) The Norfolk Division of the College of William and Mary and the Virginia Polytechnic Institute (1943-44),\(^{234}\) (6) Norfolk Division, College of William and Mary, Virginia Polytechnic Institute (1944-45),\(^{235}\) (7) The College of William and Mary and the Virginia Polytechnic Institute in Norfolk (1945-54),\(^{236}\) (8) The College of William and Mary in Norfolk (1954-58),\(^{237}\) (9) The College of William and Mary, Norfolk Division (1958-61),\(^{238}\) (10) The Norfolk College of William and Mary of the Colleges of William and Mary (1961-62),\(^{239}\) (11) Norfolk College (interim name from 1 July 1962 to 1 August 1962),\(^{240}\) and (12) Old Dominion College (as of 2 August 1962).\(^{241}\)

**Chief Administrator Title Changes**

During the period of this study from 1930 to 1962, the Chief Administrator position had four titles, namely, (1) Director (1930-33\(^{242}\) and 1942-57),\(^{243}\) (2) Dean (1933-42),\(^{244}\) (3) Provost (1957-1960),\(^{245}\) and (4) President (1960-62).\(^{246}\)
CHAPTER II

THE NORFOLK DIVISION DURING ITS FIRST DECADE

(1930-40)

Introduction

This chapter presented the political, educational and economic factors which affected the growth and development of (1) the Norfolk Division, The College of William and Mary (1930-37), (2) The College of William and Mary in Virginia, Norfolk Division (1937-40), and (3) The College of William and Mary in Virginia, Norfolk, Virginia (1940-42).

1930-31 Session

Classes offered by the Norfolk Division, The College of William and Mary were first held on 12 September 1930 in the Old Larchmont School, an abandoned elementary building, the site of which, together with improvements thereon, was deeded to The College of William and Mary by the City of Norfolk.

Leadership of the Norfolk Division, The College of William and Mary was entrusted on 3 September 1930 to the school's first director, Mr. H. Edgar Timmerman (1930-32), A.B. and A.M., Columbia University. The College of William and Mary's leadership fell to
its nineteenth president, Dr. Julian Alvin Carroll Chandler (1919-34), A.M., College of William and Mary; Ph.D., Johns Hopkins University; and L.L.D., Richmond College. A former Head of the Division of Humanities, Professor W. Gordon Akers, Old Dominion University, and a former professor on the teaching staff of the Norfolk Division, said this of Mr. H. Edgar Timmerman:

He said he had been trained for the Episcopal clergy but never entered that field. He was a blustery, get-it-done sort of fellow. He seemed to be well liked by the students, and the High Hat, the new student newspaper, referred to his getting out in the hall and bellowing to the boys to quiet down, but they loved it, and we thought of him as a reasonably efficient director.

Other than the above, the records in the Archives of The College of William and Mary and Old Dominion University were extremely devoid of any information on the brief tenure of Mr. Timmerman (3 September 1930 to 1 September 1932).

The Virginian-Pilot and The Norfolk Landmark said this about President J. A. C. Chandler:

Dr. Chandler brought to the educational scene in Virginia a dynamic force. He was primarily a builder, a practical educator and one whose privilege it was to see many of his cherished visions reduced to practical fact . . .

He established an extension of the College in Richmond, offering a junior college course of two years to men and women, and later came to Norfolk and established a junior college in the Old Larchmont School . . .

The Norfolk branch of the college is a self-supporting institution, making no drain on the resources of the State. It answered for this section of Tidewater a long-felt need, and it was almost entirely due to Dr. Chandler's own efforts that this plan was carried through. . . .
Indicative of his leadership was Mr. H. Edgar Timmerman's open letter to the new student body in which he said:

It is a rare opportunity that a college administrator has the privilege of officially welcoming a new class.

What has been done in this new division of an old and honored institution during the past two months is now history, and to say what we are going to do in the future would require a special gift of prophecy. Yet, there are so many things that one can do to make the Norfolk Division of the College of William and Mary an institution to which not only the City of Norfolk, but all of Virginia and the whole South may look to with pride. It is especially important that during this formation period that the faculty and the student body cooperate in the highest degree in order that the institution may pass through its 'critical' period. I am sure that all are desirous of seeing the Norfolk Division of the College of William and Mary expand and develop to meet the fullest educational needs of the City of Norfolk, and to this end may I ask your help?

I bid the students of the Norfolk Division, College of William and Mary a welcome.

In an address to the Rotary Club of Norfolk, President J. A. C. Chandler promised as high a standard of education for the Norfolk Division, The College of William and Mary as could be obtained at the mother college. He said:

We shall establish in Norfolk the same type of institution as is now established in Richmond. In its first year, the Norfolk branch will of necessity be required to devote most of its attention to freshman training but the second year and the years following the sophomore branches of study will be enlarged until they, too, are on the same high plane as are these same classes in the college at Williamsburg. Any person who finished the first or second years of instruction at the branch of the College of William and Mary can go on to any other institution of learning in the United States and receive full credit for work accomplished here.

To assist with the administration of the newly formed Norfolk
Division, The College of William and Mary, President J. A. C.

Chandler appointed an Advisory Board of certain leading Norfolk citizens. The board was composed of Mr. A. H. Foreman, Chairman, School Board of the City of Norfolk; Mr. C. W. Mason, Superintendent of Schools, Norfolk; Mr. H. A. Hunt, Superintendent of Schools, Portsmouth; Mr. James Hurst, Superintendent, Norfolk County Schools; and Mr. S. Heth Tyler, President of the Council and Mayor of the City of Norfolk.256

It appeared that President Chandler sought wisely to enlist the aid of several of the superintendents of schools in the Tidewater Area so as to ensure that the various high schools were brought to the attention of graduating seniors the alternative of attending a junior college in Norfolk vice leaving the area to attend a four-year school. More importantly, it presented a higher education alternative to those who could not afford a school outside the Tidewater Area.

Among the first Norfolk organizations which politically endorsed the establishment of the Norfolk Division, The College of William and Mary, was the Norfolk-Portsmouth Chamber of Commerce. Attested to by Mr. W. S. Harney, Secretary, they resolved on 17 September 1930:

WHEREAS, The College of William and Mary of Williamsburg, Virginia, the first College of higher learning in America to receive a charter from the Crown in the year 1693, has deemed it wise to establish in Norfolk a Division of the institution equipped to provide students with the first two years of the regular college curriculum; and,
WHEREAS, The establishment in Norfolk of this Division is recognized as a splendid asset, augmenting to a marked degree the educational facilities of this section and stands as evidence of the progressive and ambitious spirit of the College; and,

WHEREAS, It is hoped that the Division will expand and thrive to such an extent that it will soon be found advantageous and advisable to increase its courses to include four years of College instruction in liberal arts [underlining mine]; now, therefore,

BE IT RESOLVED, That the Norfolk-Portsmouth Chamber of Commerce heartily welcomes the Norfolk Division of the College of William and Mary and the members of its faculty, and pledges the full strength of its cooperation to the end and that the College, the Norfolk Division and its students thereof may benefit and prosper.257

No sooner had the Norfolk Division, The College of William and Mary opened its doors than a Norfolk organization, as we have seen above, advanced the concept of a four-year college.

Little notice was taken at the state level of the establishment of the Norfolk Division. The minutes of the State Board of Education contained no mention of the matter.258 Apparently, the initiation of the division was an intra-school matter, with no approval required in Richmond. Former Governor Colgate W. Darden, Jr., noted that there was no reaction in the General Assembly other than a friendly one. The assembly never went far enough to grant it any financial support because it then was desperately pressed to find money to keep the state institutions going that were already in existence. It just wasn't possible for them until some years later to extend state aid.259

At the time the Norfolk Division began its operation, a competitor, Atlantic University, a four-year college, commenced its
operations in nearby Virginia Beach. Its existence, however, was destined to be tragically short because of the effects of the depression at the time. 260

The original intent of The College of William and Mary was to offer instruction at the Norfolk Division, The College of William and Mary equivalent to that given in Williamsburg. To this end, many College of William and Mary professors commuted to Norfolk several times weekly. 261

The student newspaper, the Flat Hat, of The College of William and Mary took note of the opening of the Norfolk Division, The College of William and Mary and said:

The purpose of this new project is to 'render real service to the people of the cities and counties of Tidewater, Virginia. The Junior College is inspired by no other purpose,' The idea of a Junior College was introduced by Dr. Chandler and Mr. A. H. Foreman, of the Board of Visitors, with the hope of enabling students, in or near Norfolk, to attend college who would not have been able to do so under former circumstances. . . . The Junior College will be conducted under practically the same rules as is the College of Williamsburg. . . . 262

Barely had the two-year, junior college in Norfolk gotten underway than its newly appointed director held out hopes for a four-year school. In an address to the Norfolk Cosmopolitan Club, he said:

The Norfolk division of the College of William and Mary, now offering two years of college training to its students, will be expanded to include a four-year curriculum if supported in attendance and in public demand. . . . We are perfectly willing to make it a four-year college if there is a demand for it. . . . The best evidence of an expansion program was the purchase by Dr. J. A. C. Chandler . . . of twelve or thirteen acres of land adjacent to the college building. 'We expect to use that property,' he said, 'and we are not going to leave it vacant.' While there is no
definite program for additional facilities in the way of expansion, we plan to go ahead as fast as the people of Norfolk are willing.

It was evident from the above that from the very beginning administration officials of the Norfolk Division, The College of William and Mary envisioned the growth and development of a four-year institution in Norfolk.

In a letter to Director H. Edgar Timmerman, President J. A. C. Chandler appeared to put a damper on the concept of a four-year college in the near future, but, nevertheless, held open the door to the possibility of a four-year school at a later date. Apparently, Mr. William Holmes Davis, an ardent supporter of higher education in Norfolk, had spoken to Mr. Timmerman earlier. In his letter, Dr. Chandler said:

Dr. Hodges informs me that William Holmes Davis has told you that we cannot have anything but a junior college in Norfolk. That is all that I have committed myself to and all I propose to commit myself to at this time, and I do not care for you to talk about further developments. However, I want you to stop William Holmes Davis from talking, by giving him the following information, if he has made any such statements.

1. We have bought about 12 acres of land in Norfolk and we can do with it whatever we wish.

2. . . . c. That the courses given in said college shall embrace at least full Freshman and Sophomore courses and such other courses as in the discretion of the college are practicable to be offered.

If Mr. Davis told you we were restricted, will you kindly call him up or get in touch with him personally and give him the facts from the deed, and ask him please not to continue to make such errors, that the College of William and Mary is absolutely unrestricted as to what type college it may conduct in Norfolk with the property which it has bought, and with the property which the city gave to it. It must have at
least Freshman and Sophomore classes, and may add to these classes as seems wise in the discretion of the administrative officers.

Two months later, Dr. Chandler again implied his desire to keep the Norfolk Division at the two-year level. It appeared that Mr. Timmerman wanted to expand the course offerings to include a junior year. In a letter to Mr. Timmerman, Dr. Chandler stated:

We do not propose to offer any three year courses in Norfolk. As I have previously stated to you, I am not in a position to offer three years of anything yet. As I wrote you, I wish the three year pre-dental and the three year pre-medical course outlined in your catalogue, with the notation in each case that the third year of this work is offered at the College in Williamsburg.

The role Norfolk Division students were to play in the destiny of their school was evident in a High Hat editorial late in the fall semester quoted below:

The members of this division of the College of William and Mary have a dual responsibility upon their shoulders.

It is not only necessary for us to uphold the tradition of the second oldest college in the United States, but we must establish the records and precedents of a new institution.

We must uphold the 'family name.' We are the little sister or the little brother of the William and Mary family, but the family name is equally our possession.

Aside from the fact that we are expected to establish high collegiate standards in our college, there is the encouraging fact that we are eager to do so. Casting all duty and expectations aside, we have a personal desire to promote our institution.

Of course, this matter of promotion and carrying on is obviously an individualistic undertaking. Each student must consider himself a separate and distinct factor, not merely a small piece of the student body, necessary to our desire aims.
Late in the second semester, the High Hat again appealed to
the student body in the following editorial:

As the first student body of the Norfolk Division of the
College of William and Mary, there are certain duties that we
owe our school. All that follows us here at this college
will be guided by the examples which we are setting and the
standards which we are making. We are now establishing a
reputation by which the growth of the school will largely be
determined. Unless we are extremely careful for the first
few years outsiders will get an entirely wrong conception of
us. The City of Norfolk and Tidewater Virginia are watching
us with keen interest. The success of the school hangs in
the balance.

In our efforts to preserve the ancient traditions of the
College of William and Mary let us arrive to make this school
a model center of learning with a well-balanced curriculum,
good athletic record, high scholastic standing and a winning
school spirit.

Do you think that this division has a good reason for
growing? If you do, then it is the duty that we owe our
school to do all we can to help it grow. We should advertise
the school in the right way.

Again, the High Hat devoted another editorial at the close of
the second semester, pointing out to the student body the value of
the Norfolk Division of William and Mary College as follows:

Distinctly as asset to the community, the Norfolk
Division of the College of William and Mary has proved to be
in the past year one of the most successful of the various
undertakings that have been instituted in the quest of higher
education in this city. Drawing principally upon the
students from this locality, the college has opened a way for
many who otherwise would not continue their schooling.

It is in an attractive location, and is easily accessible
to a large number of people.

The high school students are particularly enthusiastic
about the college, as it permits the continuance of
friendships begun earlier in life and provides for the
starting of an educational career in school near their homes,
friends, and other interests.
Improvement, too, of the spirit in educational circles in Norfolk has noticeably been effected. Long despairing of any institution of advanced learning being located here, those interested in this matter are now assured of a permanent college whose history dates back to the early days of the colonies.

Norfolk newspaper coverage of the new division was extremely limited. No editorials appeared during the 1930-31 session; there were 8 articles of a general nature; no articles which reported organizational endorsement of a four-year college; and there were 2 articles which reported individual endorsements of a four-year college.

The 1930-31 session concluded on 5 June 1931. Exercises were held with President Chandler as the principal speaker. Indicative of a growing division was his announcement that a new academic building and gymnasium were being proposed. In addition, a considerable sum would be expended during the summer to enlarge the library facilities.
1931-32 Session

The 1931-32 session of the Norfolk Division, The College of William and Mary began on 11 September 1931.  

A local newspaper carried a headline to the effect that the Norfolk Division of William and Mary expected enrollment double the size of last year's session. This, of course, would have made the enrollment figure 412. The actual figure was 455.

Leadership was again in the capable hands of Director H. Edgar Timmerman, while the mother school was under President J. A. C. Chandler.

The Advisory Board, appointed previously by President Chandler, was continued.

With the start of the first semester of the 1931-32 session, The College of William and Mary cooperated with the Virginia Polytechnic Institute and initiated training in engineering subjects directly with the people of Tidewater, Virginia. A member of the V.P.I. faculty was assigned to the Norfolk Division where he oversaw and directed the teaching of engineering subjects just as they were taught in Blacksburg. The first year, along with regular science, chemistry, and physics already taught at the division, included engineering, such as to give a student full insight into the various segments of engineering. The work of the second year was identical to that taught in Blacksburg and included courses in chemistry, mining, civil, industrial, mechanical, electrical, and architectural engineering. Even if unable to go to V.P.I. for the last two years,
students received fundamental scientific training which proved of real value to industries of Tidewater, Virginia. The cooperative work with V.P.I. was viewed as a type of enlarged educational service which The College of William and Mary gave to the people of the Norfolk Area.275

Initially, the faculty of the Engineering Branch was selected by V.P.I. and paid by V.P.I. The finances were kept separate. Later, when V.P.I. realized finances would probably cause difficulty, they turned all financing over to William and Mary. All faculty members were paid through William and Mary's local budget.276

Director Timmerman commented that the rapid development of Hampton Roads as a port and the growth of industry created a situation that called for technically trained personnel. It was his hope that this was but the first step in the greater development of the Norfolk Division of The College of William and Mary which would make Norfolk an educational center.277

The College of William and Mary and the Virginia Polytechnic Institute joint venture was a success from its very beginning. In the words of Professor Edward White, former Dean of the School of Engineering, Old Dominion University and a former professor on the teaching staff of the Norfolk Division:

We were fully accepted and oriented into the program here. There was one, just one, faculty; that was anyone that was here and in the effort of teaching and having a good Division. So we all operated together and there was just a few in number in those days. . . . And so, when we felt like entertaining the faculty, we entertained the entire faculty. . . .
In response to a question by Dr. James Sweeney to former President Lewis W. Webb, Jr., of Old Dominion University, and former professor on the teaching staff of the Norfolk Division, concerning whether Virginia Polytechnic Institute and William and Mary worked together in the Norfolk Division and if there were any frictions in that relationship, President Webb replied:

They worked very well together. V.P.I. had only an interest in getting good engineering students to them. William and Mary had no engineering program, so they weren't particularly interested in the engineering students. . . . There seemed to be no quibbling. Our salaries they paid us weren't enough I guess for them to worry about who was paying them.

Mr. Lewis W. Webb, Jr. was hired in the summer of 1932 and began teaching in the fall of 1932, as a member of the V.P.I. Division under the William and Mary Division. Atlantic University, a privately financed school, ran into difficult times because of the depression's dire economic circumstances. It ceased operations early in 1932. In an editorial, a local newspaper said:

The recommendation of the receiver that all further efforts to continue Atlantic University be abandoned, has been confirmed by court order. An institution fatally attained for many months has breathed its last. . . .

When Atlantic University was launched in the autumn of 1930 there was some reason for believing that it might strike root here and develop a permanent growth. That belief was founded altogether on the fact that interested individuals in New York and elsewhere were expending large sums of money on this enterprise. What was not generally known at the time but is fully known now was that the amount of this money was grossly exaggerated. . . .

It did not have the normal parentage of sturdy collegiate foundations, but was fathered by a mixed company of
enthusiasts moved primarily, not by a dedication to the cause of higher education but by their interest in occult phenomena. . . .

The *High Hat* had this to say in an editorial, "Finis to Atlantic U."

We feel, that as the medium of opinion and news of its rival institution, the Norfolk Division of The College of William and Mary; we should say a few words on its passing, at the same time extending the warm hand of friendship to those of its shipwrecked student body who have cast themselves upon the safe island of education which this college represents.

We are glad you are here and hope that your college careers which started out so well, and then in the middle of a semester crashed to such absolute depths may be continued here with no further interruptions.

From the start success seemed uncertain, especially when we saw it housed in a rented hotel and not in the fine marble and limestone buildings that had been proposed for it. . . .

We sincerely hope, for those of the student body who have joined our student body, that the added numbers will lead to a rapid expansion of our facilities so that we can give them the best to make up for the losses suffered under their first stern teacher, Experience.

In addition to the additional student enrollment generated by the demise of Atlantic University, the Chemistry Department and the library of the division were enhanced by equipment, supplies, and books purchased from the defunct school.

Director Timmerman appeared to have followed President Chandler's wishes set forth in his letter of 28 January 1931, in which he asked Mr. Timmerman not to talk about further developments. None of the Norfolk or college newspaper media reported any speeches by him during the balance of the 1930-31 session and all of the 1931-32 session. Although there is no record
of it, President Chandler must have communicated with Mr. Timmerman regarding the addition of junior level courses. In his letter of 28 March 1931 to Mr. Timmerman, he stated that he was not in a position to offer three years of anything yet. No Norfolk nor college newspaper media, local leader, or organization carried any editorials, articles, or public pronouncements regarding a four-year college.

In an article headlined "Junior Courses to Be Offered at William and Mary," the Virginian-Pilot and The Norfolk Landmark stated:

The Norfolk division of the College of William and Mary which heretofore has offered only freshman and sophomore work, will include junior courses in next curricula next year.

Two English courses of junior grade will be offered with a full schedule of junior courses in economics and business administration.

Beginning with next session, the division also will offer the first three years of a standard four-year course in secretarial science.

Asked whether the extension of courses to third year work in the third year of operation meant that the full four-year college course would eventually be added, Mr. Timmerman said he could not answer.

On 24 April 1932 Director Timmerman announced that he had been granted a leave of absence to complete studies at Columbia University. Dr. Edward H. Gwathmey, Professor of English at Williamsburg, had been appointed as the new Director of the Norfolk Division for the next year.

The Flat Hat of 26 April 1932 carried an article concerning
Dr. Gwathmey leaving to direct the Norfolk Division. It stated that he would assume the duties of Director of the Norfolk Division beginning with the September term.

The 1931-32 session was concluded on 4 June 1932. Professor Edward M. Gwathmey who succeeded Mr. G. Edgar Timmerman as director delivered the principal address in closing exercises held in the Assembly Hall of the William and Mary Building. Director Timmerman also spoke and made the following statement:

The success of the Norfolk Division of William and Mary had exceeded all expectations. President Chandler had told him that the progress of the division had been as great as the college had expected by 1934. He [Timmerman] predicted that within a few years the Norfolk Division would have a group of buildings on their present property, with a commerce school, a school of law, a school of fine arts, and a great M.A. center. He declared he had visions for the years to come of William and Mary College being, not a division, but the school itself, with the others ranking as divisions.

Norfolk newspaper media coverage was once again extremely limited. There were no editorials covering the period from the end of the 1930–31 session through the 1931–32 session. There were 12 articles of a general nature, up 4 from previously; no articles which reported organizational endorsements of a four-year college, the same as previously; and no articles which reported individual endorsements of a four-year college, down from 2 previously. This was a total of no editorials and 12 articles, up 2 from 10 previously.
1932-33 Session

The 1932-33 session of the Norfolk Division, The College of William and Mary commenced on 16 September 1932. Leadership was in the hands of the school's second Director, Dr. Edward Moseley Gwathmey (1932-33), A.B., Richmond College; and M.A. and Ph.D., University of Virginia, formerly of the English Department of The College of William and Mary. President Chandler remained at the helm of The College of William and Mary. The Advisory Board, appointed by President Chandler in 1930, was continued.

Director Gwathmey spent such a brief period of time as Head of the Norfolk Division, little of record was available to describe him and his type of leadership. Professor W. Gerald Akers said this regarding the director:

Dr. Gwathmey of the English Department of William and Mary, described as a Virginia gentlemen and scholar, was a very charming man of whom I don't remember much because by Christmas time of the same year, after only a couple of months with us, he was called to the presidency of Converse College in South Carolina.

Prof. Lewis W. Webb, Jr., also had brief comments regarding his director:

Ed Gwathmey was a much larger man in terms of his educational philosophies and background. He didn't stay long either because he received an offer to be a president of a college in North Carolina and soon left. But he had a great deal more academic background than Timmerman. . . . Gwathmey's tenure was very, very short, as you know.

In a gathering of more than 150 William and Mary alumni as guests, Dr. Gwathmey at a reception delivered an address in which he
said, among other things: "The Norfolk Division has enrolled 480 students. . . . We are growing in numbers and importance." 295

The High Hat carried an article concerning Dr. Gwathmey's departure from the Norfolk Division in which he said that he was particularly pleased with the college spirit that existed among the students, that he believed that there was a great future ahead of the college, and that he was sorry he would not be present to take part in its development. 296

In a local newspaper which announced Dr. Gwathmey's selection as President, Converse College, the article stated that he would be exceedingly sorry to leave Norfolk and the Norfolk Division, that he had been accorded the finest sort of cooperation by the people of Norfolk during his brief stay there, and that he had complete faith in the future of the Norfolk Division. 297

During his brief, one semester tenure as Director of the Norfolk Division, Dr. Gwathmey made no public pronouncements regarding the evolution of the junior college into a four-year school. Perhaps the briefness of his tenure accounted for this. The possibility existed, however, that Mr. Timmerman passed on to him the restriction imposed by Dr. Chandler or that Dr. Chandler himself told him when leaving Williamsburg of the restriction.

With the departure of Dr. Gwathmey from the Norfolk Division, President Chandler for the second consecutive time appointed another director from the staff of The College of William and Mary. This time it was an administrator named Dr. William Thomas Hodges, A.B.,
College of William and Mary; A.M., Columbia University, Ed.D., Harvard University. The Virginian-Pilot and The Norfolk Landmark reported that Dr. Hodges would assume his new duties on 1 January 1933. He remarked that he was acquainted with both the faculty and the student body of the Norfolk Division, having been the Dean of the Extension Division in Norfolk, was fond of them, and was sure the work would be pleasant.298

The High Hat reported that Dr. Hodges was named as the successor to Dr. Gwathmey. They reported that Dr. Hodges made the third Head of the College of William and Mary at Norfolk in three years of its existence.299

The Flat Hat of 4 April 1933 carried a disquieting article to the effect that the Norfolk Division might be eliminated shortly. No similar article appeared in the High Hat or the Norfolk newspaper media. No mention was made of it in presidential correspondence or in the minutes of the Board of Visitors. The article stated that the Norris Committee of the General Assembly had suggested a move for economical purposes. The body of the article stated:

The Norfolk Division of the College of William and Mary may be eliminated as an economy move, according to Dr. W. T. Hodges, director of the division. . . . The suggestion for eliminating the Norfolk Division has been made by the Norris Committee from the General Assembly. . . .

At no time during the second semester of the 1932-33 session had the Norfolk newspaper media, a local leader, or an organization carried any editorials, articles, or public pronouncements regarding a four-year college. There were 16 articles of general interest, up
4 from previously regarding the college. This was a total of no editorials and 16 articles, up 4 from 6 previously.

The 1932-33 session ended on 9 June 1933. 
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1933-34 Session

The 1933-34 session of The College of William and Mary got underway on 15 September 1933. The title of Director was changed to that of Dean, with the assumption of duties by the third head of the division, Dr. William T. Hodges (1933-41). The leadership of The College of William and Mary remained in the capable hands of President J. A. C. Chandler.

The Advisory Board, appointed by President Chandler in 1930, was continued.

The Virginian-Pilot and The Norfolk Landmark reported that the peak of the term's enrollment would be around 400. Actual enrollment was 399.

An article in the Virginian-Pilot and The Norfolk Landmark best summarized Dr. Hodges's leadership of the Norfolk Division. It stated that he had:

Exceptional qualities that brought him wide public esteem... a public benefactor through his administrative development of the Division... Constant devotion to educational factors... Career is an inspirational one, through his exceptional administrative ability... It is his love of young people and his fine appreciation of their individual qualities... Distinguished service rendered in the educational field... Dean Hodges has worked around the acorn, and now it remains with the people of Norfolk to see whether it becomes an oak worthy of Norfolk, and worthy of the services it can render... Dr. Hodges can recall the name of any one of the 8,000 students he has known in his twenty years of association with the College of William and Mary... this remarkable trait is symbolic of his character, for he has a deep love for all humans... He's a hard taskmaster... Quiet, democratic, and alert to every educational opportunity, Dr. Hodges has gained an enduring recognition in his community for his work with the Division...
The High Hat carried an editorial entitled "A Greater Division." In the editorial the editor addressed the plans embodied under the new Civil Works Administration building project to build a stadium and a new building to house a modern gymnasium and classrooms. Such plans meant a greater Norfolk Division if they materialized. The newspaper hoped that it would mean a full four years of work, at least in some courses, in the not too distant future.

A few days prior to the end of the second semester, the Norfolk Division and The College of William and Mary were saddened by the death of President Chandler who had died from a kidney ailment, suffered over a period of several months.

Among the many associates who grieved over his death was Mr. C. J. Heatwole, Editor of the Virginia Journal of Education, who said:

Dr. Chandler was one of Virginia's most versatile and vigorous educational leaders. Like Woodrow Wilson his specialty was the future. He always envisioned in detail the logical processes of the development of an institution with which he was connected.

In addition to John Stewart Bryan, Vice Rector of the Board of Visitors of The College of William and Mary, Dean William T. Hodges was on a list of 14 names considered to succeed to the presidency, vacated by the death of Dr. J. A. C. Chandler.

Closing exercises were held at a convocation on 8 June 1934. Mr. Winder R. Harris, Managing Editor of the Virginian-Pilot and The Norfolk Landmark, complimented the student body on the work achieved
and pointed them on to other achievements which lay before them. Dr. Hodges, in a tribute to Dr. Chandler, affirmed that "what he [Dr. Chandler] achieved educationally . . . cannot be appraised properly within the next decade. But his work lives on and will live on."312

There were no public pronouncements by Dr. Hodges from the end of 1932-33 session through the 1933-34 session regarding the feasibility of a four-year college, nor were there any by any local leader or organization. No Norfolk or local college newspaper media carried editorials or articles concerning a four-year college.

There were 28 articles of a general nature, up from 12 previously concerning the division. This was a total of no editorials and 28 articles, up 12 from 16 previously.
1934-35 Session

The period of time between the end of the 1933-34 session and
the start of the 1934-35 session saw the selection of Mr. John
Stewart Bryan to be the new Head of The College of William and Mary.

The Board of Visitors reached into its own ranks and selected
its Vice Rector, Mr. John Stewart Bryan (1934-42), A.B. and M.A.,
University of Virginia; L.L.D., Harvard University; Litt.D.,
Washington and Lee University; L.L.D., University of Richmond; and
L.L.D., Ohio University, to be the twentieth President of The College
of William and Mary. In his acceptance speech, Dr. Bryan said the
following:

I am not attempting to change my career this late in
life, but in response to earnest requests from alumni and
friends of The College of William and Mary, and the Board of
Visitors, I will attempt as best I can to carry out some
specific plans for the college.

An editorial in the Virginian-Pilot stated:

As a rule American colleges fill their presidential
vacancies by selections from the ranks of professional
educators. There have been notable departures from this rule
in recent years, but they have been negligible in number.

The election of John Stewart Bryan, Richmond publisher
and president of the Richmond-Times Dispatch and News Leader,
to the Presidency of the College of William and Mary to
succeed the late Dr. J. A. C. Chandler, is one of those
notable departures from academic precedent. It is notable
not only because of the rarity of this type of selection, but
because, in the present instance, it has brought to the post
of direction at Williamsburg one ideally fitted to give the
College of William and Mary the kind of leadership that it
needs at this particular time in its long history. . . . An
intelligent and discriminating civilian has been summoned to
redress, in the interest of higher education, some of the
imbalance that has been produced by the constructive labors
of a professional educator. . . .
It was more than the alumni and the Board of Visitors that persuaded Mr. John S. Bryan to accept the Presidency of William and Mary. It was chiefly a friend of the college, one Mr. John D. Rockefeller, Jr.

The Virginia-Pilot carried an article to the effect that Mr. J. S. Bryan was persuaded by Mr. Rockefeller to head the college and that the philanthropist was believed ready to aid William and Mary financially. The text of the article was as follows:

The Times Dispatch (Richmond, Va.) says tonight that it learned from 'apparently authentic sources' that John Stewart Bryan decided to accept the presidency of the College of William and Mary at the urgent solicitation of John D. Rockefeller, Jr.

The paper says this was taken by alumni and friends of the institution to mean that the philanthropist is 'deeply interested' in the future of the institution and is prepared, with an approved man at the head of it, to lend William and Mary substantial assistance even if he did not intend to make it financially independent.

To the above, Mr. J. S. Bryan, the following day, issued a denial. He said the reports that Mr. John D. Rockefeller, Jr., might give large financial aid to the institution were, so far as he knew, without foundation.

The 1934-35 session of the Norfolk Division, The College of William and Mary began on 14 September 1934. The leadership of the Norfolk Division continued under its Dean, Dr. W. T. Hodges, while the mantle of leadership at the mother college was placed upon its recently elected President, John Stewart Bryan.

The Advisory Board, appointed by Dr. Chandler in 1930, was continued by President Bryan.
President Bryan's leadership embraced the pursuit of the following objectives:

1. A highly educated and enthusiastic faculty
2. A carefully selected and capable student body
3. A physical plant adequate for the instruction and well-being of both the faculty and the students
4. A sound and progressive financial structure without which the other purposes cannot be fulfilled

The idea of a four-year college continued to persist within the minds of the division student body. In a *High Hat* editorial, "Another Year Begins," the editor emphasized:

However, those of us who have dreamed of a larger college at Norfolk still cherish the dream and still make the point that to logically fulfill its greatest usefulness the Division must eventually expand to a four-year college. With all due respect to the parent college at Williamsburg, and to other institutions to which local students have gone to finish, the majority of opinions which we have heard express the desire to continue here if the work were only available. . . . The quality of its training was proved last year when five out of twelve Phi Beta Kappas were former Division students. . . . Present prospects at the Norfolk Division, then, are for further strengthening its position as a two-year college preparation for expansion when that becomes possible. . . .

The *Virginian-Pilot* and *The Norfolk Landmark* reported that registration at William and Mary was far ahead of 1933. It was expected that the division would have an enrollment of approximately 400. In actuality, the final enrollment of 341 fell considerably short of the expected enrollment.

The *Flat Hat* carried an account of the inauguration of Mr. John Stewart Bryan as the nineteenth President of The College of William and Mary. In a front-page story the student newspaper
related that in a simple and inspiring ceremony Mr. John Stewart Bryan, widely known as a traveler, newspaper editor, and lawyer, became the nineteenth President of the 241 year-old College of William and Mary in Virginia. The conferring of the official duties of the new president were in connection with the conferring of honorary degrees on President Franklin D. Roosevelt and Governor George C. Peery of Virginia. 324

The New York Times devoted space to "Old William and Mary."

In the article they said:

The College of William and Mary, old in years for an American institution, renews its youth 'like the eagle. ' . . . With the inauguration Saturday of John Stewart Bryan as the 19th president . . . takes added luster from the attractive personality and brilliant achievements of one of the foremost public men of our days. . . . Mr. Bryan brings to it a national reputation, but even better than that an acquaintance with the deep Virginia background as well as its present life and institutions. . . . The newspaper men of America should be especially proud that a member of the Fourth Estate has come to the presidency of America's oldest continuing college. 325

The division closed for the 1934-35 session on 7 June 1935. 326 No mention was made in the Norfolk newspaper media regarding closing exercises.

No pronouncements regarding the feasibility of a four-year college were forthcoming during the period from the end of the 1933-34 session through the 1934-35 session from Dr. Hodges. The Norfolk Virginian-Pilot carried no editorials or articles regarding a four-year college, nor was there any public pronouncement by a local leader or organization.
Norfolk newspaper media coverage of the division had definitely increased. There were 2 editorials and 36 articles of general interest. This was a total of 38, up 10 from 28 previously.
1935-36 Session

The 1935-36 session of the Norfolk Division, The College of William and Mary commenced on 20 September 1935.327

The Advisory Board, Norfolk Division, instituted by President Chandler in 1930 and continued by President Bryan in 1934, remained intact.328

Leadership of the division remained in the capable hands of Dean William T. Hodges, while that of the College of William and Mary continued with President John Stewart Bryan.329

The Norfolk Virginian-Pilot reported that freshman registration was greater than in the past two years and that total registration for the first day of school was 173.330 Total actual registration for freshman (day) was 238, up 16 from the previous two years.331

Mr. A. H. Foreman, Chairman of the Advisory Board of the Norfolk Division, when honored as the Cosmopolitan Club's "First Citizen," among many other comments, said this: "The Norfolk Division last year (1934-35 session) had seven percent of the graduates of the College at Williamsburg but thirty percent of the students who made Phi Beta Kappa." A Colonel Mann at the same function made the following comment: "It is interesting to observe that the division now has an enrollment three times as great as The College of William and Mary itself enjoyed in 1919."332

The division closed on 5 June 1936 and held its first real commencement exercises, complete with an academic procession.333 Dr.
William A. A. Goodwin, Rector of Bruton Parish Church, Williamsburg, was the principal speaker. Among various remarks he made was: "When I first went to The College of William and Mary thirty-three years ago, it was not as large as the Norfolk Division today and had only about half as many students."334

Dr. Hodges made no pronouncements during the period from the end of the 1934-35 session through the 1935-36 session with respect to the establishment of a four-year college; no Norfolk and local college newspaper media carried any editorials or articles, nor did any local leader or organization have anything to say about a four-year college. There was a total of 30 articles of a general interest. This was a total of 30, down 8 from 38 previously.

Despite the foregoing, there was, nevertheless, a strong, feeling in the Tidewater Community, particularly Norfolk, that the division should be raised to a four-year status. Mr. Lewis W. Webb, Jr., made this comment:

The topic (a four-year school) had come up very strongly, even back in the thirties, late thirties . . . of a four-year program. . . . If you'll look in the records, you'll see that they (William and Mary) had no formula which said horizontal expansion of the Norfolk Division. No vertical expansion. Meaning nothing beyond the first two years of college work. The faculty, of course, still wanted very much to have four-year work. They didn't want to be restricted to teaching just at the two-year level. . . .335
1936-37 Session

Classes of the 1936-37 session of the Norfolk Division, The College of William and Mary were held, beginning 10 September 1936.\(^{336}\)

Leadership of the division was once again in the hands of Dean W. T. Hodges; that of The College of William and Mary in those of President John Stewart Bryan.\(^{337}\)

The Advisory Board, Norfolk Division was continued by President Bryan.\(^{338}\) Nowhere in any Record Book of the Board of Visitors Minutes, College of William and Mary for the periods of the presidencies of Chandler and Bryan was there any mention of any advice rendered by the board or taken by either Presidents Chandler or Bryan. None of the presidential correspondence contained any evidence of any advice given by the board, nor was the local college and Norfolk newspaper media devoted to any coverage of any advice given by the board. It appeared, therefore, that the board was, in essence, without substance and, therefore, essentially window dressing. The board, however, in all probability publicized the advantages of the Norfolk Division to its various constituencies. In that respect the board served some value.

For the first time since the 1930-31 session, The College of William and Mary provided no faculty support. The entire burden of instruction was on the shoulders of the Norfolk Division teaching staff, sixteen in number.\(^{339}\) It appeared that Norfolk Division was left to shift for itself.
In reply to a question that made reference to the Faculty of The College of William and Mary, which looked on assignment to the Norfolk Division as something of an exile, that if you got sent down there it was not exactly a good thing, Dr. James W. Miller, former Dean of the Faculty of The College of William and Mary, replied: "I wouldn't put it quite that way. I would say that in those early years most members of the faculty were blissfully unaware of the existence of the Norfolk Division."

Dr. Gordon W. Akers made these comments:

Right or wrong, the administration in the parent school and perhaps to a lesser extent the faculty had no great interest in this Norfolk Division. Their primary interests, quite properly, were in the parent school, William and Mary, and, to put it bluntly, I think at times they must have felt us to be kind of annoying, irritating excrescence... It always seemed to us that on rare occasions when administrative officers came from Williamsburg to visit us that they had, perforce, but a small understanding or even concern for the problems and work of this urban school; that their primary interests were in William and Mary proper, and they conceived of this Norfolk Division as a small feeder from the lower Tidewater area to William and Mary proper."

Mr. Lewis W. Webb, Jr., in response to various questions, conveyed the following:

So there was no real tie, yet the only close supervision of this institution was over its finances. The budget director saw to it that this school operated within its finances; that there was no drain on The College of William and Mary. They felt that William and Mary didn't have enough money of its own and certainly couldn't share any here. So in the beginning the two divisions (Norfolk and Richmond) were supervised only through control of the President and his Financial Director. There was no academic control.... This feeling (that William and Mary looked on the Norfolk Division as its 'poor relation') was a feeling which came from the faculty, not from the administration.... John Stewart Bryan does not show up in the records as particularly interested in the Norfolk Division...."
An editorial on "Higher Education in Norfolk" proclaimed:

There has arisen on Hampton Boulevard an institution of learning that has permanently enriched its educational resources and certain to play an increasingly important part in the intellectual life of the community. . . . Best of all, the institution is completely self-sustaining. That ensures for it a pay-as-you-go growth that will make it independent of the vicissitudes of State financing and make it truly responsive to the educational needs of the territory which it serves. 343

The Norfolk Virginian-Pilot reported that Dean Hodges of the Norfolk Division expected 400 full-time day students. 344 He was very close. In reality 403 full-time day students were enrolled for the 1936-37 session. 345

In an editorial, "The Division Grows Up," the Norfolk Virginian-Pilot, among other statements said:

The miracle is still so new that the city does not yet realize its good fortune. Poverty-stricken all of its life in the matter of higher educational facilities, the Norfolk community now possesses an institution that is fundamentally altering the educational picture for the better. It is as certain as anything can be in this uncertain world that the Norfolk division will continue to grow, acquiring more buildings as it acquires more students and that the city's pride in it will keep pace with the expansion. 346

The High Hat carried an article stressing dignity, school spirit, and the eventual objective of a four-year curriculum. 347

Dr. William T. Sanger, President of the Medical College of Virginia, was the principal speaker at the closing exercises on 4 June 1937. He made the statement: "The time will come when there won't be a community of 100,000 in the United States that won't have some kind of a college, and very few with 50,000 won't have either a two-year or four-year college." 348
Once again, Dean Hodges made no pronouncements from the end of the 1935-36 session through the 1936-37 session concerning a four-year college. The Norfolk Virginian-Pilot carried no editorials nor articles dealing with the subject. No local leader nor organization had anything to say about a four-year school. There were 4 editorials and 22 articles of general interest. This was a total of 26 editorials and articles, down 4 from 30 previously.
1937-38 Session

September 24, 1937, marked the beginning of classes for the 1937-38 session\(^{349}\) under a new school name, The College of William and Mary in Virginia, Norfolk Division.\(^ {350}\)

Leadership of The College of William and Mary in Virginia, Norfolk Division, and The College of William and Mary was again under the tutelage of Dean William T. Hodges and President John Stewart Bryan, respectively.\(^ {351}\)

Once again, the Advisory Board, Norfolk Division, was kept in effect by President Bryan.\(^ {352}\)

The *Norfolk Virginian-Pilot* proclaimed that the William and Mary freshman day student enrollment of 227 was a record.\(^ {353}\) Fact was, the total enrollment for freshmen day students during the 1937-38 session was 313.\(^ {354}\)

In an editorial, the *Norfolk Virginian-Pilot* viewed President Bryan's leadership in a different light than that previously set forth in this study: "President Bryan, of the Williamsburg institution, has blended a wise parental supervision with that degree of local self-determination that is necessary to 'esprit de corps' and healthy growth."\(^ {355}\)

On 10 November 1937 the Secretary of the Committee on Classification of Universities and Colleges of the Association of American Universities advised the College of William and Mary as follows:

The committee was particularly disturbed by the poor support accorded to the Norfolk and Richmond divisions of the
College, with resultant inadequate facilities. The comments on the Norfolk division centered about the poor faculty salaries, the wholly inadequate library, the heavy teaching loads of the faculty members, and the fact that the division seemed to be exceeding its original purpose and that there were a number of students who were taking a third year of college work.

The foregoing correspondence originated in connection with a special report on the Norfolk Division in relation to the accrediting of the College of William and Mary by the Association of American Universities.

The Norfolk Division was evaluated against nine standards used for junior colleges by the Southern Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools. As a result of this evaluation, the following recommendations were made:

1. The Norfolk Division should be considered a two-year unit with a curriculum of arts and sciences for freshmen and sophomore students only. Students should not be permitted to take more than two years of work or approximately sixty semester hours, and the College should not give more than approximately sixty semester hours credit from the Division

2. Increase the annual appropriation for books for the library to $1,000

3. The offerings in the fields of history, philosophy, psychology, sociology and Latin should be so adjusted that the teaching faculty is not required to work in such diversified fields.

It appeared from the above that the Norfolk Division's efforts, which moved toward a four-year course by adding junior-level courses, were thwarted by the committee's report and recommendations.

Dean Hodges reported to the Board of Visitors that both the Norfolk Chapter of the American Association of University Women and the Norfolk Chapter of the Virginia Polytechnic Institute Alumni had
passed resolutions recommending that all local high school seniors with college expectations enroll in the Norfolk Division before entering colleges of their final choice. He also reported that for the first time in the history of the Norfolk Division, a full-time librarian had been appointed. Dean Hodges further reported:

The problem at Norfolk is complicated by the fact that the Committee on the Classification of Universities and Colleges in the Association of American Universities, has written a direct criticism of the Norfolk Division. I have asked Dr. K. J. Hoke, who has had long experience in such matters, to examine and report on this criticism. With Dr. Hoke, I appointed on the committee Dr. James Wilkinson Miller.

Dean Hodges issued no public statements on the feasibility of a four-year school during the period from the end of the 1937-38 session through the 1937-38 session. Norfolk and local college newspaper media carried no editorials and/or articles advocating four-year status for the junior college. No local leader or organization had anything publicly to say about a four-year school. There were, however, 6 editorials and 8 articles of general interest related to the division. This was a total of 14 editorials, down 12 from 26 previously.

The 1937-38 session closed on 10 June 1938.
1938-39 Session

Between the end of the 1937-38 session and the beginning of the 1938-39 session, Dean K. J. Hoke of The College of William and Mary Faculty filed a report with President Bryan addressed to the findings and recommendations of the Committee on Classification of Universities and Colleges of the Association of American Universities with respect to the Norfolk Division. In the report Dean Hoke stated that he had made further investigation of the issues raised in connection with conditions in the Norfolk and Richmond Divisions and which affected the status of the membership of the college on the accredited list of the association. Dean Hoke's report dealt with the classification of the college, curriculum, library, teaching load, and salaries of faculty. He drew the following conclusions:

1. Work beyond the junior college level would be limited to six semester hours. No student will receive more than 66 semester hours of credit toward a bachelor's degree.

2. The following conditions will be made for the 1938-39 session:

   a. An outlay of approximately $4,000 or $5,000 for a supply of well-selected books for the library and their maintenance thereafter.

   b. Employment of the following full-time instructors:

      (1) One instructor in history

      (2) One instructor in English

      (3) One instructor in science

   a. A total increase of $3,000 to $3,600 in professors' salaries.
The 1938-39 session of The College of William and Mary in Virginia, Norfolk Division started 16 September 1938. 361

The guidance of The College of William and Mary, Norfolk Division and The College of William and Mary devolved once again on Dean William T. Hodges and President John Stewart Bryan, respectively. 362

As was true of the 1937-38 session, the Advisory Board, Norfolk Division was kept intact. Membership had continued composed of the very same five people who were appointed by President J. A. C. Chandler in 1930. 363

Indicative of the academic preparation provided by the Norfolk Division was the large number of students who went on to other schools to complete their last two years of college work. Among the schools to which graduates of the 1937-38 session transferred were:

1. The College of William and Mary
2. Virginia Polytechnic Institute
3. University of Virginia
4. Medical College of Virginia
5. Mary Washington College
6. James Madison College
7. University of North Carolina
8. Randolph-Macon Women's College
9. University of Michigan. 364

When queried about students back in 1938, Professor C. S.
Sherwood, III, former Head of the Department of Geophysical Sciences and a former member of the teaching staff, The College of William and Mary, Norfolk Division, commented:

I think that students back in those days were a very interesting group. Because we were a two-year school so that students wanting a degree would spend two years with us and then transfer to a 'college of their choice,' we never had juniors or seniors. We had to prepare students for the junior and senior year since they took their junior and senior year at such a variety of other colleges. We had to prepare them well in their freshman and sophomore years for this variation. As a result, we probably had in our freshman and sophomore courses much more material than was present in the freshman and sophomore courses in any one of the schools to which the students transferred.

We were getting outstanding students. . . . The "C" students who wanted not only what they could get academically from a college but also wanted a very extensive social experience would go away to college where all of these things were available. As a result, our "C" students were practically non-existing. Many good "A's" and "B's". . . .

What of the quality of the instructional staff at the Norfolk Division? Dr. A. Rufus Tonelson, former Dean of the School of Education, Old Dominion University, and one of the first students to enroll at the Norfolk Division related the following:

As I look back, I would think that the faculty was rather outstanding because of the fact that the majority of the professors had their doctorates. . . . This (offering a teacher a William and Mary contract vice one from the Norfolk Division) had a great deal to do in enticing the professors that they got there. I think that it was really the prestige of William and Mary. I mean, the people who applied for positions knew of William and Mary. . . . I think that this had a great deal to do with the recruitment of professors who taught here. Of course, as I say, it was during the depression years and it may have been difficult for some of these professors to have gotten jobs and here was a new school opening up with a rather prestigious name attached to it. . . .
In an editorial entitled "Norfolk Division - Ninth Year," the Norfolk Virginian-Pilot editorialized:

At this time— with new students still trickling in—the total enrollment at the Norfolk Division of William and Mary College exceeds 460. . . . It indicates a total enrollment of approximately 540, after the February admissions. . . . The figures tell their own story of a revolutionary development in local education. . . . It begins its ninth year with an enrollment which, when it reaches its maximum will be larger than that of Randolph-Macon College, or Hampden-Sydney, or Roanoke, or Emory and Henry. . . . The College of William and Mary at Williamsburg joined with the city of Norfolk in a far-sighted act to remedy the emptiness (the fact that this was one of the largest metropolitan areas in the United States without home facilities for instruction about the high school level). . . .

Actual enrollment for the 1938-39 session was 541 day students.

The High Hat reported that students who entered the Norfolk Division compared favorably with those who entered other colleges throughout the country. The comparison was based on the results of the Thurstone and Thurstone College Aptitude Tests given at the college every year to new students. Among the 355 colleges of all types rated, the local college held 133rd place with a median score of 92.25 as compared with 120.00, the highest median, and 54.69, the lowest. Only 132 of the schools considered were higher than the Norfolk Division and 222 ranked lower.

The Board of Visitors Minutes contained a report from Dean Hodges to the effect that the work of the Norfolk Division had steadily improved and that the division had a spirit of cooperation between The College of William and Mary and the division that
presaged the elimination of any further conflict between the two institutions in the matter of work and credits. 370

The end of the 1937-38 session through the 1938-39 session saw no public utterances by Dean Hodges regarding a four-year school. Norfolk and local college newspaper media published no editorials and/or articles on the same subject. No local leader nor organization endorsed a four-year college. There were 2 editorials and 18 articles of general interest concerning the division. This was a total of 20, up 6 from 14 previously.

The prevailing local public attitude towards a four-year school was underlined by Mr. Lewis W. Webb, Jr.'s following observation in response to a question by Dr. James R. Sweeney, Archivist, Old Dominion University, to the effect that he [Sweeney] was wondering how, in the early days, the Norfolk Community received the division, whether the relationship of town and gown was a close one:

No. Not at all. In fact, it took a long time for the community to accept this as anything other than a temporary educational promise. Because, in the beginning, the students would go to William and Mary, V.P.I., the University of Virginia, some other institution to finish. And, when they got their degree, they felt a loyalty to that institution rather than to the Division. 371

The 1938-39 session closed on 7 June 1939. 372
1939-40 Session

Prior to the opening of the 1939-40 session, the Norfolk Virginian-Pilot carried an article to the effect that the Norfolk Division would train plane pilots. Dean Hodges stated that the division was expected to train 20 pilots. The training included 72 hours of ground school instruction and between 35 and 50 hours of flight instruction. This training was authorized by the Civil Aeronautics Authority. The training program had two objectives, namely:

1. It created airmen thoroughly schooled in the basic principles of flight theory and flying, who in time of national emergency would serve as a valuable pool from which military and naval forces would draw material for accelerated training

2. It stimulated the growth of private flying in this country and promoted commerce and contributed to the programs of the country

The 1939-40 session of The College of William and Mary in Virginia, Norfolk Division, convened 18 September 1939. Dean Hodges forecasted an enrollment figure of 500 day students. The dean's forecast was conservative because the final enrollment for the 1939-40 session was 522 day students.

Dean William T. Hodges gave direction to the division while the mother college was guided by President John Stewart Bryan. President Bryan retained the Advisory Board, Norfolk Division for yet another school year.

Apparently, the College of William and Mary needed to reaffirm the direction it had taken in the area of a liberal arts education. While it was generally conceded that President J. A. C.
Chandler had concentrated on the school's physical plant growth, to the neglect of academic accomplishments, President J. S. Bryan bore down on both the development of the growth of the school's physical plant as well as academic growth. This new emphasis was also on the minds of the Board of Visitors. On 4 October 1939 the board unanimously adopted a resolution calling for the rector to appoint a special committee to formulate plans for The College of William and Mary and to seek endowment. The Rector, Dr. James Hardy Dillard, appointed a special committee which consisted of Messrs. J. Gordon Bohannon, Sidney B. Hall, and Channing M. Hall.

The special committee apparently had questions regarding its objectives to formulate plans for The College of William and Mary and to seek endowment. President Bryan answered these questions by means of a "General Survey of William and Mary." His survey included the Norfolk Division as follows:

The Norfolk Division represents an ideal which has not worked out exactly as intended. Undoubtedly, Dr. Chandler expected this Division to furnish a great many more students to William and Mary than have actually come here, but the Division for its part has rendered very conspicuous and highly valuable service to Norfolk and its environs, and has made for itself a position which will undoubtedly cause the Division to be continued.

This Division is now operating as a junior college and in conjunction with V.P.I. it reaches a number of young men and women who otherwise would not be able to obtain the instruction and advancement which the Division offers.

There seems to be no thought of, and certainly there is no justification for, extending the Norfolk Division into a four-year college. If it continues as at present there is likewise no good reason for separating it from the mother college of William and Mary.
It was decided to employ an outside consultant to conduct the survey of The College of William and Mary and its satellite outlying divisions. To finance such a venture it was necessary for President Bryan to secure funding from a source outside the state. Such funding was provided in early 1940 by the General Education Board (founded by Mr. John D. Rockefeller in 1902 and incorporated in 1903), New York City, New York.\(^\text{381}\)

With the funding provided President Bryan approached various educational leaders who had conducted similar surveys. He settled on Dr. George A. Works, Dean of Education, Department of Education, University of Chicago. Dr. Works’s Survey Committee consisted of: Dr. Charles H. Judd, former Chairman, Department of Education, University of Chicago; Dr. Frank L. McVay, President Emeritus of the University of Kentucky; and Dr. W. F. Ogburn, Chairman, Department of Sociology, University of Chicago.\(^\text{382}\)

President Bryan must have felt that the Norfolk Division was neglected. Dr. James W. Miller, former Dean of the Faculty of The College of William and Mary, said the following with respect to his relations with the Norfolk Division:

"It began this way. President Bryan said to me one day that we had all been devoting all of our attention to the college in Williamsburg and that we ought to learn more about and get acquainted with the work being done in the Norfolk Division of The College of William and Mary... He asked me if I would make visits to these institutions (Richmond and Norfolk) in an informal way, by way of getting acquainted and also showing them that we’re interested in them.

So, from then on, for many months, I took trips to Norfolk and Richmond for that purpose. My relations with Norfolk became much closer than they did with Richmond,
Norfolk became much closer than they did with Richmond, for a very good reason. The Norfolk Division was primarily a liberal arts institution giving the first two years of college. It was a liberal arts junior college under the sponsorship or the authority of the parent institution in Williamsburg. . . . Well, it was different with Norfolk. I had several meetings there. I think they were always of an informal nature. . . . What was important was the informal meeting with members of the faculty and particularly members of the faculty who were most interested in my being there. . . . It was the faculty I got to know.

Mr. Lewis W. Webb, Jr. said the following with respect to the relations between the division and the mother college:

In no case was there ever any great amount of supervision for the faculty here [Norfolk] by faculty there [Williamsburg]. . . . But it was always a one-way street; we had to go there [Williamsburg]. No one came here to say, 'Let me help you select your text. Let me help you relate it to the curriculum.' It was always, 'If you want any help you come up and get it, but we're not a great deal interested.' . . .

For the first time since the 1930-31 session, there was a statement by a local leader of a local organization with regard to a four-year college. The Norfolk Virginian-Pilot reported that Mr. F. E. Turin, Manager of the Norfolk Advertising Board, urged the Norfolk Cosmopolitan Club to support his suggestion that the Norfolk Division of The College of William and Mary . . . be extended to offer full four-year courses.385

Indicative of the high esteem in which the Norfolk Community held him, Dean Hodges was honored as Norfolk's First Citizen and received the Cosmopolitan Club's Distinguished Service Medal. In attendance at the dinner were Governor James H. Price of the State of Virginia, President John S. Bryan of The College of William and Mary,
and more than 150 representatives of virtually every major phase of Norfolk's civic life. The governor presented Dean Hodges with a citation which read, "For distinguished service rendered in the educational field in the interest of the City of Norfolk and the Commonwealth of Virginia, especially with regard to the development of the Norfolk Division of the College of William and Mary."  

While one local leader spoke out for a four-year college and was reported in a local newspaper, Dean Hodges once again remained mute on the subject, as did the college newspaper. In addition to the article which was an endorsement by an individual, there were 6 articles of general interest to the division. There were no editorials and no endorsements by organizations. This was a total of 6, down 14 from 20 previously.

The 1930-40 session came to an end on 29 May 1940.  


Summary of 1930-31 through 1930-40 Sessions

The leadership of the Norfolk Division changed twice and that of The College of William and Mary changed once. Director H. Edgar Timmerman (1930-32) was replaced as director by Dr. Edward Gwathmey (fall semester 1932 only), who, in turn, was succeeded, and named as dean, by Dr. William T. Hodges (1932-41). President J. A. C. Chandler's (1919-34) death in 1931 led to the naming of Mr. John Stewart Bryan (1934-42) as the President of The College of William and Mary.

The initial enrollment for the division numbered 206 day students for the 1930-31 session while the enrollment at the end of the 1939-40 session was 522 day students.

The Advisory Board in Norfolk, appointed by President Chandler in 1930, remained in effect throughout the decade.

The Virginia Polytechnic Institute began a two-year school in cooperation with the Norfolk Division which started with the 1931-32 session.

Evidence was presented demonstrating the high quality instruction employed by the teaching staff and the high quality performance by the junior college graduates when they went on to four-year schools.

Further evidence was presented of the indifference and neglect of the Norfolk Division, for most of the decade, by the administration and faculty of the mother college.

While there appeared to be relatively little said concerning
a four-year college during the decade, some Norfolk and local college
newspaper editorial and articles were quoted, as were certain local
leaders, some organizations, and the first director of the division.

Numerous interviews were quoted of personalities, faculty and
administration, connected with the Norfolk Division and The College
of William and Mary.

A question of accreditation by the Association of American
Universities was dealt with.

The Norfolk Division had two names during this decade,
namely, (1) Norfolk Division, The College of William and Mary (1930-
37), and (2) The College of William and Mary in Virginia, Norfolk
Division (1937-40).

In October 1939 the Board of Visitors authorized a survey of
The College of William and Mary and its divisions. Dr. George A.
Works was authorized to conduct the survey.

Norfolk newspaper editorial and articles for the first
decade (1930-40) totaled 101. There was very little editorialized
about the division, with only 7 editorials generated during the
entire period. There were 2 endorsements of a four-year college by
individuals but none by an organization. Altogether there were 92
articles of general interest to the division.

A summary of the essential features and data of the 1930-31
through 1939-40 sessions may be found in the Appendix, pages 531-34.
CHAPTER III

THE NORFOLK DIVISION DURING ITS SECOND DECADE

(1940-50)

Introduction

This chapter presented further political, educational, and economic factors which affected the growth and development of (1) The College of William and Mary in Virginia, Norfolk, Virginia (1940-42); (2) Norfolk Division of the College of William and Mary and the Virginia Polytechnic Institute (1942-43); (3) The Norfolk Division of the College of William and Mary and the Virginia Polytechnic Institute (1943-44); (4) Norfolk Division, College of William and Mary, Virginia Polytechnic Institute (1944-45); and (5) The College of William and Mary and the Virginia Polytechnic Institute in Norfolk (1945-54).

1940-41 Session

Following the end of the 1939-40 session and the beginning of the 1940-41 session, there appeared in the Norfolk Virginian-Pilot a lengthy article which extolled the virtues of the Norfolk Division. In addition to information about the division's past and present, the reporter, Mr. A. T. Dill, commented on the division's future as follows:
As President Bryan, of the College of William and Mary, recently remarked that it is now up to the city to determine by its demands what the Division will become. It would easily be possible for a college offering a complete four-year course to be developed from the nucleus now existing, but without the whole-hearted support of the community such a development would be futuristic and visionary. Only Norfolk and the surrounding area can determine the future of the Division. . . .

The 1940-41 session of The College of William and Mary in Virginia, Norfolk, Virginia, began quietly on 23 September 1940. Before the session ended on 3 June 1941, the Norfolk Division and The College of William and Mary were rocked by a grade-fixing scandal which involved Dean William T. Hodges of the Norfolk Division. As a result of the scandal, the first public efforts on the part of the Norfolk citizenry were made to separate the Norfolk Division from The College of William and Mary.

As the 1940-41 session started, the reins of administration of the Norfolk Division and The College of William and Mary were still in the hands of Dean W. T. Hodges and President J. S. Bryan, respectively.

The Advisory Board, Norfolk Division, was kept in place by President Bryan.

With the start of the 1940-41 session, a new phenomenon was observed by Miss Alice R. Burke, registrar at the division:

An increasing number of employed persons are attending, . . . That's quite a contrast with the make-up of the enrollment during the depression years. It seems to me to show just how far we've come during the 10 years the college has been in existence. . . . An unusually large number of Navy Yard and Naval Operating Base workers are attending school. Many of these are night shift workers who go to college in the daytime. . . .
Dr. Charles H. Judd of the Dr. George A. Works's Survey Team filed the following preliminary survey, subsequent to 28 October 1940 on the Norfolk Division, which is reported in part:

The following is a report of the observations which I made during a visit . . . at the Norfolk Division of the College of William and Mary. Dean Hodges of the Division spent the day with me. I had an opportunity to meet and talk with a number of the members of the faculty and with the registrar. I saw the library, the laboratories, the classrooms, and the grounds. I visited some of the classes while they were in session. . . . Following Virginia traditions, refuses to call itself a junior college. . . . While the courses given in the Division are dictated by the parent institution, there seems to be very little intercourse between the faculty of the Division and the faculty of William and Mary. Indeed, it seems that the Division suffers from extreme isolation so far as the College of William and Mary is concerned. The relations with Virginia Polytechnic seem to be more cordial.

In response to the inquiry made at Norfolk and also at Williamsburg, the statement was made that unless the Norfolk Division were maintained it is very probable that a local college would be organized in the Norfolk area. . . .

If it is true that a college at Norfolk is inevitable, and it seems to be so, and if the College of William and Mary does not want a competitor in the Norfolk area, as seems also to be true, there should be a decided change . . . with regard to the Division . . . .

While the Norfolk Virginian-Pilot did not carry an article concerning enrollment for the 1940-41 session, the official count was 540 day students. 395

An editorial in the Norfolk Virginian-Pilot which concerned the selection of nine Phi Beta Kappas at The College of William and Mary who were former division students made the following comment:

The point to be made about this 'most amazing sweep of elections' in the history of Phi Beta Kappa is that the achievement is highly to the credit of the faculty of the
Norfolk Division and to the boys and girls that it sends on to the parent college at Williamsburg. In this year's senior class the students who received their first two years of training at the Norfolk Division took 70 percent of the Phi Beta Kappa honors although they constituted only 30 percent of the class. It is part of a consistent record. Throughout its brief ten years, the Norfolk Division has sent to Williamsburg a student corps which has regularly won a larger percentage of the scholastic honors than its percentage of the student group from which the honorees are picked.

Dean William T. Hodges finally made his first public speech concerning the establishment of a four-year college. He stated that it was not a question of the City of Norfolk being able to afford a four-year college but a question of whether it can afford not to. In an address to the Norfolk Kiwanis Club, he stated that he had been asked a number of times how soon Norfolk would have a four-year college and had replied that you'll have it any fine old day when the community cares enough to make it so. He reviewed the means by which Norfolk might obtain a four-year college. He felt that the most likely method would be gradual development under the William and Mary flag so that it would have state support and no question regarding its credits. A new State institution was unlikely because the State already had too many colleges.

An editorial in a local newspaper commented as follows on Dean Hodges's speech before the Kiwanis Club:

There is plenty of local support now for the four-year college idea, but it needs to grow much larger to produce the exploration, organization, and planning which alone can lead to its realization. That, in time, this will come about, the Virginian-Pilot is certain. We are on the way to becoming an urban community of 200,000 and a metropolitan community, counting the immediately adjacent counties and cities of 400,000. Geographical factors impose on this metropolitan
area a separateness from the remainder of the State and give it a particular range of economic interests which call for an institution of higher learning especially geared to its needs. A four-year college vacuum is being created in this area which the State's educational arrangement will not permanently tolerate.

All that can be foreseen at this moment, in this connection, is that a four-year college can be established here on a stable footing only through State aid under the continuing aegis of The College of William and Mary. There is no precedent for such a development in the State's educational history. . . . Given the mobilization of local opinion . . . ways and means will probably be found for including Virginia. . . .

Dr. George A. Works filed a "Preliminary Report" late in 1940 which reported, in part, on the Norfolk Division:

The present status of the Norfolk Division is clearly that of a junior college. This, however, has not always been the case, and was brought about only under pressure exerted by the College in Williamsburg. Prior to the year 1937-38 the Division, with a faculty no larger than its present faculty, was offering three years of college work. It seems apparent that it lacked sufficient resources for so ambitious a program, and the college ruled that it would accept no more than two years of work on a transfer. . . . Despite Dean Hodges's discomfiture at this restriction of his program, there seems little doubt that the influence on the quality of work at the Division has been salutary. . . .

The Norfolk Division offers no terminal programs. Dean Hodges expresses the opinion that Norfolk is educationally too backward to be receptive to the idea of a junior college offering terminal programs, that the community has not learned to think in any other terms than those of the traditional four-year curricula. As non-conceived, the main function of the Division is that of preparation for upper divisional work. . . . By Dean Hodges's own statement there is but little community interest in the Division. . . .

The Norfolk Division has been a financial drain on the parent college, and the present administration of the College has from time to time entertained the idea of abandoning the project. One reason why this step has not been taken is undoubtedly the fear that a four-year institution which would enter into competition with William and Mary might be set up only forty miles from Williamsburg. It is possible that the
City of Norfolk might take over the institution if it were abandoned by William and Mary. The Norfolk area, including South Norfolk and Portsmouth, embraces a population of about 300,000, and possibly could support a four-year institution. The relationship between the Division and the Virginia Polytechnic Institute have been much more cordial than between the Division and the College.

On 3 February 1941 Dr. George A. Works forwarded his final report to the Board of Visitors and the President of The College of William and Mary. This report was a survey of the state of the mother college and its divisions and was to serve as a blueprint for the reordering of academic priorities at all institutions. Works's study included sections on the student body, faculty, educational program, administration, and state policies. All of the foregoing sections included information pertaining to the Norfolk Division.

Under the section on the student body, the Norfolk Division was described by Dr. Works as follows:

The picture presented by the division at Norfolk is somewhat different from that at Williamsburg with respect both to total enrollment and the proportion of men and women. Practically all the students at the Norfolk Division come from Norfolk and vicinity. Unlike the College at Williamsburg, the Division makes no pretense of being selective in its admissions, but admits all high-school graduates regardless of scholastic standing.

It is expected that in an institution which makes no scholastic selection, yet which stresses the function of preparation in the senior college, there would be a high first-year mortality. This is the situation at the Norfolk Division, where a high degree of self-elimination occurs because of unsatisfactory marks. In a total of 2,117 course registration in the first semester of 1939-40, there were 519 cases, 25 percent of the total, in which no credit was obtained. Three hundred sixty-six, or 18 percent were failures; 153, or 7 percent were drops or incompletes.
In the section which dealt with faculty, the report dealt with the Norfolk Division as follows:

The typical teaching load is 15 semester hours, though occasionally it may run as high as 18 hours. In extenuation of such heavy loads it might be mentioned that, not only are there no upper division courses offered, but many of the courses are sectioned—a fact which is not taken into consideration in computing loads on a semester hour basis. On the other hand, many of the faculty members also teach in the evening extension courses and in the summer session for extra compensation. The evening teaching and summer teaching are not included in the above calculation of teaching loads.

In another section of this report it is indicated that there should be larger funds available at Norfolk to make possible salary adjustments.

The Norfolk Division's educational program received the following comments from Dr. Works:

The branch at Norfolk has formulated its program for the day students on the basis of preparing them for the last two years' work at Williamsburg. There are three types of educational programs that might be carried out through two years of post-secondary school work in a community like Norfolk. They are:

1. Vocational instruction at the junior-college level adapted to the abilities of the student and the needs of the community.

2. General education adapted to the needs of those who have neither the inclination nor the time to take a full four-year course in higher education. This may be thought of as a terminal program of general education as contrasted with a program followed by those who spend four years in college.

3. Preparation of students for advanced work in a four-year college, which is the program that is now conducted at Norfolk.

Under the administration section, the following report was submitted by Dr. Works on the Norfolk Division:
At present neither of these divisions (Norfolk or Richmond) gets the attention of the central administration which it deserves. If they are to be retained as parts of the college, the local administrations should have the maximum assistance practicable, both financially and administratively, from that source. It seems clear that both of them should be retained and directed in such a manner as to serve the needs of the state and of the parent institution until some other provision is made for them. . . . If the state were ready to develop a state-wide program of publicly supported junior colleges, Norfolk might be made a part of it. . . .

The main issues with reference to Norfolk seem to grow out of finances, isolation from Williamsburg, and the desire of the Norfolk branch to offer a program more than two years in length. The Norfolk school is under constant pressure to be entirely self-supporting, with the results that teachers' salaries are low, the operating margin is narrow, and the institution is pinched financially all around. . . .

The need for the institution at Norfolk seems to be clearly shown by its enrollment data. . . . The situation seems to call for at least two steps by the central administration:

1. A conference with representatives of Norfolk . . . regarding the future of the institution and for the purpose of determining if some public support cannot be drawn from local sources. . . .

2. Inclusion in the budget of the College of William and Mary of an item for the support of the College of Norfolk, with the stipulation that the money should not be used for any other purpose. The amount should be large enough so that salaries of staff members at Norfolk could be put on a basis fairly comparable with those at Williamsburg, training, ability, and experience considered. . . .

The staff at Norfolk has a feeling of isolation in its relationship with the parent institution. Inquiry of faculty members at Williamsburg indicated that in most cases they knew little or nothing about the personnel at Norfolk, even in their own fields of work. There appears to be but little commerce between the faculties of the two institutions. Even in the case of administrative officers the contacts are too infrequent for the development of the full understanding and
sympathy necessary for the most helpful relationships. The following suggestions regarding administration are offered toward the improvement of this situation:

1. The dean of the College at Williamsburg should be given responsibility under the president for dealing with the dean at Norfolk.

2. In addition to the contacts maintained by the dean at Williamsburg, the president of the College should visit the division frequently enough to obtain and keep a good first-hand acquaintance.

3. Steps should be taken to develop closer relationships between faculty members at Williamsburg and Norfolk. In making appointments at Norfolk, consultations should ordinarily be held with staff members at Williamsburg, and Norfolk might well have representation on important committees, e.g. curriculum.

The final section of the "Works's Report" dealt with state policies. The following was said with respect to the Norfolk Division:

At present the division at Norfolk is concerned only with the preparation of students for the last two years of college work. There are other educational needs of the Norfolk area that should be met through this division. The needed expansions have been indicated and the possibility suggested that the University of Virginia and the Virginia Polytechnic Institute might share with the College the responsibility for this expanded program. Another responsibility, and one that should have careful consideration, is that of giving the State Board of Education responsibility for the College of Norfolk, with the understanding that its work will be limited to the junior-college level.

In a letter to President Bryan, Dr. George A. Works, written as a follow-up to his report, reminded President Bryan that the changes called for in his report might in many instances require several years to bring about. He further suggested that he thought the institution at Norfolk should do much more than prepare students for their last two years of work in college at William and Mary or
Virginia Polytechnic Institute. He was of the opinion that it would be best if the Norfolk Division were placed under the State Board of Education.

The Rector of the Board of Visitors, J. Gordon Bohannon, commented on the "Works' Report" and wrote the following to President Bryan:

'The report poses a very serious problem with respect to the Norfolk and Richmond Divisions, a problem which demands our unbiased and intelligent solution. While these divisions cannot, probably, until we find proper foster parents for them, or until they are able to work out their own destinies, be abandoned. I should be glad to see the work of the College of William and Mary concentrated in Williamsburg, and I would welcome the eventual severance of all connection, in name as well as in fact, between these divisions and the college. If this is not done, then these divisions should demand more attention from the Administration and from the Board.

In the absence of President Bryan, Mr. Charles J. Duke, Jr., the Assistant to the President, replied to Rector Bohannon's letter as follows:

If I might make a suggestion, I think among the most urgent matters for the consideration of the Board are the two divisions, and it seems to me that in view of the financial problems involved to some extent in both places, but particularly in Norfolk, it is necessary that the Board arrive at some definite policy with reference to the program and future at the Divisions.

This study devoted itself in great detail with the grade-fixing scandal which involved Dean Hodges. It was a focal point for the first ground swell of a local movement which would have led to the separation of the Norfolk Division from The College of William and Mary and the possible establishment of a four-year college.

Mr. Robert C. McClelland wrote a lengthy paper which
described the background of the grade-fixing scandal which involved
Dean Hodges, President Bryan, the Board of Visitors, the Norfolk
Division Faculty, the College of William and Mary Faculty, the
Norfolk Community, the City Council of Norfolk, the Norfolk Division
student body, and others. He described the situation at the Norfolk
Division prior to the scandal as follows:

The generally disorganized status of the Norfolk Division did not become public knowledge.

For a considerable time members of the Norfolk faculty have discussed the situation at the Division with much uneasiness and dissatisfaction. ... Among the sources of dissatisfaction were the general undependability of official organization, the absence of any system of promotions or increases in salary consonant with length of service, and the misapplication of funds. ... Many members of the faculty expressed openly the opinion that Dr. Hodges was a most incompetent administrator. ...

With respect to altered academic records, eventually the deciding factor in later developments, a representative of the American Association of Universities had made an official visit to the campus. ... Dr. Gray informed him of Dr. Hodges's practice of exercising 'executive discretion' in students' records. ...

A principal forum for faculty views was the local chapter of the American Association of University Professors. ... It was decided that the suggestion of the A.A.U.P. representative should be carried out and that a committee should consult with Dr. Bryan and Dr. Miller (Dean of the Faculty, The College of William and Mary) in Williamsburg, and to present to them a list of complaints and suggestions for improving conditions at the Division. ... It was agreed that the committee should act even though their action might be instrumental in embroiling Dr. Hodges with his superiors. ...

The committee, composed of Drs. Ernest Gray, W. Gordon Akers, and E. Ruffin Jones, duly traveled to Williamsburg and presented on 6 February 1941 its list of complaints and requests to Dr. James W. Miller, Dean of the Faculty, The College of William and Mary. ... By an oversight, the matter of grades was omitted from the agenda.
In a letter to the Rector and Members of the Board of Visitors, President Bryan described in great detail his knowledge of Dr. Hodges's administration, both at The College of William and Mary and the Norfolk Division:

Dr. Hodges, who had been Dean of Men at Williamsburg under Dr. Chandler, had later been sent by Dr. Chandler to the Norfolk Division, as a result of temperamental incompatibility between the two. . . . Dr. Chandler had twice brought before the Board of Visitors officially the difficulty he had in working with Dr. Hodges. . . .

During the 1934-35 session the first cause of difficulty arose between us. That cause lay in the unwillingness of Dr. Hodges to operate the Norfolk Division in accordance with the requirements of the Association of American Universities. . . . Among those rules was the requirement that no more than two years of college be given at the divisions. I did not know that three years were being given at Norfolk. . . . I took up the question with Dr. Hodges, and pointed out that while I understood as well as he did that it seemed more advantageous for students to have three years there and live at home, yet the few students who were benefitted by this extra year jeopardized the degrees and the rating of William and Mary for the thirteen hundred students at the parent college, and would damage our standing and desperately harm our reputation if we were dropped from the Association. . . . At the very time I was explaining this matter and insisting on it, Dr. Hodges, expressed his desire to put in the three-year college at Norfolk as a preliminary suggestion for a four-year college. . . .

It was Dr. Chandler, and not Dr. Hodges, who founded the Norfolk Division. . . .

On 18 February 1930 when Dr. Hodges was Dean of Men at Williamsburg, Dr. Chandler wrote him:

'I feel that you absolutely have not grasped the catalogue or the purpose of the College in its Law School, . . . As custodian of the good name of this College I have no right to register any student in the Law Department when the registration is contrary to the terms of the catalogue, and certainly not until you have talked the matter over with me. . . .
Disregard of my direct request and instruction can be regarded only in the light of insubordination or inefficiency. It will therefore be impossible for you and me to continue to work together without a definite understanding.

After Dr. Hodges assumed the Deanship of the Norfolk Division on 29 March 1933, Dr. Chandler felt constrained to send him some definite instructions, to wit:

If any student applies to you to rule on matters regarding his course, you will please refer him to me without any expression of opinion from you. . . . It is bad for you to try to tell professors what to do. You must content yourself with running the Norfolk Division, and leave us to run the College at Williamsburg. . . .

Again, on 8 August 1933, he felt the necessity to write to Dr. Hodges as follows:

Whether our standards are recognized by other institutions or not, it is quite necessary that we maintain the standards we set out for.

On 8 December 1933 he communicated with Dr. Hodges, thusly:

I think you are giving your best, but I am kept on pins and needles for fear that something will be done about policy that I know nothing about. . . . You will see, therefore, that what I am driving at is that you must learn to work in harness, or I will not know what to do, and will always be uneasy.

There are a number of things that have come up since you have been in Norfolk about which I have not been consulted. You employ people without my consent.

Six weeks later on 31 January 1934 Dr. Chandler had to once again chastise Dr. Hodges as follows:

I am further reminding you that you must abide by the regulations of the College of Williamsburg. . . . All I am asking is that you abide by the catalogue.

At a meeting of the Board of Visitors on 9 June 1933,
President Chandler was formally instructed to reprimand Dr. Hodges. It was to be noted, also, that Dr. Chandler's list of appointments for the 1933-34 session did not include the name of Dr. Hodges.

At an Executive Committee meeting in Richmond on 22 June 1933, Dr. Chandler made a long statement with regard to Dr. Hodges. The board, subsequently, elected Dr. Hodges to a new appointment for the 1933-34 session but made it contingent "on the conditions outlined by Dr. Chandler's statement." President Bryan, who then was Vice-Rector of the Board, recalled that Dr. Chandler had said he could not work with Dr. Hodges unless Dr. Hodges took his orders and abided by the rules laid down by the executive. . . .

Dr. James W. Miller, Dean of the Faculty, The College of William and Mary during the late 1930s and early 1940s, said the following with regards to Dr. Hodges:

I learned there was some considerable dissatisfaction with the Dean on the part of the faculty or lack of enthusiasm for him. A certain amount of disrespect, a tendency to tell anecdotes about him that did not represent him as a distinguished administrator. . . .

On 11 February 1941 the representative of the Norfolk Division of the American Association of University Professors alleged that Dr. Hodges had given out untrue records of students. This was well known and so greatly opposed that the registrar at the Norfolk Division refused to sign transcripts which Dr. Hodges had allegedly "pieced out." . . .

Dr. James W. Miller related the actual circumstances regarding Dr. Hodges's resignation as follows:
On one of my trips to Norfolk I was taken aside by three members of the staff. . . . Dr. Ernest Gray informed me, in very solemn tones, to my great shock, that strange things were going on in the Division. In particular, that transcripts which had been falsified were being sent out to other institutions by direction of Dean Hodges. . . . I returned to Williamsburg and reported to President Bryan, who was quite as shocked and distressed as Dr. Ernest Gray and his group were. He said that we must go right down to look into this. . . . We took with us Miss Kathleen Alsop, who was the Registrar in Williamsburg, for technical assistance. We went to Dean Hodges's office. We met with Dean Hodges, and Mr. Bryan confrontcd him with the allegations that had come to notice and Dean Hodges admitted it right away. He said, 'Well, I did do that in perhaps three cases.'

There was a boy who was wanting to go to another institution, I think a military institution (U.S. Naval Academy), that required a course in physics. Well, the boy had not had a course in physics. So Dean Hodges had given him credit on the transcript for a course in physics to make it possible for him to be admitted there. In two other cases, as I recall, he raised the grade that the student had acquired to make it possible for him to meet the qualitative standard for admission somewhere. . . . Mr. Bryan said, 'Were there any other cases in which you did this?' Dean Hodges said, 'No, that was all.'

Meanwhile Miss Alsop had been working in the Registrar's Office in the Norfolk Division and at that point she came in with twenty transcripts. She had found in these falsifications indicated in Dean Hodges's handwriting. So then Mr. Bryan said, 'Dean Hodges, I must ask for your resignation'. . . .

Before I go on with that let me say about Dean Hodges that he did not do these things, I am sure, for any personal gain. He was a kindly man, a popular man who loved popularity. He didn't seem to realize or stop to think he was being dishonest, and that he was damaging the Division and The College of William and Mary. He thought only of helping the boys and girls . . . who wanted to get admitted to other institutions into which they would otherwise not have been admitted. I don't think for a minute that any money passed under the table or anything of that sort. It was pure kindness of a misplaced sort, well-meaning generosity. He was thinking only of these kids that he was helping and completely unaware of the ethics of it and the academic damage to both institutions.
Dr. Bryan's statement regarding the resignation of Dr. Hodges differed somewhat from Dr. Miller's, not in substance, but in detail. He made the following statement in a personal and confidential letter addressed to Alumni of The College of William and Mary and the Norfolk Division:

On March 21, 1941, I went to Dr. Hodges's office and said to him, 'I have come on a very sad mission.' His immediate response was, 'Well, let's get done with it!' I continued, 'It is about the records of Oden, Halpern, and Purnell.' Dr. Hodges replied, 'I thought it would be about those cases, and I have the cards here on my desk.' He gave me the cards. I was dumbfounded and insisted that there could not be the slightest justification for this behavior. Dr. Hodges said, 'I am guilty, if you choose to call it so, and I throw myself on your mercy.'

The next day, March 22, 1941, Dr. Hodges called on Mr. A. H. Foreman, a member of the Board of Visitors, and made a written statement in which he said that he had a contract with Oden that 'I would give him the privilege of making up his final grades on June 1939, which were incomplete, and of taking sufficient special examinations in subjects on which he already had first semester passing grades. He kept his contract with me by receiving last January [1941] 2 B's and 4 C's on his six subjects. I thereupon kept my contract with him by piecing out his former ragged record to the extent of getting him the required 65 hours.'

This statement from Dr. Hodges was given to me by Mr. Foreman in the presence of the Rector, Mr. J. Gordon Bohannon; Miss Lulu Hitz; and Mr. Channing M. Hall, all members of the Executive Committee of the Board of Visitors.

On March 25, 1941, I went back to Dr. Hodges's office, carrying this statement with me, and asked him to show me the cards on which there was evidence that re-examinations had been given Oden. The cards were forthcoming, but there was no evidence of a re-examination, and Dr. Hodges admitted that there had been no re-examination.

I then went over with Dr. Hodges the cases of Halpern, Purnell, and Strole—the Strole Case had been brought to my attention by Dr. Hodges on my first visit to him. The Halpern Case differed from the others in that Oden, Purnell, and Strole had been the recipients of marks which were
arbitrarily improved by Dr. Hodges: Halpern's card showed on its face that Dr. Hodges had deliberately substituted a course in Physics with a grade of "B," for a course in Economics with a grade of "C" for the first semester and a grade of "D" for the second semester.

Dr. Hodges admitted that Halpern not only had not made a "B" in Physics, but Halpern had not even taken Physics.

When pressed for an explanation Dr. Hodges replied, 'I simply advanced him these credits.'

Now Halpern had apparently won a competition for entrance to the Naval Academy at Annapolis, but in order to enter he was required to have done a certain amount of work in Physics. This work he had not done, and in order for Halpern to enter Annapolis without going through an examination Dr. Hodges certified that Halpern had made five credits in Physics when, as a matter of fact, Halpern had not even taken the course in Physics at the Norfolk Division.

When I asked Dr. Hodges why this untrue statement had been given to the United States Government, Dr. Hodges said in the presence of Dr. Miller, who accompanied me, exactly the same thing he had said before, 'I am guilty, if you choose to call it so, and I throw myself on your mercy.'

I asked, 'Are the cases of Oden, Halpern, Purnell, and Strole the only cases we have to consider?' He replied, 'That is all.'

I walked out of the office and found Miss Kathleen Alsop, the Registrar at The College of William and Mary at Williamsburg, had been hurriedly going over the permanent records of the Norfolk Division and discovered some thirtyodd cases in addition to those mentioned above. In that situation I turned to Dr. Hodges and said, 'I shall have to ask for your resignation as Dean of the Norfolk Division.' He said at once, 'I will give it to you. I only request that you put it into effect immediately.' I replied, 'I do not know what I shall do about this matter, because it is very serious.'

I then left his office.

The next morning I received a special delivery letter from Dr. Hodges saying that he had decided not to resign and asking for a hearing before the Board of Visitors.

Using a Norfolk Division, College of William and Mary,
Norfolk, Virginia, letterhead dated 26 March 1941, Dr. Hodges wrote Dr. Bryan the following:

After conferring with friends I have changed my mind about acceding to your request for my resignation.

Instead, I prefer to face the issue which you have raised. I am ready, with a clear conscience, to stand behind everything that I have done during the eight years of my service here. If you still feel you do not wish me to continue in charge of this Division, then I must ask for a full investigation and hearing before the Board of Visitors of the College.

Dean Miller, who accompanied Dr. Bryan to confront Dr. Hodges, made the following observation after the meeting with Dr. Hodges:

Mr. Bryan and I both took for granted that this was a fait accompli; Dean Hodges was out and the next thing would be to start looking around for somebody to take his place. . . .

On 27 March 1941, the day following receipt of Dean Hodges's letter of 26 March 1941, Dr. Bryan replied:

I have your Special Delivery letter of March 26, in which you tell me that you have changed your mind and will not send me a letter of resignation, as you had proposed to do on Tuesday afternoon, March 25.

You also state that you would like to have a full investigation before the Board of Visitors of the College of William and Mary. I submitted your request to the Rector, Mr. J. Gordon Bohannon, and by his direction I wish you to be informed that the meeting of the Board of Visitors will be held on Wednesday, April 2, at 10:30 a.m., at the College of William and Mary. The Rector hopes that you will be present.

He would like to have you bring all the records which we discussed.

The Portsmouth Star carried an editorial on 30 March 1941 which cautioned that judgment be reserved. It said:
It may be conjectural as to what is deeply involved but suppose it turned out to be an indirect effort to actually close the Norfolk Division of William and Mary.

There have been rumblings for some time that seemed somehow threatening the life of the Norfolk Division of William and Mary. It has been agreed that the Division has not been financially self-sustaining and that the parent-college could not be expected to further divide with the Norfolk Division state-allocated funds.

Could all this actually be the laying of an indirect foundation for the development of reasons to be found why the Norfolk Division should be divorced from the William and Mary system. The future will tell.

Support of Dean Hodges was spread throughout the Norfolk Community. On 30 March 1941 the Norfolk Virginian-Pilot expressed itself in an editorial, to wit:

Both the College of William and Mary in Williamsburg and its branch in Norfolk are too deeply rooted in this city's affections to permit of local indifference to any development capable of doing injury to either institution or to their responsible heads. Because the charges preferred by President John Stewart Bryan . . . against Dean W. T. Hodges . . . are serious enough to raise the possibility of such injury, the Norfolk community cannot help viewing them but with distress and concern.

This is not to prejudge the case but only to emphasize what every fair person will admit—that charges tending to undermine the professional reputation of educator . . . need the fullest substantiation, both as to letter and spirit.

. . . Judgment as to the merit of the charges must be suspended until they are fully stated and fully answered.

In his "The Case of Bryan vs. Hodges, March-October 1941," Mr. Robert C. McClelland stated that alumni chapters of the colleges at Williamsburg and Norfolk set up offices to carry on the fight on behalf of the dean. Why Williamsburg? It must be remembered that Dr. Hodges, prior to going to the Norfolk Division, had served many
years in the administration in Williamsburg. He was as immensely popular with the student body there as in Norfolk. Both the Williamsburg and Norfolk alumni groups adopted resolutions which called on President Bryan and the Board of Visitors to retain Dean Hodges in his position. Several local personages indicated their support for Hodges, and numerous "Letters to the Editor" filled the local newspapers. The Norfolk Branch of the American Association of University Women gave him their support and stated their belief that he had acted in good faith. The Southside Kiwanis Club, Retail Merchants Association, Norfolk Kiwanis Club, Oceanview Parent-Teacher Association, and United Daughters of the Confederacy all supported Dean Hodges. Mr. Robert M. Hughes, Jr., prominent local attorney and a son of a former member of the Board of Visitors, paid Dr. Bryan a personal visit and urged that the contemplated discipline be reduced in severity.426

On 4 April 1941 Norfolk citizens held an indignation meeting in the Norfolk City Council Chamber. Attendance was so great that people stood against the walls, overflowed back into an adjoining hall, and filled up the aisles between rows of seats. The meeting resulted in the formation of forty-seven civic, school, business and professional clubs, and organizations into an organization designed to let the Board of Visitors know how strongly the people of Norfolk felt about the retention of Dean Hodges in his position. The group voted to send a delegation to Williamsburg on Saturday, 12 April 1941, to demonstrate support for Dr. Hodges in his meeting on that
date with the Board of Visitors. Of the forty-seven clubs which
attended the meeting, many numbered eight to ten members each.427

In a 6 April 1941 editorial the Norfolk Virginian-Pilot
declared that whatever the outcome might be of the effort to oust
Dean Hodges, the demonstration at the City Council Chamber the
previous Friday recorded the judgment of the Norfolk Community that
the charges against Dean Hodges that so far had been made in public
had not justified the kind of action attempted against him.428

Dr. W. Gerald Akers declared that most of the faculty at the
Norfolk Division was fond of Dr. Hodges as a person, that there
probably was never a more popular citizen of Norfolk, both among the
students who knew him and the people of the city, and that he could
be characterized as being kindhearted and generous to a fault.429

Professor Frank McDonald, a former staff member of the
Department of Philosophy, The College of William and Mary, and a
former member of the Faculty at The College of William and Mary in
Virginia, Norfolk Division from 1938-56, made the following comments
to Dr. James R. Sweeney, former Archivist, Old Dominion University:

Instead of being congratulated on having undertaken the
unhappy task of exposing a difficulty that had to be
corrected, the entire city of Norfolk, as far as I can
determine, decided that anybody who believed that Dean Hodges
had done anything of this sort must be a vicious person. The
newspapers were all one hundred percent in support of Dean
Hodges without knowing anything at all about what had
happened. They didn't know because nobody who was in the
position to know would tell because it would be quite
inappropriate and a breach of confidence to discuss the
business of the college and indeed Dean Hodges's business
publicly at that juncture until it was acted on by the parent
authorities in Williamsburg, until all people were properly
consulted. Nevertheless, meetings all over Norfolk were
held, I remember several meetings were held to criticize and complain about the 'vicious' members of the faculty who said Dean Hodges had done something wrong. So the whole town was in support of him, and the headlines and newspapers supported him. . . . Many of us thought it altogether likely that somehow or other Dean Hodges would triumph in this and the whole thing would be swept under the rug. . . . It looked as though the tremendous enthusiasm and public following that Dean Hodges had in Williamsburg was going to come out ahead and he was going to be whitewashed and somehow triumph. . . . Dean Hodges created a widespread impression that our local college was being abused by The College of William and Mary in Williamsburg. . . .

Dr. James W. Miller related to Dr. James R. Sweeney the following concerning the public outcry for Dean Hodges:

Well, friends of Dean Hodges in Norfolk soon found out about this and started a big publicity campaign in the Norfolk papers on his behalf by getting his dismissal cancelled. There was a great deal of uproar in the newspapers, especially in Norfolk, to what extent in other papers in the state, I don't know, but certainly big in Norfolk. . . .

In a telephone conversation between Dr. George A. Works and President Bryan on 2 April 1941, Works said with reference to Dr. Hodges:

In my judgment recognition will be withdrawn from William and Mary (not the Norfolk Division but the parent school) if this action of Hodges becomes known and is tolerated.

President Bryan had declared that the Hodges's Case was an executive matter, not to be tried in the newspapers.

Faculty members at the Norfolk Division were divided into two groups, one favored open support of Dr. Hodges, the other insisted upon the original purposes of the American Association of University Professors, Norfolk Division Committee, namely, complete re-examination of the division's affairs and a definition of Dr. Hodges's status. Campus politics became so heated that Dr. Miller
came from Williamsburg, called a meeting of the faculty, and read a brief statement in which he declared that he was concerned with respect to the integrity and ethics of persons who engaged in a campaign that supported acts of gross dishonesty or who placed loyalty to persons about loyalty to principles. Open agitation on the campus almost ceased.

Apparently, President Bryan's letter of 27 March 1941 to Dr. Hodges contained a typographical error. Instead of the Board of Visitors' meeting to be held 2 April 1941 at 10:30 A.M., it should have read 12 April 1941. Six days seemed like a very brief time for Dr. Hodges to prepare his defense. Nowhere in any official correspondence was there any indication of a date change. This may have been handled by telephone, but there was no memorandum in the official papers of President Bryan that such a call was made. In light of the foregoing, Mr. Robert C. McClelland's summarization of the circumstances which surrounded the Bryan-Hodges Affair seemed quite pertinent when he wrote:

The aspects of Dr. Hodges's case which appeared in the press and were publicized at numerous meetings were by no means the only factors in the long series of unfortunate events. Indeed the background of the immediate developments have been long and varied, attended often by grave discussions and warm debates. When the case reached public attention, official silence was imposed upon many of the principal persons concerned, and these were furthermore rendered averse to talking by a natural reluctance arising from the delicate nature of the affair. Consequently, many pertinent facts weren't divulged and misunderstandings were propagated. Dr. Bryan based his case solely on the documentary evidence of altered grades, and at no time, even in his final summarizing document, did he allude to the many other factors involved. The generally disorganized status of the Norfolk Division did not become public knowledge.
The High Hat carried an article which stated that student body support was offered to Dean Hodges. The largest assembly of students ever to be in the Larchmont Auditorium gathered there on Tuesday night, 8 April 1941, and offered their support to the dean. A petition was offered by the students which expressed their loyalty to the dean.

An editorial in the High Hat entitled "Who's to Judge the Right?" commented thusly:

Through no fault of his own but because he followed the dictates of a kinder heart and a higher judgment than lesser men possess our Dean has been asked to resign. It is claimed that in about forty instances he has given students credits which, strictly interpreted, they did not deserve.

He has been our dean for eight years. Everyone knows that during this time Dean Hodges has made thousands of decisions about credits. Now the claim is made that in about forty times out of all those thousands of decisions he had made a wrong decision. Forty wrong decisions (conceding they were wrong which is very debatable matter)—forty out of thousands.

If an umpire in a baseball game makes as good a proportion as that he's doing very well. . . . Is it then right to ask a man of Dean Hodges known integrity and granted skill to resign because he might have called a few strikes that did not quite clip the outside corners of the plate?

We know Dean Hodges as the finest and kindest of counselors, a wise and firm guide through the paths of learning. . . . Indeed, if we were forced to witness what seems to us so grave a miscarriage of justice, most of us will lose faith in the benefit of higher learning. . . .

The vast majority of the public do not know the facts concerning the incident, and still are poorly informed on the situation, but all of them know Dean Hodges and what he stands for and didn't doubt for a minute that the dean was right. . . .
Seldom, if ever, is a person as well suited for a position as W. T. Hodges is as Dean of the Norfolk Division. We feel that 'Uncle Billy' builds men, instead of grades, and we approve.

As for the offense occurred: We believe that when a rule is so inflexible and rigid that it cannot be bent to meet human needs occasionally, it should be abolished. Mr. Bryan is sincere in his belief that the college should run on a strict academic rule; we respect his opinion but do not concur with it.

We feel that there is little doubt that our beloved 'Uncle Billy' will not be forced to resign and of this we are profoundly glad.

The Ledger-Dispatch referred to the tremendous support given to Dean Hodges in the following manner:

During the past two weeks since the story of Dr. Bryan's demand for the dean's resignation was published, more than 80 organizations of all kinds have sent resolutions to members of the college board and to Dr. Bryan requesting that Dr. Hodges be retained as dean of the local school. Hundreds and hundreds of letters and telegrams were sent to the board members as well.

The Newport News Times-Herald reported 12 April 1941 that The Board of Visitors of The College of William and Mary met in executive session and discussed the controversy which had arisen from the requested resignation of Dean William T. Hodges of the Norfolk Division. The board called Dean Hodges and his counsel, James Martin of Norfolk, into the closed afternoon meeting. More than 200 persons, which included a large delegation from Norfolk, were present when the board went into executive session in the Phi Beta Kappa Memorial Hall at 10:50 A.M. to discuss procedure.

The Richmond News Leader reported on 12 April 1941:
The Board of Visitors of The College of William and Mary decided today to continue Dr. William T. Hodges as Dean of the school's Norfolk Division for a thirty-day period.

President John Stewart Bryan said that Dean Hodges would not 'exercise any authority in the matter of grades, professors or marks' nor would he assume any authority in any policy-making program for education.

Dean Hodges... said at the close of the meeting, 'I am very satisfied.'

His attorney... likewise expressed his gratification at the action of the board.

The hearing was asked by Dean Hodges to permit the presentation of his side of the controversy.

The Danville Register carried an editorial on 12 April 1941 which shed some interesting light on the Bryan-Hodges controversy as follows:

The Hodges case has become an educational cause celebre.

Under his [Hodges] guiding hand the Norfolk Division has become an important institution with a steadily growing student body.

Dr. Chandler had found the struggling little college lacking quantity in plant, faculty, students and curriculum. He sought to develop all in a general expansion program that proved extraordinarily successful. About the time of Dr. Chandler's death there was a widespread questioning of the value of bigness. Many saw in the ancient College of William and Mary in Virginia an institution that might serve the Commonwealth best by a return to its early emphasis on the classics as the basis for a liberal education. Among those who had this conception was the new president, Publisher John Stewart Bryan. Quality rather than quantity in students and curriculum formed the Bryan concept. Mediocrity in the mass found no encouragement and little tolerance in the school of thought represented by Dr. Bryan.

While these basic changes in policy at the mother institution were being applied, Dean Hodges was following the Chandler formula for building an institution at Norfolk. That the two should clash was inevitable.
The hearing . . . and the outcome, aside from its effect on Dr. Hodges personally, will go far in determining the future policy of the college. The educational concept of the President and the Division Dean are at variance; the Board of Visitors must choose between policies as well as pass upon the ethics of Dean Hodges' acts.

The Record Book of the Board of Visitors Minutes, College of William and Mary, February 6, 1940, to June 1, 1946 contained the following which was presented to the board even before Dr. Hodges and his counsel were called to appear before them 12 April 1941:

Mr. Foreman made a statement in which he reviewed the history of the Norfolk Division, declared that he had taken pride in its accomplishments, that he had always supported it, that he believed it had made a real contribution to the City of Norfolk, and was a credit to the Mother College. He stated, however, that in view of the circumstances that had arisen in Norfolk and in view of a resolution that he had heard had been adopted by the Board of Managers of the Alumni Association sometime ago that it might be desirable for the College of William and Mary to consider severing its relationship with the Norfolk Division, that he would not oppose such a severance if in the opinion of the Board it seemed desirable.

The Record Book further stated that Judge Shewmake, a member of the board, offered a resolution that a committee be appointed to consider the advisability of severing the relationship which existed between The College of William and Mary and its Norfolk Division.

Mr. George S. Shackleford, Jr., another member, made a motion, that before the consideration of any resolution, Dr. Hodges and his counsel be requested to meet with the board and give the board and him an opportunity to discuss whether or not, if the resolution was adopted, he would be willing to withdraw his request for a hearing before the board. The motion was adopted.
After the adoption of the motion, Dr. Hodges and his counsel appeared before the board. The Rector, J. Gordon Bohannon, stated to both of them that they were called to appear at this time, in order that they could hear the above resolution. He further wanted to know if the resolution was passed by the board would he, Dean Hodges, withdraw the request which he had made for a hearing before the board?

The Secretary to the Board, Mr. Charles J. Duke, Jr., read the following motion:

Moved that a committee of three members of this Board be appointed to study the advisability of severing the relations that now exist between the College of William and Mary and its Norfolk Division, as and when arrangements can be effected to continue the work of the Norfolk Division unimpaired; and that such committee report to this Board and that this Board act thereon within thirty days from this date.

After verbal exchanges between the rector and Mr. Martin and after the latter conferred with Mr. Robert M. Hughes, Jr., another Norfolk lawyer with an interest in the Norfolk Division, The College of William and Mary, Mr. Martin stated that his client, Dean Hodges, found the proposed resolution satisfactory to himself and that he would withdraw his request for a review by the board.

Judge Shewmake's resolution was adopted.

Dr. Hodges and his counsel were again called before the board. The rector explained that the resolution had been passed and that after adjournment the board would meet again on 10 May 1941. In the meantime it was hoped that the Committee of Three would have a report to make in accordance with the terms of the resolution.
After Dr. Hodges and his counsel were excused and departed, President Bryan presented to the board a detailed report on the Norfolk controversy. The essential substance of that report is set forth elsewhere in this chapter.

Nowhere in the Board of Visitors minutes for 12 April 1941 was mention made of a Three-Man Committee to study the advisability of severing the relationship between The College of William and Mary and the Norfolk Division. A letter, however, dated 29 April 1941 and signed by President John Stewart Bryan mentioned the three committee members, to wit: Judge Oscar L. Shewmake, Mr. A. H. Foreman, and Mr. Channing Hall. Newspapers also carried the committee members' names.

The Norfolk Virginian-Pilot carried a headline, "V.P.I. - Ruled Norfolk Division, with Hodges to Remain Head, Looms As a Likely Possibility." In the accompanying article the newspaper predicted that the severance of relations with The College of William and Mary appeared to be a probable outcome. The newspaper went on further and said:

It appeared last night that Dean Hodges was almost certain to remain the head of the institution as President Julian A. Burruss of V.P.I. . . . said his institution would take over the Norfolk college only with Dean Hodges as its head. . . .

Students and supporters of the Norfolk College foresaw the possibility of the expansion of the branch from its present status as a two-year school into a standard four-year institution if it does become affiliated with V.P.I. . . .

Our relations with Dean Hodges have always been cooperative and friendly. . . .
President Burruss, however, declined to comment on the possibility of expanding the present plant into a four-year school.

He pointed out that, although V.P.I. had not made any formal plans for action, it surely would take action if The College of William and Mary did sever relations with the Norfolk Division.

There was a strong feeling in Norfolk that The College of William and Mary was seeking a means of divorcing itself from the Norfolk Division. A Ledger-Dispatch editorial seemed to bear this out as stated below:

At first thought, it would appear that the happiest settlement that could have been reached would have been one which affected a composition of the differences between President Bryan and Dean Hodges.

But that, it seems certain, would not have cured the fundamental trouble. That fundamental trouble is that, apparently, there is a strong disposition, if not a controlling disposition, at the College of William and Mary to sever the mother college's relations with the Norfolk Division. Whatever the reasons, and they are reported to be numerous, there seems to have been a growing coolness at Williamsburg toward its two-year college at Norfolk. Therefore, while the Bryan-Hodges difference should not—again, in logic—have brought this trouble to a head, it probably is just as well that it should have.

With the possibility that the Committee of Three appointed by the Board of Visitors would recommend the severing of relations between The College of William and Mary and the Norfolk Division, the City of Norfolk became vitally interested in the outcome. According to the Norfolk Virginian-Pilot, the city would watch its interests in the Norfolk-William and Mary case. The city council on 15 April 1941 voted authority to Mayor Wood and City Manager Borland to appoint a Committee of Five members to look after the city's interests.
In a letter to the City Council of Norfolk, the city manager on 15 April 1941 advised the council as follows:

The Norfolk Division of the College of William and Mary has, as is well known to the Council, become an educational asset to the City of Norfolk and is an institution of which our citizens are justly proud. On the material side of this development, the City has contributed financially.

The City Government and the community at large are, therefore, particularly interested in the future status of this institution, and as there are reports that a committee of the Board of Visitors of the College of William and Mary are considering the advisability of that College withdrawing from the local facility it is my thought, and I so recommend, that a committee be appointed to look after the City's interest and report to the Council from time to time on the information obtained. If the Council concurs in my recommendation, I suggest the appointment of a committee of five, composed of two City officials, preferably the City Attorney and the Director of Public Welfare, and three interested citizens outside of the City Government.

The city manager's above recommendation was adopted unanimously and the President of the Council and the city manager were empowered to name three members of the committee.

Norfolk City Clerk, John D. Corbell, addressed a letter on 15 April 1941 to Messrs. W. D. Faucette; Louis I. Jaffe; James Mann; Alfred Anderson, City Attorney; and H. G. Parker, Director of Public Welfare regarding The College of William and Mary, Norfolk Division. The letter subsequently said:

Pursuant to recommendations by the City Manager to the Council at its session held on yesterday, copy of which is attached, you gentlemen were subsequently appointed by Mayor J. D. Wood to serve as a committee and officially report to the City Council such information as is deemed material to the City's interests concerning the subject matter.

The Norfolk City Council minutes stated that promptly after their appointment all members of the committee met for a general
discussion of the situation. As a result of that meeting, the committee agreed that the best interests of the community would be served by a continuation of the Norfolk Division of William and Mary and V.P.I., to be conducted along the lines indicated below:

1. That an institution of collegiate rank, offering liberal arts, engineering, and various technical and 'terminal' courses, corresponding to, and the equivalent of, such courses offered in the first two years of standard colleges, is indispensable to Norfolk and its metropolitan area.

2. That the Norfolk Division of William and Mary and Virginia Polytechnic Institute have been supplying this need for more than ten years and is highly esteemed by this community which feels, however, that the Division has been working under serious handicaps, and that these handicaps must be removed if it is to achieve its highest usefulness.

3. That is unsound policy and obstructive of the Division's proper and necessary growth, to impose on the Division the rigid requirement that it be completely self-sustaining.

4. That, in particular, the requirement that interest and amortization charges, as well as replacement, plant maintenance and plant expansion needs all be defrayed from the Division's income from tuition charges and student fees, is indefensible, and, if continued as a permanent policy will result in the Division's unavoidable deterioration and eventual atrophy.

5. That the Norfolk Division of William and Mary is entitled to the status of an integral part of the parent college, and as such, to an appropriate share of the general fund appropriation made by the State of Virginia to the College of William and Mary, to supplement its income from tuition and student fees.

6. That the prevailing low-income population texture of this community makes it desirable to expand the curriculum of the Division to include, in addition to courses already offered, vocational and other utilitarian courses arranged on a 'terminal' basis, to serve particularly those students who must receive in this institution the only higher education they will be able to afford.

7. That the expansion of the Division's curriculum be directed along horizontal rather than vertical lines—that is, toward
producing a high-standard two-year college of fully accredited rating, rather than toward striving for a three-year or four-year college course.

8. A more cordial, cooperative, and sympathetic attitude on the part of the college to the Norfolk Division should hereafter be pursued.

On 22 April 1941 the City Manager, Charles B. Borland, reported to the City Council of Norfolk in a letter dated 18 April 1941 the following members of the Committee of Five to look after Norfolk's interests in connection with the proposed change in the status of the Norfolk Division:

Following action of Council on April 15, as a result of my recommendation, that the President of the Council and the City Manager be empowered to name three members of a committee to look after the City's interest in connection with the proposed change in the status of the Norfolk Division of the College of William and Mary and report to Council from time to time, I wish to report that this committee has been appointed.

For Council's information, the Committee is composed of the following:

Mesers. N. G. Parker, Chairman
W. D. Faucette
Louis I. Jaffe
James Mann
Alfred Anderson

This committee will meet within the next few days and will report to the Council at a later date.

The Norfolk Virginian-Pilot reported that the city had a $120,000 "stake" in the Norfolk Division and that the municipality would watch developments of the Board of Visitors. This $120,000 "stake" represented actual cash and material outlay by the city in the Norfolk Division. In addition the city had spent even more than that amount in street additions and improvements as a result of the
construction of Foreman Field. The city's investment in the Norfolk Division was represented by over $78,000 with improvements for the Old Larchmont School, over $38,000 for construction of the stadium, and over $13,000 for five acres of land.

Besides the City's Attorney, Alfred Anderson, and its Welfare Director, H. G. Parker, the other three members of the committee were: Mr. Louis I. Jaffe, Editor of the Norfolk Virginian-Pilot; Colonel James Mann, prominent local attorney; and Mr. W. D. Faucette, Chief Engineer of the Seaboard Airline Railway and a former member of the Board of Trustees of the Greater University of Norfolk Carolina and of the Board of Trustees, North Carolina State College.

The High Hat raised the question as to whether it was actually known what happened in Williamsburg on 12 April 1941. It encouraged the student body to not consider the fight as being over but to stand fast by the dean and not "let the wool be pulled over their eyes." They were further urged to keep the power of public opinion aroused and that if the dean got a "raw deal" when the board convened again on 10 May 1941 they had only begun to fight.

President Bryan wrote to Dr. George A. Works, apprising him of the situation in Norfolk, in the following light:

The whole City of Norfolk has gotten into an uproar, and I cannot foresee any good to William and Mary in any way from this excitement.

I have talked a great deal with Dr. Hoke here who gives a very hazy judgment as to what will be the attitude of the Southern Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools; he says that they certainly won't condone it...
I find no reputable college or university which will state that the practice was in any way proper.

The people of Norfolk have openly stated that they would resist and resent any effort to transfer the Norfolk Division from William and Mary unless it were given to V.P.I. I cannot believe that V.P.I. would be a desirable competitor for us, or that it would be a satisfactory solution for Norfolk in the long run. The best solution would be to improve the courses we now have, to set up terminal courses and to follow the general proposals of your report.

Five days later, Dr. Works responded to President Bryan in the following one-page letter:

It is too bad that you have run into such serious difficulties in the Hodges's case. I do not see how the people in Norfolk can defend such an action as you report for Hodges.

I note your comment regarding the release of Norfolk to V.P.I. I am inclined to think that the Norfolk Division might better be tied up with the State Board of Education than with any of the institutions.

A question on many minds was this: If the Committee of Three reported to the Board of Visitors and advised against the severing of relationships between The College of William and Mary and the Norfolk Division, what would be Dean Hodges's status? Would the board then have to act on his appeal or would he remain as the Dean, Norfolk Division? In a letter to President Bryan, the Rector, J. Gordon Bohannon, said the board would have to consider Dean Hodges's appeal if the committee came in with a recommendation to keep the status quo. His letter, in part, read:

Unless some reason appears to the contrary I shall write Mr. Martin [Dean Hodges's counsel] that, in the event the committee appointed at the last meeting of the Board should report against the advisability of severing the relations now existing between the College and the Norfolk Division, and in the event that Dean Hodges should not withdraw his request
which he has made for a hearing before the Board, the Board
will, at the meeting on May tenth, consider his request for
an appeal. I think that he should be advised of this so that
he may be prepared at time to proceed with the hearing. If
he should withdraw his request to the Board for a
consideration of the matter, I take it that his resignation
will be properly submitted.

The following day President Bryan replied to the foregoing
letter as follows:

I should be most surprised if Dr. Hodges were to insist, in
view of all the facts in the case, upon an open hearing with
the attendant publicity.

Yesterday Judge Showmake, Mr. Foreman, Channing Hall,
Charlie Duke, and I conferred about the Norfolk situation. I
am going to Norfolk on Friday with this committee to sit with
a committee appointed by the Norfolk City Government.

It seems too clear for argument that no matter what
happens William and Mary will have to retain ownership of
Norfolk Division and administer it from this office.

While the Committee of Three appointed by the Board of
Visitors deliberated the advisability/inadvisability of severing
relations with the Norfolk Division, segments of the administration
at The College of William and Mary proceeded as if the situation had
not existed. Specifically, Dr. James W. Miller, Dean of the Faculty,
submitted to Dr. Bryan on 30 April 1941 his recommendations with
respect to the "Work's Report." The letter which contained the
recommendations follows:

At your request I have drawn up the following plan for an
expansion of the services of the Norfolk Division.

Three considerations should be stressed at the outset.
First, no expansion should be undertaken until the salaries
and teaching load of the faculty can be improved and until a
more adequate provision for the library has been made.
Second, the plan for the development of the work at Norfolk is, of course, predicated on the assumption that new revenues to finance the expansion will be available. Third, it would seem desirable to put any plan of expansion into effect step by step rather than all at once.

Two other types of instruction could well be provided with great advantage to Norfolk and no doubt to us, when funds are available for them. First, a scheme of general education for students taking a two-year course only, with no intention of going further, could be introduced. Second, a program of vocational instruction for the day students could be undertaken.

The scheme of general education is partly served by the present college courses at Norfolk but should be supplemented by new terminal courses.

In Dean Hodges's mind, there must have existed the strong possibility that The College of William and Mary would not sever relations with the Norfolk Division and, therefore, he could retain his position as dean only by appealing to the Board of Visitors on 10 May 1941. He must have realized that his defense for what he had done was at best essentially of a very flimsy nature and would not bear up under the close scrutiny of the board. Upon reflection he must have also realized that when President Bryan asked for his resignation he had asked only for his resignation as Dean of the Norfolk Division, not for his resignation from the college. This intent on Dr. Bryan's part was evidenced by what he said and wrote about the affair. No doubt there were friends of Dean Hodges who counseled him both to resign as well as to fight his case before the board. At any rate, on 30 April 1941 Dean Hodges, in a handwritten letter, personally delivered to Dr. Bryan, offered his resignation. The letter contained the following:
When you asked me to resign I understood that you meant I should sever my connection with the college. I am now informed that this was not your intention, and I recognize your authority to change my position within the college.

Accordingly, I am willing to relinquish my title of Dean, and to continue with the College in such work as seems to you best for its welfare.

Under these circumstances of course I have no reason to appeal to the board. But I wish again to emphasize my desire to serve the College to the best of my ability.

President Bryan wasted no time in replying to Dean Hodges's letter of resignation. The same day, 30 April 1941, he sent the following letter:

I have your letter of April 30, tendering your resignation as Dean of the Norfolk Division of the College of William and Mary. I accept this resignation effective as of June 30. In so doing I would say that I fully recognize the essential part you have taken in building up the enrollment of students and developing the courses at the Norfolk Division.

It is therefore my purpose and desire to arrange your duties so that the Norfolk Division may continue to have the benefit of your energy and interest.

The Richmond News Leader carried an article the next day to the effect that Dean Hodges had quit as Dean of the Norfolk unit and recounted all the events leading up to his resignation. In addition the article stated that the Board of Visitors' Committee of Three would meet in Norfolk's Municipal Building with the City of Norfolk's Committee of Five to discuss the problem of the Norfolk Division and that the college had taken no part in the recent activity over the Norfolk Division, all publicity coming from Norfolk groups.

The High Hat front page proclaimed "Hodges Remains." The article went on and said that he would accept another post, that he
had resigned as dean but would remain with the college in another capacity. There followed a message from Dean Hodges to the student body thanking them for their unwavering loyalty to him and the business-like way in which they attended classes during the controversy.

The Newport News Times-Herald reported that the Special Committee of the Board of Visitors of The College of William and Mary which considered the advisability of severing the Norfolk Division from the parent institution had met in Norfolk on 2 May 1941 with a committee appointed by the Norfolk City Council to "protect" the city's interests in the division. It was further reported that progress was made concerning solution of the problem. Further meetings of the committees were expected to be held. There had been discussion of the possibility that the division might be taken over by V.P.I., should the College of William and Mary decide to separate itself from the division in Norfolk.

It appeared that the American Association of Junior Colleges was concerned with what was going on at the Norfolk Division. Evidently, a Dr. Kenneth Eells of the A.A.J.C. had contacted The College of William and Mary. President Bryan wired him on 9 May 1941 and acknowledged his desire to come to Williamsburg for a preliminary discussion with reference to the problems of the Norfolk Division.

May 10, 1941, marked the special meeting of the Board of Visitors, The College of William and Mary in Williamsburg to receive the report of the Committee of Three, Judge Oscar L. Shewmake, Mr. A.
H. Foreman, and Mr. Channing Hall, concerning the advisability/inadvisability of severing relations with the Norfolk Division. The question of Dean Hodges's appeal for a hearing if the committee recommended separation was moot, in that he had tendered his resignation as Dean of the Norfolk Division to President Bryan the previous 30 April.

Judge Shewmake reported that the committee had held seven formal meetings to resolve the question. The meeting the afternoon of 12 April was devoted to organization and general discussion. On 18 April the committee met with the Attorney General of Virginia, Abram P. Staples, and President Julian A. Burruss of Virginia Polytechnic Institute, who was invited to attend the conference because it had been suggested to the committee that, in the event a severance of relations with the Norfolk Division became a reality, the work of the division might be carried on by V.P.I. On 23 April the committee met with Mr. Charles J. Duke, Jr., Secretary to the Board of Visitors, and continued its investigation. On 28 April the committee met with President Bryan and further discussions were held. The committee, in the meanwhile, was advised that a Committee of Five was empowered by the Norfolk City Council to investigate the same situation. The Committee of Three deemed it appropriate to invite the Committee of Five to confer. On 2 May the two committees met in Norfolk, with President Bryan and Mr. Duke in attendance. The Committee of Three met again on 7 May and held its final meeting on 9 May.
The committee pointed out that, while its authority was limited to a study of the advisability/inadvisability of severing relations, they deemed it proper to also consider and report on the question from a legal viewpoint. In the language of the board, if relations were to be severed only when arrangements could be effected to continue the work of the division unimpaired, it followed that whatever institution or authorized agency continued the work of the division unimpaired, must take over the work of the division, plus its physical plant and equipment, which was owned by The College of William and Mary. If such a transfer of property could not be lawfully effected, if such a transfer was impracticable, or if no agency could be found to take over such property, a further study of advisability/inadvisability of severing relations would be unprofitable. The Corporation, known as The College of William and Mary in Virginia, was created by an Act of the General Assembly approved on 7 March 1941. The act clearly prohibited the disposition by The College of William and Mary of any of its property without specific legislative authority. This raised the question of whether William and Mary had had the authority to establish the Norfolk Division. Regardless of authority or not, The College of William and Mary established, fostered, and sponsored the Norfolk Division for more than ten years and was the owner of substantial property acquired and used in connection with the division. The College of William and Mary had a money investment of over $109,000 but was also responsible for a bonded indebtedness of $70,000. If any other
state-controlled institution or agency assumed control of the division, William and Mary would have to be reimbursed. To effect the transfer of the property of the division to a private purchaser would be a task difficult of accomplishment and would require legislative action. To effect the transfer of the property of the division to another state-controlled institution and at the same time protect the interests of William and Mary would be an even more difficult task. The attempt to effect such a transfer was deemed neither expedient nor practicable.\textsuperscript{470}

The committee reported that the Norfolk Division could not continue to function as an independent institution if relations with The College of William and Mary were severed.

The committee further reported that the Norfolk Division had been a costly venture to the mother college. While many persons complained about the refusal of the Board of Visitors to make good out of the college's general funds the operating deficits of the division, they were not aware that the board had no specific authority to use college funds appropriated for its maintenance and operation for the improvement of facilities at the division.

The committee offered the comment that a belief had been engendered in the minds of many of the good citizens of Norfolk that the division was not favorably or sympathetically or even justly regarded by the administration in Williamsburg and its board. In fact there was a tendency of those in charge of the division to
develop a competing educational unit instead of a cooperative one with the mother college.

The committee also pointed out that for nearly 200 years Norfolk had regarded itself as a "William and Mary town." Severance of the relations which existed between the college and the division would mean the loss of much of that good will. The strengthening of the ties that bound the people of the Norfolk Area to The College of William and Mary could increase that good will and benefit both the college and the educational interests of the Norfolk Area.

The committee specifically stated that in its judgment it was neither advisable nor practicable to effect a severance of relations that existed between the College of William and Mary and its Norfolk Division. They recommended the following:

1. That the existing relations between the College of William and Mary and its Norfolk Division be not severed, and that such relations be continued and strengthened and that adequate financial provision be secured therefore; and

2. That the obligations which the College of William and Mary in Virginia assumed when it accepted the property known as 'the old Larchmont School site,' by deed from the City of Norfolk of July 5, 1930, including the obligation to conduct at the Division 'full Freshman and Sophomore courses and such other courses as in the discretion of the College are practicable to be offered' be recognized as resting upon The College of William and Mary in Virginia, and fully and faithfully discharged; and

3. That the liberal arts courses now being given at the Norfolk Division be supplemented, horizontally rather than vertically by the incorporation in the curriculum of (a) vocational instruction adapted to the abilities of the students and the needs of the Norfolk Division, (b) terminal courses best suited to those students who do not intend to pursue their college work beyond the Norfolk Division, and (c) such special courses as will enable the College; through its Norfolk Division, to do its part in the program of national defense; and
4. That a suggestion made to this Committee by President John Stewart Bryan of the College of William and Mary be adopted and acted upon, leading to the appointment by the Council of the City of Norfolk's permanent and continuing Advisory Committee of five worthy citizens of that city with whom the authorities of the College of William and Mary may confer from time to time and work in mutual cooperation for the best interests of the College of William and Mary in its Norfolk Division.

After the report of the Committee of Three was received by the Board of Visitors, it was unanimously adopted by the board. 472

A committee recommendation that there be no severance of relations between The College of William and Mary and its Norfolk Division met with unanimous approval of the college's Board of Visitors, according to the Richmond Times-Dispatch. The committee reported that it was neither advisable nor practicable to sever relations that existed but that the relations which existed should be continued and strengthened. The committee recommended that the liberal arts courses at the division be supplemented by the addition of courses in vocational work and terminal courses. The committee also recommended that the City of Norfolk Council be requested to name an Advisory Committee of Five to work with the board for the best interests of the college and its Norfolk Division. 473

Apparently, the "Works's Report" recommendations and the recommendations of Dr. Miller of The College of William and Mary were being implemented. An editorial carried in the Norfolk Ledger-Dispatch advanced the point of view that the virtual upheaval which Norfolk had watched with deep concern had resulted in the outlook for a brighter future for the Norfolk Division. There was much discussion as to the possibility of the substitution of V.P.I. for
The College of William and Mary as the sponsoring institution, a possibility which would have offered certain advantages as well as obvious disadvantages. The editorial emphasized the point that the "Shewmaker-Hall-Foreman Committee Report" endorsed by the board made formally and officially certain what was virtually certain. The editorial further explained that it would have been extremely difficult, if not impossible, for The College of William and Mary to cut off the Norfolk Division if it had nothing of equal value to offer in its stead. The editorial concluded with the thought that the incident would end in good for the Norfolk Division. 474

During the period of the Bryan vs. Hodges controversy, which lasted from 25 March 1941 through 19 May 1941, approximately 101 editorials and articles (81 articles and 20 editorials) were generated state-wide, as a result of the affair. Attention undoubtedly was given by various media outside the commonwealth, but the extent of that coverage was highly problematic. 475

Not all of Norfolk citizens were satisfied with the decision of the Board of Visitors. A Mr. William Holmes Davis, a strong and vocal proponent of a four-year school, in a letter to President Bryan said the following:

It is a matter of sincere regret to me to learn from the public press that the Board of Visitors of The College of William and Mary decided on the 10th instant to continue the operation of the Norfolk College of William and Mary as a two-year college rather than follow the example of the University of California and develop the college at Norfolk into a four-year college. . . .

While it appears that you have been thinking it best that The College of William and Mary should not undertake to
operate a four-year college in Norfolk, I feel sure that you will agree that Norfolk ought to have such a college. . . .

Of course a goodly number of boys and girls will always go away to college; but if we had a first class four-year college here we should get from elsewhere as many as we send elsewhere. . . .

On 17 May 1941 the Norfolk Virginian-Pilot announced to its readers that Mr. Charles J. Duke, Jr., Bursar of The College of William and Mary and Assistant to the President, had been selected to be the new Director of the Norfolk Division. His predecessor, Dean Hodges, became the Director of the Extension Division, an organization devoted to night classes and defense courses. President Bryan announced, according to the newspaper, that Dr. James W. Miller, Dean of the Faculty at William and Mary, would henceforth act as a Special Liaison Officer between Williamsburg and Norfolk. President Bryan said that he proposed to cooperate unreservedly with the Norfolk Faculty and the city and find the most important and largest use that could be met by the division. Mr. Duke was reported as having said that he recognized the serious situation into which he had been placed and that he intended to get the advice of all the people connected with the college and translate that advice into a program of close cooperation. Mr. Duke attended Wake Forest College before he entered the U.S. Army in 1917. After returning from overseas, he attended The College of William and Mary and graduated from there with a B.S. degree in 1923. In 1929 he was appointed to the Board of Visitors. Until his appointment, he was Secretary to the Board. Despite his appointment to the Norfolk Division, he kept
his position as Bursar and Assistant to the President, The College of William and Mary.

In an editorial of 18 May 1941, the Norfolk Virginian-Pilot voiced some concern over the division reorganization. It stated the following:

Mr. Duke, now to be Director of the Division, will assume the executive duties on June 30. This would ordinarily be thought of as a full-time responsibility. Apparently it is not to be, since Mr. Duke will simultaneously carry important responsibilities in Williamsburg. How much of his time he will devote to the Norfolk Division, the extent to which he will be in Norfolk, and various other details of his increased are not yet revealed. . . . The additional appointment of Dean Miller as a 'special liaison officer' may throw further light on the board purposes. Mr. Duke is essentially an administrator, chiefly in business management. Dean Miller is essentially an academic administrator. The normal assumption would be that while Mr. Duke as Director will be the responsible executive of the Division, with all the authority inherent in one who holds the position, Dean Miller's advice and counsel will be counted on in academic problems.

A High Hat editorial set forth the Norfolk Division student body's feeling about the new reorganization. It said:

The arrangement does not have to have changed things around to any alarming extent. Perhaps, in the final analysis youth is more conservative than age, at any rate we are very loath to relinquish things which have become dear to us. The name of William and Mary College is precious to us and so the personality of Dr. Hodges. We are very glad, indeed, that it now appears assured that both will remain with us. . . .

When the new school term begins next September there seems to be no reason why the reorganized faculty body, the students, and the parent college at Williamsburg cannot cooperate. . . . That the harmony and cooperation being taught the students may be practiced by the adults.

President Bryan in a letter to Mr. William Holmes Davis of
Norfolk made the following pertinent statement regarding a four-year college in Norfolk:

I have no doubt that it would have been very simple years ago to establish a four-year college at Norfolk, but in my judgment it is not conceivable that the State will agree to add another college under present conditions.

In a letter to President Bryan on 2 June 1941, the Rector, J. Gordon Bohannon, of the Board of Visitors discussed the Norfolk Division in the following manner:

As Dr. Killer very properly points out, the problem of increasing the value of the Norfolk Division to the students and through them to the City of Norfolk is a financial one. And it seems that it is impracticable at this time to separate the Norfolk Division from the College of William and Mary, we must find ways and means to give it the financial support necessary for its maintenance.

I think that Dr. Miller very clearly points out that the Division is not fulfilling its main purpose, in that it is not functioning as a feeder to the College of William and Mary.

In compilation of the report of the committee to be based on the "Works's Report," I think we should go somewhat further than Dr. Miller has gone in his report and make to the Board of Visitors some more tangible recommendations with reference to the future conduct and control of the Division. We are burdened with a load that should never have been imposed on the College, and we are finding it difficult to shake off 'the old man of the sea.'

The eventful year which followed the opening of the 1940-41 session was filled with controversy which resulted in a new director and a new direction to the division. The session closed on 3 June 1941.

From the end of the 1939-40 session through the 1940-41 session, there were 12 editorials in the Norfolk newspaper media, 2 directed at "The Four-Year College Dream," in particular. Also there
were 22 articles of a general nature concerning the division. There were 2 articles containing an endorsement of the four-year college concept by an individual but no endorsement by local organizations. This was a total of 36 editorials and articles, up 30 from 6 previously.
1941-42 Session

In the interval between the end of the 1940-41 session and the beginning of the 1941-42 session, several events occurred of which note should be taken.

President Bryan presented to the Board of Visitors at its meeting on 6 June 1941 his views on the Norfolk Division. He told the board that he had sent Mr. Charles J. Duke, Jr., to head up the Norfolk Division. He was convinced that by virtue of his background, his knowledge of Norfolk, his interest in William and Mary, and his unusual ability as an administrator that he would perform a service of the utmost value to the college by going to Norfolk.

Dr. Hodges's services would be continued in the Extension Division.

President Bryan observed, that as a result of his recent, frequent trips to Norfolk, the situation was much better than it had been for years. The entire administration at Norfolk, which had gotten into a state of laxity and mismanagement, had been remedied. The interest in Norfolk would be discharged by careful and vigorous attention.483

Prior to assuming the Directorship of the Norfolk Division, Mr. Charles J. Duke, Jr., made the following statement to the Norfolk Virginian-Pilot:

In the past, the Division has been principally concerned with the preparation of students for the last two years of college. . . . There are other educational needs which the Division will attempt to provide. . . . The City Council has been invited to appoint an advisory committee to assist the college in the development of the Division. . . . We shall
attempt to expand our present program to include vocational instruction at the junior college level. . . . And to include a general educational program designed to prepare the youth at Norfolk who lack the time or incentive to continue their formal education beyond two years. . . . Establish itself more and more effectively as the chief cultural nerve center of the community it seeks to serve. . . . The community has demonstrated a deep interest in the Division and a willingness to cooperate and help in every way.

In its recommendations submitted to the City Council of Norfolk, the Committee of Five recommended that the council follow the suggestion of President John Stewart Bryan, in that it appoint a permanent and continuing advisory committee of Norfolk citizens with whom the authorities of the college would confer from time to time and work in mutual cooperation for the best interests of The College of William and Mary and its Norfolk Division. This committee would not only be advisory but have the right to inquire and recommend any action that seemed to it appropriate.

In furtherance of the above recommendation, the committee further recommended that instead of creating a committee with advisory and cooperative functions which would be limited to conferences with the authorities of William and Mary, the council create instead a Norfolk Council Committee on Higher Education which would have authority to advise and confer not only with the authorities of William and Mary but also with the authorities of the Virginia Polytechnic Institute and with any other individuals or interests with which, from time to time, the committee might deem it desirable to confer or consult in furtherance of the city's objectives in the field of higher education.
The committee also recommended that the Committee on Higher Education should have an official status comparable in dignity with the Board of Visitors, The College of William and Mary and other educational authorities or foundations that it might be called upon to confer or advise with. This could be effected by passage of a city ordinance for that special purpose.

An article in the *Norfolk Virginian-Pilot* stated that Mr. Charles J. Duke, Jr., saw no possibility of making the Norfolk William and Mary a four-year school. Instead, he thought that the division could be of greater service to the community by spending a like amount of money and adding new practical courses, both in the fields of defense and along other lines.

The minutes of the City Council of Norfolk carried the following on 15 July 1941:

Pursuant to action of the Council on July 8th in approving the recommendation of the City Manager for an ordinance, an ordinance designating, electing, and defining the terms of office and duties of a committee to be known as Norfolk City Council Committee on Higher Education, was this day presented and adopted, by an aye and nay vote, as an Emergency Measure.

The ordinance was passed unanimously.

The ordinance was quoted below:

WHEREAS it is necessary for the daily usual operation of the Department of Education that the hereinafter Committee be immediately designated and elected, an emergency is set forth and declared to exist, pursuant to the provisions of Section 15 of the Norfolk Charter of 1918; therefore,

BE IT ORDAINED by the Council of the City of Norfolk:

Section 1: - That there be and is hereby designated and elected a Committee composed of five citizens of Norfolk to
be known as the Norfolk City Council Committee on Higher Education whose terms of office and duties shall be as herein defined.

Section 2: That two members of the said Committee shall be officers or employees of the City of Norfolk to be designated by the Council with power in the Council to designate at any time their successors or successor, of either of them, the Council now hereby designating as said two members, Dr. H.G. Parker, Director of Public Welfare, and Alfred Anderson, City Attorney. The remaining three members shall be elected by the Council for terms of three years each, except that the three first elected shall be elected for terms of 1, 2, and 3 years, respectively, the following three citizens being hereby elected as members of said Committee, namely: Messrs. W. D. Fauvette, Louis I. Jaffe, and James Mann, to serve in the order named, respectively for 1, 2, and 3 years from July 1, 1941.

Section 3: The duties of the Committee shall be as follows, to wit:

(a) To keep in touch with the affairs of the Norfolk Division of the College of William and Mary in Virginia and Virginia Polytechnic Institute and to report to Council with its recommendations such matters affecting the Division, as in its opinion, should be brought to the attention of the Council and receive its consideration.

(b) To work in mutual cooperation with the authorities and Boards of Visitors of the College of William and Mary and Virginia Polytechnic Institute, and to confer from time to time with the other representatives of the College, and of the V.P.I., and of the Norfolk Division.

In a luncheon meeting speech before the Norfolk Junior Chamber of Commerce, Mr. Charles J. Duke, Jr., expressed the opinion that there were more reasons for a two-year college than for a four-year college. He said that plans were underway which broadened, strengthened, and increased the liberal arts school and added courses in "terminal education" facilities. He also said he hoped to develop a series of lectures on subjects related to philosophy, art, and
music as part of a program to make the college the "cultural center" for this metropolitan area.

The 1941-42 session of The College of William and Mary in Virginia, Norfolk, Virginia, began on 22 September 1941, with no enrollment figures given in the Bulletin or carried in the newspaper media for the year.

As was true for the 1940-41 session, the Advisory Board was continued for the 1941-42 session.

As the 1941-42 session commenced, the Norfolk Division was guided by Mr. Charles J. Duke, Jr., the fourth man to head the school since its beginning in 1930 and the third one to come from The College of William and Mary staff. The College of William and Mary was under the guidance of President John Stewart Bryan.

Mr. Lewis W. Webb, Jr., said the following concerning Mr. Charles J. Duke, Jr.:

He had absolutely no academic background, except for a B.S. from William and Mary in business or something. He didn't pretend to be an academic leader. . . . He was a hard man, and he was sent here to lay down the rules and to see that the rules were enforced. . . . For several years he commuted back and forth. . . . The first year he lived at the beach and devoted quite a bit of time to the division. Then he stated coming down three times a week, twice a week, and he realized he needed someone here, so he appointed me the Assistant Director. I was really the Director because Mr. Duke would only come down or call me up there, and I would report on the conditions and what was going on.

Dr. James W. Miller more or less confirmed Mr. Lewis W. Webb, Jr.'s, observations:

He was a superb administrator, one in whom President Bryan had absolute confidence. . . . He was a man of tremendous energy, and managed to hold down two jobs. He did
his work in Williamsburg and he did his work in Norfolk. I
know he did it superbly here and I presume he did there. One
reason that Mr. Bryan chose him, I think, was Charlie was a
great trouble-shooter. He was Mr. Bryan’s trouble-shooter.
It was a natural appointment for him to make and he wanted to
appoint somebody whom he knew and knew well, so that there
would be a real rapport between both institutions
constantly.

As asked if the appointment of Mr. Charles J. Duke, Jr.,
signified the imposition of a tighter rein on the Norfolk Division by
The College of William and Mary, Mr. Lewis W. Webb, Jr., replied:

If a tighter rein, you mean someone at William and Mary
was looking at the Norfolk Division . . . Mr. Duke was
certainly given the responsibility to look after it
carefully. The academic part of the institution was under no
more scrutiny than ever. Of course, the whole question was
an academic one, but they never sent anyone down to really
examine the academic role of the institution. The faculty
here were still permitted to select their text and their
courses and proceed as usual.

The Board of Visitors scheduled the first meeting in its
history to be held at the Norfolk Division on 13 September 1941.
According to the Norfolk Virginian-Pilot, the meeting was viewed by
local observers as an implication of better times for the division.
The City Council Committee on Higher Education was invited to attend.
A tour of the division’s facilities was scheduled. The board meeting
was characterized as a special session which considered the needs of
the local division and a program for its future operation which
served the demands of the community. The meeting was regarded as a
step toward fulfillment of the objects of a resolution adopted by the
board in the spring of 1941, namely, enlargement of the present
educational program at the division.

At the above meeting, the board devoted itself to the reports
and recommendations relating to the current session of the Norfolk Division. It dealt with organization of the faculty, organization of the administration, registration, the Norfolk Advisory Committee, Civil Pilot Training Program, defense courses, V.P.I., physical improvements, financial matters, and recommendations.

The Norfolk Virginian-Pilot reported that the board was very interested in the defense work of the division. It quoted Dr. Bryan to the effect that plans for the Norfolk Division were being laid with a long-range view for the welfare of the community. He felt that the evidence of increased enrollment was impressive; however, the board did not plan to change the fundamental liberal arts background at the division. President Bryan declared that while the promise of enlargement in all fields of activity was impressive, nothing had changed the board's idea of the value of a strong foundation in history, science, literature, and the languages. The board expressed itself as hopeful for the future of Norfolk, particularly in view of the hearty and generous aid tendered by the Norfolk Council Committee on Higher Education.

Dr. William T. Hodges was appointed, according to the Norfolk Virginian-Pilot, to the position of Executive Director of the Hampton Roads Regional Defense Council. To take this position he was granted a leave of absence from the Norfolk Division, The College of William and Mary, which took effect Saturday, 20 September 1941. His new appointment took effect 1 October 1941. Although his office was in downtown Norfolk, he was still available, as needed by Mr. Charles
J. Duke, Jr., to counsel the latter on problems at the division as they arose.

As further evidence of the increased interest in the Norfolk Division by The College of William and Mary, President Bryan participated in a convocation exercise held at the Norfolk Division on 3 October 1941.

During and after the Bryan vs. Hodges Affair, there were disquieting rumors to the effect that the Association of American Universities and the American Association of Junior Colleges had somehow gotten wind of the grade-fixing scandal at the Norfolk Division. They were seriously considering investigating the situation. The Association of American Universities considered suspension of The College of William and Mary from its approved list. In his report on the Bryan vs. Hodges Affair, Mr. Robert C. McClelland said:

With respect to altered academic records . . . a representative of the American Association of Universities had made an unofficial visit to the campus and had conferred with Dr. Gray and other faculty members concerning the operation and standards of the college. The representative told them that the faculty should inform Dean Miller in Williamsburg.

In a telephone conversation with President Bryan on 2 April 1941, Dr. George A. Works confided the following to Dr. Bryan with respect to the Hodges Affair: "Recognition will be withdrawn if the action becomes known and tolerated."

In a telegram to Dr. Kenneth Eels of the American Association of Junior Colleges, President Bryan acknowledged the former's desire
to come to Williamsburg to conduct a preliminary discussion with reference to the problems of the Norfolk Division.

The following letter to President Bryan from Mr. Frank Bowles, Secretary, Committee on the Classification of Universities and Colleges, Association of American Universities came, therefore, as no complete surprise but, nevertheless, was completely shocking:

It is with real regret that I write you that the Committee on the Classification of Universities has voted to suspend the College of William and Mary from the approved list of the Association of American Universities.

A subcommittee consisting of Dean Pierson, Dean Richardson, and Mr. Bowles has been delegated to discuss with the college the reasons for the committee's action and to suggest steps that might be taken in the event the college wishes to regain its place on the approved list.

The foregoing letter came as a complete shock to President Bryan. His administration had been characterized as one which had emphasized an increased emphasis on academic attainment at The College of William and Mary, as well as the development of its physical plant. The suspension, despite its motive for imposition rooted in the grade-fixing scandal at the Norfolk Division, placed the entire William and Mary academic structure in jeopardy. Although the college in Williamsburg was above reproach, it was, nevertheless, responsible for the activities of its Norfolk Division.

Early in November 1941 President Bryan received a letter from Dean Pierson of the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill. The letter is quoted in full below:

I write in accordance with my promise of yesterday to make a summary statement of the reasons for the action of the Committee on Classification of the Universities and Colleges
of the Association of American Universities. This statement is for information and is drawn up at your request. Since I have not had opportunity or occasion to consult with my colleagues, Dean Richardson and Mr. Bowles, I think it but right to say that it is an expression of my opinion and not necessarily of theirs. I think I should ask you to regard what I say as unofficial.

The reasons for the action of the Committee, as I understand them, were as follows:

1. The Norfolk Division.

   (a) The Hodges incident placed in question the validity of the official records of the Division. The Committee had difficulty in judging how far the administration, the faculty at Norfolk, and the citizens of Norfolk condemned the conduct of Dean Hodges.

   (b) The steps taken in correction of the situation at Norfolk, precisely the relation of Mr. Hodges to the Norfolk Division, was left in doubt. According to what was reported to the Committee, Mr. Hodges was granted a leave of absence but maintained a relationship to the Division. It was reported to the Committee that Mr. Hodges would continue his residence in Norfolk and that, during intervals of absence of the new Dean from the Norfolk campus, he would represent the Dean in the local administration.

2. Support of Divisions.

   The Committee on Classification had had a report on William and Mary some four years ago in which, with reference to Norfolk, the library situation had been adversely criticized. This Division at the time was more than a junior college, often had third-year students in attendance. For the use of the student body an inadequate library was provided. The library situation at that time was described as indefensible. Reference was made to the laboratories, the equipment for sciences, and to the differential in salaries that worked against the faculty of the Division. According to reports available to the Committee this year, little or nothing has been accomplished with reference to conditions thus described at Norfolk.

3. The Administration with reference to the College at Williamsburg and to the Divisions.
The educational services at Williamsburg were not under review and did not enter into the decision of the Committee. Consideration, however, was taken of the administration. Reference was made to the occupation of the President in both journalism and education with a resultant separation of interests and labora. The question arose as to the need for greater administrative supervision of the Divisions so as to effect a greater measure of administrative accountability. Consideration was given to the personality, academic training, and administrative powers and activities of Mr. Duke. Consideration was taken of the criticisms of Mr. Duke, as well as of opinions in support of him. The Committee considered the designation of Mr. Duke as Dean of the Norfolk Division as the placement of an educational financier in a position calling for an educator as well as an administrator. I think I am right in saying that they considered Mr. Duke's appointment to the Norfolk Division as being under the circumstances unfortunate.

4. I believe that the Committee considered the conditions as reported entailed upon the College and its administration a most careful and searching scrutiny of the Divisions at Norfolk and Richmond. It was, I believe, the judgment of the Committee that administrative accountability to the College or the Division at Norfolk should be established on secure ground.

I wish to repeat, President Bryan, that these are statements of what I consider to have been the most important reasons for action of the Committee. These statements, I again say, do not represent necessarily the judgment of my associates on the special subcommittee. And again I wish to say that it was with sincere regret and with pain at heart that the members of the general committee acted in the matter.

It appeared from the foregoing letter that the grade-fixing scandal was not the only basis for the suspension. Dissatisfaction with the division's library facilities and the manner in which William and Mary administered the division were other bases cited. A question with regard to Mr. Duke's appointment to head the division was also raised, as was reference to the division's laboratories and science equipment. Faculty salaries were also questioned.
A little over one month after Dean W. W. Pierson's letter and one day before the attack on Pearl Harbor, President Bryan issued a statement to the press concerning William and Mary's suspension by the American Association of Universities. He stated that official grounds for the action had not been made known but that it was understood that the sole cause of complaint was dissatisfaction on the part of the A.A.U. with conditions at the Norfolk Division. He expressed confidence that The College of William and Mary would meet at once any requirements for libraries, laboratories, or other academic needs laid down by the A.A.U. President Bryan pointed out that while the college had been withdrawn from the "A.A.U. List," it would not affect membership in and accreditation of the college by the established rating association in its own geographical area, namely, the Southern Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools. President Bryan further noted that while The College of William and Mary had been suspended by the A.A.U., it had not been dropped. He sought to quell the fears of the student body; he stated that there was not the slightest reason for the students at William and Mary to be upset. There had been nothing lost that would in any way impair the value of degrees granted by the college. The admission of William and Mary graduates to graduate and professional schools did not rest upon recognition by the A.A.U. but upon membership in the Southern Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools. William and Mary held membership in the association without any qualification.

Three days later followed a letter from Mr. Frank H. Bowles
to President Bryan. No mention was made of the United States being at war. The letter quoted in part follows:

I have not heard from Deans Richardson and Pierson and am therefore writing to give you my own digest of the conversation.

The main topic was the Norfolk Division. So far as Dean Hodges was concerned, it was stated that there should be complete severance of his relation to the College. It was stated that provision must be made for adequate support of the Norfolk Division and that it should have responsible leadership. The Committee's representatives were not satisfied with the present arrangement between Messrs. Duke and Miller dividing their time between Williamsburg and Norfolk and a third man as chairman of the Faculty, sharing administrative responsibilities with them. . . .

President Bryan gave the Board of Visitors, The College of William and Mary a detailed report on 13 December 1941 of the suspension by the Association of American Universities. He stated, that immediately upon receiving Mr. Bowles's letter of 30 October 1941, he tried to reach him and Dean Richardson by telephone, but they were both out west. He reached Dean Pierson, who in response to his earnest plea, wrote him a letter on 5 November 1941. He further talked with a Dr. James S. Wilson, University of Virginia, on 10 November 1941 who said that he had been told at the annual meeting of the A.A.U. that nothing but a complete repudiation of Dr. Hodges would satisfy the association. On 11 November 1941 he drove to Chapel Hill, North Carolina, and met with Dean Pierson for nearly four hours and discussed the accreditation problem. On 15 November 1941 he met in New York City with the A.A.U.'s Committee, namely, Dean Richardson, Dean Pierson, and Mr. Bowles. Dean Richardson's position was that while Dr. Hodges was on a leave of absence from the
division and worked for the United States Government he was, nevertheless, a potential executive officer. To his statement that Dr. Hodges was not an executive officer and had not been since the close of the controversy, Dean Richardson replied that Mr. Duke had made a statement wherein he said that Dr. Hodges had consented to serve as his assistant and that in his absence he would act for him. Although President Bryan countered that Mr. Duke was not authorized to make such a statement, that he did not intend it, and that Dr. Hodges had not acted on it, the committee had the impression that Dr. Hodges's connection with the college had not been definitely and completely severed. President Bryan defended Mr. Duke before the committee, in that the latter had gotten the faculty at Norfolk to pull together in a way that they had never done, namely, they came to his house and he went to see them, the faculty met once a week, and for the first time in its history the faculty acted as a unit when it approached the problems of education and administration. To his pointed question as to what was wrong, they replied that it was Dr. Hodges and the library. With reference to the library, President Bryan reported to the committee that The College of William and Mary had asked the Virginia General Assembly for $2,000 for the library in the next budget. He stated that he had also asked $15,000 for equalization of faculty salaries. When queried as to specifically what conditions had to be met in order for The College of William and Mary to be restored to the "A.A.U. Accredited List," the committee replied that Dr. Hodges must go and there would have to be better
administrative accountability set up between Norfolk and Williamsburg. The committee stated that they would send someone down later in the winter or early in the spring to see how things were going.

The Board of Visitors moved and adopted a motion that the Rector, J. Gordon Bohannon, discuss with Dr. Hodges his connection with the college and that he explain to him that the board had been informed that the continuance of his connection with the college, even on a leave of absence, was a factor which adversely affected William and Mary's status with the Association of American Universities.

The onset of World War II came home forcibly to the Norfolk Division, located nearby to the largest concentration of military bases in the United States. The Norfolk Virginian-Pilot carried an article which pointed out that a sweeping reorganization of the Norfolk Division was carried out which placed the division on a war footing. A twelve-month college year was in place which telescoped and accelerated the curricula, expanded flight training instruction, and provided additional services to the public.

At the Board of Visitors meeting on 13 February 1942, it was made public that Dr. Hodges had refused to make a decision with reference to relinquishing his leave of absence unless and until all other causes for the disaccreditation had been removed. As a consequence of this, the board declared its desire to meet with the Classification Committee of the American Association of Universities.
at once in order to clarify every difference between the A.A.U. and William and Mary. It further desired that William and Mary be afforded an immediate opportunity to remove any and every condition which prevented the restoration of William and Mary to the approved list.\textsuperscript{511}

President Bryan reported to the board that in spite of certain grounds for complaint against the Norfolk Division, the compelling and final cause for the suspension of William and Mary by the Association of American Universities was the fact that Dr. W. T. Hodges had not been definitely repudiated by The College of William and Mary. He felt that as soon as the Hodges's matter was settled there would be no question as to the restoration of William and Mary to the "Accredited List of the A.A.U." He further reported that the United Chapters of Phi Beta Kappa had written and said that it would be impossible for them to carry out their acceptance of the invitation to hold their Triennial at William and Mary in September 1942 if the college was not restored to the list of accredited institutions by the A.A.U.\textsuperscript{512}

Dr. Hodges's position of Executive Officer, Hampton Roads Regional Defense Council, was abolished on 1 March 1942.\textsuperscript{513} Apparently, he wrote to Mr. J. Gordon Bohannon on 9 April 1942 with regard to the relinquishment of his leave of absence status. He also wrote on 21 April 1942 to advise the rector of his desire to return to The College of William and Mary for active work as soon as possible.\textsuperscript{514}
On February 1942 Rector J. Gordon Bohannon of the Board of Visitors wrote to "Billy" Hodges in the following manner:

I cannot say to you that your present status is, or that your return to active duty with the College of William and Mary would be, the only obstacle in the way of reaccreditation of the College by the Association. But I believe that I can say to you that the other matters are being adjusted, that they will be satisfactorily adjusted, and that the College will be reaccredited, provided some satisfactory solution can be made of the situation so far as it concerns you. And I feel that I should say to you, quite frankly, that from the information which has come to me it appears that, should you return to the College for active work, your connection with the College would be a factor adversely affecting the status of William and Mary with the American Association of Universities and Colleges and would, in all probability, prevent the restoration of the College to the accredited list.

In a memorandum on a conference between President Bryan and Dean W. W. Pierson on 31 March 1942, the following was borne out:

Dean Pierson stated, 'We did not drop William and Mary from the A.A.U. list on account of R.P.I. . . .'

I am sure that Dean Pierson meant to say in part that the suspension was due almost entirely to Hodges.

Dean Pierson said that he had no doubt that the entire situation, so far as Norfolk is concerned, can be adjusted immediately the Hodges question is settled.

Since Phi Beta Kappa depends on grades, how can the falsification of grades not be a serious blow to Phi Beta Kappa?

On 8 April 1942 Dr. Hodges tendered his resignation from any connection with The College of William and Mary with the following letter addressed to the rector:

In lieu of my recent request for restoration to active duty in the service of William and Mary, I now request that
my long period of service be terminated by a retirement arrangement based upon a stipend sufficient to provide Mrs. Hodges and myself a reasonable subsistence.

My reason for this request is advice from my physicians that I am in a precarious state of health and wholly unfit for active duty; and I am advised by friends that such a retirement arrangement should be feasible and appropriate.

President Bryan reported to the Board of Visitors on the conferences with the Sub-Committee of the Committee on Classification of the Association of American Universities in Norfolk and Richmond on 1-3 April 1942 with the following observations:

On April 1, 2, and 3, 1942, I conferred with Dean R. G. D. Richardson of Brown University, Dean W. W. Pierson of the University of North Carolina, and Mr. Frank H. Bowles, Secretary of the Committee on Classification.

On Tuesday evening, March 31, Dean Pierson, Dean James Wilkinson Miller and I conferred...

On Wednesday, April 1, Dean Miller and Mr. Charles J. Duke met Dean Richardson and Dean Pierson at the Norfolk Division.

Wednesday night Dean Pierson, Dean Richardson, and Dean Miller came to the President's house...

Thursday morning Mr. Frank H. Bowles arrived in Williamsburg, and conferred with the faculty at William and Mary, and with the other two members of the sub-committee drove to Richmond, where we met and conferred with the Rector of the Board of Visitors, Mr. J. Gordon Bohannon, and Judge Oscar L. Shewmake...

Friday Mr. Bowles, Dean Pierson, Dean Miller, and I spent the entire day with Dean Hibbs at the Richmond Professional Institute...

The sub-committee expressed the opinion that they were not concerned with what the College of William and Mary did or did not do with Dr. Hodges so long as his connection with the College was definitely terminated...
Nothing occurred which would in any way alter their conviction that the restoration of the College of William and Mary was impossible if any official connection were maintained with Dr. Hodges.

The committee told me that they had no doubt that William and Mary would be restored to the accredited list.

The Board of Visitors was stunned by President Bryan's intention to resign 1 July 1942. The board forthwith elected President Bryan by acclamation to the ancient office of Chancellor of The College of William and Mary, in order that the college might benefit from his wisdom, counsel, and general interest.

According to the Norfolk Virginian-Pilot, President Bryan gave as his reason for resigning, namely, the pressure of private business. In his elevation to chancellor, he was selected for an office held previously only by four native-born Americans, namely, George Washington, Hugh Blair Grigsby, and John Tyler. He was the fifteenth chancellor of The College of William and Mary.

Besides the pressure of private business, the increased responsibilities brought on by World War II and its effect on The College of William and Mary must have weighed heavily upon him. It was possible, too, that the grade-fixing scandal and the subsequent loss of accreditation had somewhat blunted his efforts which had included the improvement of William and Mary's academic reputation. Dean James W. Miller did not think the scandal at the Norfolk Division had anything to do with his resignation. He was of the following opinion:

Mr. Bryan was born in '71 and now in '42 he would have been 71 years old, and he died in just two years later. I
think he wasn't well. I think he felt the end coming... An old man who is sick is going to retire whether its best for the college or not.

The Flat Hat of 22 April 1942 confirmed that President Bryan's resignation was due to the pressure of war. President Bryan explained that the pressure of business matters arising out of the war was the immediate reason for his resignation.

An editorial in the Norfolk Virginian-Pilot also hinted at a possible reason for President Bryan's resignation. The editorial said that Mr. Bryan's stewardship at Williamsburg fell in a period that was dominated by depression, preparedness for war, and ultimately war itself. It was, therefore, not an ideal period in which to give full effect to the particular reorientation of William and Mary's mission that Mr. Bryan was at pains to define in his inaugural address. A time of peace was needed for that.

The following agreement was reached in May 1942 by President Bryan, The College of William and Mary and President Burruss, Virginia Polytechnic Institute:

The Norfolk Division now has a definite budget, established as a distinct section of the budget of the College of William and Mary. The Norfolk Division now has the responsibility of standing on its own feet within its established budget...

It is agreed:

(1) ACADEMIC STANDARDS:

The College of William and Mary accepts the responsibility for maintaining standards and acceptable teaching loads and administering the Division in accordance with the standards required by accrediting agencies, it being understood that V.P.I.'s authority over curricula, teaching loads, and standards in its fields is in
no wise reduced or impaired and that V.P.I. desires to cooperate in the maintenance of approved standards.

(2) SALARY PAYMENTS:

For purposes of faculty harmony and unity it is desirable that faculty rates of pay be reasonably uniform and that the faculty be paid on the same basis. . . .

(3) APPOINTMENTS, PROMOTIONS, RANK, ETC.:

In order to promote faculty harmony and unity, it is desirable that appointments, promotions in rank, and salary increases be made on a uniform basis. . . .

(4) CURRICULA AND PROGRAMS:

Each institution shall retain general supervision and authority over all curricula and programs of study in their respective fields.

At its meeting on 30 May 1942, the Board of Visitors, in order that there be a clear and concise statement of its policy with reference to the Norfolk Division and of the relationship of the Norfolk Division to the mother college in Williamsburg, adopted a restatement of the policy unanimously adopted by the board at its 10 May 1941 meeting.

At no time during the time from the end of the 1940-41 session through the 1941-42 session was a four-year college advocated or endorsed by Mr. Charles J. Duke, Jr., any of the newspaper media, any citizen of Norfolk or the surrounding Tidewater Area, or by any local fraternal or professional organization.

The Norfolk newspaper media carried a total of 14 editorials and 34 articles of general interest regarding the Norfolk Division.
This was a total of 48 editorials and articles, up 12 from 36 previously.

The 1942-42 session drew to a close on 5 June 1942.
1942-43 Session

In the period of time between the end of the 1941-42 session and the beginning of the 1942-43 session, several events occurred of importance to the Norfolk Division.

First and foremost was the selection by the Board of Visitors of Dr. John Edwin Pomfret of Vanderbilt University to be the twenty-first President of The College of William and Mary. The Norfolk Virginian-Pilot of 18 August 1942 carried an announcement of his selection. The article stated that Dr. Pomfret at the time of his selection was the Dean of the Senior College of Arts and Sciences of the Graduate School at Vanderbilt University. Dr. Pomfret held a Ph.D., M.A., and B.A. from the University of Pennsylvania, where he was also elected to Phi Beta Kappa. His teaching experience included the Universities of South Carolina, Rochester, and Iowa; Florida State College for Women; and Princeton and Vanderbilt Universities. The committee of the Board of Visitors that nominated Dr. Pomfret held the belief that he possessed the qualifications important and essential to the leadership of the college. They believed that he would earn and receive the cooperation and respect of the faculty and that the student body would be pleased with a man of his character and qualifications. He had the education and the experience in teaching and administration, suitable for a competent man in the administration of the college. The committee further felt that Dr. Pomfret's qualifications were most needed at William and Mary rather
than talent in expansion, the construction of buildings and in the
increase of numbers. 527

The latter statement tended to bear out the contention that
what William and Mary most desired in its next president was not
another John Stewart Bryan.

The Board of Visitors minutes for 2 September 1942 contained
a letter from Mr. Alexander Hamilton Frey of the Law School,
University of Pennsylvania, dated 4 June 1942, to the Executive
Committee, Association of American Law Schools, in which he quoted
Dean Richardson of the Association of American Universities as
follows:

The Norfolk Branch was left to go its own way without
proper supervision, the library was neglected, salaries
remained at too low a level owing to neglect, there was no
adequate program for advice to students. Above all there
were slackness and gross irregularities in administration.
These defects are in process of rectification; money has been
appropriated by the legislature, the faculties at Norfolk and
Williamsburg cooperate there has been a new and energetic
head appointed. But only a beginning has been made, even if
it is an auspicious beginning. The whole relation of the
branch to the parent institution needs clarification. And
the arrangement by which Virginia Polytechnic participates in
the instruction at Norfolk needs regularization. War
instruction outweighs the regular day work at Norfolk and
accentuates the problems.

The 1942-43 session of the Norfolk Division of the College of
William and Mary and the Virginia Polytechnic Institute began on 21
September 1942. 529 While the Bulletin carried no statement of
official enrollment, the Norfolk Virginian-Pilot stated that there
was an enrollment of about 300 in the day school, a figure about
equal to the 1942-42 session. Mr. Duke said that he was highly
encouraged in view of the general falling off of about twenty-eight percent in enrollment among all colleges throughout the United States. 530

For the first time since the 1930-31 session, the Advisory Board, Norfolk Division was not listed in the Bulletin. 531

As the 1942-43 session began, a newly appointed President, Dr. John Edwin Pomfret, the twenty-first President of The College of William and Mary, directed the fortunes of the mother college. Mr. Charles J. Duke, Jr., remained as Head of the Norfolk Division. 532

President Pomfret received welcome news on 4 November 1942 from Mr. Frank H. Bowles, Secretary, the Association of American Universities. He wrote the following:

I am very happy to inform you that the Committee on the Classification of Universities and Colleges will recommend to the Association the restoration of the College of William and Mary to the approved list of the Association of American Universities. The Committee felt that the College had shown the fullest evidence of good faith and disposition to improve its academic standards by the manner in which it had moved to meet the criticism that had been made by the Committee. It is probable that the Committee will at a later date ask for further report from the College as to its progress, giving particular attention to the relations between the College at Williamsburg and its divisions at Norfolk and Richmond.

In closing, may I again express the pleasure of the Committee that this action has been possible. 533

While The College of William and Mary had concerned itself with reaccreditation by the Association of American Universities and had taken all the necessary steps for restoration to the approved list, the question of accreditation of the Norfolk Division as a junior college had also arisen. On 9 November 1942 Mr. J. R. McCain,
President of Agnes Scott College, Decatur, Georgia, and Chairman, Special Committee of the Southern Association of Junior Colleges wrote the following to President Pomfret:

If the institution at Norfolk is a junior college, as I understand, according to Standard 15 of our Association it should have independent membership in the Southern Association as a junior college.

On 14 November 1942 President J. R. McCain again wrote to President Pomfret as follows:

I am quite sure it will be important that we have a conference in Memphis, probably on the first day of the meeting, November 30th.

I do not note that any steps have been taken to have your Norfolk branch accredited as a junior college by our Association.

On 17 November 1942 President Pomfret wrote President McCain the following letter:

Dean Hoke tells me that the Norfolk Division has never made formal application for accreditation as a junior college. I was a little confused, because I had discovered that the Norfolk Division was listed as a junior college on page 337 of Eall's 'American Junior Colleges.' Apparently, Dean Hodges before his retirement had sent this material in to Mr. Ealls in answer to a questionnaire.

I see no reason why the Norfolk Division should not apply for accreditation as a junior college in the Southern Association if you think this would be desirable. I believe we can meet all requirements listed under STANDARDS FOR JUNIOR COLLEGES.

I believe the main reason for not considering separate accreditation as a junior college is that most of the Norfolk students continuing their course move into the junior class at Williamsburg. Another possible reason for not acting has been the affiliation in pre-engineering which has been carried on for some years in collaboration with the Virginia Polytechnic Institute. In a large urban center like Norfolk it is essential that both the liberal arts and technical programs be available for the young men of that city.
State cannot afford to maintain two physical plants and two administrative staffs. I do not know how your accrediting group would feel about this type of affiliation, but I suppose there is really nothing new in affiliating arrangements any longer. . . .

Another indication of William and Mary's pending, imminent reaccreditation was the following letter from Mr. Fernandus Payne, Chairman, Committee on the Classification of Universities and Colleges, Association of American Universities:

I can tell you . . . that the Committee has recommended to the Association that the College of William and Mary be restored to the list. This, of course, does not become official until the Association gives its final approval. I have no doubt, however, but that approval will in the end be given. . . .

The 19 November 1942 issue of the Norfolk Virginian-Pilot stated in an article that the Norfolk City Council Committee on Higher Education had recommended and City Manager, Mr. Charles B. Borland, had included in his 1943 Budget, to be submitted to the city council, provisions for 20 scholarships of $4,000 each at the Norfolk Division for high school graduates of the area who could qualify for them by high scholastic standards and were in need of financial help.

In a letter to President J. R. McCain on 25 November 1942, President Pomfret raised an interesting question. He quoted a letter of Mr. Charles J. Duke, Jr., who had written to Dr. Eells, Executive Secretary of the American Association of Junior Colleges. He had written 1 July 1942 to Dr. Eells and had asked his opinion if it would be desirable to have the Norfolk Division accredited separately as a junior college. Dr. Eells had replied as follows:
I am a little uncertain what to suggest with reference to separate accreditation of the Norfolk Division, since it would seem on the face of it to be unnecessary. In the case of the Southern Association and the North Central Association ... accreditation of a parent institution is supposed to include that of off-campus branches as well. In the other regional associations branches are subject to accreditation independently.

I do not know that the Southern Association would even consider accrediting you separately, in view of their stated policy as indicated above.

He pointed out to President McCain that if Dr. Eells was correct, he [McCain] was suggesting the desirability of following a course of action contrary to the policy of the Southern Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools with respect to the accreditation of junior colleges. President Pomfret suggested to President McCain that the issue should be cleared up before any further steps were taken in having separate accreditation. 539

Upon his return from a meeting in Memphis, Tennessee, President Pomfret on 9 December 1942 dashed off a short letter to Mr. Fernandus Payne of the Graduate School at Indiana University. In the letter he related the following:

Thanks to the action of your committee I came off very well, since the Southern took no action aside from requesting that the Norfolk Division make application for approval as a junior college. . . .

The news The College of William and Mary had eagerly awaited arrived on 12 December 1942. Mr. Fernandus Payne wrote President Pomfret the following:

I am writing to inform you that finally the recommendation of the Committee on Classification has been approved by the Association itself, and so now I notify you officially that the College of William and Mary has been
restored to the approved list of the Association of American Universities.

The College of William and Mary's academic house was at last in order, but the question of accreditation of the Norfolk Division as a junior college remained pending.

The Norfolk Virginian-Pilot carried an article to the effect that the Norfolk Division had also been restored to the list. According to Mr. Charles J. Duke, Jr., action of the American Association of Universities which suspended the Williamsburg institution affected the Norfolk Division similarly. He expressed gratification at the restoration of the division to the approved list. 542

In his report to the Board of Visitors on 6 March 1943, President Pomfret stated that as of 12 December 1942 the college had been formally restored to the approved list of the American Association of Universities. In order to maintain the standing of William and Mary with the accrediting association, President Pomfret had agreed to undertake certain readjustments, among which was the accreditation of the Norfolk Division by the Southern Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools as a junior college. 543

On 17 March 1943 President Pomfret wrote to Dr. M. C. Huntley, Executive Secretary, Commission on Institutions of Higher Education, Southern Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools as follows:

I wrote you on December 7 about the possibility of having an inspection of the Norfolk Division of the College of
William and Mary for accreditation as a junior college in the Southern Association.

As you know, I promised the Executive Committee of the Southern Association that I would make an effort during this academic year to have the inspection made, and that I would report back to that committee within a reasonable time.

During the 1942-43 session, President Pomfret issued a "Memorandum of the Status of the Norfolk Division with Respect to the Southern Association Standards for Junior Colleges." The memorandum devoted itself to a statement of principles, organization, entrance requirements, graduation, faculty, instruction, teaching load, instructional expenditures, the library, laboratories, physical plant, student personnel work, extracurricular activities, general tone of the institution, record of transfer students, and association survey.

Ever since it opened in 1930, the Norfolk Division had never officially recognized the completion of its two years of college work. Now, for the first time, the division awarded completion certificates to those eligible for them.

Once again, Mr. Charles J. Duke, Jr., was silent on the feasibility and advisability of a four-year college for Norfolk, as were Norfolk leaders, fraternal and professional organizations, and the newspaper media.

From the end of the 1941-42 session through the 1942-43 session, the Norfolk newspaper media contained 6 editorials and 24 articles of general interest to the division. This was a total of 30 editorials and articles, down 18 from 48 previously.
The 1942-43 session came to a close on 30 May 1942 with commencement exercises held in the Larchmont School Auditorium. Dean James W. Miller of The College of William and Mary was the principal speaker.
Several days following the close of the 1942-43 session, the Board of Visitors met on 4 June 1943. Included in the report of President Pomfret for the 1942-43 session were the following comments:

Peace has been made with the Association of American Universities, with the Southern Association of Colleges, with Phi Beta Kappa, and, I hope, with the American Association of University Women. Thanks to the able and tactful work on the part of the Director of the Norfolk Division a really deplorable condition has been quickly remedied, and if the College of William and Mary is not of good odor in the Norfolk community today, I am a very poor judge.

September 20, 1943, marked the beginning of the 1943-44 session of the Norfolk Division of The College of William and Mary and the Virginia Polytechnic Institute. While the Bulletin did not contain any statement of enrollment, the Norfolk Virginian-Pilot reported an enrollment of 220 day students, down considerably from the 1942-43 session. The Council Committee on Higher Education in Norfolk, first listed in the 1942 Bulletin, was continued for the 1943-44 session.

President Pomfret was the Chief Administrative Officer of The College of William and Mary for the 1943-44 session, while the Norfolk Division Director was Mr. Charles J. Duke, Jr.

Governor Colgate W. Darden's proposed budget provided for $20,000 per year for maintenance and operating costs for the Norfolk Division, which, until two years ago, received nothing for this purpose from the state.

The effort on the part of The College of William and Mary to
gain full accreditation and membership for the Norfolk Division as a junior college in the Southern Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools was temporarily held in abeyance as of 27 October 1943. Dr. M. C. Huntley, Executive Secretary of the Association, sent President Pomfret the following letter:

Since there is to be no regular meeting of the Association this year the Council of the Higher Commission has decided that it will not transact business as usual, nor entertain applications for membership. There is no plan at present for the Council of the Commission to hold a meeting this year. President Harris suggests that under these circumstances it would be well for you to defer the report on the College of William and Mary until next year, or such time as the Association has a regularly scheduled meeting.

I had planned to send you report forms for the Norfolk Division and bring a committee to the College later in the fall for a study of that situation. Since there will be no formal action on the part of the Commission I think it would be best of us to defer this matter until another year.

Nothing of much importance occurred during the 1943-44 session. The Norfolk Division and The College of William and Mary were both caught up in the war effort. Not much of what they did reached the newspaper media, was reflected in official correspondence, nor was in the official minutes of the Board of Visitors. President Pomfret appeared not to be a "man of record," as was true of his predecessors. In other words he carried on much of the business of his presidency, with a minimum of letters, memoranda, and minutes.

While the war undoubtedly had its effect, nothing was said by Mr. Charles J. Duke, Jr., in the newspaper media or by local leaders and local fraternal and professional organizations concerning a four-
year college for Norfolk. The Norfolk newspaper media, nevertheless, carried 4 editorials and 16 articles of general interest to the division. This was a total of 20 articles, down 10 from 30 previously.

The 1943-44 session came to a close with final convocation exercises held on 27 May 1944 in the Larchmont School Auditorium.
1944-45 Session

In the interim between the 1943-44 and 1944-45 sessions, the Norfolk Virginian-Pilot carried an article which announced that the Associate in Arts Diploma would be awarded for the first time at the close of the 1944-45 session. It marked the first time that a diploma was given by any junior college in existence. The diploma to be granted by the division marked the formal recognition of graduation and marked one more step in the alignment of the college with similar institutions all over the country and added one more attractive feature to the local institution of higher learning. 556

The 1944-45 session opened on 20 September 1944 of the Norfolk Division, College of William and Mary, Virginia Polytechnic Institute. 557 Neither the Bulletin nor the newspaper media carried any announcement of the student enrollment for the 1944-45 session.

Because of the acute paper shortage and because of the relatively few changes in the college organization and curriculum, the Norfolk Division did not issue a catalogue for the 1944-45 session. The information contained in the catalogue for 1943-44 applied, except for the changes and additions noted in a pamphlet for 1944-45. 558

Based upon the above, the assumption was that the Council Committee on Higher Education in Norfolk was continued.

Once again, the chief posts of The College of William and Mary and the Norfolk Division were held by President John Edwin
Pomfret and Director Charles J. Duke, Jr., respectively, based upon paragraph one above.

An editorial in the *Norfolk Virginian-Pilot* on 2 October 1944 said the following:

A public educational facility unique in Virginia and peculiarly responsive to the times will come into being with the establishment . . . at the Norfolk Division of William and Mary-V.P.I. of a vocational school as an affiliate of the Division. There is at present no such school in the State. . . .

Announcement of the new affiliate . . . notes that it follows the recommendations in June 1941 of a special committee of the William and Mary Board of Visitors. Among these was the recommendation that the liberal arts courses now being given at the Division be supplemented by the incorporation in the curriculum of (a) vocational instruction adapted to the abilities of the students and needs of the Norfolk Division and (b) terminal courses best suited to those students who do not intend to pursue their college work beyond the work of the Norfolk Division. . . . Establishment of the vocational school . . . will put all the recommendations of the college board into effect. . . .

In his report to the Board of Visitors on the academic session of 1944-45, President Pomfret reported that former President and Chancellor of The College of William and Mary, John Stewart Bryan, had passed away on 16 October 1944.

He further reported that the division had a loyal and enterprising faculty with a spirit of initiative that prevailed there and that the citizens of Norfolk should take real pride in the achievements of the division. The division has always reached outward in its efforts to sense and provide the educational needs of Metropolitan Norfolk. It has achieved a unique personality of its
own. As a result, the division was one of the outstanding junior colleges in the United States. 561

While the war in Europe ended in April 1945, the effects of the war continued to be felt during the 1944-45 session. Little of what happened at the division appeared in the newspaper media, board minutes, and official correspondence.

Mr. Charles J. Duke, Jr., local newspaper media, local leaders, and local fraternal and professional organizations were once again silent on a four-year college for Norfolk.

The end of the 1943-44 session through the 1944-45 session saw no change in the total coverage by the Norfolk newspapers. There were 4 editorials and 16 articles of general interest to the division. This was a total of 20 editorials and articles which marked no change from the previous year.

The 1944-45 session closed on 5 June 1945 with commencement exercises held in the Larchmont School Auditorium. 562
1945-46 Session

A Norfolk Virginian-Pilot editorial on 6 June 1945 noted that the reorientation of the division which included vocational training had transformed it into a junior college primarily concerned with a two-year terminal education. Of a secondary nature was the preparation of students who continued their liberal arts studies in other colleges. The editorial stated that in its early years the division was a kind of educational outpost, its future no more secure than the favor of the parent institution. There followed a kind of colonial period in which the Norfolk Division struggled to serve a body which grew swiftly, with only nominal assistance from the parent institution. There was some concern in Williamsburg that the colony could become a competitor of the founding educational sovereignty. President Pomfret reported that the Norfolk Division must be regarded to have passed from a colonial status to a dominion status. The editorial concluded with the statement that the division's "dominion" status challenged the educational statesmanship of William and Mary to make the division a great dominion. 563

The war with Japan and World War II ended in August 1945.

September 21, 1945, saw the beginning of the 1945-46 session of The College of William and Mary and the Virginia Polytechnic Institute in Norfolk. 564 As was the case in the 1944-45 session, neither the Bulletin nor the newspaper media carried any announcement of the student enrollment for the 1945-46 session.
The Council Committee on Higher Education in Norfolk continued to be listed in the Bulletin. The College of William and Mary was once again under the tutelage of President Pomfret while Director Duke guided the Norfolk Division.

With World War II ended the feeling for a four-year college on the part of the Norfolk community surfaced. In an issue of the Norfolk Virginian-Pilot, the following was reported:

The executive board of the Sixth District, Virginia Federation of Women's Clubs yesterday set for itself the task of investigation and work toward making the Norfolk Division, College of William and Mary, a full, four-year accredited college.

In another editorial, this one in the High Hat, entitled "Looking to the Future," the following was observed:

Our college is growing up. The process of becoming completely grown up is one that will take time. It is not to be accomplished miraculously in one day, in one year, but over a period of years. Not only time is involved in this process, but the support of the community is needed. This support is perhaps the most important component.

But a great deal more than casual interest is needed.

Our city is of a size that would warrant a four-year college course. It has been said that a full college course is needed here. It has also been stated that we are in great need of it to take care of the returning servicemen.

Thus it is up to the citizens of Norfolk to see that the College of William and Mary in Norfolk is expanded.

It should be noted at this stage of the study that, since the 1930-31 session, any talk of a four-year college had always envisioned it to be under the umbrellas of The College of William and
Mary. Only during the Bryan vs. Hodges Affair was the possibility raised of the Norfolk Division coming under the auspices any other school, and then it was only as a two-year school, not a four-year college.

As was expected, the returning veterans threatened to overtax the capacities of the Norfolk Division. "Veterans Flood Division with Applications" read an article in the Norfolk Virginian-Pilot. It went on and said that the facilities of the local college would be taxed severely by the influx of veterans which paralleled conditions reported from all sections of the United States. It pointed out that the teaching staff of the college could handle only a limited number of students, if they were to keep teaching standards at a high level. The limit was nearly reached.

Dr. Ernest Gray, Chairman of the Faculty at the Norfolk Division, shocked the campus and the administration officials in Williamsburg by a letter written to Director Charles J. Duke, Jr., on 8 March 1945, to wit:

It is obvious here in Norfolk, and I believe it is becoming serious among our faculty. Ever since this branch of the college opened, we have prided ourselves on two things, the quality of our teaching and the fine loyalty and spirit among the faculty. The second of these qualities is in grave danger of melting away. . . .

The faculty feels very strongly, those who have been here for any length of time, the absence of a directing head. This year, as you must recognize, your position has been that of an absentee executive. And while Lewis [Lewis W. Webb, Jr.] and I get along well, neither of us is clearly the chief officer. . . . I do not see how we can function much longer under this vague lack of system. . . .
... I think everyone who is at all cognizant of what is going on feels that the administration in Williamsburg is not greatly concerned about the college in Norfolk. ... Mr. Pomfret visits us very infrequently and usually then only when some other business brings him to Norfolk, and Jim Miller [Dean of the Faculty, The College of William and Mary], who undertakes to judge our status and attempts to censor our activities, has literally not visited us for years. What is more, the administration takes apparently little interest in our problems even at long distance. ... We are alternately encouraged and suppressed. Further, since the administration knows so little about our activities it has no conception of what we are trying to do and often gives the impression of trying to suppress and cripple our activities when it is simply unconscious of the problems involved. ... The administration in Williamsburg has what I can only describe as an 'institutional' point of view, rather than an 'educational' point of view. ... The aim seems to preserve the safety of the college rather than to expose and then to satisfy the needs of the individual students. ... Let me then suggest that somebody, preferably Mr. Pomfret, give enough of his time to the Norfolk branch to understand what we are doing or vainly trying to do, so that some other policy can be determined. Even a negative policy would be better than none. ... These are all suffering from the lack of knowledge shown in Williamsburg as well as from being undermanned and under division authority. ... If some kind of satisfactory solution cannot quickly be found, I do not wish to continue longer in the service of the college. ... I believe that things are nearly at the breaking point now. ... I cannot longer work with enthusiasm in the fog of uncertainty that surrounds our every move.

Twelve days later, Director Charles J. Duke, Jr., replied to Dr. Ernest W. Gray, Chairman of the Faculty at the Norfolk Division, in the following vein:

I can see no real basis for believing that the College administration is indifferent or unsympathetic towards the Division in Norfolk. On the contrary, during the past four years I have felt that it has indicated a real pride in both of its divisions and that it was making a conscious effort to promote and strengthen them in every legitimate and proper manner. ... President Pomfret has indicated his sympathy and interest in the Division on many occasions. He has reviewed and complimented the work of the Division in his reports to the Board and in all of his annual printed
It is my judgment that the final form which the organization of the Division takes must of necessity await the selection of its chief administrative officer. I consider the selection of a suitable person for this position to be of the profoundest importance to the College as a whole as well as to the Division itself. . . . Any authority which I have exercised has been as a general administrative officer of the College rather than as the Director of the Division. However, I have retained that title until a permanent selection could be made. . . .

I have been interested in the College and the Division for many years. I believe that in the past I have seen the Division and the College drift apart and the Division fail to prosper on account of the very same forces that are again rearing their heads.

President Lewis W. Webb, Jr., in an interview in 1975, generally supported the comments made by Dr. Gray concerning President Pomfret and the administration in Williamsburg. His comments were as follows:

Dr. Pomfret was more a scholar than a leader in the development. He suffered us. He came down a few times, but he never had a great deal of interest in it at all. Whereas he didn’t try to harm us in any way, he certainly never went out of his way to cause any great improvements. He wasn’t the type of dynamic leader such as J. A. C. Chandler was or Mr. Alvin Duke Chandler and that group, an entirely different type, which may be what they wanted or needed for ‘dear old College of William and Mary’ at that time.

In another interview, President Lewis W. Webb, Jr., said this about President Pomfret:

Pomfret was a very firm man, a very strong academic person. He had little interest in the Norfolk Division, . . . The college was very reluctant to let us expand beyond the first two years of our program, although in trying to meet the community’s needs, especially in the field of business, it was obvious that we needed advanced courses in the field of business. And so those were very
unproductive with Mr. Pomfret. He was sympathetic, but I don't think he went out of his way to help us move ahead. But he didn't hold us back. I will say that.

A memorandum was sent to President Pomfret from Mr. Duke concerning the progress of the Norfolk Division since June 1941. In the memorandum he made the following observations:

In assessing the progress that has been made at the Division, it should be remembered that the program of development began late in the summer of 1941 and that the war years have intervened during which the regular enrollment of the Division was reduced to approximately 50%. ... It would seem ... that there is no real justification for the charge that the College has been either indifferent or haphazard in its administration of the affairs of the Division. ...

There is cause, however, for very serious concern in one respect, namely, the persistence with which a small minority of the Division's faculty refuses to accept the policies laid down for it by the governing body of the College and their resentment over any restraint that this policy imposes on the Division. This attitude is kept alive by a very small minority who undertake to impregnate new members of the faculty with the same idea. As long as I was constantly at the Division, I was able to keep this under control because I knew its source. Recently, however, it has been gathering strength and I think is a cause for real concern. ... I am compelled to reluctantly admit, however, that unless we can insure the cheerful acceptance by the Division faculty of the policies laid down for it by the governing body of the College and unless we can have an administrative head at the Division who is in sympathy with and qualified to interpret this policy, we shall be in constant difficulties and seriously impair the usefulness and the prestige of both the parent institution and the Division itself. ...

The difficulties between Dr. E. W. Gray and the administration had not been settled, as was borne out in the below letter from him to Mr. C. J. Duke, Jr.:

When I left your office last April 19th after our conference concerning the Norfolk branch and my status, I understood the following:
1. Lewis Webb was to be appointed Acting Director for one year.

2. He and I were to arrive at an equitable distribution of the administrative duties of the Norfolk college.

3. There were to be two full-time administrators at Norfolk, both of whom were to be on a twelve-month salary basis.

4. Webb and I were to occupy these posts.

5. The administration of the summer session was to be divided between Webb and me.

6. I was to be Dean of Students if I wished to have that position.

After talking to Webb regarding his conference on Saturday last with you, Mr. Pomfret, and Dean Norris, I find I must be under a misapprehension about the points listed above. . . .

Director Charles J. Duke, Jr., replied to Dr. Ernest W. Gray in the following light:

If you will review our conversation on April 19 carefully, I think you will recall that the entire discussion was predicated on my statement that if Lewis Webb were offered and accepted an appointment as Acting Director of the Division any administrative assignments would be recommended and approved by him before they were formally made by the College. If, therefore, you have regarded any of the items listed by you in your letter of May 7 as commitments on my part without reference to recommendations of approvals from Lewis, then you have evidently misunderstood what I intended to say. . . .

The matters with Mr. Charles J. Duke, Jr., were not resolved to Dr. Ernest W. Gray's satisfaction, for on 16 May 1946 he submitted the following letter of resignation to Mr. Duke:

Realizing the futility of further discussion regarding my status, I submit my resignation as of June 15, 1946.

Needless to say I regret that I am compelled to take this action. I have enjoyed my long stay at the Norfolk branch of
William and Mary, both my association with my fellows on the faculty and with the students, and I hope that the college will continue to prosper and become of greater service to the Norfolk area.

Two days later, Director Charles J. Duke, Jr., acknowledged Dr. Ernest W. Gray's letter of resignation as follows:

I regret to learn of your desire to separate yourself from the Norfolk Division. I had hoped that if you were not able to reach an agreement with the College with respect to administrative assignments that you would welcome the opportunity to return to your teaching. In fact, I recall having heard you express that desire on several occasions.

The 23 May 1946 issue of the Norfolk Virginian-Pilot carried an article labeled "Resident Director to Replace Duke at Norfolk Division, W&M." The sub-caption read, "Pomfret Announces Complete Reorganization of College Due in June; Expresses Regret at Gray's Resignation as Member of Faculty." The article is quoted in part below:

In response to a request for a statement on the resignation, effective June 15, of Dr. Ernest W. Gray as chairman of the faculty at the Norfolk Division, College of William and Mary-V.P.I., Dr. John E. Pomfret, president of the parent college at Williamsburg declared last night that he regretted the loss of Dr. Gray's services, 'since Dr. Gray had made noteworthy contributions to the college and to the division during his years of service.'

In a statement issued from the college earlier in the day, President Pomfret said that plans are underway for a complete reorganization of the Norfolk division and announced that Charles J. Duke, Jr., who has been acting as director of the division and, at the same time, serving as part-time bursar at Williamsburg would devote his full time, starting July 1, to the duties of bursar at the parent institution. He said also that a full-time resident director would be appointed for the Norfolk Division sometime in June.

Students at the Norfolk Division protested the loss of Dr.
Gray. A Norfolk Virginian-Pilot article stated that the students who held a mass meeting on 23 May 1946 had announced another meeting on Monday, when they would hear a report from a Seven-Man Committee appointed to investigate the situation.

The article further stated that they had decided to urge Williamsburg officials and Dr. Gray to reconsider their respective actions in resigning and acceptance of the resignation. Students stated that most of them felt that they were losing somebody who absolutely could not be replaced.\(^{580}\)

An editorial in the Norfolk Virginian-Pilot on 24 May 1946 made the below comments:

The Virginian-Pilot hopes that the decision [accepting Dr. Gray's resignation] is not irrevocable--that the college authorities, instead of accepting his resignation and confirming his separation from the Division will prevail on him to accept an appropriate role in the reorganized administrative structure soon to be announced.

We offer this suggestion without presuming to pass judgment on the differences with the high command in Williamsburg which prompted Dr. Gray to offer his resignation. He himself has not publicly discussed the differences. Those who know about them trace them to delays at Williamsburg in carrying out certain administrative and curricular changes which Dr. Gray recommended as essential to the Division's requirements--chief among them the delay in defining for the Division clearly recognizable local directing authority. . . .

The Faculty at the Norfolk Division urged the retention of Dr. Gray at the division and that any differences be reconciled. A Norfolk Virginian-Pilot article is quoted below:

Standing unanimously for the retention of Dr. Ernest W. Gray as Chairman of the Faculty of the Norfolk Division, College of William and Mary-VPI, members of that body have written President John E. Pomfret of the parent college at
Williamsburg urging that both Dr. Gray and the administration officials reconsider his resignation, which it was understood yesterday, had not been accepted.

The letter, approved at a meeting of the faculty Thursday, asserts that its members ‘wish to associate ourselves unequivocally with the views expressed’ by Dr. Gray. . . .

’In his letter of March 8, 1946, to Charles J. Duke, Jr., Dr. Gray did not more than speak the thoughts uppermost in the minds of the faculty,’ the letter asserts. . . .

The letter pays tribute to Dr. Gray as an able teacher, a kindly friend, and a devoted advocate of the cause of the division. . . .

’We feel that we cannot permit his retirement, and we urge both him and the officers of administration to explore every possible means for the reconciliation of such differences as may have caused the present unhappy situation. We know that much of the present difficulty has arisen from Dr. Gray’s honest advocacy of the causes of the Division to the authorities at Williamsburg.’

The Norfolk Virginian-Pilot of 28 May 1946 carried the news of Assistant Director Lewis W. Webb, Jr.’s, appointment as the new Head of the Norfolk Division and of Mr. Charles J. Duke, Jr.’s, return to full-time duty as the bursar for the mother college in Williamsburg. The article said that Dr. Pomfret made the announcement during a day spent in Norfolk where he had lunch with the City Council Committee on Higher Education and later met with the division faculty at its year-end meeting.

With his appointment by Dr. John Edwin Pomfret, Director Lewis Warrington Webb, Jr., became the fifth man to head the Norfolk Division of The College of William and Mary. Director Webb had been affiliated with the division since 1932 and had been the Assistant Director since 1943. During his fourteen-year tenure, he had
advanced from Instructor in Engineering to Head of the Engineering Department in 1940. He became a full professor in 1943. Besides his regular duties of teaching and administration, he organized and directed the War Training Program at the division from 1940 to 1945. Also, during this period he served as a principal representative on the War Manpower State Training Council for Virginia. A graduate of Maury High School, Norfolk, Virginia, Webb graduated in 1931 with a B.S. degree in electrical engineering from the Virginia Polytechnic Institute. While at V.P.I., he was active in athletics and fraternal affairs and served as a First Lieutenant in the Cadet Corps. In 1932 he obtained his master's degree with honors. In recognition of his academic achievement, he was elected to Tau Beta Pi, the highest engineering honor society.

Dr. Gray must have had second thoughts regarding his resignation. As a consequence of the action of the student body, the faculty, and an editorial in the Norfolk Virginian-Pilot, he withdrew his resignation on 29 May 1946 in the following letter to Dr. Pomfret:

In view of the excessive publicity which has arisen out of my recent statement to the faculty and which through no intention of mine has perhaps created the impression among the public that I believe the administration of the college has been unsuccessful in its management of the Norfolk branch, I should like to emphasize to you that I am fully aware of the many fine contributions made by you, Mr. Duke, and other members of your administration to the well-being of this division of the college. Your review at the faculty meeting yesterday of the changes and improvements of the last five years seemed to me clear evidence of the basic cooperation that has prevailed between Williamsburg and Norfolk. The part of my statement to the faculty which appears to the public to be most critical of your
administration was based on a letter written by me to Mr. Duke in March of this year which stated certain problems that were acute at the time. Some of these problems have been solved by the appointment of Mr. Webb as director, and I am confident that the others will be solved as an outgrowth of this appointment.

Since these problems seem to be in a fair way to be taken care of, since my relations with you and your administration have always been pleasant, since I am not ambitious to be an administrator and have considered my tenure as administrator temporary, and, finally since I now have become convinced that my action in resigning was somewhat over-hasty, I should like to ask that my resignation be reconsidered and that I be permitted to resign as Chairman of the Faculty in order to resume my former position as full-time Professor of English.

On 2 June 1946 the Norfolk Virginian-Pilot announced that Mr. A. H. Foreman of Norfolk and Vice Rector of the Board of Visitors, The College of William and Mary had been elevated to Rector of the Board of Visitors, The College of William and Mary. Mr. Foreman, for whom Foreman Field at the Norfolk Division had been named, had served on the board for over twenty-three years. Mr. Foreman had always been vitally interested in the Norfolk Division and its progress down through the years.

With the exception of one professional organization and an editorial in the High Hat, no mention was made of a four-year college by Director Charles J. Duke, Jr., local newspaper media, local leaders, or fraternal organizations. The end of the 1944-45 session through the 1945-46 session included local newspaper coverage of 6 editorials and 22 articles of a general nature directed toward the division, plus 2 articles, as mentioned above, where a local
organization endorsed the four-year college concept. This was a total of 30 editorials and articles, up 10 from 20 previously.

Commencement exercises at Foreman Field on 3 June 1946 closed the 1945-46 session.
1946-47 Session

Within three days following the end of the 1945-46 session, President Pomfret replied to Dr. Gray's letter of 29 May 1946. He reconsidered Dr. Gray's resignation in the following letter:

In response to your letter of May 29, requesting a reconsideration of your resignation and your appointment as full-time Professor of English, I am authorized to permit you to withdraw your resignation as a member of the Division faculty. The College is prompted to accede to your request solely in recognition of your long years of service to the Division and your abilities as a teacher.

As I told you in our conversation, the College emphatically denies the charges of confusion and haphazardness in its administration of the Norfolk Division that have appeared in the recent issues of the local newspapers, and it regards such charges as misrepresentations of the truth. Such publicity, I hope you realize, is damaging both to the reputation of the Norfolk Division and to the College of William and Mary as a whole.

Should you feel fit to accept a reappointment, it will be in the light of the new administrative reorganization, and an acknowledgement by you that you will not only cooperate fully with Mr. Webb for the good of the Division, but also that you will use your influence as one of the senior professors to interpret fully the relationship of the parent institution with the Division to the younger members of the faculty.

Much of the misunderstanding in the past has stemmed from a lack of sympathetic understanding of this relationship, and unless a full measure of understanding is achieved both here and in Norfolk, there can never be the desired cooperation between the parent institution, and the Division.

In a letter dated 10 June 1946 to President Pomfret, Dr. Gray notified him that he would be glad to accept the position of full-time Professor of English in lieu of his former position as Chairman of the Faculty, Norfolk Division.

Although not directly related to this study of The College of William and Mary and its Norfolk Division, a brief coverage will be
made of the St. Helena Extension of William and Mary in Norfolk. The
tremendous influx of G.I. Bill students over-taxed the educational
facilities of both The College of William and Mary and the Norfolk
Division well beyond their respective capacities to handle such an
influx. Consequently, The College of William and Mary arranged with
the Navy Department for the loan of the St. Helena Annex of the
Norfolk Naval Shipyard, Portsmouth, Virginia. The Flat Hat stated
that a standard freshman program in liberal arts, engineering, pre-
medicine, pre-law, and business administration would be offered.
Those students satisfactorily completing the first year would be
eligible to transfer to the mother college in Williamsburg or to
other Virginia colleges. An editorial in the Norfolk Virginian-
Pilot made the following comments:

The public and private colleges of Virginia, even after
supplementing their resources with such temporary housing as
they can lay their hands on, will be able to take care of
less than one-fourth of the estimated number of veterans who
will seek admission to their courses when the colleges open
next September. What of the others? Governor Tuck's reply
is: 'If these veterans want to go to school, we are going to
see that they go'.

There is no time to build these off-campus extension
colleges. They must be established in facilities already
built, in plants lending themselves easily to instructional
and dormitory use, and located near an established college or
colleges which can assume supervisory responsibility.

The St. Helena facilities are ample for the instruction
and housing of some 1,200 students, and are now unused. It
would be hard to think of a more useful employment for
this piece of unemployed naval property. In the St.
Helena project, William and Mary at Williamsburg would be the
managing agency for an extension college financed by the
State in the interest of G.I. students shut out of any of the
established colleges because of lack of space.
The Norfolk Virginian-Pilot on 26 July 1946 reported Director Lewis W. Webb, Jr., newly appointed to that position in the Norfolk Division, to have said that the request by Dr. Ernest W. Gray for reinstatement had been favorably acted upon by Dr. John E. Pomfret, President of the mother college. Dr. Gray would resume his former duties as Professor of English. 592

The 1946-47 session of The College of William and Mary and the Virginia Polytechnic Institute in Norfolk began on 20 September 1946 with 830 regular day students enrolled. 593

Once again the Council Committee on Higher Education in Norfolk was listed in the Bulletin. 594

The Norfolk Division was guided by its newly appointed Director, Lewis W. Webb, Jr., while President John E. Pomfret remained in control at the mother college in Williamsburg. 595

The St. Helena Extension of The College of William and Mary opened on 25 September 1946 with a convocation which included attendance by Vice-Admiral Louis Denfeld, Chief of Naval Personnel; Vice-Admiral William M. Fechteler, Commander, Battleships and Cruisers, Atlantic; Lt. General Delos C. Ennos, Commandant, Armed Forces Staff College; Vice-Admiral T. L. Gatch, Commander, Service Forces, Atlantic; Commodore L. F. Small, Commander, Norfolk Naval Shipyard; Governor William Tuck; former Governor Colgate W. Darden, Jr.; and Mr. A. H. Foreman, Rector of the Board of Visitors, The College of William and Mary. 596

On 13 October 1946 the Norfolk Virginian-Pilot carried an
announcement of the selection by the Board of Visitors of The College of William and Mary of former Governor of Virginia, Colgate Whitehead Darden, Jr., to be the sixteenth Chancellor of The College of William and Mary. He joined the ranks of George Washington, John Tyler, Hugh Blair Grigsby, and John Stewart Bryan as the fifth American-born person to hold the position of chancellor. The chancellor's position was provided for in the college's charter, whereby the college "shall have an eminent and discreet person to be elected and nominated . . . who shall be called Chancellor of the said college." 597

With the elevation of former Governor Colgate W. Darden, Jr., to the Chancellorship of The College of William and Mary, the Norfolk Division had a native Norfolkian to guard and further its interests. Mr. A. H. Foreman, recently elected Rector of the Board of Visitors, was another.

Apparently, the idea of a four-year college was on the minds of many Norfolk Division students. When President Pomfret visited the school on 29 October 1946, he expressed an opinion, in reply to evident student interest, that there would be no four-year course at the division because he felt that the State of Virginia would not assume the additional expense of another full-fledged college because of its already swollen educational budget. 598

According to the Norfolk Virginian-Pilot of 21 January 1947, the Norfolk Community Council investigated the possibility of making the Norfolk Division of The College of William and Mary a four-year instead of a two-year institution. 599
Director Lewis W. Webb, Jr., felt that an Advisory Board, which would assist him in carrying out the mission of the Norfolk Division, was a most desirable asset. Unlike the Advisory Board initiated by President J. A. C. Chandler and continued by President Bryan, which was made up chiefly of Tidewater Area educators, Director Webb’s Advisory Board was composed of the Tidewater Area’s leading businessmen and professional people. Early in 1947, he appointed the following people to the board:

1. Mr. John S. Alfriend
2. Mr. E. S. Brinkley
3. Mr. Thomas P. Carroll
4. Mr. Forest F. Cathey
5. Mr. E. T. Gresham
6. Mr. C. A. Harrell
7. Mr. Lawrence W. I'Anson
8. Mr. Charles L. Kaufman
9. Mr. Henry S. Lewis
10. Rev. Lowis D. Mendoza
11. Mr. Absen S. Pope
12. Mr. Crawford S. Rogers
13. Mr. John Twoby II
14. Mr. J. Hoge Tyler III
15. Mr. Nick Wright

While the original intent of the St. Helena Extension of The College of William and Mary was to remain open for only one year and
offer only a freshman program, it was decided to extend it for one additional year and add the sophomore level of instruction.

President Pomfret announced that a complete sophomore year would be added to the courses offered at the St. Helena Extension.

Director Webb held the first meeting of his Advisory Board on 22 May 1947. One of the items discussed was the four-year college as follows:

The desirability of making this a four-year college has been discussed frequently in the past few months. Certain problems make this almost impossible at the present time. It would be necessary to build at least two new buildings. . . . Financial problems would also have to be faced. . . . Adequate funds for the operation of the college would have to be secured. . . .

It appeared that the administration at the Norfolk Division did not endorse a four-year college in Norfolk's immediate future.

What happened to the effort by The College of William and Mary to get the Norfolk Division accredited as a junior college? It apparently languished after William and Mary was restored to the approved list of the Association of American Universities. Director Lewis W. Webb, Jr., had not forgotten. In an interview on 12 February 1975, he related the following:

When I took over in 1946, it was still far from being accredited. In fact, I could find no real interest in having it accredited in its own right. But that was one of my first chores, to beef up the faculty, the physical plant, the library, to a point where we would be accredited as a junior college.

With the exception of the local and college newspaper media, Director Webb's Advisory Board, and an endorsement by a local organization, no mention was made by the Director of the Norfolk
Division, Lewis W. Webb, Jr., local leaders, or by local fraternal organizations of a four-year college program. From the end of the 1945-46 session through the 1946-47 session there were 2 articles, as mentioned above, which contained an organizational endorsement and 16 articles of general interest about the division. This was a total of no editorials and 18 articles, down 12 from 30 previously.

May 29, 1946, brought the 1945-46 session to a close.
Another damper was put on the idea of a four-year college in Norfolk by an unlikely source, namely, Dr. Ernest W. Gray of the Norfolk Division. In an address before the Norfolk Cosmopolitan Club, he warned that a four-year college, unless heavily subsidized, would be an unjustifiable financial burden. He felt that an alternative which promoted a strong scholarship fund for deserving students and supported the improvement of facilities at the division would be much better. He further stated that if the people who advocated a four-year college won the battle, there would be in existence a third-rate college that no one would go to unless they were unable to afford the cost of other institutions. Finally, he stated that the state which supported twelve four-year colleges would not subsidize a thirteenth.

September 22, 1947, marked the opening of the 1947-48 session. No mention was made in the Bulletin or in the local newspaper media of the student enrollment.

Besides the Council Committee on Higher Education in Norfolk, the Director's Advisory Board was listed in the Bulletin for the first time. Director Webb related the following in connection with his appointment of the Advisory Board:

You see, when I took this job in 1946, I agreed to take it on the condition that I could select a group of fifteen citizens to be advisors to me to help me in the planning of the future of this institution. The Board of Visitors was a William and Mary Board of Visitors. . . . They were all selected for the College of William and Mary; it was their board. We needed something, so I picked fifteen of the top people in Norfolk. . . . Nobody objected. They felt, 'Well,
give him something there to meet with. They have no power whatsoever.' And this Advisory Board, as it was called, was quite proud; they probably had more to do, more problems put upon them and less power than any group ever. They could absolutely do nothing but recommend and advise and use their influence. . . . They were a very effective group to have absolutely no power, but they had tremendous power, of course, as it ended up. They could mobilize public opinion at the drop of a hat. They were presidents of banks, owners of newspapers, they were the top layers in town, they were doctors—they were picked very carefully, and they were very dedicated. Once they saw the vision, what was needed, you couldn't have swayed that group from anything but working for this institution.

The College of William and Mary and the Virginia Polytechnic Institution in Norfolk was headed by Director Lewis W. Webb, Jr., while The College of William and Mary came under the administration of President John E. Pomfret. 609 President Pomfret recommended to the Board of Visitors on 14 February 1947 that the St. Helena Extension be closed in June 1947. His recommendation was as follows:

It seems wise to terminate the program at the St. Helena Extension in June. . . .

The activities of St. Helena will be incorporated with those of the Norfolk Division. The Division, through the erection of a temporary building will be in a position to care for the majority of the St. Helena students who have not finished the two-year course. Those who have finished two years' work, and who are qualified to continue, will transfer to Williamsburg, V.P.I., and other institutions. . . .

During the summer the large stock of equipment at St. Helena, which Mr. Duke secured through the War Assets Administration, will be transferred to Williamsburg, the 610 Norfolk Division, and the Richmond Professional Institute.

The Flat Hat carried an article on 16 March 1940 to the effect that St. Helena was to conclude its existence after two years. President Pomfret said that the peak of enrollment had passed and that continued operation would not be justified in view of the
expected decline in veterans' applications. He further stated that few veterans were coming, and he felt that it would be in the interest of efficient operation to transfer the work to the division. 611

Mr. William Holmes Davis, one of Norfolk's leading proponents of higher education and a four-year college, received the following reply from President Pomfret to a letter written to him on 29 February 1948:

It is my belief that Norfolk should have a four-year college. I think the population of Tidewater large enough to justify such an undertaking and I think what has been done by the William and Mary Extension demonstrates the enormous value of a local center of learning. . . .

The College of William and Mary has done an outstanding piece of work in Norfolk and if the facilities are extended there it would seem to me that they are in a better position to undertake the assignment than is any one else. Certainly they are more conveniently located than is the University of Virginia.

In a letter written only five days later to President Colgate W. Darden, Jr., of the University of Virginia, he was considerably more conservative in his views on a four-year college. He related the following to President Darden:

It is our judgment that Norfolk cannot support a four-year college unless the Commonwealth is willing to make an appropriation of at least $200,000 per year instead of the present $40,000 which is needed to maintain the junior college. If the work of the Division extended through four years, it would mean not only a liberal arts college, but a school of engineering and a school of business administration. With the present number of institutions of higher learning that the tax-payers of Virginia must now support, I do not think the State should be burdened with another four-year college. As you know, it is far more expensive to maintain junior and senior work than it is to maintain freshman and sophomore work. The size of the
library collection usually must be multiplied by ten, and the scientific laboratories for upper class work are at least five times more expensive than for freshman and sophomore work... 

While there was some mention of the four-year college question in the newspaper media, in an Advisory Board meeting chaired by Director Webb, and in official correspondence by President Pomfret, there was nothing said by Director Webb himself or by local leaders or local fraternal and professional organizations.

Norfolk newspaper media coverage from the end of the 1946-67 session through the 1947-48 session was very scant. No editorials and only 4 articles of general divisional interest were to be found. This was a total of no editorials and 4 articles, down 14 from 18 previously.

The 1947-48 session was concluded on 7 June 1948 with final exercises held at the Norfolk Division.
1948-49 Session

September 27, 1948, saw the beginning of the 1948-49 session of The College of William and Mary and the Virginia Polytechnic Institute in Norfolk. No mention was made in the Bulletin or the local newspaper media of the student enrollment.

While the Council Committee on Higher Education in Norfolk was not listed in the Bulletin, the Director's Advisory Board was a repeat of the one listed for the 1946-47 session.

The Chief Administrative Officers for The College of William and Mary and the Norfolk Division continued to be President J. E. Pomfret and Director L. W. Webb, Jr., respectively.

The J. E. Pomfret Papers of the President's Office Files of The College of William and Mary Archives; the local newspaper media; the Records of the Office of the President Files, Old Dominion University Archives; and the college newspaper media, all conspicuously lacked any correspondence, editorials, articles, reports, or minutes related to The College of William and Mary and the Norfolk Division for the 1948-49 session.

In his "Annual Report to The College of William and Mary" for the 1948-49 academic year for the Norfolk Division, Director Webb made the following pertinent observations:

This year has seen closer harmony in every phase of our work and that of our parent institution. Many of the Norfolk Division Divisional Heads have consulted with the Department Heads in Williamsburg with a view toward improving our courses, etc. In every instance, they reported courteous treatment and willing helpfulness.
Mr. Nunn has been most pleasant and helpful in our financial problems. His suggestions are respected and appreciated.

Mr. Duke has as usual shown his strong interest in our Division by his continuing efforts in our behalf. In spite of his heavy duties with the State and College he was never too busy to help me with my problems. His advice has proven sound in every case, and I wish to acknowledge his many favors.

There was no mention from the end of the 1947-48 session through the 1948-49 session of a four-year college by Director Webb, by local and college newspaper media, in official correspondence, or by local leaders and fraternal and professional organizations. Once again, newspaper media coverage of the division was virtually nonexistent. There were no editorials and only 2 articles of general interest concerning the division. This was a total of no editorials and 2 articles, down 2 from 4 previously.

The Norfolk Division closed for the 1948-49 session on 4 June 1949.
1949-50 Session

The 1949-50 session of The College of William and Mary and the Virginia Polytechnic Institute in Norfolk commenced on 19 September 1949. The student body day school enrollment was 165 (extrapolated).

As was the case in the previous two sessions, the Director's Advisory Board was listed in the Bulletin.

Once again, Director Webb of the Norfolk Division and President Pomfret of The College of William and Mary were in charge of those two schools.

On 12 October 1949 President Pomfret communicated with Dr. J. M. Godard, Executive Secretary of the Southern Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools as follows:

Kindly let me know what steps the College should take to see that its divisions in Richmond and Norfolk are fully accredited by the Southern Association. I once had a conversation with your predecessor regarding the accreditation of the Norfolk Division, which is a junior college with a full-time enrollment exceeding one thousand, and it was my understanding that the accreditation of William and Mary covered the work of this branch.

I should be pleased if you would direct me how to proceed in this matter.

Twelve days later, President Pomfret received the following reply from Dr. J. M. Godard:

I am very glad that you wrote to me about the accreditation of . . . your Norfolk Division. . . . Actually, the standards of the Association require that branch institutions hold membership in the Association. Otherwise, the membership of the home institution may be questioned. . . .
I believe the correct procedure will be for you . . . to apply for membership in the Association in the near future. If they (Richmond and Norfolk) can achieve membership, no possible question can be raised concerning their credits . . . .

President Pomfret felt constrained to write Dr. Godard once again as follows:

Professor George J. Oliver . . . will represent The College of William and Mary at the Houston meeting. I am asking him to meet with you briefly regarding the application of our divisions (Richmond and Norfolk) for membership in the Association . . . .

After Professor Oliver has discussed this matter with you, I shall then ask . . . the Director of the Norfolk Division to make formal application for membership.

Mr. William Holmes Davis sent the following letter to President Pomfret on 6 January 1950:

A great deal of interest is being manifested in the matter of the establishing as soon as possible, here in Norfolk of a four-year, degree granting college.

Our people here are very appreciative of the fine work being done by the Norfolk Division of the College of William and Mary and before proceeding along other lines would like to know as to whether or not your Board of Visitors will raise the Norfolk Division to a four-year college, coordinate with the College of Williamsburg . . . .

The report of the U. S. Bureau of the Census for 1940 showed that Norfolk was the only centre of population in the United States that had as large a population and no four year college . . . .

President Pomfret replied to the above letter four days later as follows:

The College of William and Mary does not have the resources to increase its program at the Norfolk Division from two years to four years, and I do not believe that the Board of Visitors of the College would wish for the College to assume the responsibility for what would be the equivalent of a university at Norfolk. It might be wise for the city to
consider taking over the Norfolk Division and making an arrangement with the state by which the present appropriation would be continued. If this plan were satisfactory, the Board of Visitors of the College of William and Mary might then be asked to relinquish its operation in Norfolk. The proposed college, if the state subsidy were maintained, could be placed under the supervision of the State Board of Education, at least at the start.

Before any formal proposals are considered, however, I think it might be wise for the city of Norfolk to employ an expert in the field of college education to make an appraisal of the whole situation. . . . Such a step would need a good deal of study, and for the good of the city it should not be taken hastily. . . . A four-year college without accreditation would have no status in the educational world, since its graduates could not proceed to any accredited institution for professional degrees.

Mr. William Holmes Davis was, by all accounts, clearly the most vociferous and indefatigable supporter of higher education and of a four-year college in Norfolk. During the tenures of President John Stewart Bryan, John Edwin Pomfret, and Alvin Duke Chandler he penned more than 33 tracts and letters, plus numerous letters-to-the-editor in the local newspaper media. To President Bryan he sent 2 letters, to President Pomfret 11 tracts and letters, and to President A. D. Chandler more than 20 tracts and letters. It was during the 1950s and early 1960s that the movement for a four-year college was the strongest. It is to the credit of all three presidents that each and every one of Mr. Davis's letters and tracts was acknowledged by a letter from one to three pages in length. Mr. Davis's letters were often of a combative and uncompromising nature; nevertheless, each one was answered in a courteous and straightforward manner. This general combative attitude and uncompromising demeanor probably kept Mr. Davis from being appointed
to and serving on various committees and boards involved with
Norfolk's role in higher education and its quest for a four-year
college.

The College of William and Mary's continued efforts to seek
accreditation for the Norfolk Division as a junior college was
further evidenced in the below letter from President Pomfret to Dr.
J. M. Godard:

I am asking Mr. Webb of the Norfolk Division to apply
directly to you for the forms necessary for the separate
accreditation of our Norfolk Division as a junior
college... I shall, of course, cooperate with Mr. Webb
in furnishing the information required, and I shall assist
him in any other way that I am able while his application is
pending...

On 10 February 1950 Director Lewis W. Webb, Jr., sent the
following letter to Dr. J. M. Godard:

Our college, the Norfolk Division of the College of
William and Mary, wishes to apply for accreditation as a
junior college from the Southern Association of Colleges and
Secondary Schools. I will appreciate your sending me all
necessary forms and information needed in order to make our
application.

Pursuant to a letter on 2 February 1950 from Mr. C. A.
Harrell, City Manager of Norfolk, a recommended change of title from
Norfolk City Council on Higher Education to Norfolk Commission on
Higher Education and the deletion of any members from officers of the
city, was unanimously enacted by city ordinance on 28 February
1950.

At the Director's Advisory Board meeting on 6 March 1950,
interest in the concept of a four-year college was conveyed in the
minutes stated below:
Mr. C. A. Harrell, City Manager, felt that it would be wise for a study to be made locally of the need for a four-year college. He stated that the Committee on Higher Education for Norfolk would have the matter presented to them for consideration. With the state already supporting eleven colleges there is serious doubt of whether it will be willing to do anything.

The question was raised as to the attitude of the College of William and Mary. Mr. W. H. Davis has received a letter from Dr. Pomfret...stating flatly that they have no plans and no interest in a four-year college in Norfolk. Mr. Webb said that he felt that the subject was not closed and that in the future they would be more open for consideration. . . .

The operation of a four-year program would require about $200 per student in excess of fees. . . . The possible sources of this income would be state funds, endowment, or funds provided by the city. . . .

The Director's Advisory Board went on record as favoring the appointment of a committee by the City Manager for the purpose of studying the need for a four-year college for Norfolk. They requested that the City Manager take whatever action he found advisable to institute such an investigation.

Mr. Harrell said that he felt any such study should be regional as the interests of the entire area around Norfolk would be involved.

Once again, Director Webb was able to report for the 1949-50 session that cooperation had been given by William and Mary. In his report for the year, he stated that in each year past the administrative officials of William and Mary had always taken an interest in and actively aided the Norfolk Division. He pointed out several William and Mary personnel who were most helpful. He was particularly pleased with Dean Marshall who did much to help the Norfolk Division and had a friendly, interested attitude.

Except for correspondence with President Pomfret by Mr. William Holmes Davis and the deliberations of the Director's Advisory
Board, no mention was made during the 1949-50 session of a four-year college. The college and Norfolk newspaper media, Director Webb himself, local leaders, and local fraternal and professional organizations all said nothing on the matter.

There were only 2 articles of general interest to the division from the end of 1948-49 session through the 1949-50 session. There were no editorials. This was a total of no editorials and 2 articles, no change from previously.

June 3, 1950, marked the end of the Norfolk Division's 1949-50 session.
Summary of 1940-41 Through 1949-50 Sessions

The leadership of the Norfolk Division changed twice while that of The College of William and Mary once. Dean William T. Hodges (1932-41), who resigned his position in lieu of disciplinary action by the Board of Visitors of The College of William and Mary, was replaced by Mr. Charles J. Duke, Jr., (1941-46). As the Director of the Norfolk Division, he was succeeded by Assistant Director Lewis W. Webb, Jr., (1946-60). President John Stewart Bryan (1934-42) resigned in 1942 for business reasons. The Board of Visitors named President John Edwin Pomfret (1942-51) of Vanderbilt University as his successor. President Bryan was elevated by the board to the honorary position of Chancellor of The College of William and Mary.

The enrollment for the 1940-41 session stood at 540 full-time, day students while at the end of the 1949-50 session it registered at 615 (extrapolated).

The Advisory Board in Norfolk, instituted by President J. A. C. Chandler during the 1930-31 session and continued during President J. S. Bryan's tenure, was replaced by President J. E. Pomfret in 1942 by the Council Committee on Higher Education in Norfolk. When Assistant Director Lewis W. Webb, Jr., assumed the Directorship of the Norfolk Division, he appointed a group of leading Norfolk citizens to a Director's Advisory Board.

The Norfolk Division had five names during its second decade (1940-50), namely, (1) The College of William and Mary in Virginia, Norfolk, Virginia (1940-42); (2) Norfolk Division of the College of
William and Mary and the Virginia Polytechnic Institute (1942-43); (3) The Norfolk Division of the College of William and Mary and the Virginia Polytechnic Institute (1943-44); (4) Norfolk Division, College of William and Mary, Virginia Polytechnic Institute (1944-45); and (5) The College of William and Mary and the Virginia Polytechnic Institute in Norfolk (1945-54).

A survey, authorized by the Board of Visitors in October 1939, was conducted by Dr. George A. Works, Dean of the School of Education, University of Chicago. The survey included the Norfolk Division, as well as The College of William and Mary.

Before the college could act upon the recommendations of the "Works's Report" it was beset by a grade-fixing scandal which involved the Norfolk Division and its Dean, William T. Hodges. While the Norfolk Division student body and the Norfolk citizenry sought to retain Dr. Hodges as the Dean of the Division, President Bryan’s position eventually prevailed. The board declined to act upon Dean Hodges’s appeal of his resignation for thirty days while a committee appointed by the board investigated the feasibility/ non-feasibility of whether or not the Norfolk Division should be retained and operated by The College of William and Mary or control of the division turned over to another institution, possibly the Virginia Polytechnic Institute. Because some of its interests appeared to be involved, the City Council of Norfolk authorized the appointment of a Committee on Higher Education. The board committee and the Norfolk Committee conferred on several occasions regarding the status of the
Norfolk Division. Before the board met again in May 1941 and considered Dean Hodges's appeal, he made the question moot when he resigned as Dean of the Norfolk Division but requested that he be retained on the Norfolk Division Faculty. At its May 1941 meeting, the board heard its committee's recommendation that The College of William and Mary control and operation of the Norfolk Division be retained. The board further acceded to Dr. Hodges's request that he remain as a Norfolk Division Faculty member.

In connection with the retention and operation of the division, the "Works's Report" recommendations were implemented with a few reservations.

Because of the attendant publicity in connection with the grade-fixing scandal and because of the nature of the offense, the Association of American Universities removed The College of William and Mary from its list of accredited institutions. While the balance of President Bryan's time in office was spent rectifying this lack of non-accreditation, it was during President Pomfret's early days in office that accreditation was finally restored.

The question of the accreditation of the Norfolk Division as a junior college was raised by the Southern Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools. While President Bryan initiated corrective action and President Pomfret actively pursued the matter, it still remained unresolved at the end of the 1949-50 session.

While the Bryan vs. Hodges Affair brought the first significant movement to divorce the Norfolk Division from The College
of William and Mary and establish a four-year college, overall the 1940-50 decade was relatively quiet on the four-year college question. From time-to-time the newspaper media and fraternal and professional organizations uttered something concerning a four-year college, but the Heads of the Norfolk Division had relatively little to say on the subject.

Numerous interviews were quoted of personalities, faculty, and administration connected with the Norfolk Division and The College of William and Mary.

President Bryan resigned his position in the spring of 1942, and the board selected Dr. John Edwin Pomfret of Vanderbilt University as the new Chief Administrative Officer of The College of William and Mary. Dr. Bryan, in turn, was elevated by the board to chancellor.

Coverage by Norfolk newspaper media for the period from the end of the 1939-40 session through the 1949-50 session involved 44 editorials, 158 articles of general interest to the division, 2 articles of an endorsement for a four-year college by an individual, and 2 articles of an endorsement for a four-year college by an organization. This was a total of 206 editorials and articles, up 4 for the second decade (1940-50) from 202 for the first decade (1930-40).

A summary of the essential features and data of the 1940-41 through 1949-50 sessions may be found in the Appendix, pages 535-37.
Summary of the 1930-31 through 1940-50 Sessions

The leadership of the Norfolk Division changed four times during this period while that of The College of William and Mary changed twice. Director H. Edgar Timmerman (1930-32) was succeeded by Dr. Edward Gwathmey who remained as the Director for the fall 1932 semester only. Dr. William T. Hodges (1932-41) replaced Dr. Gwathmey and assumed the title of Dean. Mr. Charles J. Duke, Jr., (1941-46) followed Dr. Hodges and re-assumed the title of Director. Assistant Director Lewis W. Webb, Jr., became the new Director in 1946 and relieved Mr. Duke, who returned to his duties as Bursar of The College of William and Mary. President J. A. C. Chandler's (1919-34) death in 1934 resulted in the selection by the Board of Visitors of Mr. John Stewart Bryan (1934-42) who, in turn, was succeeded by Dr. John Edward Pomfret (1942-51).

The initial enrollment for the division numbered 206 full-time, day students for the 1930-31 session, while the enrollment at the end of the 1949-60 session was 615 (extrapolated).

The Advisory Board in Norfolk appointed by Dr. J. A. C. Chandler was continued during the tenure of President Bryan. In 1942 President Pomfret replaced the board with the Council Committee on Higher Education in Norfolk. In 1946 Director Lewis W. Webb, Jr., named a Director's Advisory Board to assist him with the administration of the Norfolk Division.

The Norfolk Division had seven names during its first two decades (1930-50), namely, (1) Norfolk Division, The College of
William and Mary (1930-37); (2) The College of William and Mary in Virginia, Norfolk Division (1937-40); (3) The College of William and Mary in Virginia, Norfolk, Virginia (1940-42); (4) Norfolk Division of the College of William and Mary and the Virginia Polytechnic Institute (1942-43); (5) The Norfolk Division of the College of William and Mary and the Virginia Polytechnic Institute (1943-44); (6) Norfolk Division, College of William and Mary, Virginia Polytechnic Institute (1944-45); and (7) The College of William and Mary and the Virginia Polytechnic Institute in Norfolk (1945-54).

Beginning with the 1931-32 session, the Virginia Polytechnic Institute began a two-year pre-engineering school in cooperation with the Norfolk Division.

Except for the ground swell of public opinion generated during the Bryan vs. Hodges Affair, the statements issued by the Heads of the Norfolk Division, the Norfolk and college newspaper media, local leaders, and fraternal and professional organizations, signaled no overwhelming movement on the part of Norfolk and Tidewater Area residents for a four-year college.

A survey of The College of William and Mary and the Norfolk Division, authorized by the board in 1939, was carried out by Dr. George A. Works, Dean of Education, University of Chicago. Most of the recommendations made by Dr. Works were implemented in the wake of the decision by the board in 1941 which retained control of and operated the Norfolk Division.

The overriding issue during the two decades was the grade-
fixing scandal which involved Dean Hodges of the Norfolk Division. The scandal served as a watershed. The division, which heretofore had been neglected since the death of President J. A. C. Chandler, was forcibly brought to the attention of President Bryan and the administration officials in Williamsburg. Two outcomes of the scandal were the resignation of Dr. Hodges as Dean of the Norfolk Division and the decision on the part of the board not to separate the division from The College of William and Mary. A third outcome was the restoration of the mother college to the "Approved List of the Association of American Universities" which followed its suspension after the grade-fixing scandal became known. A fourth outcome was the effort by The College of William and Mary to get its Norfolk Division accredited as a junior college, an effort which continued beyond the 1949-50 session. A fifth outcome of the scandal was the decision on the part of the Norfolk City Council to form a Committee of Five, known as the Council Committee on Higher Education in Norfolk.

Following his resignation in 1942, President Bryan was elevated by the Board of Visitors to the Chancellorship of The College of William and Mary, an honorary position.

Numerous interviews were quoted of personalities, faculty, and administration connected with the Norfolk Division and The College of William and Mary.

The first two decades (1930-50) of coverage by the Norfolk newspaper media involved 58 editorials which addressed the Norfolk
Division, 342 articles of general interest to the division, 6 individual endorsements of a four-year college, and 2 organizational endorsements of a four-year college. This was a total of 408 editorials and articles, up 206 from 202 for the first decade (1930-40).

A summary of the essential features and data of the 1930-31 through 1949-50 sessions may be found in the Appendix, pages 538-40.
CHAPTER IV

THE NORFOLK DIVISION DURING ITS THIRD DECADE AND BEYOND

(1950-62)

Introduction

This chapter presented concluding political, educational, and economic factors which affected the growth and development of (1) The College of William and Mary and the Virginia Polytechnic Institute in Norfolk (1945-54); (2) The College of William and Mary in Norfolk (1954-58); (3) The College of William and Mary, Norfolk Division (1958-61); (4) the Norfolk College of William and Mary of The Colleges of William and Mary (1961-62); (5) Norfolk College (1962); and (6) Old Dominion College (1962-69).

1950-51 Session

In the interim between sessions, North Korea crossed the 38th Parallel which set in motion the United Nations police action known as the Korean War. For the second time, in less than ten years, the United States was at war, although considerably less extensively involved than World War II. The effect on college campuses, although there was an impact, was far less than that of World War II.

September 25, 1950, marked the opening of the 1950-51 session of The College of William and Mary and the Virginia Polytechnic
Institute in Norfolk. Official enrollment for the session was set at 765 regular day students.

The Director's Advisory Board remained in effect.

Director Lewis W. Webb, Jr., continued as the Head of the Norfolk Division while the Head of The College of William and Mary was continued in the personage of President John E. Pomfret.

On 29 September 1950 Director Webb sent the following letter to Dr. J. M. Godard in Decatur, Georgia:

Under separate cover we are mailing our preliminary application for accreditation. This application is as complete and up-to-date as is possible to make it at this time...

Mr. William Holmes Davis of Norfolk sent the following to President Pomfret:

A gentlemen came to see me last night and told me that the 'William and Mary people' were opposing the effort to bring about the establishment of a four-year college in Norfolk.

On the basis of what you have written me and of what Dr. Chandler and Dr. Bryan told me, I told him that such opposition, if it did exist, was not with your approval. I further told him that all of us here in Norfolk, so far as I knew, believed that your Norfolk Division should continue to grow and believed that a four-year college should be a helpful supplement to the fine work that William and Mary has been doing.

President Pomfret replied four days later to Mr. Davis in the following vein:

There is nothing in the rumor that William and Mary is opposing the establishment of a four year college in Norfolk.

I see no objection to a four year liberal arts college in Norfolk if the work of the last two years can be properly financed by the city. If the work is not financed
properly, such an institution would have no standing whatsoever...

In thanking him for a nice luncheon a few days before, President Pomfret made the following comments to Judge Oscar L. Shewmake, a member of the Board of Visitors, The College of William and Mary:

After eight years' experience with the Norfolk Division and R.P.I., I have come to the conclusion that it would be better if they could be turned loose from the college... If they were placed under the supervision of the State Department of Education they could continue to grow and flourish in accordance with the special needs of the communities they serve. At one time, presumably, the Divisions added strength since they were regarded as feeders to the parent institution. It is my belief, however, that the College is probably losing more than it is gaining by maintaining a connection with two institutions that are so radically different in character and clientele from that of William and Mary. Although this consideration may not seem important, I do encounter from time to time great reluctance on the part of donors to contribute to William and Mary since they seem to think that their contribution in some way will be dissipated among three institutions. In future years this may constitute a real penalty.

I have been wondering if you and I could some day discuss this matter with Governor Battle, and if he accedes, steps might then be taken to turn the Division over to the State Department of Education.

It may be that Mr. Howard would look favorably on this arrangement since it would simplify somewhat the structure of higher education in Virginia...

On 30 October 1950 the following editorial appeared in the Norfolk Virginian-Pilot:

City Manager Harrell's Civitan Club talk on a four-year college for Norfolk sticks the needle of suggestion into a subject which has exhibited going-concern power of its own in recent years... It is only one step - though a much longer step in planning and doing - to ask, since such two-year collegiate institutions have shown their worth and their potentialities, why not move on to broader ideas?
Population increases stimulate the questioning further. Norfolk, Portsmouth, South Norfolk, and the adjoining built-up sections of Princess Anne and Norfolk Counties now combine in population into a single community of perhaps 400,000. By spreading the circle a little wider or including the Lower Peninsula in the count the number rises much higher. There are not many such population concentrations in the United States, if any, which do not have a four-year college. Norfolk’s lack of higher education opportunity at hand is certainly unique in Virginia and may be unique in America.

There is an abundance of experience on which a city like Norfolk could draw. The idea, in brief, is far from revolutionary.

Mr. Harrell’s procedural plan is itself far from revolutionary. He thinks a four-year college is the ‘biggest project’ toward which Norfolk should work in the next few years. He lays down the program of (1) a survey, (2) a thorough study of the needs, (3) a thorough study of the methods of attaining the goal.

Mr. Harrell seemed convinced that the parents of that institution [Norfolk Division] would not be interested in a four-year college here, and perhaps he is correct so far as The College of William and Mary is concerned.

Director Webb thought along the same lines as President Pomfret. He, too, wanted a possible separation of the Norfolk Division from The College of William and Mary. At the same time, he felt an alternative course would be the development of four years of college work under the umbrella of William and Mary. In a letter to President Pomfret he set forth the following suggestions:

I am faced with the inescapable conclusion that to serve the community’s needs to the fullest extent a departure must be made from our established policy of offering only two years of college work.

It is therefore with the greatest humility that I petition you to recommend to the Board of Visitors one of the following courses of action:
1. That the Norfolk Division continue to operate as at present, with the exception that it be allowed to develop four years of college work in such fields as would best satisfy the community’s needs. The name and present relationship with the parent institution would be retained.

2. That the Norfolk Division be released from the control of The College of William and Mary and be established as a separate institution under the State Board of Education. That the college then so established to be given a new name. The name to be such as to identify it with the community - perhaps the College of Hampton Roads or Chesapeake College.

It is hoped that you will be able to give this matter your discerning consideration and counsel with me so that any action deemed advisable may be taken in the near future...

The process of the accreditation of the Norfolk Division as a junior college moved forward. Dr. J. M. Godard informed Director Webb that he was very happy that the Norfolk Division had been approved for a committee study.

Director Webb replied to the above letter on 15 December 1950 as follows:

We are indeed happy to have been approved for a committee study by the Southern Association...

Our college will be delighted to receive the representatives who are to visit our school...

Please advise me of any arrangements that I may make to prepare for their visit or to make their stay in Norfolk a pleasant one.

Dr. J. M. Godard kept The College of William and Mary apprised of the progress being made in the accreditation of the Norfolk Division as a junior college. On 5 March 1951 his secretary wrote the following to President Pomfret:
He asked me to tell you that full committee studies of both the Norfolk Branch and of Richmond Professional Institute were authorized at the last meeting of the Association. These committee studies will be made next October.

On 6 March 1951 Mr. A. C. Harrell, City Manager of Norfolk, sent a letter to the City Council of Norfolk, in which he recommended that all pending references which pertained to higher educational facilities be referred to the Norfolk Commission on Higher Education.

In the letter he stated the following:

Although our energies are devoted constantly to improving our public schools, minor attention has thus far been given to providing adequate and full opportunities for those who wish to continue their training in college.

It is true that the Norfolk Division of The College of William and Mary has met part of this need, but it offers only a 2-year course, and those who desire further training must continue it elsewhere. Furthermore, many students are prohibited by the high cost of living at out-of-town colleges from pursuing their education further. Norfolk's increase in size and prosperity should be accompanied by a complete educational program, from which limitless benefits would result.

It is recommended, therefore, that all references received by the Council and by the City Manager be referred to the Norfolk Commission on Higher Education, with the request that the Commission study the question in detail and submit a report to the Council. It is recommended that the report deal particularly with the following:

(a) What, in the opinion of the Commission, is the obligation of the City of Norfolk in the field of higher education.

(b) Does sufficient need exist in the City of Norfolk for a 4-year college.

(c) If the need does exist, what practical steps may be undertaken, using either present or new facilities, to fulfill this need.

(d) Should new facilities be desirable, what will be the cost and how may the City best finance such a project.
The council adopted unanimously the recommendation of the city manager, and he was authorized to proceed in accordance therewith.

Mr. William Holmes Davis wrote to President Pomfret on 8 March 1951 wherein he stated that at his request the Norfolk Association of Commerce had set up a Special Committee in the Norfolk Area. He went on further and said that he was told almost every day that friends of The College of William and Mary worked in opposition to the effort which was made to establish in the Norfolk-Portsmouth Area a four-year college. He believed that it would be best for the Norfolk Division if it continued its fine work and for a four-year college to be established in addition. He concluded the letter in that he wished Dr. Pomfret would see his way clear to make exactly the same statement that both Dr. Chandler and Dr. Bryan made to him.

The movement to separate the Norfolk Division from The College of William and Mary appeared to be gaining ground. The following was contained in a report by President Pomfret to the Board of Visitors on 10 March 1951 with regard to the future status of the divisions:

In Report No. 11 relating to Higher Education prepared by Griffinhagen and Associates in 1947, as part of the work of the Commission on Reorganization of the State Government, William and Mary was commended for its moves to extend its services to Norfolk and Richmond. ‘However,’ the report continues, ‘most of the work given at its Divisions at Richmond and Norfolk is so different from that of the main college that there seems no good reason, other than proximity, why these branches should be attached to The
College of William and Mary. On several occasions during the past year both Dean Hibbs of R.P.I. and Mr. Webb, Director of the Norfolk Division, have requested that the Divisions be separated from the College. At my suggestion they have reduced their requests to writing. Both recommended that the College take steps to place the Divisions under the control of the State Board of Education. Meanwhile, the Southern Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools has ruled that the branches of an institution must obtain separate accreditation from that of the main institution. The inspection of our branches is scheduled for next October.

I do not believe that the College would in any way suffer through a separation. Not only do our alumni express indifference toward the Divisions, but large numbers of them are hostile to the relationship.

I recommend that the President be authorized to consult with the State Board of Education, and if that body is receptive to the idea of administering the Divisions, the approval of the Governor be sought in arranging for a transfer.

While the board unanimously approved the recommendation included in the president's report, the rector at the same time appointed a committee which consisted of Mr. Harold W. Ramsey as Chairman, Mr. J. V. Bauserman and Mr. A. H. Foreman as members, to consider the advisability of the separation of the Richmond Professional Institute and the Norfolk Division from the college. The committee was to report its findings to the board at its spring meeting on 26 May 1951.

President Pomfret replied on 13 March 1951 to Mr. Davis's earlier letter and thanked him for the same. He reiterated, however, that The College of William and Mary could not possibly operate a four-year college in Norfolk. He reassured Mr. Davis, that to the best of his knowledge, no friends or alumni of The College of William
and Mary were working in opposition to efforts being made to establish a four-year college. President Pomfret affirmed that no one had spoken or written to him except Mr. Davis. He cautioned that any undertaking would be an expensive one for the community with respect to the physical plant and maintenance and that every safeguard should be taken to ensure that any plan provided for a quality of work that would secure accreditation for the institution in the Southern Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools.

On 23 March 1951 President Pomfret wrote the following to Mr. Harold W. Ramsey, Chairman of the Board of Visitors' Committee which considered the advisability of the separation of the Richmond Professional Institute and the Norfolk Division from The College of William and Mary:

There, of course, has been a movement in Norfolk for a number of years in favor of establishing a four year college there. I have always refused to become a party of it since I think the City of Norfolk should assume the full financial responsibility for any extension from a two year to a four year college. . . .

I have told both Dean Hibbs and Mr. Webb that this matter will take several years before a final adjustment is made. Meanwhile, the Virginia Legislative Advisory Committee has appointed Fred Kelley, formerly with the American Council on Education, to come to Virginia for six weeks in order to study the feasibility of a consolidation of all the state colleges and universities in Virginia under a single board and a single chancellor. . . .

On 25 April 1951 the Norfolk Virginian-Pilot reported that the Board of Directors of the Norfolk Association of Commerce had joined in the agitation for the establishment of a four-year college and had asked the city council to:
1. Locate a suitable site of ample proportion on which such an institution could be erected, and

2. Call a meeting of representatives of other communities in the area to broaden the scope of the movement

The above action was taken after Mr. Frank W. Evans, Chairman of a Special N.A.C. Committee appointed in February 1951 to explore the question, declared that there was an urgent need in the Norfolk-Portsmouth Metropolitan District and adjacent area for a four-year standard college. Evans recommended that the N.A.C. project be turned over to the Norfolk Commission on Higher Education.

An editorial in the *Norfolk Ledger-Dispatch* stressed the need for further study of the four-year college. While a strong case could be made out for the desirability of the establishment of a standard, four-year college, the editorial cautioned that establishment of the proposed college should not be made on the basis of desirability alone. Factors such as the original and continuing costs should be fully considered. The editorial further cautioned that the matter should not be approached in haste and that the whole matter should be given the fullest study, in all aspects, before any decision is made, one way or the other.

The accreditation process moved ahead. Director Webb received a letter from Dr. J. H. Godard in which he said that the Visiting Committee would consist of President Irvine J. Ingram of West Georgia College and Superintendent A. C. Flora of Columbia, South Carolina, and that the visit would probably be made in October.
The Special Committee of the Board of Visitors, appointed to consider the advisability of separating the Norfolk and Richmond Divisions of the college, reported to the board on 26 May 1951 to the effect that no action had been taken with respect to the Norfolk Division.

Director Webb made a point of keeping his immediate superior informed on developments with respect to the establishment of a four-year college. On 4 June 1951 he wrote as follows to President Pomfret:

Mr. Harrell, City Manager of Norfolk, has asked me to appear before the City Committee on Higher Education to discuss in general the four year college. The City Manager understands the position of the college, and expects no commitments from us, but rather wishes us to help the Committee in matters of advice on operation costs, planning and educational policies.

The Committee has recently received requests for the establishment of a four year college on a site outside the city. A tract of over 100 acres is considered to be the minimum campus area and an expenditure of about $8,000,000 in buildings and equipment is visualized.

Mr. Harrell does not believe this to be what Norfolk needs and favors a community type college in the city proper without the expense of dormitories, infirmaries, faculty homes, etc.

With your permission I would like to appear before this group in the role of consultant or advisor. I will be careful not to involve the College and will restrict myself in any manner you suggest.

To the foregoing letter President Pomfret replied, thusly:

Please feel free to sit as a consultant or advisor in any way that seems appropriate for the discussion of the four year college proposal in the City of Norfolk. I am sure you understand that this College would be unable to sponsor such an enterprise.
While the community of Norfolk pushed for separation and the establishment of a four-year college, Director Webb entertained private thoughts to the contrary. In an interview, conducted years later, he said the following:

We had no desire to separate because we weren't strong enough. At that time this division could have been killed off very easily with very little complaint on the part of the people. And we knew this could happen; there was no way we could operate on our own. We were just beginning to get a little state aid, very little but some. There was no way that we could operate without some connection with another institution. We were working for our own accreditation. . . but we didn't want to separate in 1951 or 1948. It wasn't timely then, and I certainly wasn't pushing for it.

The concepts of separation from the mother college and the establishment of a four-year college were in strong evidence during the 1950-51 session. Director Webb, local citizens, local fraternal and professional organizations, the City Council of Norfolk, and the Norfolk newspaper media were all involved in varying degrees with the concepts. During the period from the end of the 1949-50 session through the 1950-51 session the Norfolk newspaper media carried a total of 6 editorials devoted to the four-year college concept, 6 articles of general interest to the division, 2 articles which contained endorsements of the four-year college by an organization, and no articles of endorsement by individuals. This was a total of 14 editorials and articles, up 12 from 2 previously.

Final exercises were held in Foreman Field on 15 June 1951 with Dean Pinchbeck of the University of Richmond who gave the principal address.
1951-52 Session

Between sessions, in his "Annual Report to the Board of Visitors" for the 1950-51 academic year to President Pomfret, Director Webb made the following statements:

1. Accreditation. . . . We have made application to the Southern Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools for separate accreditation. Our application has been reviewed, and we were invited to appear before their examining committee for a preliminary interview. Following this interview we were notified that we had passed this phase of the investigation and that a Committee would visit the Norfolk Division in the fall of 1951.

(a) Cooperation with Parent Institution. The cooperation given to us by the administrative officers of the College has continued on its usual high plane. . . . The cooperation given us by the academic department has also been excellent. . . .

This year saw the development of cooperation between our band and the William and Mary band. . . .

On 9 August 1951 the Norfolk Ledger-Dispatch reported:

An invitation to establish a four-year college in Norfolk was sent today to the Board of Visitors of Virginia [University of Virginia] by the Norfolk Association of Commerce Board. The Board's resolution read, 'Whereas the Board of Directors of the Norfolk Association of Commerce has unanimously approved the effort being made to establish in the Norfolk-Portsmouth Metropolitan District a four-year, degree conferring college; and whereas the president of The College of William and Mary, on March 13, 1951, has officially written that The College of William and Mary could not possibly operate a four-year college in Norfolk, and whereas we believe it to be for the best interest of higher education in Virginia, as a whole, and of southeast Virginia in particular, that the proposed standard four-year college shall be operated as a collegiate division of the University of Virginia, be it resolved . . . ' that the invitation be extended.

Mr. Charles T. Abeles, Chairman of the Norfolk Commission on Higher Education, wrote President Pomfret concerning a survey which
the commission was going to undertake regarding the establishment of a four-year college:

Lewis Webb phoned me this afternoon that he had seen you yesterday and had communicated to you my conversation with him regarding a survey which the Norfolk Commission on Higher Education . . . is considering for the purpose of determining the need for and practicability of establishing a four-year college in Norfolk. For that purpose we hope to be able to engage the American Council on Education.

The American Council, before undertaking this work, desires, among other things, to have assurance that the University of Virginia and William and Mary have no objections to the making of the survey. President Darden . . . has already advised me that he not only has no objection but would welcome such an investigation. Mr. Webb informs me that you feel the same way. So that I may advise the American Council on Education, would you be good enough to drop me a line stating that The College of William and Mary does not object to the making of the survey.

The following day President Pomfret replied to Mr. Charles T. Abeles:

I wish to assure you that the College of William and Mary has no objection whatsoever to the Norfolk Commission on Higher Education undertaking a survey in order to determine the needs for a four year college in Norfolk. . . .

The accreditation process continued to move forward, with a letter written on 23 August 1951 from Director Webb to Dr. J. M. Godard:

I wish to confirm our request for an inspection by the Southern Association to be made during this coming semester. Tentative dates of October 15th and 16th have been suggested by Dr. Flora, and those or any other dates will be satisfactory to us. . . .

In an address to the Norfolk Lions Club, Mr. Charles T. Abeles stated that officials of The College of William and Mary had given no encouragement to the possibility of the use of the
facilities of the Norfolk Division as a nucleus for a four-year college for Norfolk. Mr. Abeles expressed his personal opinion that the Norfolk public was in favor of a four-year college. He outlined six major questions that had to be settled before establishment of a four-year college could become a reality.

1. What are the obligations of the City?
2. Does the need exist for a four-year college?
3. What new facilities would be needed?
4. What would be the cost of a four-year college?
5. Are there any physical facilities here that could be used?
6. What would be the capital operating costs?

A Norfolk Virginian-Pilot editorial on 2 September 1951 complimented Mr. Charles T. Abeles on the spirit and attitude in which the Norfolk Commission on Higher Education, of which he was the Chairman, had approached the problem of a four-year college.

According to the editorial, Mr. Abeles said that when the commission was through they hoped to present a complete factual package which would contain all the information which the council would need to reach an informed and workable decision. He emphasized that he wanted to counteract the thinking that was evident in some quarters that all that was necessary was to decide that a four-year college was needed and go about creating it. The editorial stated that the hard fact was that this was a large and complex subject which could be dealt with intelligently only if all aspects of it were examined thoroughly. The editorial said it was encouraged that the commission
showed every disposition to reach to the heart of the issues with the realization that this was important public business and that it was determined to obtain all possible information. 667

The College of William and Mary and the Virginia Polytechnic Institute in Norfolk officially opened on 24 September 1951, 668 with official enrollment for the 1951-52 session set at 617 regular day students. 669

The Director's Advisory Board remained a duly constituted body. 670

Director Lewis W. Webb, Jr., continued as Head of the Norfolk Division. 671

Prior to the opening of the Norfolk Division, President Pomfret resigned the Presidency of The College of William and Mary. He had been involved during the preceding months with an athletic turmoil on campus. Succumbing to the pressure to maintain winning football at the college, high school transcripts of football players applying for admission had been altered. In addition it had also come to light that there were cases of students in college who had received credit for courses they had not attended. President Pomfret, unfortunately, had believed that certain coaches whom he had trusted and supported could not have betrayed the college in such a manner. Even further, his position was complicated in the controversy by a number of coaches who resigned. At the same time, the faculty urged a major reduction in intercollegiate athletics, particularly football. On 17 September 1951 the faculty unanimously
adopted a statement which said the controversy was caused by an athletic policy which had proceeded to the point of obscuring and corrupting the real purposes of an institution of higher learning. Because of a lack of support from both the faculty and the Board of Visitors, his position became untenable. Following his resignation, the board immediately named Dr. James W. Miller, Professor and Chairman of the Philosophy Department, as the Acting President.

The board's search for the twenty-second President of The College of William and Mary was quite brief. Before the month was out, they had selected Vice-Admiral Alvin Duke Chandler, U. S. Navy. They even prevailed, at the time, upon President Harry S. Truman to relieve Admiral Chandler of his duties and place him on the Retired List so he could assume the William and Mary Presidency. Admiral Chandler was the son of former President J. A. C. Chandler and had attended the college before entering the U. S. Naval Academy. Admiral Chandler assumed the presidency before the end of September 1951.

Documentation as to President Chandler's managerial and leadership styles was extremely lacking. Perhaps because he was a retired Vice-Admiral his managerial and leadership styles were fairly obvious and little was written about them. In an interview with Dr. James R. Sweeney, President Lewis W. Webb, Jr., described President Chandler as a very strict taskmaster, one who had an open mind, and one who was a leader-type. In an interview with Miss Emily
Williams, he expressed his opinion that Dr. Chandler was not an academic leader.

A Special Study of The College of William and Mary and the Virginia Polytechnic Institute in Norfolk was carried out from 15-18 October 1951 by Drs. I. S. Ingram and A. C. Flora. Fifteen standards were examined to determine if the Norfolk Division met the junior college accreditation standards of the Southern Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools. The standards were summarized, as follows:

1. Statement of Policy
   a. With the nature, functions and aims defined, the authorities early proceeded to organize the faculty, and build a physical plant designed to achieve these objectives. The college meets Standard One in respect to fulfilling the scope and purpose of the institution.

2. Organization
   a. This college is under the auspices and control of The College of William and Mary. The college met in every respect Standard Two.

3. Junior College Curricula
   a. Detailed survey of the offerings of the liberal arts and pre-professional courses indicated the courses listed and required are in keeping with the best usages and practices of standard colleges and universities. The college met Standard Three in every respect.

4. Entrance Requirements
   a. The admission records are assembled, checked and approved by the assistant director. They are filed with the registrar and become the property and responsibility of that office. The responsibility for admissions was clearly a function of the assistant director and was done in a most satisfactory manner.
5. Faculty
   a. The faculty had a staff of more than forty full-time persons engaged in administrative duties and teaching. The committee was of the opinion that the institution was adequately staffed by a strong faculty.

6. Instruction
   a. The college has set up a splendid program for guidance. The committee was of the opinion that department heads and staff members felt free to have initiated new teaching procedures, revised courses of study, and to have objectively weighed and compared individual and departmental methods of instruction for the purpose of instructional improvement.

7. Financial Support
   a. Past financial support from a well-stabilized student clientele, the increased annual support of the state, and the favorable location of the college gave fine promise for permanency, growth, and educational performance. The college met Standard Seven.

8. Library
   a. The library was housed in what was considered temporary quarters. The main library was located on the first floor of the Administration Building and was staffed by a trained librarian and student assistant. The periodicals and music library were located in separate rooms and were staffed by an assistant librarian and student help. The library met the standards of the association in every respect.

9. Laboratories
   a. The science laboratories were temporarily housed in an old building, but the rooms used for chemistry, physics, and biology were well-equipped. All requirements of the association were met.

10. Physical Plant
    a. The physical plant was in good shape. There were two permanent brick buildings. All these were fully described in the director's report to this association. The buildings were clean, well kept, and met standards of health, safety and space.
11. General Tone and Stability of the Institution

a. The character and integrity of the work at this junior college were of the highest order. The general atmosphere and spirit of the administration of the college and its code of ethics were found exceptional. Good morale of the faculty and students were indicated. The institution met a definite need of the Norfolk Community and did so in an efficient manner.

12. Student Personnel

a. The college had a counseling service headed by a trained and competent counselor. Student aid was available in limited small amounts. There was only a form of student government. Student morale was high.

13. Graduation

a. The permanent records of all students graduating were neatly recorded and filed in a fire-proof vault. The standard on credit hours and quality points required for graduation was followed without exception.

14. Records

a. All files of admission, matriculation, attendance, and scholarship records were examined and found in order. The requirements of Standard Fourteen were fully met in every aspect by the institution.

15. Association Survey

a. The Committee of the Association worked from Monday, October 17th, through Thursday, October 21st. The committee left the institution with deep appreciation for its high standards and effective work.

16. Summary

a. The Committee recommended to the General Committee full admission of the institution.

Director Webb telephoned Mr. Charles J. Duke, Jr., on 18 October 1951 and told him that the Inspection Committee of the Southern Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools had inspected.
the Norfolk Division on Monday, Tuesday, and Wednesday. He wanted Mr. Duke and President Chandler to know that the Norfolk Division had passed the inspection and had met all standards of the association. He further said that the Inspection Committee would make a good report on the division.

The association officially approved the division's application for accreditation as a junior college in December 1951.

Dr. James R. Sweeney, in his book on a popular history of Old Dominion University, said:

In sum, the Southern Association accrediting team found the character and integrity of the work at the junior college to be 'of the highest order.' The general atmosphere and spirit of administration of the college as well as its code of ethics were described as 'exceptional.' Faculty and student morale was high, but the physical facilities were inadequate, especially in view of anticipated growth. The committee left the college with 'deep appreciation for its high standards and effective work.'

To scotch rumors that The College of William and Mary planned to withdraw from or curtail operations of the Norfolk Division, President Chandler went on record and said that the intentions of the mother college were just the opposite. He stated that the college's policy was not to weaken but strengthen the operations of the Norfolk Division and that the two-year college facility would not be withdrawn. The article which relayed the foregoing also said that agitation for establishment of a four-year college in Norfolk had been underway for a number of years. Plans for legislation which permitted the City of Norfolk to construct, purchase, maintain, or acquire a four-year college had been discussed by Norfolk Members of
the General Assembly. The Norfolk Chamber of Commerce and Advertising Board had backed plans for an establishment of a four-year college in Norfolk and had approached the University of Virginia on the matter.

The Norfolk Virginian-Pilot reported that the movement to establish a four-year college in the Hampton Roads Area was given impetus when the Board of Directors of the Norfolk Chamber of Commerce adopted a report submitted after a year of study by its Special Committee on Higher Education. The N.C.C. Board went on record as "strongly in favor" of a four-year college and gave an authorization to the special committee which:

1. Urged our representatives in the General Assembly to do everything possible to have an appropriation made immediately to cover the expense of a survey and engage in other planning looking to the earliest possible establishment of the college in question

2. Sought the endorsement and cooperation of other political sub-divisions and organizations in the area for the furtherance of the project, and

3. Enlisted especially the cooperation of the Norfolk City Council and its Commission on Higher Education as an initial step to unify the undertaking.

A Norfolk Ledger-Dispatch editorial raised a question as to whether a separate study by a House of Delegates' Special Commission was necessary. Four Norfolk members in the house proposed that a Special Commission be created to "re-examine the situation regarding the Norfolk Division, College of William and Mary - V.P.I." The editorial stated that the Special Commission appeared to be a substitute for legislation which had been suggested by Delegate Guy
to permit the City of Norfolk to take steps to establish a four-year college in Norfolk. The editorial further stated that the Norfolk Commission on Higher Education, headed by Mr. Charles T. Abeles, had the matter under consideration and a report on the subject to the city council was in the making. The report of the Abeles Commission would provide the basis for consideration by the City of Norfolk as to what it proposed to do about the future of higher education in Norfolk. 682

At its March 1952 meeting the Director's Advisory Board approved the following statement of its beliefs regarding a four-year college:

1. Norfolk needs a four-year college
2. It is too much for the city to undertake
3. The four-year college should be operated by the State
4. It should be built on the foundation of the present school

A general discussion centered on whether the board should recommend a liberal arts college or some special kind of four year college. Dr. Flora of the visiting accreditation team of the Southern Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools was quoted to the effect that a four-year college could be operated in Norfolk with very little additional staff or equipment. No definite action was taken by the board with respect to the general discussion. 683

The Board of Visitors at its 31 May 1952 meeting authorized the appointment of a Coordinator of Divisional Activities and Director of Extension, College of William and Mary. This position
was authorized because the board had during the past eight years
taken action on numerous occasions looking to the closer coordination
of the functions and activities of the Norfolk Division and of the
Richmond Professional Institute with those of the college at
Williamsburg. The coordinator worked closely with the president,
dean of the faculty, the bursar, the registrar, and other officers of
the college in Williamsburg and secured the desired consistency of
administration and practice.

The board also stated that a monograph would be prepared on
the Norfolk Division and that the college's relationships in the
Norfolk Area would be cleared up and published for the people of
Norfolk. President Chandler felt that the college's position in
Norfolk was not clear or thoroughly understood with respect to the
college's purpose there.

The concept of a four-year college in Norfolk was supported
by virtually all sectors during the 1951-52 session. A definite
movement was evidenced. From the end of the 1950-51 session through
the 1951-52 session, Norfolk newspaper media carried 2 editorials
which endorsed the four-year college concept and 6 editorials of a
general nature, 12 articles of general interest to the division, 4
articles in which organizations endorsed the four-year college, and 2
articles of endorsement by individuals. This was a total of 26
editorials and articles, up 12 from 14 previously.

The division closed its doors for the 1951-52 session on 10 June
1952.
1952-53 Session

Following the end of the 1951-52 session, an editorial appeared on 20 June 1952 in the Norfolk Virginian-Pilot entitled "Lampert Commission on a Four-Year College." The editorial said that the Norfolk Chamber of Commerce's establishment of a Special Committee on a four-year college for the Norfolk Region was a sensible method of dealing with a complex subject. In addition the editorial also stated that higher education was in a transition stage with numerous uncertainties and the most serious financial difficulties which affected the whole body of public colleges and universities. The editorial observed that the problems connected with higher education were infinitely more complicated than counting the population of the region and noting the distance to the nearest four-year college and making comparisons with other parts of the country. The goal of the commission was to secure, if the study so determined, state-wide recognition of the need for the area in establishing such an institution with a concerted attempt to obtain legislative sanction at the 1954 session of the General Assembly.

In his "Annual Report to the Board of Visitors" for the 1951-52 academic session to The College of William and Mary, Director Webb, among other things, discussed the subjects of accreditation and cooperation with the parent college. Under accreditation he stated that the greatest single accomplishment during the 1951-52 school year was the accreditation of the Norfolk Division as a junior college by the Southern Association of Colleges and Secondary
Schools. The association voted to admit the division during its December 1951 meeting. With respect to cooperation with the parent college, he said that he wished to acknowledge with grateful thanks the cooperation and help extended by everyone in the Administrative Staff of William and Mary. The Personnel Office, the Business Office, and the Registrar's Office were all considered quite helpful. To President Chandler he offered his thanks for his helpful criticism and the support of many proposals brought before him during the year.

On 16 July 1952 Director Webb felt constrained to write President Chandler concerning the four-year college movement in Norfolk:

As you well know there has been considerable agitation in Norfolk during the past ten years or more for the formation of a four-year college. . . . This movement has never been taken seriously in the past because it seemed to have very little backing among the influential citizens and organizations of this city. The officials of William and Mary have constantly discounted the threat of such a movement and have, during the past, always taken a strict 'no compromise' stand in answer to the requests for expansion of the Norfolk Division beyond the two year level.

During the last year and a half the character of the movement has taken a decided change toward improvement. The City Council of Norfolk has appointed a Commission on Higher Education . . . The Chamber of Commerce has also come forth with a statement of policy backing the establishment of a four-year college . . . Many civic groups are also steadily falling into line to back such a movement. . . .

In my opinion William and Mary should take a decided stand to work with these groups in bringing about improved college training opportunities in the Norfolk area. I feel some form of a compromise program can be devised which would keep the control and development of the college in the hands of William and Mary and yet satisfy the educational needs of the community. I cannot envision a large university being
established in Norfolk by the State, but I do feel that the State will find itself obligated to establish a number of basic degree granting curricula which would most nearly meet the Norfolk needs. Unless we can work out such a plan I am afraid that the old attitude of 'no compromise' will cause you to ultimately lose the Norfolk Division.

A great deal of work has been done by the various committees in Norfolk and I would suggest that a conference be arranged with those committees just as soon as William and Mary is willing to change its policy regarding the aims of the Norfolk Division. Let me make it clear that I am not crusading for the four year college and take no active part in such a project. I have, however, come to the point where I believe that to withhold any higher education from the people of the Norfolk area could not be justified and would be educational hypocrisy...

Twelve days later, in response to some suggestions from President Chandler, Director Webb sent President Chandler the following letter:

Last Monday . . . I met with the Mayor, the City Manager, the Chairman of the Committee on Higher Education, and the Chairman of the Chamber of Commerce Committee on the four-year college. . . . The present thinking of this group is that there be a gradual development of offerings in the third and fourth years of college work to meet certain obvious needs. They would like for degrees to be given in a number of vocational fields such as Accounting and Nursing, as well as a general degree in Liberal Arts or pre-professional training. . . .

I believe that the majority feel that the expansion of the higher educational program should be done from the present Norfolk Division rather than to establish a separate institution. . . .

They were quite surprised that the past attitude of 'no compromise' no longer applied, and they were hopeful that a solution could be worked out to the satisfaction of both the College and the City. . . .

In discussing the higher education situation with the group . . . I believe that I could safely say that the City will probably be very favorable to giving aid to the Norfolk Division for the development of its physical plant in such needs as land and buildings. . . . An immediate study is
being made by the City Real Estate Board of the property immediately adjacent to the college with the view of taking such steps as may be necessary to prevent the development of that property and a possible confining of the college to a point where expansion would be very costly.

On 18 August 1952 the Norfolk Commission on Higher Education reported to the Norfolk City Council on the proposal to establish a four-year college in Norfolk. The report dealt with the following questions and their summarized answers:

1. Is there sufficient potential student body to justify the establishment of a four-year college in Norfolk?
   a. Before that question can be answered a decision must be reached as to the function of the proposed institution

2. What kind and scope of educational program should be provided to meet most effectively the needs of the community? Should it be predominantly vocational, at least at first, or should it embark immediately upon a program of general education?
   a. A categorical answer to this question is difficult without the aid of operational experience. A comprehensive investigation of this subject should include an inquiry into the needs of industries, the armed forces, and state and city institutions for technical and professional training of their personnel

3. What physical facilities, faculty, and administrative staff would be needed?
   a. The answer to this question rests in large part upon the size of the student body and the kind of educational programs to be provided

4. Where would the institution be located?
   a. If it is to serve its purpose effectively, it is essential that it be so situated as to be accessible to the greatest number of potential students

5. Are there presently available facilities which could be used as the nucleus of a new college?
   a. The existing plant of the Norfolk Division immediately
suggests itself for this purpose. But careful study is needed to determine whether, and if so, how, this institution could be adjusted and expanded, physically and otherwise, to a four-year program.

6. What would be the minimum capital outlay and operating cost to carry out this project?

   a. Realistic planning must have major regard for the financial commitment which the undertaking would involve. This rests largely on the answers to questions 2, 3, and 5 and upon a determination of what portion of the operating costs should be contributed by tuition and public funds, respectively.

7. How shall the institution be organized?

   a. The kind and scope of educational program best fitted to the needs of the area to be served having been determined, it is vital that the managerial and administrative machinery for the control and operation of the institution be so devised that its policies will remain responsive to those needs.

In summary, the commission concluded that:

1. The obligation to provide additional higher educational facilities in the Norfolk area rests primarily with the State than the City.

2. While evidence at hand indicates, prima facie at least, a need for a four-year college in Norfolk, that need, together with the kind and scope of educational program which the institution if established should provide, whether existing facilities can be utilized or expanded to furnish the necessary physical plant and personnel, and the cost of such an undertaking, can be definitely determined only after a comprehensive survey has developed the factual information described in this report.

The report made the following recommendations to the city council:

1. That the Norfolk delegation to the 1954 General Assembly be urged to exert every possible effort to have enacted a bill to carry into effect the report of the Virginia Advisory Legislative Council made in September 1951 to the General
Assembly that a State Board of Higher Education be created for the purposes and with the powers and duties therein set forth.

2. That if and when the State Board of Higher Education is created the City Council and the Norfolk delegation to the General Assembly request the State Board, through such channels as the law may provide, to undertake immediately a study to determine whether there is a need for a four year college in Norfolk, and to develop the further information suggested in this report.

3. That should the State Board find that a four year college is needed the City Council and the Norfolk delegation to the General Assembly take such steps as may be necessary to obtain an appropriation of funds for its construction and operation.

4. That in the meantime the administrative authorities of the existing higher educational facilities endeavor to formulate, in cooperation with their parent institutions, a plan for the enlargement of their present curricula to include courses in specialized fields for which in their opinion there is a demonstrated need, and that for the 1954 session of the General Assembly by requested to appropriate sufficient operational funds to carry the plan into effect.

On 8 September 1952 Mr. William Holmes Davis sent President Chandler a brief letter in which he said:

At a meeting of the Higher Education committee of the Norfolk Chamber of Commerce ... the report of the Norfolk Commission on Higher Education was considered and it was noted that the statement was made therein that there had been a change of heart on the part of The College of William and Mary as to the establishment of a four-year college in this district.

I seem to be the storm center in this matter and being asked as to what that 'change of heart' means. . . .

President Chandler expeditiously replied three days later to the above letter, wherein he said:

As you know, I discussed the matter of education at the meeting of the Rotary Club on September 9, 1952. I am a great believer in higher education, and I am a great believer in quality education. I do feel the people of Norfolk should
thoroughly study their needs from a standpoint of education, the traditions of the people from an educational point of view, and the development of the junior college. After the junior college begins to function in every respect I am sure that the people will then decide what their future needs are from the experience they gain in the two-year college. . . .

I do not recommend that the people of Norfolk be hasty in so far as brick and mortar are concerned without first considering the quality of education. . . .

The College of William and Mary and the Virginia Polytechnic Institute in Norfolk opened its doors for the 1952-53 session on 15 September 1952. Official enrollment was set at 654 regular day students.

The Director's Advisory Board remained as part of the Norfolk Division's administrative organization.

Director of the Norfolk Division was continued in the person of Mr. Lewis W. Webb, Jr., while Vice Admiral Alvin D. Chandler continued as President of The College of William and Mary.

According to the Norfolk Ledger-Dispatch of 27 September 1952, the Norfolk City Council of Parents-Teachers Associations named a committee to work with the Council on Higher Education in studying the feasibility of a four-year college for the Tidewater Area.

An 11 October 1952 editorial reviewed a speech President Chandler had given before the Norfolk Rotary Club sometime during the previous month. It quoted him to the effect that the Norfolk Division had not been developed fully and that he did not believe that the citizens of Norfolk had been made conscious of what William and Mary could do to assist them in higher education. Steps were being taken to make the divisions more fully reach up to its
potentialities. The division was part of an intensive study which consisted of a self-evaluation of all phases of college activities. It was tended to ascertain the resources and needs of the college. The study involved every group and individual within the college community. The ultimate goal was to make William and Mary and its branches better serve the cause of education.701

A 25 January 1953 article said that the Board of Visitors felt that the Norfolk Division, in terms of its origin, location, and tradition had a natural affiliation with the college in Williamsburg. It further stated that William and Mary would do everything possible to assure continued growth and development through strengthening and expansion of its educational services and physical facilities.702

At its meeting on 24 January 1953, the Board of Visitors of The College of William and Mary adopted a statement which defined the William and Mary System and set forth in general terms the place of the system in each of the three institutions which comprised it. This statement was a result of the self-evaluation in which the administrative personnel, faculties, students, and service staffs of The College of William and Mary, the Norfolk Division, and the Richmond Professional Institute had participated. Educational aims and means, administration, organization and finance, student life, and physical plant and facilities were all studied with respect to current status and future development. As a result of the self-evaluation the board reached these conclusions:
1. Each unit [including the Norfolk Division] which is included in the William and Mary System is an essential component of a comprehensive and well-rounded system of higher education.

2. Each unit [including the Norfolk Division] performs an essential service in providing educational opportunity for youths and adults of the area which the William and Mary System seeks to serve.

3. The Norfolk Division and the Richmond Professional Institute, in terms of their origin, location, and tradition, have a natural affiliation with the College at Williamsburg.

4. The cooperation of the Virginia Polytechnic Institute in the development of engineering and technical programs, and that of other institutions and agencies in other programs at the College in Williamsburg, at the Richmond Professional Institute, and at the Norfolk Division, has expanded in important areas the educational services rendered, and has been of mutual advantage to the institutions and agencies concerned.

The board reaffirmed the following:

1. Its recognition of the educational responsibility of the Greater College of William and Mary to the youth and adults of the State of Virginia and the Tidewater Area, in particular, and of the nation, in general, and its determination to discharge that responsibility with increasing effectiveness;

2. Its abiding interest in the Norfolk Division and the Richmond Professional Institute as essential components of the William and Mary System, and its purpose to assure their continued growth and development through the strengthening and expansion of their educational services and physical facilities by every legitimate means; and

3. Its continuing policy of reaching decisions and taking action on educational and financial problems and proposals in light of the needs of the total William and Mary System, as well as in consideration of the needs of each of the three institutions [including the Norfolk Division] and the Board's purpose to develop each to its maximum potentiality for educational service.

The board further expanded on the foregoing statement, to the effect that the general policy was that the Norfolk Division, in both
its origin and development, was designed to serve the educational needs of residents of the Peninsula - Hampton Roads Area. Specific policies included (1) recognition of the significance to the William and Mary System of the educational services rendered by the Norfolk Division and considered the support and strengthening of programs which existed to be among its primary responsibilities, (2) recognition that as new educational needs arose the board would make every effort which provided for meeting them, (3) approval by the board of those programs which were of high quality and for which faculty of adequate training and competence were available and could be secured, and (4) future development of the Norfolk Division should be regarded as a cooperative undertaking. The board concluded that the future growth of the Norfolk Division was regarded as a matter of great importance in relation to the proper overall development of higher education in the area. The board proposed to promote the development of the Norfolk Division by every proper means available to it.

Besides a statement which it issued on The William and Mary System, the board on 24 January 1953 elicited the following from Director Webb regarding the division:

1. The City of Norfolk was anxious for improvements in the educational programs in Norfolk and has indicated its feeling that Norfolk needs a four-year college

2. It was desirable to gradually expand the present program into three and four year programs
3. A four-year liberal arts program at Norfolk would not affect the College at Williamsburg. Students attended the Norfolk Division for financial reasons or because of family ties that kept them in the Norfolk Area.

4. The city wanted a four-year program which included perhaps accounting, music, nursing, etc.

5. The City of Norfolk had urgently requested a four-year college program

6. With respect to the establishment of a four-year college progress would be slow inasmuch as the programs would be developed as they were needed

7. The City of Norfolk wanted the Board's feeling concerning a four-year college

8. It would probably be five years before a four-year college accredited degree could be offered

9. The credits of the Norfolk Division are accepted by other institutions

10. No formal overture by the committees of the City of Norfolk, which concerned a four-year college, had been made to the President of The College of William and Mary or the Director of the Norfolk Division

11. No formal request for a four-year college had been made but last fall an inquiry which concerned a visit to President Chandler was made

President Chandler stated that no formal request had been made but that the city wanted to talk about a four-year college. He further stated that he thought the board should be sympathetic in the matter. A member of the board felt no formal action or expression of opinion was needed at the time but suggested that the matter be pursued further by President Chandler in conjunction with the Board's Commission on Divisions. The Rector, Judge Oscar L. Shewmake, reminded the board that it already had President Chandler's statement insofar as principle was concerned.
At its 7 April 1953 meeting Councilman Summers of the City Council of Norfolk observed the following:

From time to time Council had received information and figures, some quite impressive, regarding the need in this area of a fully accredited four-year college; that the question had been considered seriously by the Chamber of Commerce to the point where they have appointed a committee who are actively engaged in making a survey of such need; that the Norfolk Committee on Higher Education has and is still considering the matter; and because of the possibility that these groups at all may be waiting to ascertain the attitude of this council.

In view of the fact that figures repeatedly indicated a need thereof, Councilman Summers moved that the matter be approved for resolution which set forth the apparent need of a full, four-year accredited college in the Norfolk-Portsmouth Area. He requested members of the council meet with the interested parties in an effort to bring into existence such a college.

The resolution was adopted unanimously by the council.

At its 28 March 1953 meeting the Board of Visitors adopted a set of by-laws for its use. Under Article III, Committees of the Board, Section 6, the board permanently established The Committee on Divisions. The language of the section read as follows:

The Committee on the Divisions shall consist of not less than three members, to be appointed by the Rector at the May meeting of the Board of Visitors. Its members shall serve for a period of one year or until the next regular annual meeting of the Board. The Rector shall designate the Chairman. It shall examine and make recommendations to the Board of Visitors on matters pertaining to the administration and financial operation of the Richmond Professional Institute and the Norfolk Division, and on matters pertaining to the construction, maintenance, and operation of their local physical plants and facilities referred to it by the President or the Board.
A Norfolk Ledger-Dispatch editorial of 9 April 1953 commented on Councilman Summers's resolution passed unanimously by the City of Norfolk Council. It said that just how far the City Council was prepared to go with its endorsement of a four-year college was not clear. Before the proposal for the establishment of the college could be placed in its proper perspective, a number of important questions would have to be answered. Several agencies which included the Council Commission on Higher Education and the Norfolk Chamber of Commerce on Higher Education had sought some of the answers. The editorial concluded that the council's action, in agreeing to a resolution which favored a four-year college, committed the city to no course of action. There would be no specific commitment until all facts were determined.

Mr. William Holmes Davis again wrote President Chandler concerning the establishment of a four-year college in Norfolk:

You have declined to join in a public discussion as to the need of a great four-year college in the Norfolk-Portsmouth area... This need would have been met before this but for the opposition of The College of William and Mary.

Friends of The College of William and Mary, as well as others, believe that if The College of William and Mary were to establish a four-year college in this area it might easily do harm to the college at Williamsburg but that the continuance of your Norfolk Division as a junior college would be helpful to all parties concerned...

There seems to be a rapidly growing feeling that The College of William and Mary is not playing the game fairly.

I wish you would say, and say quickly, that you believed there is urgent need of a great four-year college, here.

On 6 May 1953 President Chandler briefly replied to Mr. W. H.
Davis's previous letter:

At the present time appropriate surveys are being made in connection with all of our educational facilities on all levels. Due attention is being given to the Norfolk Division and the educational needs of the Norfolk-Portsmouth Area. When all of these surveys have been completed and properly studied it is, I believe, the intention of the Board of Visitors to make appropriate statements in regard to the findings of the surveys.

I hope you will be able to bear with us until the studies are completed.

President Alvin Duke Chandler was inaugurated as the twenty-second President of The College of William and Mary on 15 May 1953. Honorary degrees went to President Dwight D. Eisenhower and Governor John S. Battle. In his inaugural address President Chandler outlined the future of the college. He stated that William and Mary was truly an educational shrine but first and always it was a living vital force in education.

In covering the Chandler inaugural the Norfolk Virginian-Pilot stated that advocates of a four-year college for the Norfolk Area had reason to be hopeful in that President Chandler had declared that the divisions at Richmond and Norfolk must be developed in keeping with their respective needs. The college [William and Mary] could not retreat within its ivy walls. The branches would require vigorous and whole-hearted support in the discharge of their special purposes.

The pressure for a four-year college finally translated itself into a four-year, degree-granting college program, namely, that of a Bachelor of Nursing. According to a Norfolk Virginian-
President Chandler told the sixtieth graduating class of Norfolk General Hospital's School of Nursing that a regional School of Nursing at the Norfolk Division appeared to be the most feasible type of organization at present and provided training that the modern nursing profession needed. He said that a growing demand for teachers, administrators, supervisors, head nurses, and clinical specialists made it seem logical "that we should go a step further than the three-year diploma and develop in this region as promptly as we can a program leading to the bachelor's degree in nursing."

President Chandler said he had accepted the Presidency of William and Mary with one firm idea in mind, that idea was to determine the educational needs of the area and to develop the facilities of The College of William and Mary to meet those needs.

A Norfolk Virginian-Pilot editorial which commented on the four-year degree course at the Norfolk Division concluded:

The first four-year degree course at the Norfolk Division of The College of William and Mary is a first step that will lead to others. The step taken is on the road that leads to the well-grounded development of the four-year college for Norfolk.

In his "Annual Report to The College of William and Mary," Director Webb said that cooperation with the administrative officers of the mother college had been very fine. He felt that the year had been outstanding for a number of reasons, one of which had been Dr. Oliver's periodic visits. Those visits had enabled the Norfolk Division to maintain a good coordination with the mother college. He
had served as a clearinghouse for much needed frequent exchange of information.\textsuperscript{715}

The 1952-53 session saw an increased movement for the establishment of a four-year college in Norfolk. During the period from the end of the 1951-52 session through the end of the 1952-53 session, there was a total of 30 editorials and 18 articles in the Norfolk newspaper media which dealt with various aspects of the four-year college question. There were no individual or organizational endorsements of a four-year college. Director Webb maintained a silence on his personal opinion as to the viability of a four-year college in Norfolk. This was a total of 48 editorials and articles, up 22 from 26 previously.

June 4, 1953, marked the end of the 1952-53 session.\textsuperscript{716}
1953-54 Session

There was much activity between the end of the 1952-53 session and the beginning of the 1953-54 session.

On 19 June 1953 President Chandler went on record to the effect that the Norfolk Division was the nucleus around which would be built the present and future educational needs of the Norfolk Community. He spoke before the Norfolk Kiwanis Club where he said that if there was a definite need for more education then the Norfolk Division of The College of William and Mary was the place for it. He cautioned, however, that his views were his own and that the Board of Visitors had not officially countenanced such action. To the suggestion that a four-year college, separated from William and Mary and the Norfolk Division and constructed on the outskirts of Norfolk, he replied that first things must come first. The question which must be first decided by Norfolk citizens was whether higher education should be built around what is already in place, an accredited college which was doing quality work, a college which had strengthened and improved its instruction and facilities, as well as an institution in which the director and faculty were interested in meeting the educational needs of the local citizenry and an institution which had the land area to expand, provided the city desired a long-range expansion. He further said that the Norfolk Division was engaged in a survey of educational needs. He concluded with a statement that the future growth of the Norfolk Division was a matter of great importance to the proper overall development of
higher education in the Norfolk Area. He thought that the division should be developed by every proper means available.

The City Council of Norfolk unanimously adopted a resolution on 30 June 1953 with respect to the advisability of establishing a four-year college in the Norfolk-Portsmouth Area, to wit:

WHEREAS, the Norfolk Commission on Higher Education has heretofore reported to the Council of the City of Norfolk on the need for a complete educational program in the City of Norfolk, with specific reference to the need for a four-year college; and

WHEREAS, on August 19, 1952, a report from said Commission was received and filed by the Council of the City of Norfolk; and

Whereas, it is the judgment of the Council that there is an apparent need for a full 4-year accredited college in the Norfolk-Portsmouth Area; now, therefore,

BE IT RESOLVED by the Council of the City of Norfolk:

Section 1: - That the Council of the City of Norfolk does hereby express belief that there is an apparent need of a full 4-year college in the Norfolk-Portsmouth Area.

Section 2: - That the Council of the City of Norfolk expresses its desire to cooperate with all interested groups or individuals, in an effort to bring about the existence of such a college, and urge others to do likewise.

Section 3: - That copies of this resolution . . . be sent to each member of the Senate and House of Delegates . . . and the said Senators and Delegates are hereby urged to take such action with respect thereto as will best serve the interests of the peoples of these communities to the end that a complete educational program keeping pace with the growth of this area be made a reality.

According to the Norfolk Ledger-Dispatch, the Board of Directors of the Norfolk Chamber of Commerce had received preliminary plans for the development of the Norfolk Division into a four-year college from the Chamber of Commerce Four Year College Committee.
The directors agreed that the chamber should ask the Board of Visitors of The College of William and Mary to increase the division from a two-year to a four-year college. The committee stated that there were two alternatives to securing a four-year college, namely, one being the development of present facilities and the other which would have created one. 719

On 10 July 1953 the Norfolk Ledger-Dispatch stated that the Norfolk Chamber of Commerce had abandoned the idea of starting a new four-year college in Norfolk and had endorsed the plan for expansion of the Norfolk Division. 720

As a result of the above chamber action, there stemmed the following developments:

1. President Chandler stated that the recommendations of the Chamber Committee were in accord with his views as to the eventual development of four-year programs leading to degrees at the Division.

2. James H. Robertson, Rector of the Board of Visitors, disclosed that for some time President Chandler and his faculty committee, with the knowledge and approval of the Board, had been investigating the possibility of establishing additional degree courses at the college.

3. The Democratic organization candidates for the General Assembly announced their approval of the program.

4. Donald W. Shriver, Secretary-Manager of the Norfolk Chamber of Commerce, announced that John S. Alfriend, President, would appoint a steering committee to consult with William and Mary authorities on how to best integrate and harmonize the plans of the two groups. 721

Mr. John S. Alfriend wrote President Chandler, thusly:

The Board of Directors of the Norfolk Chamber of Commerce authorized me to appoint a committee to confer with the Board of Visitors of The College of William and Mary regarding the
matters set forth in the recent report of the Chamber's Four-Year College Committee. . . .

We respectfully request the opportunity to appear before the Board of Visitors at its next meeting. . . .

Governor John S. Battle announced on 11 July 1953 that he would bring his Budget Advisory Committee to Norfolk late in the summer for a hearing on proposals to seek legislative appropriations to expand the Norfolk Division of The College of William and Mary - V.P.I. into a degree conferring four-year institution. The decision to come to Norfolk was made after the Governor conferred with Norfolk's six-man House of Delegates' ticket. Governor Battle intended to be personally on hand for the hearing. He said that he would be glad to have the views of any interested citizens regarding increased facilities at the division.

Although the Board of Visitors appeared to be dealing with the question of expanded educational opportunities and a possible four-year college, Mr. William Holmes Davis, in one of his several letters during the session, took an opposite tack. In a letter to President Chandler he said:

I believe that it will not be a difficult thing to convince the General Assembly that it should no longer look to The College of William and Mary for the development of higher education in the Norfolk-Portsmouth area.

In addition to those who believe that The College of William and Mary is primarily responsible for there being no four-year college in the Norfolk-Portsmouth area, there are two other groups. One group believes that the Norfolk Division has not been treated fairly. The other group believes that internal conditions at the college at Williamsburg are not favorable . . . .

In addition, there is reason to believe that the majority
of the people in this area will oppose appropriations for higher education here being handled by The College of William and Mary."

Director Lewis W. Webb, Jr., met for a three-hour conference in Atlanta, Ga., on 24 August 1953 with Dr. J. M. Godard, Executive Secretary of the Southern Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools. He met for the express purpose of clarifying accreditation policies with reference to the proposed expansion of curricula at the division beyond the junior college level. Mr. Webb summarized the conference as follows:

1. The general problem of acceptable procedure in moving from accredited junior college status to accredited senior college status was discussed

   a. Four-year programs in single-subject fields must be developed in response to need as qualified instructional personnel, library facilities, and adequate financial support are made available

      Under the above procedure, the Division would retain its accredited junior college standing for a period of three to five years. At an appropriate time within the five-year period, the Association would send a visiting committee to the Division to examine the four-year programs in operation to determine whether or not they meet Association Standards of Accreditation. Those programs which are approved will be accredited on their own merit rather than under the auspices of The College of William and Mary. As many four-year programs as are offered may be accredited until the full program of a four-year college is developed at which time the institution will be accredited as a standard four-year college. The accreditation of William and Mary will not be brought into question unless the program is brought up to standard or is discontinued

   b. Instructional personnel, library facilities, and financial support will receive primary consideration by the Association in reaching decisions as to accreditation
The programs in nursing education, business administration, and teacher education were discussed. 

Mr. administrating, former Chairman of the Norfolk School Board, told an Optimist Club gathering that he favored expanding the Norfolk Division into a four-year college rather than wait for the state to establish a new institution in Norfolk. He stated that when the site of the expanded college became crowded it could be moved. The present campus could easily be enlarged. Later, it could be moved elsewhere. He said that it would be probably 1956 or 1958 before a State Board could take action on establishing a four-year college here.

Chairman John B. Dey of the Princess Anne School Board proposed a 300-acre tract which bordered the Military Highway and was in both Norfolk and Princess Anne Counties as a site for the proposed four-year college for Tidewater, Virginia. He said the proposal to develop the Norfolk Division into a degree-granting institution was handicapped by lack of sufficient ground space.

The Board of Visitors at its 29 August 1953 meeting issued the following statement and explained that it would endeavor to expand the Norfolk Division with four-year courses leading to degrees in the fields of nursing and business administration and a certificate in teaching:

In moving into and extending these fields, the matter of accreditation was thoroughly discussed and explored. In light of the standards of the association, the board decided that additional financial support, library facilities, instructional personnel, and educational
facilities would be required in Norfolk to meet the standards of that association. . . .

The board in its meeting made it clear that these programs were approved with a proviso that they would not be established unless the standards of the Southern Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools could be met in all particulars.

The implementation of degree-granting, four-year programs at the Norfolk Division by the Board of Visitors was contingent upon approval of the necessary monies by the General Assembly. The board intended to ask the legislature for a $2,239,454 budget for the maintenance, operation, and capital outlay for the two fiscal years which would begin 1 July 1954. If the legislature granted the funds, the four-year programs would start with the 1954-55 session. In addition, Director L. W. Webb, Jr., stated that the funds, if granted, would help the division meet accreditation standards. 729

In a 1 September 1953 Norfolk Ledger-Dispatch the editorial entitled "Norfolk Moves Toward a Four-Year College" said in part:

The development of a four-year college for Norfolk has gained strong momentum. The Chamber of Commerce committee recommendation followed by several months the unanimous agreement of the City Council to work with interested parties in bringing about a four-year college. The proposal to work toward this end has met with the approval of Norfolk legislators whose help will be urgently needed when the issue of obtaining funds for the Norfolk college has to be met. Formal endorsement of the plan for the Norfolk facility will be sought from the communities in the Norfolk-Portsmouth area.

An article in the 5 September 1953 issue of the Norfolk Ledger-Dispatch stated that officials of communities throughout the south section of the Hampton Roads Area were apparently all in favor of establishing a four-year college by expanding the Norfolk
Division. Mr. John S. Alfriend, President of the Norfolk Chamber of Commerce, was quoted to the effect that it would be a better plan to expand the Norfolk Division rather than build an entirely new college.731

The College of William and Mary and the Virginia Polytechnic Institute in Norfolk officially opened its doors for the 1953-54 session on 14 September 1953.732 Enrollment for regular day students stood at 920.733

The Director's Advisory Board continued to assist Director Webb.734

President Alvin D. Chandler and Director Lewis W. Webb, Jr., continued as the Heads of The College of William and Mary and the Norfolk Division, respectively.735

On 15 September 1953 the City Council of Norfolk adopted a resolution which endorsed the program set forth by the Board of Visitors of The College of William and Mary to develop the Norfolk Division as a four-year college.

Mr. Donald W. Shriver, Manager of the Norfolk Chamber of Commerce, was quoted to the effect that the board's proposed program to develop the Norfolk Division into a four-year college in stages offered an opportunity that could not be passed up. He stated that members of the council had noted that the City Committee on Higher Education had studied a proposal of establishing a four-year college in Norfolk from scratch and had advised that it would not be feasible.736
To those critics who maintained that there was insufficient space to expand the Norfolk Division, Director Webb countered, in a speech to the Norfolk Cosmopolitan Club, that a potential of upwards of forty-five acres was available in the immediate area of the division. He stated that the expected acreage from the city would give the division more ground than the division would be able to put buildings on in the next fifty years.\(^737\)

On 9 October 1953 Governor Battle and his budget advisors visited the Norfolk Division. As part of the visit, Director Webb presented his budget for the Norfolk Division for the 1954-55 biennium. His presentation embraced the historical beginnings of the college, all construction to date, its progress from a liberal arts and pre-engineering junior college to a community college which offered technical and vocational courses, new construction needed, new land needed, new equipment required, renovations required, and the growth of the school-age population in the Tidewater Area. He closed the presentation with a plea that the Norfolk Division not be caught completely unprepared with inadequate physical facilities to care for the needs of students wanting higher education.\(^738\)

The Hampton Roads Chapter of the National Association of Cost Accountants adopted a resolution on 10 October 1953 which endorsed the program of the Board of Visitors of The College of William and Mary and requested that the General Assembly appropriate funds for the division to establish in the Tidewater Area a properly accredited four-year institution.\(^739\)
"Norfolk's Hope for 4-Year College Im Set Back by Low Appropriation" was the headline on an article in the 19 January 1954 issue of the Norfolk Virginian-Pilot. The article stated that Norfolkians closely associated with the drive for a four-year college had expressed shock and disappointment at the budget recommendations made by Governor Battle for the Norfolk Division. A total of $1,007,900 was provided for general operations and maintenance for two years, and salaries of additional personnel to implement a four-year program in certain fields were provided. Director Lewis W. Webb, Jr., made the comment that staff for the four-year program had been provided but not the physical equipment. He did not know what effect the budget would have on plans to get a four-year accreditation. He was particularly disappointed that a $750,000 request for a library and a fine arts building was not included in the submitted budget to the General Assembly. A $100,000 request for library books and periodicals also was not included, as well as a $25,000 request for library and fine arts building equipment.

Although this study was not concerned with college building construction per se, it devoted some attention in detail to the construction of a library and the attendant problem of securing books and periodicals. The new library, shelved with sufficient books and periodicals, was essential to the obtaining of accreditation for a four-year college by the Southern Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools.

The Alumni Council of the Norfolk Division in a letter to
alumni and friends pointed out that the hope for obtaining a four-year college in Tidewater received a severe setback when Governor Battle failed to recommend appropriations of $750,000 for a library and $100,000 for books. They recommended that alumni and friends should write to legislators and Governor Thomas S. Stanley to urge their support to reinstate the cuts. 741

On 1 February 1954 Director Webb wrote to Senator Robert O. Morris, Jr., Chairman of the Joint Committee on Appropriations, the Senate and House of Delegates, General Assembly of Virginia. In the letter he respectfully requested that the General Assembly appropriate $750,000 for a library and a classroom building. In an accompanying brief he pointed out that an adequate library was essential, but there was neither sufficient volumes or a building to house them. He had been asked how much of the $750,000 for a library building and $100,000 for books was needed because of the four-year programs but found it difficult to answer because the current enrollment justified a new library even if the four-year programs were not taught. 742

In a letter to the Alumni Council, Mr. Marcus L. Oliver, Assistant Secretary, The Alumni Association, Virginia Polytechnic Instituted opposed the establishment of a four-year college in Norfolk. He stated that the Norfolk Division had enjoyed an enviable record as a two-year college. It was outstanding in the least, but he predicted that, because of the conservative attitude of the
legislature, the division would rapidly become mediocre as a four year college.

Three days later Director Webb sent a letter to Mr. Marcus L. Oliver in which he stated that the division had no desire to become a four year institution in engineering but was concentrating on fulfilling the needs of the Norfolk Area which seemed to be in the fields of business, elementary education, and nursing education. The division would probably go into other fields but he could not envision going into highly technical subjects, such as medicine, engineering, etc.

On 5 February 1954 Mr. Charles T. Abeles, Chairman, Norfolk Commission on Higher Education, wrote the Honorable Howard H. Adams, Chairman of the Appropriations Committee, House of Delegates:

The Commission was requested by the Council [Norfolk City] to investigate the need of a four-year college in Norfolk, and if such a need appeared, how it could best be met. . . . The Commission concluded that there was a need for such an institution . . . and that the responsibility for providing the additional funds which would be required rests primarily with the State. Recognizing that the establishment of a new college or the expansion of existing facilities would be costly, the Commission recommended, among other things, an interim program for the provision of four-year courses in certain fields for which the need appeared to be most acute and immediate. . . . A Committee of the Norfolk Chamber of Commerce initiated discussions with the administrative authorities of The College of William and Mary at Williamsburg for the purpose of enlisting their cooperation in expanding the curriculum of the Norfolk Extension to provide four year courses in certain subject. As a result of these discussions the College agreed to institute such courses in Education, Business Administration, and Nursing, provided the funds essential for the additional faculty personnel and library facilities, without which accreditation could not be secured, were provided by the General Assembly.

I understand that in his budget recommendations Governor
Battle did not include appropriations of $750,000 for the construction of a building to house the library needed for the accreditation of the additional courses.

I am writing as one who, after considerable study, is convinced that Norfolk and its environs constitute a vacuum in the higher education system of the State, to urge that the Appropriations Committee of the House reinstate the request of the Extension for the $750,000 for the construction of a library building.

Approximately forty letters, telegrams, and resolutions were addressed to Governor Thomas B. Stanley from various individuals and organizations in the Tidewater Area. All of them urged the establishment of a four-year college and the restoration of the $750,000 for the library not included in Governor Battle's budget. Some of the organizations represented several hundred members.

Typical of Governor Stanley's reply to various individuals and organizations was this letter:

This will acknowledge your letter... with reference to an appropriation for the Norfolk Division of The College of William and Mary.

I know you are aware of the heavy demands upon the State Treasury for such necessary services as mental hospitals, tuberculosis sanatoria and public schools, which require increased appropriation at this session of the General Assembly. Since the funds available are limited, some projects, of course, must be omitted.

In an address to the Norfolk Woman's Club, Director Webb urged the club to back the request for $750,000 appropriation for a classroom and library building. He stated that it would be impossible for the division to become accredited as a four-year college without additional library facilities. The minimum number of books for a senior college was 50,000; the division had 24,000.
also pointed out that the growth of public school enrollment in Norfolk had increased the need for a four-year college. Norfolk County alone had an increase of 251 percent since 1938. The percentage for the rest of the nation was 748.

An article in the *Norfolk Ledger-Dispatch* on 15 March 1954 stated that the Norfolk Division would be able to begin its four-year college program in the fall of 1955 as a result of the $375,000 wrested from tax credit funds with the aid of Norfolk members of the General Assembly. Director Lewis W. Webb, Jr., was quoted to the effect that if this $375,000 had not been forthcoming, the division would have had to delay the start of the four-year program until the fall of 1957 if the General Assembly had not provided the needed money. Director Webb further stated that while $750,000 would ultimately be needed for the library, the $350,000 would allow part of it to be built, enough to get the needed accreditation.

Mr. John S. Alfriend, President of the Norfolk Chamber of Commerce, wrote President Chandler the following:

*I was really quite thrilled when I learned that the State Legislature had approved an appropriation for the library building, thus insuring an accredited four-year program. I feel certain that the Norfolk Division is going to be a great benefit to Norfolk and the surrounding territory as well as a credit to the mother institution at Williamsburg.*

At the Board of Visitors meeting on 29 May 1954, a resolution was adopted which authorized President Chandler to request Governor Stanley to allocate $40,000 of his Discretionary Fund to purchase library books for the division.

The appointment of an architect for the proposed division
library was also discussed. It was decided by the board that selection of an architect be left to President Chandler.\textsuperscript{752}

In his "Annual Report" to President Chandler, Director Webb lauded the spirit of cooperation between the division and the parent institution. He stated that cooperation with the administrative officers of the mother college had been excellent. Relationships had been free and unrestrained which made for full and helpful coordination of the two schools. President Chandler had been very considerate and had acted as a stimulus which had helped develop the Norfolk Division rather than acting as a check on its progress. This genuine interest was evidenced by the frequent invitations which he had given to Director Webb to appear before the board and the work he had done to obtain hearings for the division by the Governor's Budget Committee and Finance Committee of the General Assembly.\textsuperscript{753}

From the end of the 1952-53 session through the 1953-54 session, there was a veritable deluge of editorials and articles in the Norfolk newspaper media concerned with the establishment of a four-year college in Norfolk. There were 26 editorials, 24 articles which reported organizational efforts to obtain a four-year college, 20 articles which reported individual endorsements of local leaders, and 60 articles of a general nature which reported the progress and status of the four-year college movement. This was a total of 130 editorials and articles, up 82 from 48 previously which dealt with the four-year college question. Even Director Webb, for the first time, publicly endorsed the four-year college at the division. While
there was a small movement for the establishment of a four-year college separate from the division, it soon faded from a lack of general support. The overwhelming movement was for expansion of the Norfolk Division which would incorporate four-year programs as the need was generated.

An eventful year for the division came to a close on 3 June 1954.
A few events occurred between the end of the 1953-54 session and the beginning of the 1954-55 session which should be noted.

On 14 July 1954 the Reference Librarian at The College of William and Mary filed a memorandum with President Chandler concerning community fiscal support to college libraries. He cited several instances where local communities had joined forces with colleges in the maintenance of libraries which served town and gown. Apparently, the memorandum was generated because of a discussion between William and Mary and division personnel concerning the financial problems of building and staffing a library at the division.

Director Lewis W. Webb, Jr., in an address to the Portsmouth Rotary Club, told his listeners that a four-year college for the Tidewater Area was well on its way. The division had been advanced from a two-year college to a degree granting institution and more courses would be added as soon as possible. The need for a four-year college in Norfolk was pinpointed by the fact that the school population in Tidewater was expected to increase by eighty-two percent by 1975.

Members of the Advisory Committee, Norfolk Division were advised by Director L. W. Webb, Jr., on the subject of the library needs of the college and the city. In his letter he said:

An adequate library is the only remaining barrier to accreditation as a four-year degree-granting institution.

During the last few months there has come . . . the
suggestion that the City of Norfolk and the college combine their resources to build a library to meet not only the needs of the college but the needs of the city as well.

If one library could satisfy the needs of both the college and city there would naturally be a number of advantages to the joint undertaking. If such a venture appeared feasible, the Board of Directors of the Library would be asked to join with us in an appeal to the City Council for financial assistance. Advantages were:

1. Capital cost saving from combining in one building the two libraries
2. Maintenance and operation costs would be reduced materially over the operation of two physical plants
3. The combined collection of books, periodicals, and other materials would enable the library to serve more completely the needs of the community
4. Costly duplication of material would be avoided, as well as the expense of housing and maintaining the duplicate material
5. A more adequate, better qualified, personnel staff would be attracted to the larger joint library
6. Annual purchasing by both college and city would make possible a superior collection of current material
7. The availability of the college faculty on the campus to assist those doing research in the library
8. Adequate parking would be available
9. Land is already owned and available
10. A person normally first turns to an institution of higher learning for information or research assistance

Disadvantages were:
1. The proposed site is not in the center of the population
2. The library might not be thought of as a city library if located on or near the college campus
3. Administrative control might be more difficult until a joint arrangement had been worked out. . . .

In a Norfolk Virginian-Pilot article dated 5 September 1954, it was reported that a joint city-college library was being undertaken as a way to get a four-year institution. The article said further that the idea of such a joint venture - with the library to be constructed on municipal property adjacent to the college on Hampton Boulevard - was in such an advanced stage that it was sure to hit official circles with an impact. What the City Library Board would think of abandoning its site in the designated cultural center area was problematical. Those who knew about the plan said the idea for a combined project originated several months ago. It was theorized that the council which had backed all efforts to get four-year training at the division would be willing to "strain a point" to move up the library schedule if immediate funds for a joint project would hasten the four-year program.

A 7 September 1954 Norfolk Virginian-Pilot article declared that the equation for a library would not balance. First, the Norfolk Division would contribute only about one-third of the capital cost of a new library, but the library itself would become predominately a college library at a convenient site for the college but an inconvenient one for public use. Second, such a joint library undertaking would be invested from the outset with institutional characteristics which the city public library would seek to avoid.
Unless it is avoided, the public library's clients would feel like visitors.

Commencing 20 September 1954 The College of William and Mary began its 1954-55 session. Official enrollment stood at 996 regular day students.

The Director's Advisory Board again was listed in the Bulletin for 1954.

The Heads of The College of William and Mary and the Norfolk Division were President Alvin D. Chandler and Director Lewis W. Webb, Jr., respectively.

Mr. William Holmes Davis once again wrote to President Chandler concerning the four-year college question:

I understood your father and Mr. Bryan and Mr. Pomfret to say that they believed that The College of William and Mary at Williamsburg would benefit from the operation of a first-class junior college in Norfolk but that the operation of a great four-year college in Norfolk would do more harm than good to the college at Williamsburg...

In my opinion a great State-supported college in Norfolk will make it more difficult for the college at Williamsburg to get adequate funds from the State and more difficult to enroll students.

I do not believe the Board of Visitors of The College of William and Mary would be justified in doing their best to establish a great competitive four-year college in Norfolk...

I have always favored the operation of your Norfolk Division; but I can not favor a program that for a quarter of century has denied a college education - a four-year college education - to thousands of our boys and girls because we have no four-year college here...

Mr. W. H. Davis, the old curmudgeon, apparently had not kept abreast of the efforts of the Board of Visitors to establish four-
year programs in business administration, nursing education, teacher education, and such other fields as the needs manifested themselves.

He, too, apparently was not informed as to the demography involved, namely, that with the ever-increasing high school population, there were more than enough applicants for The College of William and Mary.

A "Capital Outlay Study for the Commission on State Capital Outlays" said this about area statistics:

The Hampton Roads Area has the largest population of any area in the State. The Norfolk Division of The College of William and Mary has, within a radius of twenty miles from its campus, over one-half million persons living on the Norfolk-Portsmouth side of Hampton Roads. When the Hampton Roads Tunnel is completed, an additional 200,000 persons living in the Newport News, Warwick, and Hampton Areas will come within commuting distance of the college. In spite of the now existing water barrier, ninety-three students from those areas are presently enrolled. The Norfolk Division is the only white college located in the area and must serve not only the college youth group but must serve the adult population as well. . . . To compare the growth of this area with the national picture, one only needs to take the ten year period from 1930 to 1940. During this period the nation as a whole experienced a DECREASE of three percent in school age population while the Norfolk area showed an INCREASE of thirty-six percent during the period. Not only is the area growing rapidly, but it is the only area of its size in the United States that is served only by a single college.

The number one priority was the library. The study said this:

The present library facilities at the Norfolk Division are four rooms. . . . Since more of the space was originally designed for a library, naturally it does not properly fit the needs. This space, which has been used by the college since 1938, is now hopelessly inadequate for the present size student body.

The collection of 25,000 volumes now completely fills all of the stack space, and several thousand additional volumes must be stored under the gymnasium. The seating capacity of the Library is also grossly inadequate, and now seats about ten percent of the present study body. The Norfolk Division,
having been authorized to offer degrees in the fields of Business Administration, Elementary Education, and Nursing, faces the problem of increasing its library, both in plant and volumes, from a junior college status to that of a senior college. This will mean a minimum of 50,000 volumes and a great deal more seating space to accommodate approximately thirty percent of the student body. Our enrollment is rising rapidly, and all indications are that it should continue this trend. It will be impossible to take care of our library needs using the present facilities, and there are no possibilities of expanding these facilities within the existing structure.

The present planning is for a library containing a central stack to contain 100,000 volumes with the possibility of vertical expansion to an ultimate capacity of 250,000 volumes. This will be surrounded by reading rooms, work rooms, etc., as needed for capacity of student body.

Mr. Arthur T. Hamlin, Executive Secretary of the Association of College and Reference Libraries, wrote Director Webb on 9 December 1954:

Although I cannot point to any healthy example of important public and institutional library union, I would urge you not to give up the idea as impossible. Let me suggest a few cautions.

It is tremendously important that a college library be on a campus and it is equally important that the public library have a central city location. I cannot say from this distance that your campus would not be a proper setting for the public library, but I doubt such is the case. An important downtown branch might possibly take the place of the downtown location for the central library. Be sure to seek the advise of a leading public librarian on the pros and cons of site before proceeding.

If a joint library is set up, put it in the hands of a single administration. Have one librarian as the administrative head. You can work out town and college representation on a single governing board.

I don't know how you would work out finances, but don't try to keep the books and services separate. I believe you
would have to establish a formula for financial support and spell out the details of ownership and joint city-institution responsibility.

If the important factors of site, support and ownership are favorable, and if the joint library is put under one wise operating head, I believe the library could give as good or better service than that of two separate libraries and at considerable saving in plant and operation. If any of the principal factors is unfavorable, I advise you to give up the idea of a joint library.

The Norfolk Division Foundation, Inc., which was established under the laws of the state to receive contributions to the Norfolk Division, circulated a brochure entitled "For the Four-Year College in Tidewater's Future . . . College of William and Mary, Norfolk Division Needs Your Help." The foundation's president was a local lawyer, Mr. Charles L. Kaufman; its vice-president, Mr. Edward H. Jones; and its secretary-treasurer, Mr. Frank Batten, a local newspaper publisher. In the brochure was a statement that to become an accredited four-year college, the Norfolk Division would need additional financial support. A paragraph was devoted to the library, namely, that the immediate and imperative need for the Norfolk Division's growth was the expansion of its library. If the division had an adequate library, it could carry on the function of a regular four-year college with only minor additions in staff and equipment. Increased library facilities were absolutely essential for accreditation. Application was being made to the Southern Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools for accreditation as a four-year college. The brochure further stated that in order to meet the association's requirements, the Norfolk Division would have to
double the size of its present book collection as well as provide
library facilities for a greatly increased enrollment. While an
appropriation had been made by the General Assembly for a library
building, the funds for the purchase of a large number of books were
not available. The foundation pointed out that any gift could very
well be the gift of a lifetime, since they were not planning to
conduct annual campaigns. The overall objective was to assure
accreditation as a four-year college by raising $100,000 for
books. 768

The Faculty at the Norfolk Division on 2 February 1955
adopted the following resolution:

WHEREAS, the Faculty of the Norfolk Division of The College
of William and Mary recognize the adoption of a more
considerate administration policy toward the branch
institution on the part of the President since his term
office, and

WHEREAS, he has encouraged and aided in the expansion of the
curricula to the granting of degrees and satisfying other
urban needs of the Tidewater area, and

WHEREAS, the physical plant of the Norfolk Division, dormant
since 1938, has been increased through appropriations secured
from the State Legislature, and

WHEREAS, the Faculty and Administration have experienced a
closer and more friendly relationship than has heretofore
existed between the two institutions, therefore be it

RESOLVED that the Faculty of the Norfolk Division, in
recognition of the close cooperation and friendly attitude
extended to the Norfolk Division, do hereby extend to
President Alvin Duke Chandler a sincere vote of appreciation
for his administrative policies during his current
administration. 769

In a letter to the alumni, students, faculty, friends, and
staff of the Greater College of William and Mary in Virginia,
President Chandler for the first time publicly set forth his concept of the Greater College of William and Mary in Virginia. He said on several occasions during recent months that he had had the opportunity of getting together with William and Mary students and alumni through a series of letters reporting developments at the college. Each time, however, the scope of his observations had been confined to the college in Williamsburg. By setting such limitations he felt that many failed to recognize the significant role that William and Mary played in higher education. He pointed out that his letter marked the first time that any communication from the college had been circulated to the groups which comprised the Greater College of William and Mary in Virginia. He felt that all too often many were inclined to confine their thoughts of William and Mary to Williamsburg or to Norfolk or to Richmond; many had lost sight of the fact that The College of William and Mary in Virginia embraced three institutions in three separate localities. In reality, the three institutions, namely, The College of William and Mary in Williamsburg, the Norfolk Division in Norfolk, and the Richmond Professional Institute in Richmond actually constituted The College of William and Mary in Virginia. He emphasized that sometimes an injustice to the college was done when there was a failure to observe it from a broader perspective. He observed that there really wasn't anything new about the greater college area; it merely involved the restorations of an earlier policy. Initially, the greater college involved the proliferation of extension centers throughout the state.
Looking to the future, President Chandler considered it essential that the college be considered as a whole and not just from the standpoint of its component parts. The Greater College of William and Mary in Virginia could operate for the greatest good only when the college's position was considered from a broader perspective. 770

On 18 April 1955 Judge H. Lawrence Bullock of the Corporation Court of the City of Norfolk incorporated the William and Mary, Norfolk Division, Educational Foundation. The purpose of the foundation was to receive, administer, and distribute funds and property of all kinds, exclusively in furtherance of the educational activities and objectives of the Norfolk Division of The College of William and Mary. The initial members of the foundation were the current members of the Director's Advisory Board. 771

The Norfolk Division newsletter contained an article concerning the division's drive for books for the library. The article read in part:

A drive to secure for the Norfolk Division Library approximately 30,000 books and periodicals is now underway in the Tidewater Area. The purpose of the drive is to increase the Library holdings so that the college, now offering four-year programs, may meet the requirements of the Southern Association of Colleges and other accrediting agencies for senior colleges. . . .

The Norfolk Division already fully accredited as a junior college, now has approximately 25,000 volumes. The college now offers four-year courses in elementary education and business administration. A four-year course in medical technology has recently been approved. . . .

Those wishing to contribute books should get in touch with Mr. William C. Pollard, the Librarian of the College. 772

The Norfolk Virginian-Pilot for 22 May 1955 reported that the
library fund for the division was at the half way mark. Mr. John S. Alfriend, who headed the drive, said that the appeal had not reached its objective on schedule but that he was confident that this was one public undertaking that could not fail.

The Norfolk Virginian-Pilot reported the following day that a door-to-door books drive had been set by the division. The article reported that the division was interested in receiving any hard-backed book, regardless of the subject matter, or a pledge of any size.

The number of editorials and articles which dealt with the idea of a four-year college declined dramatically from that of the previous year. From the end of the 1953-54 session to the end of the 1954-55 session, there appeared 2 editorials which addressed the four-year college concept and 12 editorials of general interest, down 12 from 26 previously; 42 articles of a general nature, down 18 from 60 reported previously; 4 articles which reported individual endorsements, down 16 from 20 previously; and no articles which reported organizational endorsements, down 24 from 24 previously. This was a total of 60 editorials and articles, down 70 from 130 previously.

The division closed for the 1954-55 session on 7 June 1955.
Before the beginning of the 1955-56 session of The College of William and Mary in Norfolk on 19 September 1955, several events occurred during the preceding summer months. On 12 June 1955 the Norfolk Virginian-Pilot reported that the library fund was nearing its goal of $100,000.

The Board of Visitors at its meeting on 24 June 1955 received a statement from Dr. George J. Oliver, Coordinator of Divisional Activities, in which he said:

From the beginning of his administration, in both formal statement and official act, President Chandler has expressed a philosophy of education which recognizes a major responsibility of an educational institution to be the rendering of effective service to its constituents. As an institution supported by the people of Virginia, he has conceived the educational mission of The College of William and Mary, therefore, to be that of providing appropriate educational service and opportunity to the people of its region, the state which supports it, and the nation at large. To this end he has worked consistently and tirelessly to develop the organization and programs which would enable the College to expand and improve the quality of its educational services.

Dr. Oliver described the development of The William and Mary System thusly:

When President Chandler took office he found that the operation of the Norfolk Division of the College and the Richmond Professional Institute was only loosely coordinated with the functioning of the College at Williamsburg, despite the fact that the administration at Williamsburg had legal and financial responsibilities in relation to both the off-campus institutions. To remedy this situation a William and Mary system was conceived; the purposes of each of the three units were defined and clarified; a staff member (Dr. Oliver) was designated to serve as liaison between the general administration at Williamsburg and the local administration in Norfolk and Richmond; the facilities of the three units joined in campus functions and a general feeling of being
participants in a single educational enterprise was cultivated. Each unit of the William and Mary System accepted its contributing role – the College at Williamsburg emphasized the liberal arts; the Richmond Professional Institute provides professional education; and the Norfolk Division a combination of the two in terms of local need. Thus organized through the efforts of President Chandler, the William and Mary System is enabled to offer a balanced, coordinated, and effective educational service.

Dr. Oliver's statement further dealt with the development of the Norfolk Division of The College of William and Mary:

During the administration of President Chandler the development of a four-year degree-granting institution at the Norfolk Division has begun. Four-year degree programs in Business Administration, Elementary Education, Nursing Education, and Medical Technology have been inaugurated. In this undertaking the President has consulted continuously with responsible citizen groups and individuals in Norfolk in assessing the need for a four-year college, in determining the type of degree programs to be offered, and in arrangements for securing the necessary land and other physical facilities. In order to assure that all work offered at the Norfolk Division would be fully up to acceptable educational standards, the President has checked with the Southern Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools all plans and each step as it is taken. The Association is the accrediting agency for colleges and universities in this region. The development of an institution of higher learning is a complex task and the progress which has been made at the Norfolk Division testifies to the quality of the vision and understanding of educational problems which President Chandler has brought to bear on the enterprise.

In his "Annual Report to the Board of Visitors on the Status of the Norfolk Division," Director Webb made the following comments:

It is therefore obvious that considerably more progress has been made during the four years under President Chandler's administration than at any other similar period in the history of the Norfolk Division.

I am certain that the faculty of the Norfolk Division feel more secure of their ultimate purpose and goal and that they also feel more secure in their work. A definite feeling of friendliness for the President is obvious, and he is
always invited to social and community functions sponsored by the faculty.

Following World War II the administrative supervision of the Norfolk Division was extremely lax. During the years 1946 to 1951 visits by the President to Norfolk were very rare, often only once a year. The Bursar also paid very spasmodic visits. The Director, while given little authority, was given almost complete responsibility for policy making, hiring, firing, and budgetary control. Overall budget control was, however, held the responsibility of the College Bursar and never was the Director permitted to meet with the Board of Visitors, or the Governor's Budget Committee to present the Norfolk Division's needs.

Since 1951 a great change has taken place in the administrative procedures. President Chandler expects the Director to report regularly to him concerning progress and plans of the Norfolk Division. Monthly or more frequent trips are made to Williamsburg by the Director and the President often visits the Norfolk Campus. President Chandler speaks to at least one student convocation each year and attends the final exercises.

One of the most noteworthy improvements in administrative policy is the insistence by the President that the Director appear before all regular meetings of the Board of Visitors in order to make administrative requests pertaining to the Norfolk Division or to report on the plans and progress of the institution. The Director now, with the President's approval, presents his budget to the Finance Committee of the Board, then to the Full Board and finally to the Governor's Budget Committee.

Many administrative policies are now being clearly defined and a strong feeling of organizational partnership has been developed. No longer does the Norfolk Division feel unwanted and inconsequential, but there is now a healthy feeling of contributing to the overall service which the Greater College of William and Mary can offer to Virginia and the nation.

Great progress can clearly and certainly be seen under President Chandler's policy of administration.

The open-mindedness of Mr. Chandler as well as his foresight and courage to make decisions which he believes are best for the overall College of William and Mary have gained for him the respect of those here at the Norfolk Division.
"A 25-Year Program for a 4-Year College" was the title of an 8 September 1955 editorial in the Norfolk Ledger-Dispatch. The editorial was quoted below in part:

In mid-1953, largely as the result of a recommendation by a special committee of the Norfolk Chamber of Commerce, the movement for obtaining a four-year college in Norfolk became concentrated into an effort to expand the Norfolk Division of The College of William and Mary into a full-fledged degree-conferring institution. Progress in that direction has been gratifying in the intervening two years and now the newly revealed plans of the parent institution at Williamsburg, covering a 25-year period, provide an even more satisfying prospect.

The program which has received the endorsement of the Board of Visitors calls for an expansion of the Norfolk Division to accommodate an eventual 5,000 students, with the 25-year total in capital outlays to amount to some $6,000,000 over and above the sums already committed by the state and recommended by the Capital Outlay Study Commission. . . .

The $6,000,000 would cover the erection of 12 buildings at a cost of about $500,000 apiece, and it is apparent from the figures that the rate of growth would be about the same as that contemplated by the capital study group for the initial six-year period. . . .

And from the newly approved plans this community has solid assurance that the expansion of the Norfolk institution figures importantly in the long-range purposes of the college.

The Norfolk Virginian-Pilot reported an enrollment of 918 students in the day school of the College of William and Mary in Norfolk, an increase of approximately 30 percent over the previous year. Official enrollment figures for regular day students for the 1955-56 session was 1,315. While the William and Mary, Norfolk Division, Educational Foundation was incorporated during the 1954-55 session and while its membership consisted of the same personnel as those on the Director's
Advisory Board, the board apparently continued to exist and was listed in the Bulletin of 1 April 1955.785

The parent institution in Williamsburg continued to be headed by President A. D. Chandler while the Norfolk Division was headed by Director L. W. Webb, Jr. 786

It was during this session that the Norfolk Division celebrated the Silver Anniversary of its founding in 1930. The 23 September 1955 issue of the Norfolk Ledger-Dispatch carried an extensive article devoted to the recounting of the history of the twenty-five year period. The article gave the circumstances surrounding its establishment by President J. A. C. Chandler in 1930; the upholding of William and Mary traditions by the student body; the adoption of the honor system; the popularity of Bud's Emporium, a local student hangout; the Dean William T. Hodges's grade-fixing scandal; the years of World War II; the assumption of the directorship in 1946 by Mr. Lewis W. Webb, Jr.; and the future of the division.787

Despite the forward outlook of the Board of Visitors with regard to the plans for the Norfolk Division, President Chandler continued to get letters from Mr. William H. Davis, such as the following:

I have reluctantly come to the conclusion that the reason that the Norfolk-Portsmouth Metropolitan District is the largest center of population in the United States that has no great four-year college is due to the retarding influence of The College of William and Mary.

I favor the holding of mass meetings of citizens at which the points at issue may be debated.
On 4 November 1955 President A. D. Chandler replied to Mr. W. H. Davis as follows:

In all fairness, I must say that I disagree with you in your statement that the College of William and Mary in Virginia has been a retarding influence in so far as the Norfolk-Portsmouth Metropolitan District is concerned. On the contrary, William and Mary had the foresight to found a college in Norfolk twenty-five years ago, and is now, under the direction of the Board of Visitors of The College of William and Mary, moving into four-year programs in Norfolk with the support of the people of Norfolk...

My experience has been that very little is accomplished in mass meetings, and that the greatest good is done through the cooperation of individuals of good will. I believe that the Chamber of Commerce, the City Council, and other civic organizations in the City of Norfolk are very much interested in higher education in Norfolk, and I believe that they will go along with any plan which is in the interest of higher education. The College of William and Mary has recommended to those organizations that the Norfolk Division should be developed to meet the needs of education in the Norfolk area.

The book drive to stock the library at the Norfolk Division was apparently a success, according to a Norfolk Ledger-Dispatch editorial of 9 December 1955:

The book drive which began here last March in behalf of the Norfolk Division of The College of William and Mary has produced two concrete achievements. One was the success of the campaign itself in acquiring enough funds and books to assure accreditation of the school as a four-year, degree conferring institution. The other was the creation of a special organization, the William and Mary, Norfolk Division, Educational Foundation, which will continue to solicit funds to help meet various future needs of the college...

This public participation in a vital phase of the Norfolk Division's growth establishes more firmly than ever the community character of this institution and assures for it an increasingly great contribution to the cultural life and welfare of the community over a long period of years.

The 21 February 1956 issue of the Norfolk Virginian-Pilot
contained an editorial entitled "Widening Four-Year Horizons at the Norfolk Division." The editorial said the following:

Next Fall the Norfolk Division of The College of William and Mary - V.P.I. will inaugurate a four-year degree program in secondary education. This is the second degree course at the college in teacher training. The college already offers a degree course in elementary education. It also offers degree courses in business administration, medical technology, and nursing. When the course begins its 1957 academic year, it will be offering five four-year degree courses.

Since 1953 the college has measured a stride toward four-year degree status of which it, and the community at large, may be proud.

There has been help from the Board of Visitors of The College of William and Mary at Williamsburg and from the Governor and the General Assembly. There has been understanding of goals and study from the City Council. There has been a wide measure of public support. 1791

The Norfolk Ledger-Dispatch carried the following editorial on 21 February 1956:

The four-year course in secondary education, which the William and Mary Board of Visitors has authorized for the Norfolk Division starting next Fall, will bring to five the number of degree courses which this local institution offers. . . .

Thus both the activities and the facilities of the Norfolk Division are being gradually expanded to meet the goal which the Board of Visitors of the parent institution at Williamsburg set for the college about two and a half years ago. The first 15 students ever to receive degrees from the division will be graduated this June. Norfolk's long-discussed four-year college is not materializing in any spectacular way but it is materializing. The community has good reason for satisfaction over the transformation.

A movement had been underway in the State of Virginia for many years to bring the control of higher education under some agency other than the State Board of Education. This movement culminated in
the approval on 10 March 1956 of legislation by the General Assembly which created a State Council of Higher Education. Chapter 311 of the Code of Virginia was quoted below:

An act to provide for the coordination of the State-supported system of higher education; to this end to amend the Code of Virginia by adding in Title 23 a chapter numbered 1.1 containing section number 23-9.3 through 23-0.14, creating a State Council of Higher Education; provided for the appointment, qualifications, terms of office, and compensation of members thereof; vesting certain powers and duties in Council; requiring certain budget requests to be submitted to such Council and providing for consolidation thereof and the submission of its recommendations to the Governor; to provide for cooperation between certain agencies as to coordination between the system of public free schools and the State-supported system of higher education; to appropriate funds, and to repeal certain statutes (H-66).

In the by-laws adopted by the Board of Visitors on 24 March 1956, Section 4 dealt with the duties of the Director of the Norfolk Division, as follows:

The Norfolk Division of The College of William and Mary in Virginia is one of three units comprising the William and Mary System. Subject to the authority of the Board of Visitors and of the President of The College of William and Mary, who is the over-all administrative head of the William and Mary System, the Director of the Norfolk Division is its chief resident administrative officer. He is a member of the faculty of the Norfolk Division, presides at general faculty meetings and is responsible to the President of The College of William and Mary for all projects, programs, and reports which form any part of the activities of the Norfolk Division, and has appropriate authority of approval and supervision, subject to the higher authority of the Board of Visitors and the President of The College of William and Mary. Subject to the direction and approval of the Board of Visitors and the President, he has the duty and right to define the scope of authority and duties of officers, faculty, and committees. He is the official medium of communication with The College of William and Mary, its President, and the Board of Visitors.

The Norfolk Ledger-Dispatch of 14 May 1956 carried an article
headlined "Norfolk W & M Awards First 4-Year Degrees on June 6." The article stated that of 103 degrees, diplomas, and awards, 15 of these would go to the first students to complete the four-year course at the division. Thirteen of the four-year degrees would go to candidates in business administration while 2 would go to those in medical technology.

Director Webb's "Annual Report to the Board of Visitors" contained ample evidence of the Norfolk Division's amazing forward progress. The report included:

The academic year just past has been one of considerable activity and progress for the Norfolk Division. It has witnessed... the awarding of the first baccalaureate degrees... .

The City of Norfolk has shown its interest in the development of our college in a number of ways. The City Council actively assisted in our budget presentation before the Governor's Budget Committee and helped to secure its approval by the State Legislature. It has also helped more materially by... the purchase of all property between 48th and 49th Streets bounded by Hampton Boulevard and Bluestone Avenue... . the donation of $100,000 for providing the piling and foundation necessary for our new library building....

Our library continues to improve, but it is, of course, becoming increasingly inadequate to handle our volume of books and the large student body. Circulation rose from 12,438 to 15,744, or a gain of 27 percent. Over 30 additional periodicals were subscribed to. . . . The number of volumes added was 1,231 in spite of not having a cataloger. We are trying to secure a professional cataloger for next year as we must rapidly increase our holdings.

The Library Fund Drive resulted in over $80,000 in cash donations, and in addition, nearly 20,000 volumes were given. . . .

Planning is proceeding on the new library building, and the preliminary plans indicate we will have a very fine library in about two years. . . .
The past year has been one marked by splendid faculty cooperation with the administration. . . . Much credit has to be given to the President and Board of Visitors of The College of William and Mary, for their support in developing the Norfolk Division has done much to improve student and faculty morale. The community itself has a feeling of pride and a proprietary sort of interest in the progress of the Norfolk Division. . . .

I believe, however, that we now have the organization and the spirit to meet problems as we may encounter them and with the usual cooperation of the President of the College, the Board of Visitors, and others concerned that we can develop the Norfolk Division to serve the community and the State.

Increased interest in the four-year college at the division was reflected in a greater number of editorials and articles than for the previous year. From the end of 1954-55 session through the 1955-56 session there appeared 18 editorials, up from 6 previously; 24 articles of general nature, up from 20 previously; no articles which reported individual endorsements, down from 4 previously; and no articles which reported organizational endorsements, no change from previously. This was a total of 42 editorials and articles, down 18 from 60 previously.

The division's 1955-56 session ended on 1 June 1956.
1956-57 Session

From the end of the 1955-56 session to the beginning of the 1956-57 session of The College of William and Mary in Norfolk on 17 September 1956, several events worthy of note occurred during the interim months.

On 26 June 1956 the City Council of Norfolk received a letter from the City Manager, Mr. Thomas F. Maxwell, in which he recommended acquisition by the City of Norfolk of certain parcels of land lying between Hampton Boulevard and Bluestone Avenue and 48th and 49th Streets for use by The College of William and Mary, Norfolk Division. He also recommended an appropriation of $100,000 be paid The College of William and Mary as a contribution from the City of Norfolk toward the cost of piling for a new library building. The council unanimously adopted an ordinance with authorized the purchase of the land recommended by the city manager. The $100,000, to be paid The College of William and Mary as a contribution from the City of Norfolk toward the cost of piling for the new library building, was adopted by ordinance on 3 July 1956.

On 5 July 1956 Director Webb wrote to Mr. Thomas F. Maxwell, City Manager of Norfolk, and thanked him and members of the Norfolk City Council for the support given the Norfolk Division in the acquiring of land for expansion and the $100,000 for the piling for the library building. He concluded the letter with a statement that the Faculty and Staff of the Norfolk Division felt that the city council was doing a fine job in its forward thinking and progressive
planning for the future of the city. It was his hope that the city would continue its unselfish endeavors which insured the City of Norfolk would be a better community for the homes and businesses of its citizens.

On 30 July 1956 Governor Thomas B. Stanley authorized the Board of Visitors to accept as a gift from the City of Norfolk the sum of $100,000, to be used for payment by the Norfolk Division of The College of William and Mary for necessary piling for the proposed new library building.

The Norfolk Ledger-Dispatch of 10 August 1956 carried the following editorial:

The plan of The College of William and Mary to add two four-year degree courses to its curriculum this fall will make another significant step in the progress of this institution toward a full four-year college.

This institution reached the four-year degree level in its 25th year. It was established as a junior college, offering only freshman and sophomore courses. But the demand for four-year college courses increased through the years. It has come to occupy a place of great importance in Norfolk. It is moving forward in the development of its physical facilities in order to meet the steadily growing demand for its services. The projected addition of two more four-year courses marks a further broadening of its field that will enable increasingly valuable service to the community.

While the Board of Visitors approved the natural science curriculum for a four-year program at the Norfolk Division, the social studies curriculum was withdrawn, to be presented at a later meeting.

While The Virginian-Pilot reported a total of 1,150 students enrolled in the day college, the official enrollment for the 1956-
57 session was 1,503 day students for The College of William and Mary in Norfolk.

Despite the existence of the William and Mary, Norfolk Division, Educational Foundation, the Director's Advisory Board remained in force.

Once again President A. D. Chandler and Director Lewis W. Webb, Jr., remained as the respective heads of their institutions at The College of William and Mary and the Norfolk Division.

President A. D. Chandler and Director L. W. Webb, Jr., prepared a pamphlet entitled "The Development of the Four-Year College at the Norfolk Division, College of William and Mary" in September 1956 for the Board of Visitors and Administrative Officers of The College of William and Mary. The pamphlet devoted itself to (1) "Rising Tide of Interest in a Four-Year College in Norfolk," (2) "The Norfolk Commission on Higher Education," (3) "The Four-Year College Committee of the Norfolk Chamber of Commerce," (4) "The Chamber of Commerce Recommendation to Its Board of Directors," (5) "Past Action of the Board of Visitors," and (6) "The Expression of the Distrust of William and Mary's Leadership." The following conclusions were drawn:

1. There is no institution in the State of Virginia with a greater potential for service to the citizens of the community and State than the Norfolk Division

2. The Norfolk Division has in terms of its origin, location and tradition a natural affiliation with the College of William and Mary at Williamsburg

3. It is, and should continue to be, planned to meet the educational needs of residents of the Hampton Roads Area,
and is susceptible of expansion in those areas where there is a demonstrated need

4. This expansion should be welcomed by the authorities of the College of William and Mary as a unique and unusual opportunity to carry out the College's objectives of serving the educational needs of the Tidewater Area.

5. There is no reason to fear an adverse effect upon the parent college in Williamsburg, but to the contrary, it will provide a wider field of influence and enhance its prestige.

6. Therefore, every effort should be made to secure appropriations, gifts and grants for expanding the faculty and physical plant of the Norfolk Division in order that it may properly serve the State and the people of the Hampton Roads Area.

On 30 October 1956 Director Webb sent members of his Advisory Committee [Board] the following letter:

The Board of Visitors of The College of William and Mary is meeting in Norfolk Saturday, November 10, and you have been invited to attend a luncheon and be present at a meeting of the Board this afternoon. . . .

Since the action of the Board of Visitors in 1953 authorizing the Norfolk Division to develop four-year programs and to expand to meet local educational needs, a number of new Board members have been appointed. A few of these members are not informed as to the conditions at the Norfolk Division and are not in sympathy with the movement to expand its offerings. Whereas this group is a small group, they nevertheless are in a position to harass and impede the progress we wish to make. . . .

Following the luncheon Mr. S. C. Lampert will present the request of our group for pressing forward with the expansion of our facilities and offerings, and we feel confident that if we can show a strong local backing that we can convince the Board of the urgent need for a fully developed four-year college in the Norfolk area. . . .

Mr. Paul Farrier, Executive Secretary of the Virginia Council of Higher Education, wrote to President Chandler on 7 November 1956 and said that the newly created Council of Higher Education in
Virginia had asked him to make an initial visit to each one of the state institutions. It was the plan for the council to make an official visit at a later date.

The Board of Visitors' meeting on 10 November 1956 was devoted, for the most part, to the affairs of the Norfolk Division. Director Webb; Mr. Kaufman of the William and Mary, Norfolk Division, Educational Foundation; and Mr. S. C. Lampert of the Director's Advisory Committee [Board] all made extensive presentations before the board. The board unanimously adopted the following statement made by President Chandler with respect to clarification of the program at the Norfolk Division:

On August 29, 1953, the Board of Visitors of The College of William and Mary approved certain proposals concerning programs in higher education needed in Norfolk. These proposals, while not implicit, implied a four-year program in education, a four-year program in business, and a four-year program in nursing. In the development of these programs, it has been necessary to expand the offerings in (1) art education, (2) biology, (3) business education, (4) chemistry, (5) English, (6) foreign languages, (7) history, (8) mathematics, (9) music, (10) physical education, and (11) social studies consisting of sociology, economics, and education. . . . In addition, to round out this program [teaching] it will be essential for us to set up programs in (1) physics, (2) industrial arts, and (3) psychology. . . .

The program which is being developed for pre-medical work in Norfolk leads to a Bachelor of Science degree, with a concentration in Biology or Chemistry.

In view of the fact that we are committed to four-year programs in Norfolk, it is essential that we develop concentrations which will give sufficient subject material to support the various professional courses which we have embarked upon in the Bachelor of Arts and Bachelor of Science degree programs.

In view of the fact that we have also an arrangement with the Norfolk Division in connection with Pre-Law students, we
are developing those background courses in government, economics, and history, in addition to other general education courses which the program requires and which are so essential to the law profession.

In a letter to Mr. Thomas F. Maxwell, City Manager of Norfolk, President A. D. Chandler on 26 November 1956, wrote:

The College is now preparing its working drawings for the new Norfolk Division Library. . . . We would appreciate your taking the necessary action to deed this property to the College in the very near future so as to not delay the construction of this vitally needed building.

We would also appreciate your informing us of just what procedure will be used in expending the funds for the foundation. Does the City wish to handle this as a separate contract and pay the contractor directly, or does the City wish to deposit the funds into the College's account and have the College make the necessary contracts and expenditures. Since the foundation will be the first contract awarded we would like to have the method determined as soon as you can conveniently do so.

The College is very pleased with the fine support which the City has given us, and we are making plans to expand the offerings of the College in order to provide excellent opportunities for both the youth and adults of this community. . . .

Norfolk City Manager, Mr. Thomas F. Maxwell, replied eight days later to President Alvin D. Chandler's foregoing letter. In it he replied:

The necessary action to deed the property to the College will be undertaken promptly. The architect preparing the plans for the library is going to send me next week a description of the land necessary for construction of the building, and that information will be used as a basis for conveyance.

With regard to the $100,000. . . . I was advised bids probably will not be accepted until later in the year, possibly in the spring or early summer of 1957, and payment to the contractor probably will be made about sixty days thereafter. . . .

As for the handling of the money, I believe it would be best
for the City to make the funds available to the College and not enter into the contract...

On 20 December 1956 President Chandler wrote to Governor Stanley:

The Norfolk City Council has taken action to make property available for use of the College in the building of its new Library and Classroom Building. In addition to the gift of the necessary land on which to locate this building, the City Council has also agreed to appropriate up to $100,000 for the necessary piling of the site...

Since it is extremely urgent that the Norfolk Division proceed rapidly with this building in order to meet accreditation requirements, the present overcrowded library...we will greatly appreciate your releasing the preliminary plans which are on file in your office and authorizing our architects to proceed with the working drawings.

The site plan prescribing the location of this library and the architectural sketches of this proposed building have been presented to the State Art Commission and were approved on November 2, 1956...

The Norfolk Division prepared a pamphlet on The College of William and Mary in Norfolk for the perusal of the State Council of Higher Education during its tour of inspection on 15 January 1957. The pamphlet told of: (1) "The Establishment of the Division in 1930 and the Virginia Polytechnic Institute's Cooperative Affiliation in 1931," (2) "The Special Four-Year College Committee Meeting with the Board of Visitors," (3) "Support of the Four-Year College by Civic and Political Organizations," (4) "The $100,000 Library Campaign by Norfolk Citizens to Insure a Four-Year College," (5) "Assistance by the City of Norfolk in the Development of a Four-Year College," (6) "Civic Organizations' Interest in the College," and (7) "The Place of the College in the Community." The contents of the pamphlet
were summarized in the following fashion:

1. There is no institution in the State of Virginia with a greater potential for service to the citizens of the community and State than the Norfolk Division.

2. The Norfolk Division has in terms of its origin, location and tradition a natural affiliation with the College of William and Mary.

3. The present enrollment of the Norfolk Division has already exceeded the capacity of its physical plant.

4. There is a potential of future college students now crowded in the elementary and secondary schools of the area which will overwhelm the present facilities even with the completion of planned additions to the physical plant.

5. Students can be taught in a community college at a cost to the State of one-third the cost to provide this education in a resident college. The expenditures for college physical plants are from two to three times as great at a resident college where dormitories infirmaries, and many auxiliary buildings must be provided.

6. The Norfolk Division is, and should continue to be, planned to meet the educational needs of residents of the Hampton Roads Area, and is susceptible of expansion in those areas where there is a demonstrated need.

7. This expansion should be welcomed by the authorities of the Commonwealth of Virginia as a unique and unusual opportunity for serving the educational needs of the Tidewater Area.

8. Therefore, every effort should be made to secure appropriations, gifts and grants for expanding the faculty, curriculum, and physical plant of the Norfolk Division in order that it may properly serve the State and people of Hampton Roads Area.

By memorandum dated 18 January 1957, President Chandler outlined to the Richmond Professional Institute and the Norfolk Division his chief duties and responsibilities as Head of The William and Mary System. He pointed out that he was the Chief Executive Officer of The William and Mary System and was responsible for
enforcing the decisions, actions, administrative regulations, and business policies of the Board of Visitors. He was to be present at all business meetings of the board and at its regular or special meetings or committees of the board. The president was to have authority over the selection, appointment, promotion, salaries, transfers, suspension, and dismissal of all officers and members of the faculties. He was to decide all questions of jurisdiction not specifically defined by board action. He was to have the right of presiding over the deliberations of the faculties and veto over their decisions. The president was to be the means of communication between The College of William and Mary, the Governor, the Governor's duly appointed officers, and the Board of Visitors. Each unit in the system was to transmit through the president all communications to the Board of Visitors and the State Council of Higher Education.

At its meeting on 13 April 1957, the Board of Visitors unanimously adopted a resolution which set forth a new organization for the Norfolk Division, its head being designated as a provost vice that of director.

The Virginian-Pilot carried an article on 23 May 1957 which stated that The College of William and Mary in Norfolk would confer bachelor's degrees on sixty-five students, four times the number of the 1956 graduating class.

An editorial, dated 27 May 1957, in The Virginian-Pilot and entitled "Four-Year College Growth - A Liberal Arts Flowering" said
The 65 graduates of The College of William and Mary in Norfolk who will receive their bachelor's degrees at commencement exercises on June 12 will represent a striking growth of the four-year college idea in Norfolk. Those graduates of the college receiving bachelor's degrees are in a class four times larger than that of 1956.

The role of specialized, technical education will be increasingly important in the college. This has been so in many urban colleges which gear their courses to the immediate need in their localities. Yet courses that have a broad base in the liberal arts are also nurtured by these college administrators, if they are wise. . . .

The College of William and Mary . . . is planning for the next quarter-century. It will grow educationally in two directions. It will vary its courses in the educational and professional specialties, but it will also continually broaden the base of the courses that rest upon the liberal arts. It is at the fountain of these liberal arts that the culture of a community continually refreshes itself.

In his "Annual Report to the Board of Visitors," Provost Webb wrote about enrollment, personnel, physical plant improvements, academic developments, and the library. In connection with academic developments, he reported that the division offered a Bachelor of Arts (B.A.) degree with a major in business administration and one in sociology. The Bachelor of Business Administration (B.B.A.) degree was also offered. In addition Bachelor of Science in Elementary Education, Bachelor of Science in Secondary Education, Bachelor of Science in Medical Technology, Bachelor of Science in Physical Education, Bachelor of Science with a major in biology, Bachelor of Science with a major in chemistry, and Bachelor of Science with a major in pre-medicine or pre-dentistry degrees were offered. Provost Webb noted that the library continued to improve despite a rather
difficult situation in which the present library facilities were grossly inadequate. The library was unable to purchase and process books expeditiously because of a lack of shelf space and enough professional librarians. The plans for the new library had progressed and work was scheduled to begin in the fall of 1957. The completion date was estimated to be February 1959. Provost Webb pointed out the lack of adequate seating space for users of the present library was very serious and would become worse as the student body increased. There was no hope for relief until the new library was completed as all available space in the present library was being used beyond its proper capacity.

Compared to the previous year, interest in the four-year college, as reflected in the Norfolk newspaper media, apparently waned. Perhaps this was because the Norfolk Community felt that the Board of Visitors had sincerely advanced four-year college programs as the need arose. At no time was the idea promulgated of an independent, four-year college with its own governing body. From the end of the 1955-56 session through the 1956-57 session there was written 8 editorials, down from 18 previously; 8 articles of a general nature, down from 24 previously; 2 articles which reported organizational endorsements, up from none previously; and no articles which reported individual endorsements, same as previously. This was a total of 18 editorials and articles, down 24 from 42 previously.

Final exercises were held on 12 June 1957 at 7:00 P.M. in front of the Administration Building. The speaker was Dr. W. Carson
Ryan, Kennan Professor of Education Emeritus and former Head of the Education Department at the University of North Carolina.
1957-58 Session

Commencement of the 1957-58 session of The College of William and Mary in Norfolk began on 16 September 1957. In the interim between the close of the 1956-57 session and the beginning of the 1957-58 session, several events occurred of interest.

On 18 June 1957 the City Manager of Norfolk in a letter of the same date stated that by ordinance adopted 23 April 1957 the city had conveyed to The College of William and Mary the properties acquired by the city for the college library. In the same letter, the city manager proposed that the city also convey three properties on West 48th Street adjacent to the library. The council unanimously adopted the city manager’s proposition.

In reply to a letter from President Chandler, Attorney General of Virginia, Mr. J. Lindsay Almond, Jr., wrote the following:

Initiation of these curricula was conditioned upon a sufficient increase being made by the General Assembly in its appropriations to The College of William and Mary to enable the institution to meet the standards of the Southern Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools. Subsequently, general fund appropriation for the 1954-56 biennium were increased to provide funds in support of the program in question, and this increase was maintained for the 1956-58 biennium.

In light of the foregoing, and in view of the increase in appropriations made by the General Assembly of Virginia for the specific purpose of providing funds for the establishment of the curricula under consideration at the Norfolk Division of The College of William and Mary, I am of the opinion that the Board of Visitors of The College of William and Mary is authorized to continue the program initiated in 1954.

Governor Stanley and members of his Budget Committee met at the Norfolk Division on 7 September 1957. Because of the large
number of persons in attendance, it was necessary to shift the place
for the hearing from the library to the gymnasium. Mr. James
Robertson, Rector of the Board of Visitors, acted as the coordinator.
President Chandler welcomed the group while Provost Webb presented
the budget request for both the Maintenance and Operation and Capital
Outlay needs. The budget was presented by means of many large charts
and graphs which showed the division's growth from 206 students in
the 1930-31 session to over 3,000 during the 1956-57 session, as well
as the tremendous potential enrollment to come from the Tidewater
Area's present crowded elementary and secondary schools. Over 70
percent of the increase in the budget for the 1958-60 biennium was
for Personal Services because of merit increases, faculty salary
adjustment, and the increased number of faculty positions due to an
expanded student body.

Support for the budgetary hearing from the Norfolk Community
was considerable. There were 13 speakers. One Congressman was
present, as were 7 members of the General Assembly. The Provost's
Advisory Committee included 13 persons. Norfolk-Portsmouth
Newspapers, Inc., was represented by 2 people. Eight people were
from the National Bank of Commerce. Civic clubs and organizations
were represented by 24 people. The Norfolk Division Alumni
Association had 10 persons represented. Interested citizens numbered
60 while the Norfolk Chamber of Commerce had 8 people in attendance.
The total number of people who attended the budgetary hearing and
were directly interested was 144.
The Virginian-Pilot reported an enrollment of 1,262 day students when classes began, but the Bulletin showed an official enrollment of 1,620.

Although Director Webb had become Provost Webb, the Director's Advisory Board continued to be listed by that name in the Bulletin.

The Norfolk Division was headed by a Provost, that new title having been conferred on Director Lewis W. Webb, Jr., as the result of the reorganization plan for the Norfolk Division approved by the Board of Visitors the previous spring. President Alvin D. Chandler continued as the Chief Executive Officer of The College of William and Mary.

"Four-Year College Support" was the title of a local editorial on 20 September 1957. It stated that the expansion of the Norfolk Division into a full, four-year institution was assured of vital support as a result of the approval of the development by Mr. J. Lindsay Almond, Jr., the Democratic nominee for governor.

The William and Mary authorities had asked Governor Stanley for an increase of approximately 100 percent in its present annual appropriation of $250,000. The increase was sought in order to strengthen the college faculty and to make possible the expansion into four-year status.

In his endorsement of the four-year college, Mr. Almond did not mention specific appropriations. He said, however, that in his
opinion, "the demand for the service fully justifies expansion into a full-fledged, four-year college."\(^{831}\)

On 1 November 1957 Mr. Donald C. Agnew, Executive Secretary of the Southern Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools, wrote Provost Webb the following letter:

A screening committee of the Committee on Junior Colleges has asked me to request you to appear for an interview at the meeting in Richmond on December 2nd. . . . The Committee is concerned about the capacity of the library to serve the needs of the students. . . .

The Virginian-Pilot of 19 November 1957 carried an article which stated that bids would be called for on the new College of William and Mary in Norfolk Library within two weeks. Provost Webb was quoted as saying that he hoped the library would be completed by February 1959. The General Assembly had appropriated $955,000 for the structure while the City of Norfolk had given $100,000 for the piling.\(^{833}\)

The Virginian-Pilot reported that The College of William and Mary in Norfolk had lost the first round in a bid for sufficient funds to get really going on a four-year college basis. Governor Stanley in a proposed billion-dollar-plus state budget recommended only 2.2 millions for operation of the college during the 1958-60 biennium. It was .33 million short of what had been asked by Hampton Roads's Communities for operations.\(^{834}\)

Provost Webb was quoted as saying the budgetary curtailment would stop the four-year expansion program in its tracks, prevent the
opening of all new faculty positions, and prevent an enrollment increase.

In a talk before the Political Club of The College of William and Mary, Mayor W. Fred Duckworth of the City of Norfolk stated that Virginia's failure to provide Norfolk with a full, four-year college was a disgrace. He hoped that he would live long enough to see a real high-class, four-year college in Norfolk. He noted that Norfolk was the only city of its size in the United States that had no full, four-year college. The city council, according to him, was greatly interested in the continued progress and growth of the division. The city had recently given the division land valued at $260,000 and had contributed $100,000 for piling for the new library.

According to the Norfolk Ledger-Dispatch and The Portsmouth Star of 29 January 1958 The College of William and Mary in Norfolk had picked up Governor Almond's endorsement for the $330,000 it needed for operating expenses for the 1958-60 biennium. The governor was quoted as saying that he had given permission to say that he was most anxious to have every effort made to put in the budget the necessary funds to meet these needs. President Chandler in the same article stated that unless the funds were restored the Norfolk college was in danger of losing its accreditation.

A House of Delegates' bill which established The College of William and Mary in Norfolk as a four-year college in certain courses was passed by the State Senate.

Governor J. Lindsay Almond, Jr., signed the foregoing General
Assembly bill designed to make legal four-year courses at The College of William and Mary in Norfolk. The bill cleared up all questions of the right of the division to be considered for appropriations necessary to maintain four-year courses.

According to The Virginian-Pilot of 16 February 1958, Provost Webb predicted that The College of William and Mary in Norfolk would become the greatest college in the State of Virginia, the reason being that it was only one of two properly situated colleges, the other eleven being mislocated. He stated that the $330,000 appropriation, if passed, would make it possible for the division to keep its accreditation and continue with its present expansion program.

In an editorial entitled "The Four-Year College Saved" the Norfolk Ledger-Dispatch and The Portsmouth Star stated that approval by the House Appropriations Committee of the full budget request of The College of William and Mary in Norfolk provided virtual assurance that the expansion of the division into a full, four-year status would not be interrupted. It also stated that the General Assembly had cleared up the shadow of doubt which had arisen over the legality of the four-year status of the division. With the action by the General Assembly and with the virtual certainty of the necessary appropriations, the expansion of the division seemed assured. Everything pointed to General Assembly approval of the necessary appropriations and the continued orderly enlargement of the college.
to meet the urgent and growing need for such a four-year facility in Norfolk.  

On 31 March 1958 Governor J. Lindsay Almond, Jr., authorized the Rector and Board of Visitors, The College of William and Mary to proceed with the construction of a new library at the Norfolk Division.

In a letter to Governor J. Lindsay Almond, Jr., the Chairman of the Advisory Board of the Norfolk Division, Mr. Charles L. Kaufman, wrote:

I take great pleasure in carrying out a resolution which was recently adopted by the Advisory Board of the Norfolk Division of The College of William and Mary, expressing the Board's deep and lasting gratitude for your interest in and help to the Norfolk Division.

This was concretely and convincingly evidenced during the recent session of the Virginia Assembly, when the Norfolk Division stood at the crossroads. Your actions were of incalculable value in helping the Division to proceed on the proper course. As a result, the Norfolk Division will be able to render a service of much greater breadth and usefulness to the Commonwealth and particularly to the young men and women of the Tidewater area. I feel certain that the future of the Norfolk Division will clearly demonstrate the wisdom of your judgment.

Once again interest in the four-year college in Norfolk had risen as evidenced by the coverage given to the subject in the Norfolk newspaper media. Again, no idea was advanced suggesting that there be an independent, four-year college with its own governing board. From the end of the 1956-57 session through the 1957-58 session there were written 32 editorials, up 24 from 8 previously; 48 articles of a general nature, up 20 from 28 previously; two articles which reported organizational endorsements, same as previously; and 4
articles which reported individual endorsements, up from none previously. This was a total of 86 editorials and articles, up 68 from 18 previously.

The 1957-58 session came to a close on 10 June 1958.
1958-59 Session

The 1958-59 session of The College of William and Mary, Norfolk Division began on 15 September 1958. In the interim following the end of the 1957-58 session and the beginning of the 1958-59 session, only one event of interest to the Norfolk Division occurred. On 28 July 1958 Provost Webb wrote to the Executive Secretary, Commission on Colleges and Universities, Southern Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools and proposed a February 1959 date for initiating a self-evaluation.

The official enrollment for the 1958-59 session was 2,046 day students.

The Director's Advisory Board by that name continued to be listed in the Bulletin.

Provost Lewis W. Webb, Jr., and President Alvin D. Chandler continued as Heads of the Norfolk Division and The College of William and Mary, respectively.

The Virginian-Pilot carried an editorial on 15 September 1958 entitled "A Four-Year College Begins a New Year." It said that in buildings, equipment, and teaching standards Norfolk's college was rising to meet the challenge of increased student enrollment. It had become a degree-granting institution in a much shorter time than had seemed possible a few years ago. The college, Norfolk, and the state all deserved a fair share of the credit. Norfolk wanted and needed a four-year college. The editorial traced the development of the four-year college. Five years ago the Board of Visitors of The College of
William and Mary in Williamsburg had authorized four-year courses at the Norfolk Division. A year later in 1954, the General Assembly made the first appropriation for the first, four-year course. In 1956 bachelor degrees were conferred upon 15 graduates of the Norfolk Division; in 1957 there were 64 degree graduates; and in 1958 there were 104.

On 26 September 1958 Provost Webb wrote to Dr. Gordon W. Sweet, Executive Secretary of the Southern Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools, in the following vein:

The major stumbling block in our way [accreditation as a four-year college] at present is our Library. We have a new building under construction and expect to occupy it during the spring of 1959. The complete changeover, however, will not be effected until the beginning of the school year in the fall of 1959, so therefore we are planning to make the request [for accreditation] at the December, 1959 meeting of the Southern Association for a study to be made during 1960.

As of June, 1958 we had three classes to graduate and will have an additional class to graduate next June [1959] which will give us even more indication as to the acceptance of these students by graduate schools and the work that they are doing at these institutions.

The 2 October 1958 issue of the High Hat carried an article concerning construction of the library. The article stated that work on the new library was steadily progressing. It described the new 180 foot by 120 foot, two-story building as being located on 48th Street just west of Hampton Boulevard. College Librarian, Mr. William C. Pollard, was quoted to the effect that he hoped the library would be ready for the summer session of 1959. The building was described as having its four sides shaded by a solar screen construction of white, glazed, ceramic tiles in a filigree design.
The screen was not only decorative but served a practical purpose because it prevented direct sunlight from entering. This made it possible to air-condition the building economically. The first floor would house the new books and other materials of interest. The circulation desk would be located near the entrance to the building. Beyond it would extend the General Reading and Reference Room with study tables and chairs to accommodate approximately 300 persons. Adjacent to the room would be the main body of the library's books. There would be shelving space for nearly 90,000 volumes. Also located on the first floor would be a smaller reading room for approximately 100 readers.

During October 1958 Mr. Albert Teich, Jr., a Norfolk attorney, circulated a pamphlet, "We Need a Full Four-Year College."

The pamphlet is quoted in part below:

One of the greatest services which the Norfolk Jaycees can render to the City of Norfolk is to get behind the big push which is needed to firmly establish a full four-year college in the city. There has been much talk about the progress towards such an educational institution but frankly the real progress has been fairly small considering the need existing. We do not now have a full four-year college nor will be in the near future unless there can be some method devised which will not only push our City Council, but also to influence the Legislature at the next session in 1960. The people of the city are prepared for such an institution and will be behind such a movement. All we need now is the proper leadership.

There is no more logical group to furnish the proper leadership than the Norfolk Jaycees. In conversations which I have had with Mr. L. W. Webb and Mr. E. H. Hong and various other persons associated with the College, the great need right now is for an independent survey of the Norfolk area in regards to its needs and just how these needs can be met by the local branch of William and Mary...
There is much apathy in the Legislature towards the building of the type of college which we need. . . . If we could present to the legislators an independent survey by experts putting down in dollars and cents the amount of money which we lose in the entire state due to the lack of a proper educational institution here, we would stand a better chance to obtain the needed funds. . . .

In March [1956] I went to Washington to inquire about the possibility of federal aid in obtaining a survey for our area. . . .

We can ask for, and the search will be made, for any type of information which we deem necessary. . . .

Besides the cost of a private survey I have been informed by the Office of Higher Education that a private firm is not well enough trained to conduct such a survey. . . .

If the Jaycees decide to have Drs. Hollis and Martarona of the Office of Higher Education to conduct a survey on their own time, then we could probably schedule the survey at our pleasure. Drs. Hollis and Martarona would confer with us and advise us. Then they would set up the survey. HOWEVER, the leg work of such a survey would have to be done by the JAYCEES. The survey papers would be sent to us and we would have to go from door to door and office to office. Frankly, we would have to obtain the help of other civic organizations to provide much of this work. I have been in contact with a representative of the League of Women Voters and have been unofficially assured that this is the sort of work which they love to dig into. I also understand that the Junior Women's Club also likes to tackle such a project. . . .

I hope that we would not only use the information [from the survey] to influence the Assembly but also our City Council. There is no reason why we should always look to Richmond for a handout. We will gain more from a full four-year college than any other part of the Commonwealth, therefore, we should provide some of the needed money ourselves. . . .

In my opinion, the Norfolk JAYCEES could undertake no project more worthwhile than the educational survey suggested. . . .

Apparently Attorney Teich presented his proposed Jaycees
project to the Norfolk City Council, for on 22 October 1958 Mayor W. Fred Duckworth sent him the following letter:

The Council was very pleased at your statement at its meeting of the 21st containing the proposed plan of the Junior Chamber of Commerce . . . to request the United States Department of Health, Education, and Welfare to conduct an educational survey of the Tidewater Area for The College of William and Mary here in Norfolk in order to determine the educational requirements and physical facilities to best serve the people of this Area.

The establishment of a four-year college here in Norfolk was one of the original projects on which the Council embarked when first elected, and anything done to help advance the purpose of the College contained our attention, and the Council wishes to assure you of its interest, support, and cooperation not only in getting this survey but in conducting it as well.

Provost Webb also communicated his pleasure at Attorney Teich's efforts to conduct an educational survey of the Tidewater area. He wrote:

The Norfolk Division of The College of William and Mary is delighted with the proposal of the Junior Chamber of Commerce to have an educational survey made of the Tidewater area for the purpose of determining how we may better serve the community.

You may be sure that our faculty and staff will be made available to any survey team and will assist them in every way to make a thorough and impartial survey of the needs of the area for higher education.

President Chandler wrote on 30 October 1958 to Dr. Ernest W. Hollis, Chief of College Administration, Office of Education, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare the following:

When I assumed the presidency of The College of William and Mary in 1951, I realized that there was a genuine need for improved, high-quality higher education in Tidewater, and stated in Norfolk in 1952 that I did not think we were fulfilling our mission in higher education in all of
Tidewater. The citizens of Tidewater Virginia on both sides of the James River have become very much interested in higher education because they recognize the need for more education in this area in view of the fact that industry is coming into Virginia, and particularly in our area of the state.

I was certainly pleased to learn from Mr. Albert Teich, Jr., the Director of the Norfolk Junior Chamber of Commerce, that he has had discussions with you in regard to a survey of this area in connection with its educational needs, and that he has received considerable support from the Council of the City of Norfolk and the citizens of Tidewater. I am sure that you are familiar with the endeavors of the Junior Chamber of Commerce in Norfolk, and I feel that their efforts are very timely at this particular time, since no survey, to my knowledge, has ever been made.

I can assure you and Mr. Teich, by copy of this letter, that the College of William and Mary, including its branches, will do everything possible to cooperate in such a survey.

At its 1 November 1958 meeting, the Board of Visitors unanimously adopted a resolution which called for naming the new library at the Norfolk Division the Robert Horton Hughes Library and for the erection of a suitable tablet in the foyer of the library to preserve his memory.

It appeared that the Norfolk Division's objective of gaining accreditation, based upon its new library under construction, had run into some difficulty, as was evidenced in a letter written to Provost Webb by Dr. Gordon W. Sweet, the Executive Secretary of the Southern Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools. In the letter he said:

The Committee expressed concern over the inadequate library facilities and is also concerned about the new library being inadequate. It is possible that you are able to explain the proposed library facilities in relation to future enrollment. If the supplementary information you are able to send is sufficient, your report will be filed as satisfactory;
otherwise I shall arrange a conference with the Committee at the annual meeting in Louisville.

On 7 November 1958 Provost Webb replied to Dr. Sweet's letter to him of 3 November 1958:

We are quite aware that our present library seating capacity is inadequate since we at present can seat only 10% of our student body. As you probably know, the growth of our student body during the last four years has been very large, and also we have for many years been planning new library facilities. There were many delays in obtaining the funds from the State for this purpose. During the last biennium, however, the State appropriated $875,000 and the City of Norfolk gave us an additional $100,000 for the construction of our library. When completed the library building alone will cost in excess of $1,000,000.

Our report probably failed to make clear just what we were planning and building as I was quite surprised to note that the Committee expressed concern as to whether the new library would be adequate. This building is a two-story building of 190 feet by 130 feet. It will have a total floor area of 45,000 square feet. We feel that this library will be adequate for the next ten years of our anticipated growth, and in fact are only planning to use the first floor during the next few years.

I am enclosing a sheet of the first floor showing the arrangements of the stacks, work areas and seating spaces. You will note that this will give us a seating capacity of 396, steel shelving for approximately 60,000 volumes, wood shelving for approximately 5,590 volumes, as well as certain special purpose rooms for music and visual aids. Since at present our collection is only slightly over 25,000 volumes, we can, if necessary, use part of the stack space for additional seating, but the 396 seats would be sufficient for approximately 2,000 students.

It is our plan to take over rooms on the second floor of this building which will be temporarily occupied by classrooms, just as fast as they are needed for additional library seating use; thus you can see the arrangement is flexible and permits many years of growth both in the student body and the collection of books.

The building is now over half completed, and we expect to use it during the second semester. In the meantime we are
Dr. William H. McFarlane of the State Council of Higher Education sent a letter to the U. S. Office of Education on 31 December 1958 in which he set forth a tentative proposal for an educational survey in the Tidewater Area of Virginia. The letter dealt with general considerations, wherein the council desired to submit a proposal for an educational survey of the Tidewater Area; questions to be answered, such as the possibilities of expansions of present facilities, educational needs of the community, and probable number of students who would seek training; nature and extent of community interest; geographic area to be covered, including the Cities of Norfolk and Portsmouth, Norfolk and Princess and Counties, and the Peninsula Cities of Newport News and Hampton; local resources, chiefly, the Norfolk Junior Chamber of Commerce which would provide office space and telephone facilities, stenographic help and supplies, and chauffeuring service; and a timetable which called for completion of the survey within six months.

In a report prepared by the Bureau of Population and Economic Research, University of Virginia the populations of selected areas in Virginia were enumerated. In 1940 the population of north and south Hampton Roads was 256,561. In 1950 it rose to 454,766, with the total in 1957 being 591,582. It was projected to go to 734,000 in 1965 and to 825,000 by 1970. The growth of public schools in the Norfolk Area showed the Norfolk City Schools had increased 88.5 percent from 1938-39 through 1957-58 while those of Norfolk County
rose by 166.6 percent, Portsmouth City Schools by 73 percent, Princess Anne County and Virginia Beach by 363.7 percent, and South Norfolk by 160.2 percent. These figures did not include the schools on the Peninsula. Clearly, a veritable tidal wave of high school graduates was creating and threatened to engulf the higher education facilities in the Norfolk Area. It was imperative that preparations be made for this onslaught of college-bound students.

Apparently, Dr. McFarlane had sent President Chandler a copy of his proposed working outline for a survey of the needs in higher education of the Tidewater Virginia Area. President Chandler replied:

It is particularly interesting to note that in the basic factors which you propose to study, your outline follows rather closely an analysis of growth opportunities which was proposed to this college by a professional consulting service several months ago.

As you know, the William and Mary System has grown up in the twentieth century in response to the very needs for educational services which are now manifesting themselves in acute form, and to which the State Council of Higher Education is directing its attention along the lines suggested by your outline.

On 3 March 1959 Dr. McFarlane made the following announcement to the Chief Executive Officers of Virginia state-supported institutions of higher learning:

The State Council of Higher Education is pleased to announce completion of plans to conduct a survey of the higher educational needs of the Tidewater area. A survey team from the U. S. Office of Education, headed by Drs. E. V. Hollis and S. U. Martarona, will begin its work during the first week in April and will submit a completed report on or about September 1, 1959.

The project was originally conceived and sponsored by the
Norfolk Junior Chamber of Commerce, which is also underwriting the direct costs of the study. Staff time of the survey team is being contributed by the U. S. Office of Education. Total costs of the survey, estimated at $25,000, are thus being financed at no expense to the State.

Norfolk newspaper media coverage of the Norfolk Division and its interest in a four-year college reached the lowest point of the 1950-51 through 1959-60 sessions. Once again, no one person or organization put forth a suggestion or idea that Norfolk should have its own independent, four-year college with its own governing board. Only 2 editorials appeared during the entire 1958-59 session, down 30 from 32 previously; 12 articles of a general nature, down 36 from 48 previously; no articles which reported organizational endorsements, down from 1 previously; and no articles which reported individual endorsements, down from 2 previously. This was a total of 14 editorials and articles, down 72 from 86 previously.

Officially the 1958-59 session ended on 1 June 1959.
1959-60 Session

September 14, 1959, saw the beginning of the 1959-60 session. In the interim between the close of the 1958-59 session and the commencement of the 1959-60 session, several events occurred. In an editorial in *The Virginian-Pilot* the following observations were made:

There may be a widening spread of degrees in professional courses at the College of William and Mary in Norfolk, but the base of liberal arts will be extended also. There are now seven courses taught at the college leading to a bachelor's degree. The number of degree graduates has risen from 15 to 1956 to 160 of this year (1958-59).

Four-year courses were not authorized at the college here by the board of visitors of the College of William and Mary in Williamsburg until 1953. The General Assembly did not make the first appropriation for the first four-year course at the College of William and Mary in Norfolk until the following year.

This is a beginning only for Norfolk's four-year college. It is a remarkable five-year record of progress. The promise is for large growth in the years ahead, now that the first difficult steps have been taken.

The 13 August 1959 issue of *The Virginian-Pilot* carried the below article:

Separate accreditation for the College of William and Mary in Norfolk is believed virtually certain.

The new library and a strengthened faculty are expected to bring the college up to the standards set by the Southern Assn. of Secondary Schools and Colleges. . . .

With separate accreditation, William and Mary in Norfolk would draw near a crossroads. One road would lead to the further development of the institution within the Greater College of William and Mary, the other to its establishment as a separate state college.
The million-dollar William and Mary in Norfolk library will open soon for the fall term, giving the college its greatest boost toward separate accreditation.

The Board of Visitors' minutes for 13 August 1959 carried an invitation from Provost Webb to attend the dedication of the new library on 17 October 1959. The board voted unanimously to accept Provost Webb's invitation and to hold its next meeting in Norfolk on the day of the dedication.

An invitation was extended to Governor Almond by President Chandler to attend the dedication of the library and make a few remarks. He concluded the letter by saying that the college was indebted to him for the assistance which he rendered on behalf of the Norfolk Division of The College of William and Mary in the development of quality education in the Metropolitan Norfolk Area.

In a visit to the Norfolk Division on 25 August 1959, Governor Almond stated that he favored continued growth of The College of William and Mary in Norfolk under its parent institution rather than as a separate institution. He felt that the growth at the Norfolk Division was in response to the ever-growing needs of those citizens at the local level who could not go to or could not be accommodated at institutions already established elsewhere. He said that the program at the Norfolk Division was the only effective answer that the state could give to the increased demand for service beyond the secondary level of education.

The quest for accreditation moved forward. On 27 August 1959 Provost Webb wrote to President Chandler the following:
The Southern Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools has requested that we notify them by September 1st if we desire to be included in their schedule for studies for the 1959-60 session.

As you know, we have been four years since inaugurating our first degree program and have also strengthened our faculty and the library to a point where I feel certain that we could meet the requirements of the Association. I feel that it is very important for us to obtain the required accreditation as soon as possible and am confident that we will more than meet the inspecting committee's demands.

I have suggested the Spring of 1960 as the date for the committee's visit, but if you believe it should be postponed until the Fall I would suggest that November of 1960 be designated.

The concept of an independent, four-year college with its own governing board gained momentum in the Norfolk Community. This idea was reflected in a Norfolk Ledger-Dispatch and The Portsmouth Star editorial on 28 August 1959 which said:

No one familiar with what Governor Almond did for the College of William and Mary at Norfolk during the 1958 General Assembly has any doubts as to his support of four-year college status and continuing expansion for this Tidewater institution.

But there is less certainly over the soundness of tying the local college permanently to the parent facility in Williamsburg, an attachment the governor has said he is inclined to favor.

Under some circumstances it might be a toss-up as to whether the branch would fare better on its own or with the parent link unbroken. There is also a case to be made for clinging to the prestige, experience, and other benefits accruing from the bond with Williamsburg.

But there is something to be said for separation, too. Since the governor spoke there has already been some dissenting reaction here. And there may be more, for there is, and has been for a long time, a significant body of opinion in favor of a completely independent four-year institution to serve this area.
This whole subject is one which is receiving prime attention in the U.S. Office of Education survey sponsored by the Junior Chamber of Commerce and in a companion study being carried out by the State Council of Higher Education.

But as of now, there is no reason to assume that the connection with Williamsburg must be preserved forever.

The official day student enrollment for the 1959-60 session of The College of William and Mary, Norfolk Division was 2,178.

The title of the Director's Advisory Board was officially changed with the issue of the 1 April 1959 Bulletin to that of the Provost's Advisory Board.

Once again, Provost Lewis W. Webb, Jr., and President Alvin D. Chandler were the Chief Executives of the Norfolk Division and The College of William and Mary, respectively.

During September 1959 the State Council of Higher Education published a survey authorized by the council and initiated and financed by the Norfolk Junior Chamber of Commerce. The survey was prepared by a Director of the Office of Education of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare (HEW); a chief consultant; and eleven college specialists from the College and University Administration Board of HEW. The survey was entitled Higher Education in the Tidewater Area of Virginia. Page 196 of the report stated:

Some readers may wonder why among the alternatives cited there is no mention made of the possibility of creating individual institutional governing boards for each of the campus units, thus giving to each one a complete autonomous base and an institutional identity. The survey staff explored this possibility in considerable depth. The end result of this exploration, however, was that there was
little realism to the idea of a separate institutional
governing board for each campus in the Tidewater Area. . . .

There are three other feasible alternative possibilities:

1. Abolition of the present structure in favor of one which
would incorporate at least some of the Tidewater campus
units into the higher education systems of the University
of Virginia or Virginia Polytechnic Institute

2. Retention of the present structure

3. Modification of the present structure to make it more
truly an area-wide governing and administrative
organization for strengthening higher education in the
region.

On pages 196-201 of the "Survey Report," the alternatives
suggested above were discussed. With respect to Alternative Number
One, it was felt by the staff that there would be little if anything
to gain by such a change of organization over the present plan.
There would be much to lose, namely, it would violate the basic
principle of maintaining so far as possible a geographic coherence
and integrity for the public higher education of a region. With
respect to Alternative Number Two, the staff felt that it appeared
that the present structure for higher education in the area was not
adequate to meet its demands. Discussion of Alternative Number Three
lead to the following on the part of the staff:

This alternative would use the existing administrative
structure for higher education in the Tidewater Area as the
starting point and would modify and strengthen it so that
some of the weaknesses pointed out in this report can be
overcome. The essential weaknesses of the present
administrative structure are:

1. There is a lack of public acceptance and understanding
of it for the reason that several State-supported higher
institutions are involved in one or more aspects of
higher education in the area and, too, because the
College of William and Mary is considered by the public more as an 'old line' liberal arts college rather than as an agency for providing a comprehensive educational service to a large metropolitan area.

2. The Norfolk Division of the College of William and Mary lacks an institutional identity commensurate with the size of its enrollment and the character of the program it provides.

3. The local character and identity of any new institutional program such as the one recommended in this report for the North Hampton Roads Area, would likely be submerged in the College of William and Mary tradition and institutional practices, as was the case in Norfolk.

What was proposed in the "Survey Report" was the creation of a System of Associated Colleges in the Tidewater Area. Within the new System of Associated Colleges, each component unit would have a definite institutional identity either as a two-year, junior college; a four-year, undergraduate college; or a comprehensive college that was authorized to offer specified graduate and professional programs. Each component would have its own name, its own administrative staff for managing authorized programs, and its own instructional staff.

All of the component units of the system or constituent colleges, as they might be termed, however, would be governed by a single Board of Visitors and administered by one Chief Executive Officer.

The "Survey Report" contained the following specific recommendations which pertained to the foregoing matter:

1. The citizens of the Tidewater Area and the State of Virginia should support a steady and orderly expansion of post-high school educational programs in the Tidewater Area.

2. In the broad statewide planning of higher educational development now being done in the Legislature, the State Council of Higher Education, and the governing
boards of existing institutions in Virginia... strong
considerations must be given to decentralization of post-
high school services within the existing framework for
higher education in the State...

4. There would be developed as soon as possible a plan for
orderly expansion of lower-division programs at all of
the campus centers in the Tidewater Area to provide
places for the growing numbers of students who will seek
to carry on their studies beyond high school in the years
of the next decade...

5. An upper-division program in engineering should be
developed at the Norfolk Division of William and Mary,
beginning with one or two basic engineering curricula
such as civil or industrial...

6. When and as demands for graduate programs develop in the
Tidewater Area an examination should be made of the
possibilities of their being provided by educational
resources in the area...

7. A new 2-year college campus center should be developed in
the North Hampton Roads Area (the Peninsula)...

8. The State Council of Higher Education, in its consideration
of budgetary recommendations to the Legislature for higher
education, should take into account the relatively
inequitable position held by the Tidewater Area,
particularly the South Hampton Roads section, and seek to
bring about a level of State support for the institutions
commensurate with the proportion of the State's population
and the area's contribution to the State's income

9. The State Council of Higher Education... should
recommend to the Legislature a policy for financing the
entire costs of physical plant expansion on existing
campuses south of the river...

10. In the establishment of a new 2-year college in the North
Hampton Roads area... the governmental jurisdictions
in this area... should be expected to conform to the
statewide policies and plans currently being formulated
by the State Council of Higher Education for financing
a 2-year colleges...

11. The State Council of Higher Education... should seek
from the Legislature a more equitable allocation of
funds for higher education in the Tidewater Area...
12. In financing current operations of the new 2-year program in North Hampton Roads, the policies and principles presently being developed by the State Council of Higher Education should be observed.

13. The State Council of Higher Education, in the approval of higher education programs to be offered by extension in the Tidewater Area, should adopt as its guiding policy the principle that local resources for higher education should be utilized to serve the area before those of State higher institutions located elsewhere in the State are called upon to do so.

14. The Norfolk Division of the College of William and Mary should have and make known the fact that it has administrative and program autonomy in fields of engineering as approved by the State Council of Higher Education.

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

According to a 19 September 1959 issue of a local newspaper, the new library at the Norfolk Division was to be named after Mr. Robert Morton Hughes, Sr., a prominent Norfolk attorney, who died in 1940. At one time, he was the Rector of the Board of Visitors and was principally instrumental, along with President J. A. C. Chandler of The College of William and Mary, in the establishment of the Norfolk Division, The College of William and Mary in 1930. In his will Mr. Hughes bequeathed his own library to the library at the Norfolk Division.

The 18 October 1959 issue of The Virginian-Pilot reported on the opening of the Hughes Library at the Norfolk Division. The Robert Morton Hughes Library was described as having come from 'dream stuff into reality' through the cooperation of the commonwealth, the
The guest list for the dedication of the Robert Morton Hughes Library, with Rector James M. Robertson of the Board of Visitors who presided, showed 5 administrative personnel from The College of William and Mary, 3 from the Norfolk Division, 2 from the Richmond Professional Institute, 3 from the Virginia Polytechnic Institute, 2 from the Southern Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools, 12 from the Board of Visitors, 8 from the State Council of Higher Education, 1 from Frederick College, 11 from the City Council of Norfolk and various city officials, 9 local school superintendents, 18 members of the Provost's Advisory Board, 27 members of the Virginia General Assembly, 4 personnel from the Governor's Office, 7 architects and builders, 5 members of the Norfolk Library Board, 8 Captains of the Drive to Raise Funds for the Faculty, 72 friends of the college, and 11 special guests of the college. This totaled 208 guests in attendance. Added to this were 212 persons, for a grand total of 420 guests. With a few exceptions, all of these guests had a direct and abiding interest in the present and future status of the
Norfolk Division. Their presence at the dedication of the library was indicative of their general support of the Norfolk Division.

The Richmond News Leader on 12 January 1960 reported that the State Council of Higher Education had proposed the appointment of a chancellor to coordinate the administration of The College of William and Mary and its branches in Richmond and Norfolk. The council's proposal would not relieve the present Heads of William and Mary, its Norfolk Division, and the Richmond Professional Institute of direct administrative responsibility for their schools. All schools would report to the chancellor who would report to the Board of Visitors whose membership would be increased to fifteen. President Chandler would be relieved of some of the duties of his office under the proposal administrative setup. The council proposed that the college at Williamsburg and its two divisions be re-named The Colleges of William and Mary, with the parent college bearing the name The College of William and Mary in Virginia.

The Norfolk Ledger-Dispatch and The Portsmouth Star carried an article entitled "W & M Norfolk Seeks Full College Status" in which it was stated that accreditation would be sought from the Southern Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools and that it would be a major step in establishing the Norfolk unit as a nearly independent educational institution.

According to an editorial in The Virginian-Pilot, The College of William and Mary in Norfolk hoped to secure independent accreditation for its four-year degree courses during the year 1960,
but it would not be able to win accreditation unless a cut of $363,105 in its requested operating appropriation was restored in the state budget.

A Norfolk evening newspaper editorial said this:

The trouble is in the operating budget, which the governor [Almond] put at $3,257,700 for the coming biennium. Although this is 30.1 percent more than for the current two-year period, it is $363,105 below what the college asked to cover the needs of its growing enrollment and to meet minimum accreditation standards.

Another editorial in The Virginian-Pilot threw further light on the budgetary crisis faced by the Norfolk Division. It said, in part, that the budgetary cut of $303,105 was a disabling one that would reduce the college's general fund appropriation below the level required by the Southern Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools for accreditation. Two hundred dollars per student per year was the standard required by the association. The general fund appropriation recommended in the governor's proposed state budget amounted to only about $154 per student.

Despite the threat of a budgetary cut and the possible delay in accreditation, nevertheless, The College of William and Mary forged ahead with its plans for the Norfolk Division's accreditation.

In a letter to Dr. Gordon W. Sweet, Executive Secretary of the Southern Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools, President Chandler wrote:

In 1955 the Executive Secretary was notified by my office of the decision of our Board of Visitors to institute the process of change necessary to develop the Norfolk Division of The College of William and Mary from its status as a
junior college to that of a four-year, baccalaureate degree-granting college of arts and sciences. . . .

The Norfolk Division has now graduated four classes. The latest, in June 1959, saw 160 students receive their degrees. During the interim period the degree programs developed in Norfolk have been under the supervision of the parent institution in Williamsburg, and their growth and development have received the scrutiny and advice of the corresponding department of instruction there.

In addition much progress has been made in developing the faculty and physical plant, and we now believe the Norfolk Division to be fully qualified to meet the standards of the Southern Association. . . .

The College, therefore, requests that the Executive Secretary appoint a special studies committee for investigation prior to initial accreditation. . . . We would appreciate a visit from this study committee during April or May of this year, 1960. . . .

The College also requests that the Executive Secretary schedule a visit to the Norfolk Division by the regular visiting committee in either October or early November, 1960, for the purpose of checking the institution for accrediting by the Southern Association as a senior college. . . .

On 4 February 1960 The College of William and Mary made a special plea to the General Assembly for an extra $365,000 its officials claimed was needed to keep the college accredited, according to The Virginian-Pilot. Provost Lewis W. Webb, Jr., said that the Norfolk unit of William and Mary was in an impossible position because of Governor Almond's recommended operating funds budget for the school. Provost Webb further stated that the proposed budget would provide less than the minimum funds necessary for accreditation. The Provost's Advisory Board was also in attendance in Richmond. Provost Webb spoke before a joint hearing of the House Appropriations and the Senate Finance Committees.
The Virginian-Pilot reported that a bill which would set up a system of colleges in the Tidewater Area and other areas of the state under The College of William and Mary had started in the House of Delegates on 10 February 1960. Delegate James W. Roberts of Norfolk and twelve other legislators from the Hampton Roads and Richmond Areas co-sponsored the bill. The bill came in response to recommendations of a Special Study sponsored by the Norfolk Junior Chamber of Commerce. The bill provided that a fifteen-member Board of Visitors be set up that would have power to appoint a chancellor to serve the colleges and two-year facilities that would operate under the parent school at Williamsburg.

On 9 February 1960 Mr. Dabney S. Lancaster, Chairman of the State Council of Higher Education, wrote a letter to Governor J. Lindsay Almond, Jr., which set forth certain recommendations which concerned the development of the community college program and dealt particularly with the administrative modification of The William and Mary System, establishment of regional colleges, and consolidation of community facilities:

1. That The College of William and Mary in Williamsburg, together with its affiliated branches and such other units as may be established in the future, be designated as The Colleges of William and Mary

2. That the present governing board of The William and Mary System be enlarged to a number not in excess of 15 members and redesignated as the Board of Visitors of The Colleges of William and Mary

3. That the parent institution in Williamsburg retain its traditional title, The College of William and Mary in Virginia. That other institutional units in the System be designated by distinctive and appropriate titles
4. That the Chief Executive Officer of The Colleges of William and Mary be designated as Chancellor of the System. That the Chief Executive Officers of major four-year units in the System be designated as President or Provost.

5. That, through authority of legislation enacting this proposal, the Board of Visitors of The Colleges of William and Mary be authorized and requested to prepare by-laws of The Colleges of William and Mary.

6. That the Board of Visitors of The Colleges of William and Mary appoint a Chancellor of The Colleges of William and Mary; that said Board . . . appoint a President of The College of William and Mary in Virginia.

7. That the chief executive . . . report to the Chancellor of The Colleges of William and Mary, and through him, to the Board of Visitors of The Colleges of William and Mary.

8. That within two years . . . the Board of Visitors of The Colleges of William and Mary shall provide for establishing the Chancellor's Office.

Governor Almond signed The Colleges of William and Mary System into law, but the funds which were allocated for the new Office of Chancellor would seriously hamper its operation, according to The Virginian-Pilot. The newspaper article state that the new law placed the Williamsburg college and the Norfolk and Richmond colleges all on an equal footing.

On 22 March 1960 President Chandler again wrote to Dr. Sweet on the matter of accreditation for the Norfolk Division. The letter was virtually identical to the one sent to him on 1 February 1960.

Dr. Sweet replied to the above letter with a lengthy reply on 4 April 1960. He wrote:

I interpret your letter of March 22 to indicate that you desire to seek accreditation for the Norfolk Division of The College of William and Mary as a senior college. Will the college continue to be a division or branch of The College of
William and Mary or is it seeking to gain identification as a separate college independent from The College of William and Mary? . . .

Enclosed you will find an information sheet which indicates the procedure to be followed by a college moving from a junior to senior college. . . . This report will be submitted to the Committee on Admission to Membership at its October and December [1960] meetings. At this time the Committee may authorize that a Special Study for initial accreditation as a senior college be made of the Norfolk Division. The study will then be made during 1961 prior to the next October meeting. Special studies for accreditation are made only when authorized at the annual meeting by the Committee on Admission to Membership.

It is possible that you may wish to have the Executive Secretary or some other consultants visit the college before next October to review its position as a senior college. . . . It is not possible, however, for us to arrange a special visiting committee to follow up on your self-study. . . .

I admit I am a little confused as to the exact nature of the two committee visits which you have requested. Normally the committee for the periodic visitation program does not visit an institution until after it has been accredited. Junior colleges, of course, are participating in this program but I do not believe it would be wise for you to have a committee visit in the institutional self-study and periodic moved to a senior college program at the Norfolk have already moved to a senior college program at the Norfolk Division. . . .

On 21 April 1960 Dr. Sweet wrote identical letters to Provost Webb and President Chandler. In them he said that it appeared that he would visit the Norfolk Division, but the only dates available were 18 and 19 May; otherwise, he would have to postpone his visit until September 1960. He felt that the May dates would give him the opportunity to quickly survey the operation in Norfolk. Should he find the need to recommend certain corrections or adjustments, he could return in September. He said he would review the report forms
upon arrival and would relate these as much as possible to the total program as he would see it during his brief visit. The report forms would then be retained by the Norfolk Division for up-dating at the close of the fiscal year [30 June 1960] and for forwarding to his office around 1 October so that they could be reviewed by the Screening Committee as an application for a Special Study of the Norfolk Division as a senior college. 895

Probably with the concurrence of President Chandler, Provost Webb wrote to Dr. Sweet on 29 April 1960 as follows:

I am delighted to know that it will be possible for you to visit our College on May 18th and 19th. We are making plans for your visit and will have as much as possible of the full report completed when you arrive. . . .

I would also be happy to arrange for you to meet members of the Norfolk City Council or our local Advisory Committee, if you care to do so, in order to see the close relationship which exists between the community and the college. . . .

Thank you very much for scheduling this visit at such short notice, but we do feel it important and wish to move ahead as quickly as possible with our request for accreditation. 896

Provost Webb in a letter to President Chandler wrote concerning the legislation recently signed into law setting up The Colleges of William and Mary System:

Since the General Assembly enacted the legislation for the administrative re-arrangement of the college, there have been many favorable comments from both our city leaders and other persons in the community. There has been comment on various parts of the Bill, but one that I would like to bring to your attention just now is that of the changing of the name for the College in Norfolk. . . . The overwhelming sentiment, both on the part of the citizens of Norfolk and
our Faculty, is for retention of the name of College of William and Mary in Norfolk.

If the Board will not permit us to use the name College of William and Mary in Norfolk, a number of names have been suggested which I will list below for your information:

1. The Virginia College of Arts and Sciences
2. The College of Chesapeake
3. Chesapeake College
4. The College of Hampton Roads
5. Hampton Roads College
6. Elizabeth River College
7. Prince Henry College
8. The College of Tidewater Virginia

While the four-year college program for the liberal arts proceeded apace, the development of a four-year program in engineering was met with resistance. The Virginian-Pilot reported that trenchant opposition from the University of Virginia and the Virginia Polytechnic Institute had hindered efforts to get a four-year engineering program at the Norfolk Division. Provost Webb, himself an engineer and a graduate of the Virginia Polytechnic Institute, was quoted that the attitude of U. Va. and V.P.I. was that if the Norfolk Division "got some of the pie that they would get less." The Virginia Military Institute supported the division's efforts to get a four-year, engineering school.

At its 21 May 1960 meeting, the Board of Visitors of The Colleges of William and Mary adopted an organization for The Colleges of William and Mary. The organization had sections which dealt with
Norfolk newspaper media coverage swung in the opposite direction from the 1958-59 session. During the end of the 1958-59 session through the 1959-60 session, the idea of a separate four-year college with its own governing board definitely emerged. Twenty editorials appeared during the 1959-60 session, up 18 from 2 previously; 52 articles of a general nature, up 40 from 12 previously; no articles which reported organizational endorsement, the same as previously; and 2 articles which reported individual endorsements, up 2 from none previously. This was a total of 74 editorials and articles, up 60 from 14 previously.

The College of William and Mary, Norfolk Division closed its doors for the 1959-60 session on 30 May 1960.
The College of William and Mary, Norfolk Division opened its doors for the 1960-61 session on 19 September 1960. In the interim following the end of the 1959-60 session, several events were noted.

Dr. Gordon W. Sweet, Executive Secretary of the Southern Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools, sent Provost Webb a lengthy letter in which he summarized his visit to the Norfolk Division on 18 and 19 May. In the letter he said:

I was very favorably impressed with the program and with the projection for development at your college.

This college has been an accredited junior college as a branch of William and Mary and completed the transition with some four graduating classes and all of the developments in library, program, faculty, etc., pertaining to a senior college. The college is now ready, in my opinion, for a Special Study. The Executive Secretary examined in detail the college's report on all standards and held conferences with all administrative officers, President Chandler of the Williamsburg parent institution, with all division chairmen, and with a large number of students.

The visit included a complete review of all physical facilities. The college certainly has prospered, however, to a great extent because of the interest and support from the parent institution.

The admissions procedures are sound and it appears that the standards selection of students are good, especially since this is a state institution which might be expected to accept more students in the lower ranges.

The college has made an excellent transition in curriculum from junior to senior college.

Because of the good program and good faculty, instruction appears to be strong in most areas.

The faculty is good. The present report shows a number of B.S. people but an explanation indicates that several of
these are approaching the doctorate without the master's that many doctorates will be added in 1960, and that the whole faculty will be much improved.

Library facilities, service and use by faculty and students are excellent... The visitor was impressed by the use of the library at all hours of the day, especially since this is a commuter's college.

The administration of the college is very strong and all needs for such a large operation appear to be satisfied with sufficient clerical help, IBM equipment, etc. Certainly these administrators have given great dedication and hard labor to the fine development of this college. As indicated above, the college serves the community and the community supports the college.

On 1 July 1960 the Board of Visitors announced the organization of The Colleges of William and Mary. President Chandler was promoted to the position of Chancellor of The Colleges of William and Mary. Dr. Davis Young Paschall was selected as the new President of The College of William and Mary in Virginia. Provost Lewis W. Webb, Jr., became the President of the Norfolk College of William and Mary of The Colleges of William and Mary.

In a letter to Mr. W. Brooks George, a member of the Board of Visitors, on 1 July 1960, President Chandler made the following observation:

I am sure you realize that the Norfolk people are very community minded about this college. If you could read the letters which I have received in recent days in regard to the nomination of Mr. Webb for the presidency, you would realize that they are determined to have a voice in that institution, almost to the extent that they believe it should be a city college rather than a state college.

At its 27 August 1960 meeting, the Board of Visitors of The Colleges of William and Mary entertained suggestions for a name for the Norfolk Division. President Webb (he had just been elected as
president by the board) stated that the Faculty at the Norfolk Division felt that The College of William and Mary in Norfolk would be an appropriate name. He further stated that a decision for a name should be postponed until the board meeting in October in Norfolk.

The figure of 2,452 was the official regular day student enrollment for the 1960-61 session.

Although Provost Webb had become President Webb, the Bulletin carried his Advisory Board as The Provost's Advisory Board.

Newly named President Lewis Warrington Webb, Jr., became the Chief Executive Officer of William and Mary's satellite institution in Norfolk. President Davis Y. Paschall, also a newly named president, became the twenty-third president of The College of William and Mary in Virginia of The Colleges of William and Mary. Dr. Alvin Duke Chandler became the Chancellor of The Colleges of William and Mary.

In his elevation to the chancellorship, Dr. Chandler became the sixth American to become chancellor. He joined a list of notables which included George Washington (1788-99), John Tyler (1859-62), Hugh Blair Grigsby (1871-81), John Stewart Bryan (1942-44), and Colgate W. Darden, Jr. (1946-47), all native-born Americans.

President Webb described President Paschall as a quiet type of person who elected to direct the operation of The College of William and Mary by keeping things running smoothly instead of going into new innovative changes or great promotional ideas.
On 16 September 1960 President Webb forwarded to Chancellor Chandler a list of names which had been submitted to him in connection with the naming of the Norfolk Division. President Webb stated that he had no preference as to names but felt that the name selected should reflect the community being served as well as the tie to The College of William and Mary. The list submitted included:

1. Chesapeake College
2. College of the Chesapeake
3. King James College
4. Prince Henry College
5. College of Hampton Roads
6. Jefferson College
7. Thomas Jefferson College
8. Norfolk College of William and Mary
9. College of William and Mary in Norfolk
10. Gateway College
11. Eastern Virginia State College
12. Southeastern State College
13. State College of Hampton Roads
14. State College of Eastern Virginia
15. Thoroughgood College
16. Atlantic College
17. Norfolk College
18. College of the Elizabeth River
19. Lafayette State College
The Flat Hat reported on 30 September 1960 that Dr. Davis Young Paschall had assumed the Presidency of The College of William and Mary in Virginia. ¹²

Except for one other item on the agenda, the entire meeting of the Board of Visitors on 22 October 1960 was devoted to the consideration for a name for the Norfolk Division. The committee which had been appointed by the board for consideration of a name for the Norfolk Division gave a report and stated that they had met with the Naming Committee of the Norfolk Advisory Board [The Provost's Advisory Board]. Mr. Charles Kaufman reported that they [Advisory Board] felt very strongly that the local college have a name which would identify it with the mother college. The committee submitted to the board the name of "The Norfolk College of William and Mary of The Colleges of William and Mary." A protracted discussion followed concerning the pros and cons of the name. Some members wanted to simply name it Norfolk College, but this would have conflicted with a Norfolk College, a one-year business college, already in Norfolk. A few objected to having William and Mary appearing twice in the title. On a vote of seven to three the board adopted the name as submitted by the Special Committee to the board, namely, "The Norfolk College of William and Mary of The Colleges of William and Mary." ¹³

Dr. Gordon W. Sweet, in a letter to President Webb on 7 December 1960, advised the latter that it had been recommended that a Special Study of the Norfolk Division be made and the college be considered for membership in 1961. He advised President Webb that he
preferred April 1961 for a visit although February 1961 was also a possibility. 914

President Webb replied to the above letter on 12 December 1960. He thanked the Committee on Admission to Membership for their action which recommended a Special Study for the Norfolk College of William and Mary. He noted in the letter the official change in the name of the college. A visit in April was agreeable with him. He wanted Dr. Sweet to let him know of the exact date in April and the number of persons in the study group. 915

The Virginian-Pilot on 11 April 1961 reported that a study of standards at the Norfolk College of William and Mary was underway and might lead to the college's accreditation by the Southern Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools. A Three-Man Committee, composed of Drs. W. F. Jones, Robert H. Spiro, and LeRoy Martin, opened doors, asked questions, and "nosed" around to determine whether the college was ready for accreditation as a senior college. The campus visit included a conference with the faculty and a study of the twenty-one standards which had to be met for accreditation. Items which were looked at included (1) instruction, (2) training and development of faculty, (3) teacher load, (4) pay and tenure of faculty, (5) financial support, (6) educational expenditure, (7) library, (8) physical plant and equipment, (9) student personnel work, (10) extracurricular activities, (11) intercollegiate athletics, and (12) general administration. 916
An editorial in the 27 May 1961 issue of The Virginian-Pilot stressed Norfolk's engineering need as follows:

Several months ago the Virginia Council on Higher Education appointed Dean Lawrence Quarles of the University of Virginia School of Engineering, Dean John Whittemore of Virginia Polytechnic Institute's School of Engineering, and President Lewis W. Webb, Jr., of the College of William and Mary in Norfolk, as a committee of three to study the need for a four-year engineering school at The College of William and Mary in Norfolk.

In an address to the Engineers Club of Hampton Roads and the Virginia Society of Professional Engineers . . . Mr. Webb outlined the impasse that developed in the committee. It blocked the approach to an impartial study of the need Norfolk's four-year college has for a four-year engineering school.

'Trenchant opposition' from the engineering schools of the University of Virginia and Virginia Polytechnic Institute was reflected by their deans . . .

It is not surprising that the committee reached an impasse. The composition of the committee as arranged by the Virginia Council on Higher Education was not exactly inspirational. Dealing much in the pure science of mathematics does not necessarily give engineering schools an immunity from the egocentric point of view, or the tendency to see a proposition from the point of self-interest.

An intelligent compromise was reached. Each member of the committee named two out-of-state engineering deans . . .

The deans added to the committee will, it is hoped, see the need for an urban college of engineering in the state's largest center of population. There may be duplication in engineering education in Virginia. But there is only a two-year college of engineering now in the state's largest metropolitan area where a four-year professional engineering school is needed most. It's a question of population mathematics that should be clear to engineers.

Norfolk newspaper media coverage was down for the 1960-61 session. This may be attributed to the Norfolk Community's feeling that with the General Assembly's legislative action in the spring of
1960, which created The Colleges of William and Mary and set in motion organizational changes for Tidewater Area educational facilities, was more than adequate. On the other hand, there continued to be a rising movement for the creation of an independent, four-year college with its own governing body. Ten editorials appeared from the end of the 1959-60 session through the 1960-61 session, down from 20 previously; 26 articles of a general nature, down from 52 previously; no articles which reported organizational endorsement, the same as previously; and no articles which reported individual endorsements, down from 1 previously. This was a total of 36 editorials and articles, down 38 from 74 previously.

The Norfolk College of William and Mary brought its 1960-61 session officially to an end on 2 June 1961.
1961-62 Session

This session concluded the study and was the final session before the Norfolk College of William and Mary became the independent, four-year institution named Old Dominion College governed by its own Board of Visitors. This session opened on 21 September 1961. In the period of time between the close of the 1960-61 session and the beginning of the 1961-62 session, items of importance occurred which should be noted below.

On 21 June 1961 the Tidewater Chapter, Virginia Society of Professional Engineers; the Engineers' Club of Hampton Roads; the Norfolk Chamber of Commerce; and the Tidewater Virginia Development Council presented a "Tidewater Community Report to the Committee Studying Engineering Needs in Virginia for the State Council of Higher Education." The committee members included Dean Harold Lampe, North Carolina State College; Dean Lawrence R. Quarles, University of Virginia; Dean John Ryder, Michigan State University; President Lewis W. Webb, Jr., Norfolk College of William and Mary; and Dean John W. Whittemore, Virginia Polytechnic Institute. The report included sections devoted to (1) "A Brief for a Professional-Level Engineering Program at the Norfolk College of William and Mary"; (2) "Definition and Description of Tidewater Area"; (3) "Urban Areas and Urban Colleges"; (4) "The Case for the Engineering School"; (5) "The Needs of Industry"; (6) "Engineering Employment in Tidewater"; (7) "The Needs of Students"; (8) "Laboratory, Instructional Staff, and Library
Resources in the Area"; (9) "Support from Civic Leaders"; and (10) "Conclusion." The report concluded with this statement:

The considered judgment of this group is in accord with that of the Health, Education, and Welfare Department's Office of Education survey committee which concluded three years ago that the chief need in the Tidewater Area is for a professional engineering program in the basic fields. These are generally viewed to be civil, mechanical, industrial and electrical engineering. The demands of business and industry; the numbers of students, actual and potential; and the resources of laboratories and libraries, and trained instructional staff in the area - all support the conclusion that the Norfolk College of William and Mary can and should develop bachelor degree programs in these fields.

While the Board of Visitors, Virginia Polytechnic Institute ostensibly had control over the two-year engineering course at the division, it chose to exercise very little control, other than to hire and designate administrative and instructional personnel for the technical courses in engineering, as well as to control the engineering curricula. From the 1932-33 session through the 1940-41 session, engineering students were carried on the rolls of Virginia Polytechnic Institute. The non-technical courses in the engineering curriculum were taught by the division liberal arts faculty. All of the facilities, including maintenance and acquisition of land; construction of new building; salaries; and issuance of Bulletins concerning the engineering program were provided by the Board of Visitors, The College of William and Mary through the Norfolk Officers of Administration.

With an eye to the future, the Norfolk College of William and Mary must have considered the benefits of a public relations program for the college. On 31 July 1962 Mr. T. J. Reed, Director of the
College's Bureau of Business Research, forwarded a copy of the "Supplementary Report: Public Relations and the Norfolk College of William and Mary" by Dr. Kenneth H. Thompson to President Webb. In the letter, Mr. Reed said that he hoped the report would provide (1) a standard of measure and (2) an evaluation of the college's own program that would prove useful in the planning and execution of both long and short-range programs. The report dealt with the following:

1. The Norfolk College of William and Mary has not yet succeeded in creating a strong, positive image of the institution in the minds of the citizens of the Tidewater Virginia area

2. A policy statement of clearly defined goals and objectives of the Norfolk College of William and Mary should be developed

3. The coordination and direction of the public relations program of the College should be the full-time responsibility of a professionally trained and experienced person

4. Directed by the Chief Public Relations Officer, an expanded Office of Public Information should be developed to provide complete service to all media of communications in Tidewater Virginia

5. It would be highly desirable to conduct a survey of community attitudes and opinions about the college

6. More members of the community should be drawn into active service to the college through appropriate recognition

7. A Speakers' Bureau should be established to facilitate the appearance of representatives of the College before civic, professional and service organizations of the Tidewater area

8. College publications should be designed to effectively transmit a unified, cohesive image of the institution

The official enrollment in the regular day college was 2,970 for the final session of this study.

President Lewis W. Webb, Jr., President Davis Y. Paschall, and Chancellor Alvin D. Chandler headed up the Norfolk College of
William and Mary of The Colleges of William and Mary, The College of
William and Mary in Virginia of The Colleges of William and Mary, and
The Colleges of William and Mary, respectively. 923

The Provost's Advisory Board became The President's Advisory
Board to President Webb. 924

On 31 October 1961 Mr. James W. Bailey, Assistant Director of
the State Council of Higher Education, wrote to members of the
Committee to Study Engineering Needs in Norfolk, Virginia. In the
letter he included a version of the draft of the final report for the
Committee to Study Engineering Needs in Norfolk, Virginia. The
report included (1) "Purpose of the Study," (2) "The Committee and
Its Organization," (3) "A Statement of the Problem," (4) "The Need
for an Engineering Program in Norfolk," (5) "Type of Program
Proposed," (6) "Proposed Program Development," (7) "Assistance in the
Development of the Program," (8) "Estimated Cost of the Program," and
(9) "Conclusions and Recommendations." The committee to study the
need for a four-year, engineering program in Norfolk concluded that
there was a developing need for a four-year program in general
engineering that did not exist in Virginia. If the state concluded
that such a program to meet the particular needs of the students and
industries in the Norfolk Area should be established and supported in
addition to the existing engineering programs in the state, then the
committee would make the following recommendations:

1. It recommended to the State Council of Higher Education that
   a four-year program leading to the degree bachelor of science
   in general engineering be established at the Norfolk
   College. . . .
2. It recommended that the proposed program be started with third-year courses in September 1964 and fourth-year courses in 1965.

3. It recommended that, with the approval of this proposed program by the General Assembly, an advisory committee composed of two representatives from each of the two existing engineering schools be selected to assist the administration and faculty of Norfolk College of William and Mary in the development of the curriculum, the design of the building, and the recruitment of able faculty for the program.

4. It recommended that, beginning in September 1964, the engineering program at Norfolk College became an independent department of the college. Until that time, the existing two-year program should be continued under the sponsorship of the Virginia Polytechnic Institute.

The 11 October 1961 issue of the Flat Hat carried a full account of the inauguration of Dr. Davis Y. Paschall as the twenty-third president of The College of William and Mary in Virginia of The Colleges of William and Mary. His acceptance speech outlined a broad concept of the college, its future, and the role it should play in the life of the student.

On 23 October 1961 four members of the Board of Visitors met with the Council of Higher Education in Richmond. The council presented a plan whereby they would submit a report to the governor relative to certain recommended dispositions of the System of The Colleges of William and Mary. The proposed context of the report would result in the dissolution of The Colleges of William and Mary. They recommended, inter alia, the following:

1. That a separate Board of Visitors be created to administer the affairs of the Norfolk College of William and Mary. The Board would be instructed to rename the College, with no reference to the name of William and Mary.
It was noted by the board that the recommendations, if considered favorably by the governor and the General Assembly, would render ineffective a system which had in the past eighteen months functioned efficiently and extremely economically. The Board of Visitors felt that after a thorough review of the survey and report, *Higher Education in the Tidewater Area of Virginia*, the recommendations of the State Council of Higher Education, the actions of the board at its 9 January 1960 meeting, the actions and statutes of the General Assembly of 1960, and the implementation procedures of the visitors since the creation of The Colleges of William and Mary, that it was their considered opinion that the colleges had functioned as was intended by the legislature. The board further felt that the mutual close association of all units concerned had made possible the development of quality education, financial economy, and a closeness of purpose in the public welfare which would be impossible in a group of totally separate units operating under separate governing boards, each with its own totally independent goals, purposes, and scope. The board finally felt that it would be unwise, more expensive, and improper to make the changes recommended by the State Council of Higher Education.927

On 29 October 1961 President Webb wrote to the Board of Visitors, The Colleges of William and Mary. The letter was written, in order that he could state categorically his position with respect to the separation of the Norfolk College from The Colleges of William and Mary. In the letter he said:
Today, I am required to make the most difficult decision of my career. It is a decision which cannot be made in such a way as to please everyone, and which is certain to displease a number of friends and colleagues with whom I have worked harmoniously for years. It is a problem which I had hoped would not require such a decision during my time as President of the College in Norfolk. The problem has been, as we all know, constantly in the background almost from the inception of the Norfolk Division back in 1930.

On two previous occasions I have met with the Board of Visitors of the College of William and Mary when they struggled with the decision of whether to divest themselves of the Norfolk Division, once in 1941 in the Hodges case and again in the early fifties under President Pomfret. On each occasion it was decided to retain the 'Division' which I honestly believe was for the best interest of both parties and their student bodies.

Now the question has been put categorically, 'Are you, or are you not in favor of the separation of the College in Norfolk from the parent institution.' Any hesitation which I have shown in answering the question was not because I wished to avoid the issue or to harm the case of either side of this controversy, but was because I truly felt that the question was of tremendous importance and required knowledge of many facets of which I did not have full information.

It is my hope that an analysis of as many factors as possible will enable me to give a proper answer to the question and one which will be to the benefit of both of our colleges. The factors are far more numerous than many of you realize and may even surprise some of you. I have asked myself the following questions and have searched appropriate sources to get the proper information. As best I can determine, the answers given to the following questions are correct and reflect the true feeling in our current situation:

1. Does the faculty of the College of William and Mary in Williamsburg desire the separation? Yes

2. Do the majority of the administrative officers of the College of William and Mary in Williamsburg desire the separation? Yes

3. Does the majority of the faculty of the Norfolk College of William and Mary desire the separation? Yes
Does the average citizen in Norfolk feel that a separation should take place? Yes

Do the State Legislators from Norfolk feel the separation would be desirable? Yes

Does the Citizens Advisory Committee for the Norfolk College of William and Mary feel the separation is inevitable? Yes

Does the State Council of Education feel the separation to be desirable? Yes...

Finally, I asked myself the following question:

a. Does the Board of Visitors of The Colleges of William and Mary feel a separation would be of the best interests of the College of William and Mary in Virginia? This you must determine for yourselves. I am sufficiently aware of the feelings of many of you, however, to say that there is obviously a sharp division among you and I can obtain no hope of a strong support or even of a majority favoring retaining the present system.

At this time I would like to point out that this action which is being forced on us did not originate in Norfolk, nor was I or my faculty consulted in any aspect. . . . I say this to let you know that while the faculty may feel separation is desirable they have worked well under the present arrangement and have not consorted with anyone to bring about a change.

In view of the weight of all the evidence I have been able to gather, there is but one inescapable conclusion - The Norfolk College should be separated from the College in Williamsburg. It is, therefore, with sincere regret that my answer is to the affirmative - Yes - The Norfolk College of William and Mary should be separated from The College of William and Mary in Williamsburg.

You have asked for my opinion and I have given it as sincerely as possible. . . .

On 28 October 1961 there was a special meeting of the President's Advisory Board, at which time they unanimously supported a resolution recommending separation of The Norfolk College of
William and Mary from the System of The Colleges of William and
Mary.\textsuperscript{929}

The Richmond Times-Dispatch reported on a Board of Visitors' meeting in Richmond on 30 October 1961. This meeting was carried out amid speculation that a major reorganization might be in the making for the William and Mary College System. According to the article, there were Capitol Hill sources which speculated that the State Council of Higher Education would request that most of the colleges in the William and Mary System be removed from the central administration of the Chancellor of The Colleges of William and Mary. No one present at the board meeting would comment on the content of the meeting, although there indications that the purpose of the meeting was allegedly to discuss the State Council of Higher Education recommendations and vote to approve or oppose them. It appeared that there was no final vote, and the question before the board was not resolved. There were further indications that the board would meet in the near future with the council for further discussion.\textsuperscript{930}

On 31 October 1961 the Richmond Times-Dispatch again reported on the pending recommended reorganization of The Colleges of William and Mary. It was reported that the State Council of Higher Education would meet on 6 November 1961 for a final review of its recommendations which were to be submitted to Governor Almond. Although nothing appeared on the Council Agenda, it was expected that the Board of Visitors of The Colleges of William and Mary would meet
jointly with them. The proposed recommendations to the governor and the General Assembly allegedly included suggestions that the existing overall administrative structure be substantially changed. The article concluded with a statement that extensive changes in the system would be a reversal of the council’s thinking two years ago. In January 1960 the council recommended to the General Assembly the existing organization. Subsequently, the General Assembly enacted and the governor signed into law a bill which authorized The Colleges of William and Mary, a chancellor to oversee them, and a reorganization of Tidewater Area educational affairs.

On 7 November 1961 the Richmond Times-Dispatch carried an article wherein it reported that the State Council of Higher Education on 6 November 1961 had voted unanimously to forward a series of recommendation to Governor Almond which included proposals for a major reorganization of The Colleges of William and Mary. It was also reported that the Board of Visitors of The Colleges of William and Mary had met in joint session with the council for two and one-half hours. Before the joint meeting it was reported that the council met to put the finishing touches on the report. Following the joint meeting, Dr. William H. McFarlane, Executive Director of the Council, announced that the final recommendations were approved without dissent.

The Flat Hat on 10 November 1961 reported that changes proposed by the Council of Higher Education would place The College of William and Mary on a separate basis from the two, four-year and
two junior colleges presently associated with it and would leave the
President of William and Mary as its Chief Executive Officer,
"directly responsible to the Board of Visitors." In a report to
Governor Almond on 9 November 1961, the council recommended
dissolution of the present administrative setup. The article further
stated that under the proposed administrative setup each of three
senior colleges would be under control of a separate board and the
president of each college would be directly responsible to that
board. The council recommended that the name William and Mary be
reserved for the college in Williamsburg alone, with the names of the
other senior colleges chosen by the proposed governing boards.
According to the report, the decision to re-establish William and
Mary on an independent basis was reached because "its prestige and
traditional role as a great center of the arts and sciences ... commend it for special consideration in being preserved with no
compromise of character or identity in name or purpose." The report
further cited the growth of the Richmond and Norfolk institutions and
the heavy burden thus placed on single board as additional reasons
for the proposals. The Flat Hat also said that the council, when
discussing the Norfolk Branch, had said that because of the growth of
the area as a major metropolitan center, the accompanying increased
needs for higher education, and the continuing identification of such
needs with the name and traditional character of William and Mary
would serve not only to compromise the identity of the ancient
college but also impose an excessive and conflicting burden on a single board. 933

The State Council of Higher Education, according to The Virginian-Pilot, recommended on 10 November 1961 the establishment of a four-year, engineering program at the Norfolk College of William and Mary. The report submitted to the General Assembly said that the program would be inaugurated as a department of the college and not as a special school. An appropriation of $585,000 for an engineering school was recommended by the Capital Outlay Commission, and another $215,000 would be required for equipment. Establishment of a four-year, engineering program in Norfolk had been previously recommended by a Committee of Engineering Deans who had made a study of area engineering needs. Norfolk Chamber of Commerce President, Frank Batten, said that the council's support of an engineering school for Norfolk would have clear sailing through the legislature. 934

A Virginian-Pilot editorial commented, in part, as follows:

Norfolk has long recognized the probability - and, we think, the desirability - of eventual separation of the college in Norfolk from the college in Williamsburg, to which the college in Norfolk owes much. The main uncertainty has been when and under what circumstances. Now that the Council [State Council of Higher Education] has recommended sweeping changes which embrace the Norfolk institution but are not limited to it, the time is at hand.

The "Effect of Independence on College Issue of Impending Power Struggle" was the title of an article in the 16 November 1961 issue of the Norfolk Ledger-Dispatch and The Portsmouth Star. The article asked whether the Norfolk College of William and Mary would prosper or suffer if it took a new name, had its own governing board,
and went its separate way from its parent institution. That question was at the root of a power struggle which brewed for the 1962 General Assembly and which would decide the future of Tidewater education for years to come. The focus of the bitter battle expected in the legislature was a recommendation by the State Council of Higher Education to Governor Almond that the colleges in Richmond, Norfolk, and Williamsburg become independent institutions, each with its own governing board. The naked issue was whether the State Council of Higher Education or the Board of Visitors of The Colleges of William and Mary, through Chancellor Chandler, should decide the future of Tidewater Colleges. While Chancellor Chandler kept public silence on the council's recommendations, certain forces behind him on the board allegedly said privately that separation now could only hurt the Norfolk college. They reasoned that the Norfolk college would lose not only the prestige value of the William and Mary name but the financial support it received in the state legislature as part of the William and Mary appropriations. It was further believed that an independent Norfolk college would experience difficulty in the recruitment of talented professors. Dr. Dabney S. Lancaster, Chairman of the State Council of Higher Education, stated that the council was in error in 1960 when they recommended the establishment of The Colleges of William and Mary, a chancellor for the system, and a reorganization of the Tidewater Area educational facilities. He additionally stated that the chancellorship had a trial run and it hadn't worked out very well.
Not only had the Norfolk College of William and Mary reached senior college status and had taken steps to become a fully-accredited, four-year college, it had embarked upon graduate education, as well. President Webb said that the college planned to initiate and expand a long-range, graduate program whether or not it became independent of William and Mary in Williamsburg. The Board of Visitors approved the initiation of the program. The first graduate program was to be in business administration, to be followed by ones in business education, history, and law. Initiation of the program was contingent upon receipt of funds from the General Assembly.

A 17 November 1961 editorial devoted most of its space to a discussion of the State Council of Education's recommendations to Governor Almond but concluded with the following:

However, the real issue is whether the need to find a new name and the other disadvantages of the change will be more than offset by the independence and new standing (separate four-year accreditation is already in the offing) of the Norfolk college.

From Tidewater's point of view, separation is essential for the simple reason that the college here can grow more rapidly and develop its special potentialities more fully on its own than under absentee direction. It can do almost everything better, including the presentation of its own needs to the legislature, if it has its own board of visitors and is free to manage things for itself.

The school here, as no one can deny, owes much to Williamsburg, having grown under that sponsorship from a spindly 'division' to a position of one of the largest and finest colleges in the state.

But independence was logical and inevitable. We think, along with the State Council of Higher Education, that the time for it is now.

On 21 November 1961 the Norfolk Chamber of Commerce adopted a
resolution which gave its whole-hearted endorsement to giving the Norfolk College of William and Mary independent status. Among other things, the resolution pointed out that the character and missions of the Norfolk and Williamsburg colleges were too dissimilar for continuing effective management by a central Board of Visitors. 939

President Webb, in his quest for an independent, four-year college, left very little to chance. On 20 November 1961 he wrote to Governor-Elect Albertus S. Harrison, Jr., to apprise him of the Administrative Officers' and Faculty's support by the Norfolk college of the State Council of Higher Education's recommendations. According to President Webb, this support was almost 100 percent. He pointed out that it was essential to the orderly growth and administration of the Norfolk college for it to have a governing board of its own whose members could give the time required to its needs. President Webb trusted that if and when the issue got on a state level of policy decision that Mr. Harrison would assist the Norfolk Community in obtaining the desired action. He thanked Mr. Harrison for the interest which he had shown in the college in the past and earnestly solicited his continued interest and support. 940

Governor-Elect Albertus S. Harrison, Jr., replied to President Webb's letter in the following vein:

Be assured that the recommendation of the State Council of Higher Education which calls for a separation of the Norfolk College from the William and Mary system will have my very earnest consideration. I shall be delighted to discuss this matter with you for I will need all the information that I can get.
I enjoyed my visit to your campus. I think the future of the Norfolk College is without limit...

On 29 November 1961 the Alumni Association of the Norfolk College of William and Mary strongly endorsed the separation of the college from its parent institution. It not only endorsed separation but encouraged active public support of the separation on the part of its membership and of the citizenry of Tidewater.

The day that the Norfolk college became fully accredited as a senior college finally arrived. The Norfolk Ledger-Dispatch and The Portsmouth Star reported on 7 December 1961 that the Norfolk College of William and Mary had received accreditation from the Southern Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools as a full, four-year college. The accreditation meant that the Norfolk college could grant diplomas independently of the parent institution in Williamsburg. Accreditation also strengthened the position of those who advocated the independent status of the Norfolk college.

The Richmond News-Leader also said that the granting of accreditation for the Norfolk school strengthened the chances of the legislature going along with the State Council of Higher Education's recommendations that the Norfolk college be separated from The Colleges of William and Mary System.

Mr. M. Carl Andrews of the Roanoke World News was made the Chairman of a Five-Man Committee by the Board of Visitors to investigate the advisability of the separation of the Norfolk college from The Colleges of William and Mary. In a letter to him, President Webb observed that it was apparent that the board in a previous
meeting on 9 December 1961 had not been completely informed and that no attempt had been made to inform it. Delegate McMurrn, who was brought in, had obviously received his information solely from Chancellor Chandler, and there was the careful avoidance of appointing anyone to the committee who was known to favor the proposed separation. This could hardly be considered as an unbiased action by the rector. President Webb said further that he had tried to find out all that he could about the reasons for the State Council of Higher Education's recommendations and the reaction of as many persons as possible in order to help himself in his own decision.

President Webb reported his findings to Mr. Andrews as follows:

1. My local Advisory Board heard Rector Robertson, Mr. Duckworth, Mr. Harper, and Mr. Chandler discuss reasons for retaining the present system. They also heard Dr. McFarlane, Mr. Rawls, and Mr. Tyler give reasons for the State Council's recommendation.

2. The faculty in Norfolk met and discussed the matter. They voted by secret ballot 145 for separation and 5 against separation. These men have at stake their careers in the future.

3. The entire administrative staff of the Norfolk college favors separation (approximately 10 persons)

4. The Norfolk Chamber of Commerce adopted a resolution supporting the State Council's recommendation concerning the Norfolk college

5. The Norfolk Junior Chamber of Commerce adopted a resolution supporting the State Council's action

6. The Norfolk College Alumni Association voted unanimously to support the State Council's action

7. I have talked to a number of the Administrative Staff of The College of William and Mary in Williamsburg and the feeling for separation is very strong and is probably even unanimous
8. I have talked to a number of the faculty of the College in Williamsburg and they all assure me that the move for separation would receive overwhelming support.

10. I have talked with hundreds of citizens of this area; they have telephoned and written me, and I have not had one to urge me to support continuation of the present system. In fact, the only real opposition I have noted is coming from the Chancellor and members of the Board of Visitors.

In view of the above and other considerations, President Webb felt that it was in the best interests of all the colleges to separate from the present system. It was his sincere hope that this could be done amicably and soon so as to avoid a legislative battle which could only harm all of us.

On 12 December 1961 Dr. Gordon W. Sweet wrote to President Webb concerning accreditation as follows:

"It is a pleasure to welcome you into membership as a senior college in the Southern Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools. You and your staff may be proud of this achievement."

President Webb replied to Dr. Sweet on 22 December 1961. In the letter he said:

"Everyone here is delighted that we have been granted this full membership and I especially want to thank you for the many considerate acts which you have done for our college.

As you know, legislative action is pending which will separate us entirely from The College of William and Mary in Williamsburg. Whether this is accomplished will not be known until the middle of March [1962], but your office will be informed as to the action taken. I personally feel that this would strengthen our local college a great deal by providing a separate Board of Visitors who could help in the work of expanding our college as it must do to meet the oncoming crowd of students who will soon be pouring from the high schools."

An editorial entitled "A College Comes of Age," which
commented on the Norfolk college's accreditation, said the following:

The Norfolk College of William and Mary has now received its diploma, so to speak, as a four-year institution of higher learning. . . .

The diploma was 31 years in the winning, and it didn't come easily. It was earned. . . .

It signifies that the Norfolk College of William and Mary has come of age as an independent diploma-granting college. . . .

The college's new status comes, appropriately, at a time when the State Council of Higher Education is recommending that it be made a fully independent institution. . . .

The evidence is persuasive that the interests of both colleges and the Commonwealth would be best served by granting independence now.

The Women's Division, Norfolk Chamber of Commerce voted at its November 1961 meeting of its Board of Directors to go on record as wanting the Norfolk College of William and Mary to be separate from the College of William and Mary in Williamsburg.

A 28 December 1961 editorial said:

The case for the separation of the Norfolk College of William and Mary from the parent college at Williamsburg grows stronger all the time.

One reason is the magnitude and source of the support which the independence proposal has won since it was put forward by the State Council of Higher Education last month.

There is opposition, of course, and it may become more vocal when the matter goes before the General Assembly. . . .

Fresh argument for the change came in last week's buttressing statements from the state council. The latter was speaking out in answer to two questions which have been heard since the governor released the council findings.

The first question concerned the possible downgrading of the present main college at Williamsburg once the Richmond Professional Institute and the Norfolk college sever their
connection and the old institution is removed from the jurisdiction of the chancellor.

The Council's reply to this has been a thorough-going denial of any notion that the historic old school would lose any status. In fact, just the opposite....

A second question which has been raised is this: How does the proposal for a break-up jibe with the findings of the commission just two years ago, recommendations which created the present spoke-like system of 'The Colleges of William and Mary.' In other words, if independence for RPI and the Norfolk school is desirable, why didn't the council propose this in 1960 instead of suggesting a system in which the units have presidents who are responsible to the chancellor who is in turn responsible to a central board of visitors?

Here are key excerpts from the council's answer:

'The council recognized ... that the 1960 adjustment was simply a step in a long-range development that would eventually lead to separate status for all of the senior colleges. ... Complete separation in 1960 would not have been appropriate, because of transient conditions at that time. For one thing independent accreditation for the Norfolk college was then two years away (this accreditation has just been granted)....

These reasons add up. As we wrote last month, the establishment of semi-autonomous units was a natural step along the way to complete autonomy with separate boards of visitors.

As to the speed, this is a crucial period in the history of higher education generally, what with the maximum impact of the population explosion just ahead. It then becomes a matter of great urgency to cure the difficulty which is at the heart of the council's proposal - the problem with which the council was chiefly concerned - the difficulty of managing three institutions with differing missions, and at some distance from each other, through a central board of visitors.

The sooner this is done, the better.

What was the position of the Norfolk Delegation to the General Assembly on the council's recommendations which were to come
before it when the legislature convened in January 1962? Tom Reilly, the *Ledger-Star* political writer, observed that the city's delegation to the General Assembly appeared to be a long way from getting together on any united stand regarding the proposed separation of the Norfolk College of William and Mary from its parent institution in Williamsburg. He further observed that the issue had generated into one of the most perplexing problems faced by the 8 Norfolk legislators. Mr. Reilly found but 2 of the 8 that would say they favored independent status for the Norfolk college. The other 6 said they would take no public stand until they had studied the proposition more. Among the 6 it was reported that a few entertained serious doubts about the advisability of the separation at this time. The legislators heard a lengthy discussion of the issue when they met with the Norfolk City Council to receive the city's requests for legislation at the General Assembly. Rector James M. Robertson of Norfolk and a member of the board, Mr. John P. Harper, also of Norfolk, appeared at the council meeting and presented arguments against the separation. Senator Edward L. Breeden, Jr., noted that a Five-Man Committee of the Board of Visitors was making a study of the alternatives to the break-up of the William and Mary System. The legislators said they were primarily concerned with doing what was best for the college and the city. Mr. Reilly concluded that the Norfolk Delegation would like to go to the General Assembly with a united front on the question of the separation of Norfolk William and Mary. The attitude of the delegation would be the determining factor.
as to what course the General Assembly would take regarding the Norfolk college. 951

The Officers and Board of Directors of the Engineers Club of Hampton Roads went on record as favoring the proposed plan for the separation of the Norfolk College of William and Mary made by the State Council of Higher Education and that their feelings be made known to the Board of Visitors of The Colleges of William and Mary, the members of the General Assembly from Norfolk, and the Governor of the Commonwealth. 952

On 6 January 1962 the Rector of The Colleges of William and Mary's Board of Visitors, James M. Robertson, sent Governor J. Lindsay Almond, Jr., with a special copy to Governor-Elect Albertus S. Harrison, Jr., and members of the General Assembly, a statement of position on and recommendations of the State Council on Higher Education. The statement was adopted by the board on 6 January 1962 on a ten to five vote. The preparation of the statement involved four meetings held by the Special Committee of the Board appointed by Rector Robertson to consider the organizational set-up of The Colleges of William and Mary.

The statement included sections on (1) "Background of the Present Situation," (2) "Proposals of the State Council on Higher Education," (3) Comments," (4) "Recommendations," (5) "Suggested Statement of Policy," and (6) "Summary."953 The board found that the reasons for the dissolution of The Colleges of William and Mary presented a strange and complete contrast to reasons offered by the
same authority [the council] for the creation of the system only two years [1960] earlier. With respect to the charge that there was too wide a diversity of institutional types and programs, the board answered that it was worthy of note that the council found no such diversity existed in the relationship of Radford College to Virginia Polytechnic Institute or of Mary Washington to the University of Virginia, although both situations were entirely comparable. That the tasks involved in supervision of the Five-College System were too monumental for the present Board of Visitors, the board countered that the board had found no such problems existed. Cognizant of the responsibilities concerned with individual institutions of the William and Mary System, the board made it a regular practice to meet alternately at The College of William and Mary, the Norfolk College of William and Mary, and the Richmond Professional Institute. To the charge that the council wished to assist The College of William and Mary in Virginia to preserve its prestige and traditional role as a great center of the arts and sciences, the board respectfully stated that it was possible to achieve both of these purposes under the present set-up. The charge that both the Norfolk College of William and Mary and the Richmond Professional Institute were able to stand on their own feet brought a reply from the board that it appeared to them that the demand for separation was largely local in nature. The board pointed out that the Norfolk college student body was drawn from a wide area outside the City of Norfolk as well as within the city. Because it was a state institution, its direction and control
should not be localized. The board also observed that the growth and
accreditation of the Norfolk college had been due largely to the
influence of the parent institution and direction of the board and
that students and graduates continued to value the name and
connection with William and Mary.

The following comments were made by the board in its report:

1. No reason has been given for the sharp reversal and change of
mind on the part of the Council on Higher Education except the
admission of a mistake. There was no evidence presented to the
Board which indicated that The Colleges of William and Mary
System when established was of a temporary nature or that it
had not worked as planned

2. The Council’s new proposal is diametrically opposed to its
findings and proposals of two years [1960] ago when it stated
that there was little realism to the idea of a separate
institutional governing board for each campus in the
Tidewater Area and that to do so would be in quite direct
conflict with the well-established pattern in Virginia of
developing systems of higher education

3. The establishment of separate boards for Norfolk College and
the Richmond Professional Institute as well as The College
of William and Mary in Virginia would break the pattern of
concentration of authority recommended by the State Council
to the General Assembly only two years [1960] ago. It would
set a precedent for diffusing control of centers of higher
education, would lead to inevitable confusion, and create a
much greater competition for State funds

4. The basic guide for the functioning of this system was taken
from the report of competent and objective educators and the
implementation was undertaken with the Acts of the 1960
General Assembly

Recommendations by the board included:

1. That the Office of the Chancellor be removed from the campus
of the College of William and Mary in Virginia.

2. That the Chancellor shall not be the Chief Executive Officer
of The Colleges of William and Mary
3. That the chancellor shall be the coordinator of the constituent institutions with authority and responsibility over matters of common interest to the member institutions and that he shall coordinate the budgets and educational programs and have such other duties as the Board may assign or direct.

4. That the respective presidents and directors of the constituent colleges shall be the Chief Executive Officers thereof and shall report directly to the Board of Visitors.

5. That the corporate name of the present system be amended to read: 'The College of William and Mary in Virginia and Associated Colleges' and that the style of names be as follows unless and until otherwise designated by the Board of Visitors:

   a. The College of William and Mary in Virginia (the name William and Mary being reserved exclusively for the College at Williamsburg)

   b. The College of Norfolk (or other appropriate name). An Associate of the College of William and Mary

   c. Richmond Professional Institute. An Associate of the College of William and Mary

   d. Christopher Newport College. An Associate of the College of William and Mary

   e. Richard Bland College. An Associate of the College of William and Mary

6. That State funds continue to be budgeted to the individual member institutions as is now the practice.

The board summarized its report to Governor Almond, Governor-Elect Harrison, and members of the General Assembly as follows:

1. The Board of Visitors has endeavored faithfully to execute and implement the intent and purposes of the legislative act creating the Colleges of William and Mary. The system has been in effect only 18 months and has not had, therefore, adequate opportunity to achieve its full potentialities.

2. This Board and the William and Mary System can cooperate with other institutions of the State in developing such advanced degree courses as may be required by the cultural,
industrial and commercial development of the area and by the immense defense complex of the Hampton Roads Area

3. The Board believes that . . . the William and Mary System has been operating with high efficiency and economy to the State, which would be nullified or sacrificed in event separate boards were created and a competition launched for State funds

4. Finally, the Board of Visitors asserts its firm conviction that it can work harmoniously with the State Council on Higher Education and other State institutions to provide Eastern Virginia with the highest quality of education as may be required by it as they develop and at the lowest cost to the students and the Commonwealth.

On 8 January 1962 Governor J. Lindsay Almond, Jr., replied to Rector James M. Robertson’s letter of 6 January 1962. He said:

I have considered both reports [the Board of Visitors’ report and the recommendations of the State Council on Higher Education] and need not assure you of my high respect for the ability, dedication and lofty purpose of the William and Mary Board and the State Council on Higher Education. The views and recommendations of the Board and the Council embrace a matter of profound public interest, the salutary solution of which is of vital impact to the over-all program of State supported higher education in Virginia.

The resolution of the divergent viewpoints and the issues raised can and will be accomplished only by action of the General Assembly and the next administration. This circumstance persuades me that I should refrain from expressing my very definite opinion which I have formed. . . .

The 12 January 1962 issue of the Flat Hat summarized the revisions for The Colleges of William and Mary System, as follows:

1. Until approximately two years ago [1960], the Williamsburg campus in Williamsburg was responsible for two other colleges, called divisions—Richmond Professional Institute and the Norfolk College. The Council of Higher Education recommended and the Legislature approved in 1960 the establishment of the College of William and Mary, the Norfolk College, Richmond Professional Institute, plus two junior colleges (one in Newport News and one in Petersburg) as separate colleges under one Board of Visitors and under
the direction of a chancellor who was responsible to the Board of Visitors.

2. In August 1961 the Board of Visitors adopted and subsequently submitted to the State Council on Higher Education a report outlining the missions, goals, purposes, and programs of the College.

3. However, the Council on Higher Education was meantime reconsidering the entire set-up, and in early November [1961] the second part of its biennial report to the legislature recommended sweeping changes in the five-college system.

4. The Council recommended these changes because of the diverse needs which the five institutions fill their rapid growth and the subsequent burden.

5. The Council countered accusations that its proposals for separate boards of visitors for the three large colleges were in direct conflict with its 1960 action (establishing the William and Mary College system) by stating that in 1960 Norfolk was not yet fully accredited and Richmond had just acquired a new chief executive.

6. Latest in the series of reports published by the factions involved in the controversy was a statement by the Board of Visitors which was adopted at their January 6 meeting and sent to Governor J. Lindsay Almond.

In his address to the General Assembly on 15 January 1962, Governor Albertus S. Harrison, Jr., endorsed the State Council of Higher Education's recommendations to be being basically sound. His address, in part, was as follows:

What we do at this General Assembly may well determine the direction of higher education in Virginia for the next fifty years.

I have studied the report of the Council of Higher Education on the system of The Colleges of William and Mary and believe that its recommendations are basically sound. This system has the largest enrollment, 10,974, of any system under a single governing board in Virginia. To continue this system, with each institution growing and
expanding, projects an excessive burden on board membership in trying to devote the time, effort, and attention that the respective colleges obviously demand.

The Norfolk College of William and Mary has increased 225 percent in enrollment during the past ten years. From a relatively small-two year division, with limited offering, it has now become a four-year degree-granting institution, accredited as such last month by the Southern Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools. It harbors the seeds of a desperately needed urban educational facility in the great metropolitan area which it serves. It is destined to become a large and significant center of learning. To nourish and guide such a development on a sound basis, educationally and economically, will require a board of its own - dedicated constantly to its colossal mission. . . .

A college [William and Mary] with so rich a promise of fulfilling such a timely mission - a college that has withstood the ravages of wars and fires - does not have to compromise its identity or character, or bargain its name for support by this Commonwealth.

To the contrary, it should enjoy a new birth as a truly great undergraduate institution of liberal arts and sciences, strengthening and improving the advanced program is now has. . . .

I was a member of the General Assembly that created the Council of Higher Education. It was prompted by a need to coordinate our far-flung higher educational system, avoid duplication of effort, and increase the efficiencies and effectiveness of these institutions. Its usefulness has been demonstrated and will grow in direct proportion to the support it receives from this General Assembly, our State colleges and universities, and the people of Virginia. . . .

Mr. Tom Reilly, Ledger-Star political writer, reported that a bill to give independence to the Norfolk College of William and Mary was being readied for introduction in the House of Delegates, with over half of the hundred delegates signed up as co-sponsors. The bill was assured of passage in the house, and it looked as if it would get the blessing of the senate. Mr. Reilly further reported
that until Governor Harrison gave his strong endorsement in his address before the General Assembly the possibility of a heated legislative wrangle had loomed. The forces of separation were so dominant and optimistic that a meeting was cancelled for the night of 17 February 1962 between Norfolk Area Legislators and members of the Norfolk College of William and Mary Advisory Board. The board had voted unanimously for separation. Apparently, they felt that the separation was all set to go through the legislature and the meeting would, therefore, be unnecessary.

On 16 January 1962 "House Bill No. 156" was introduced in the House of Delegates of the General Assembly. In summary, the bill read as follows:

Amend and reenact sections . . . , as amended, of the Code of Virginia, and to amend the Code of Virginia by adding in . . . the amended and new sections redefining the method of appointing visitors of The College of William and Mary in Virginia, and their powers and duties, and creating boards of visitors for new corporate bodies entitled . . ., and 'The Visitors of Norfolk College,' and defining their powers and duties.

"W & M Separation Virtually Assured" read the headline on a 18 January 1962 article in the Norfolk Ledger-Dispatch and The Portsmouth Star. According to the article, the William and Mary separation bill went into the hopper on the same date with virtual assurance of passage. All of the house members from Norfolk were among the co-sponsors of the bill. The number of signatures on the bill assured passage in the house. There was no concerted opposition expected in the senate. The bill referred to the Norfolk institution
as the Norfolk College but that was only for purpose of identification.

According to a newspaper article on 24 January 1962 the House of Delegates' Education Committee would take up the William and Mary separation bill and was expected to give it fast approval. The committee then decided that it would not call a formal, public hearing on the measure.

A 31 January 1962 editorial in a local newspaper said:

For the past several days, the Tidewater area has been practically assured of the independence of the Norfolk College of William and Mary.

Of course, the basic idea of creating a major, four-year college here on an independent basis has been a Tidewater dream for years and years. But it was only in the surge of enrollments and growth and the attainment of mature status in the past decade or so that the Norfolk offshoot of the Williamsburg college became the best and most hopeful focus of these aspirations.

Circumstances were nearly right when the state council [State Council of Higher Education] went into the situation two years [1960] ago, but it is doubtful that complete decentralization could have been carried out then without some serious wrenches.

But with the partial autonomy given the Norfolk college under the 1960 changes, the stage was set for what is now taking place - the final severance of the links with the parent school and the restoration of the latter to its traditional emphasis as a high quality college of arts and sciences.

There was opposition, chiefly centered in the Board of Visitors which now controls the whole spoke-like system through a single chancellor. The board majority presented its own alternate to the council plan, a proposal which had the merit of concurrence in the need for some kind of change.
But as the list of patrons for the House bill began swelling, it became apparent that the opposition had no strength where it counted—in the legislative halls. And the House vote of 86-2 confirmed the situation. . . .

The delegates' near unanimity, for one thing, suggests the stature the Council of Higher Education has attained and the confidence now reposed in its judgments.

The voting is a measure, too, of Governor Harrison's decisiveness and leadership. . . .

Also there has been a chain of favorable reaction extending all the way back to the original nucleus of support given the break-up proposal by such groups as the Advisory Board of the Norfolk College, the alumni and faculty here, the Norfolk Chamber of Commerce and the Norfolk Junior Chamber. . . .

Mr. Tom Reilly reported on 1 February 1962 that the Senate Education Committee had on the same date put into the hands of a sub-committee a bill to effect the breakup of the William and Mary System of Colleges. This action followed a committee hearing during which the Board of Visitors of The Colleges of William and Mary was heard. The separation feature of the bill was not questioned by the board. Instead, it focused upon the section which would require the board to keep in office the president and directors, professors, teachers, and agents of the parent institution and the two junior colleges which would remain under William and Mary control. Critics claimed that it would be difficult to get responsible citizens to accept the responsibility of serving on the board if they were not accorded the authority to hire and fire. . . .

The Senate by a 33-3 vote followed a House of Delegates' 86-2 vote and the General Assembly passed on 9 February 1962 the bill which broke up The Colleges of William and Mary System and gave to
the Richmond Professional Institute and the Norfolk College of William and Mary independent status and to each its own governing board. A newspaper article, headlined "Assembly Votes to Split W & M," reported that final General Assembly approval was given to the reorganization of The Colleges of William and Mary. The article further reported the bill was to go to Governor Harrison for his signature which he was certain to sign because he had previously gone on record as favoring independence for the two schools.  

The Virginian-Pilot on 12 February 1962 carried an editorial entitled "New Chapter for an Urban College" which is quoted in part below:

A considerable measure of credit for the fact must go to Governor Albertus S. Harrison, Jr. Not every new governor would so boldly have backed the sound but challenged recommendation of the State Council of Higher Education for the separation of the College of William and Mary in Norfolk . . . from the William and Mary System.

Another governor might have chosen to avoid a commitment on a question involving, as Governor Harrison knew, not only the future of the William and Mary system, but of graduate education in Virginia. The William and Mary board opposed the break-up. Old guards of the alumni association might have trooped up to Richmond, if the separative act had not been made a matter of policy of Governor Harrison's administration. . . .

The College of William and Mary in Norfolk and the Richmond Professional Institute are urban colleges that have outgrown their parent institution in the academical town of Williamsburg. Norfolk's four-year degree-granting college stands in a strong position . . . to begin its new chapter of life as an independent college. It is fully accredited . . . Its record has been one of steady growth and it looks toward the addition of an engineering school in the near future. . . .

The next step toward expansion will be in the field of graduate education. That will not come tomorrow. But the
urban college is the logical location for graduate studies and the Norfolk metropolitan area is the largest in Virginia.

As Norfolk's college begins its new independent career it will be toward still higher education.

On 13 February 1962 President Webb wrote Governor Harrison the following letter:

On behalf of the faculty, administration, student body, and alumni association of the Norfolk College of William and Mary I want to thank you most sincerely for the support you have given to the recently-passed legislative act that sets up our College as a separate institution of higher education with its own governing body.

You will find that your action is supported almost unanimously by the people of this area, just as was the vote in the Senate and the House of Delegates. It is our belief, as I am sure it also is yours, that the separation will serve best the interests of both the parent institution and its growing offspring.

The day anticipated by Tidewater Area citizens ever since the establishment of the Norfolk Division, The College of William and Mary in 1930 finally arrived. On 13 February 1962 Governor Albertus S. Harrison, Jr., signed into law the bill which made the Richmond Professional Institute and the Norfolk College of William and Mary independent institutions of higher learning, each with its own governing board. The College of William and Mary, the Norfolk College of William and Mary, and the Richmond Professional Institute would have separate presidents. A chancellor would have jurisdiction of two junior colleges, Richard Bland at Petersburg and Christopher Newport at Newport News.

President Webb made the following comments when interviewed
years later after the separation of the Norfolk College of William and Mary from The Colleges of William and Mary:

Of course, there's no way I believe right now that we should have stayed under William and Mary as part of William and Mary. I feel that staying under it as long as we did was an advantage to us. The only thing we gained from William and Mary was its name, and we traded on that very heavily. I used to change the name of institution quite frequently. I think one of the things this college has is that probably it has had more variations in its name than any university in the world.

When queried about the role of the Board of Visitors in the development of a four-year program during the 1950s, President Webb replied:

The Board of Visitors, of course, continued to oppose that development into a four-year college, probably because they feared the overshadowing of the main College of William and Mary. The four-year degree program was bound to happen. I think lots of them saw that it was going to happen, but Mr. Chandler was reluctant at first.

In response to a question about The Colleges of William and Mary, President Webb made the following observation concerning Dr. Alvin Duke Chandler:

That was his idea to develop the Norfolk campus of William and Mary, the Richmond campus of William and Mary, and of course one later in Newport News and one in Petersburg. This group was to serve the educational needs of Tidewater Virginia. I'd say it was Mr. Chandler's idea to bring the whole area together under one big University of William and Mary. He wanted help. He wanted the Norfolk group to work with him and he wanted the Richmond group. He was very active in soliciting support for his idea everywhere he could get it. As I said he almost pulled it off. The legislature made the final decision for separation that broke it up. We felt that when it (the Division) got further along that the Norfolk part, at least, should be separated so as not to hinder the development of a college or university here in Norfolk. That's when the local people got behind the separation. Although he (Mr. Chandler) tried to dissuade them in this movement he was unable to do
so. He realized that they were going to demand a separation, and the bill was put into the state legislature to separate. At the last meeting of the William and Mary board which I attended in Richmond we were briefed by the board as to what our role would be in keeping the system together, and we were told very positively that the board wanted the system to stay together. . . . The legislators were pretty well in favor of keeping it together (it looked like the vote would be to keep it together) . . . .

Questioned further about the legislature, President Webb further said this:

The vote in the legislature seemed to be favorable to holding it together. Disruption is a pretty rough thing, especially when the institution was doing well, and what reason did you have to break it up? There wasn't too positive a feeling why you should break it up. It was more positive - they're doing all right; they're organized; it's their thing, leave them alone. So the legislature - not all, but the majority, I would say, of the legislature felt 'Leave them alone; let them do what they're doing.' But some of our Norfolk people got to the governor and persuaded him that the interest of education in the Norfolk area would be enhanced by the separation, and he (Governor Albertus Harrison) came out that morning with a statement that he felt the separation should take place. There was almost a landslide of legislators that went along with him. The thing was carried with no difficulty at all. . . .

Asked about what appeared to be a sudden switch, President Webb replied:

Mr. Chandler felt very bitter naturally about not being able to hold it [The Colleges of William and Mary System] together. He [Governor Harrison] didn't have the courtesy to talk to me at all to hear my views on whether the college should be held together. He made up his mind from talking with others.

I was never asked or talked to, and I was on my way to Richmond. . . . 'I had my radio on, and I heard on the radio that the governor had decided to recommend the separation of the Colleges. I made a U-turn in the middle of the road and never went to the cocktail party.' Once the word came out it was obvious. . . . They were committed; they were going with the governor and the Norfolk Division and R.P.I. would be separated.
President Webb touched on faculty feeling at The College of William and Mary:

You see . . . there was very little association between the faculties [Norfolk and Williamsburg]. They [Williamsburg] had no interest and looked down on the faculty here [Norfolk], although we probably had just as strong a faculty as they. They looked down on the faculty and had little or nothing to do with it. And they did not want a large university development at William and Mary. So there was dissension right in its own group. The faculty of William and Mary wanted to break it up and to leave them alone and let them be a small, first-class, liberal arts college. The faculty: 'This is what we want. We don't want to be a great university. We want to be a top-flight liberal arts school.' And so undercover they worked to break up the System.

The bill authorizing the independence of the Norfolk College of William and Mary with its own governing board also contained a provision whereby the Norfolk college Board of Visitors would have to select a name for the independent college, one with no reference to William and Mary. As part of the search for a new and meaningful name, Dr. Strickell, a professor on the division teaching staff, had his class in "Industrial Psychology" carry out a project on the "Naming of the College." The project report contained sections on (1) "Procedure," (2) "Charts," (3) "Results," and (4) "Conclusions." Of the people polled, the "University of Southern Virginia" was the name most liked, with the "University of Norfolk" which placed second. "Tidewater College" was the third choice.

On 11 May 1962 Governor Albertus S. Harrison, Jr., named the first Board of Visitors for Norfolk's yet unnamed college, to become independent of The Colleges of William and Mary on 1 July 1962. The
Rector of the Board of Visitors was Mr. Frank Batten, publisher of the Norfolk Ledger-Dispatch and The Portsmouth Star and The Virginian-Pilot. The other members included:

1. Mr. James M. Howard, Norfolk, lawyer
2. Mr. Reid M. Spencer, Norfolk, lawyer
3. Mrs. Harvey L. Lindsay, Norfolk civic leader
4. Mr. Roy R. Charles, Norfolk, businessman
5. Mr. W. Peyton May, Virginia Beach, businessman
6. Mr. A. K. Scribner, Portsmouth, businessman
7. Mr. Joseph E. Baker, Norfolk, lawyer
8. Mrs. John F. Rixey, Norfolk, civic leader
9. Mr. John W. Wood, Virginia Beach, businessman
10. Dr. Darden W. Jones, Franklin, mayor
11. Mr. Charles B. Cross, Jr., Norfolk County, county clerk

Ex-officio member was Dr. Woodrow W. Wilkerson, State Superintendent of Public Instruction.

A resolution was adopted unanimously by the Board of Visitors of The Colleges of William and Mary on 19 May 1962. The resolution was as follows:

WHEREAS, The General Assembly of Virginia has deemed it necessary to dissolve the educational system established in 1960 and known as The Colleges of William and Mary, and

WHEREAS, This dismemberment will sever ties of long standing between the College of William and Mary in Virginia and its two eldest children, the following statement and resolution is deemed fitting and proper:

Establishment of The Colleges of William and Mary by act
of the General Assembly in 1960 confirmed a relationship already in existence for more than 30 years and added to it certain responsibilities for establishment of two new community colleges - Christopher Newport and Richard Bland.

The Norfolk College of William and Mary, known most of its lifetime as the Norfolk Division . . . came into being as a result of the foresight of the College of William and Mary in taking to the people of Virginia opportunities for education at the college level.

Due largely to the genius of the late Dr. J. A. C. Chandler both for organization and for convincing the state leaders of the soundness of his ideas, William and Mary pioneered in and assumed the chief responsibility for establishment of a far-reaching extension system, the first in Virginia. Concentrated in Richmond and Norfolk, these classes gradually were expanded into branch colleges. With members of the Williamsburg faculty forming the backbone of the instructional staff, other instructors were added as needed. Through the prestige of William and Mary eminent faculties have been maintained.

Under the continued direction of Dr. Chandler's successors, Dr. John Stewart Bryan, Dr. John E. Pomfret, and Dr. Alvin Duke Chandler, the system was expanded and improved until both the Norfolk College and R.P.I. were fully accredited. With modesty the Board of Visitors wishes to point out that this initiative, foresight, planning and hard work brought into being a thriving and successfully system well before the establishment of The Colleges of William and Mary in 1960.

It is the belief of the Board of Visitors that the system now being dissolved, resting upon the firm foundation of the preceding organization, has brought great credit to the Commonwealth and has afforded higher education to thousands who otherwise would never have had such opportunities.

THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, That the Board of Visitors of The Colleges of William and Mary, in acceding to the action of the General Assembly which brings the system to an end on July 1, 1962, does herewith bid Godspeed with all good wishes for their continued success to its two eldest children, the Norfolk College of William and Mary and the Richmond Professional Institute, as their home ties are severed and they take upon themselves the responsibilities of independence.

RESOLVED FURTHER, That the Board hereby greets the newly
appointed Boards of Visitors of the Norfolk College of William and Mary and Richmond Professional Institute, wishing for them continued success in their direction of these William and Mary children and expressing the hope that their service to the Commonwealth and its people may find an ever growing and responsible role.

The Virginian-Pilot on 24 May 1962 carried an article which announced the first meeting of the new Board of Visitors for Norfolk's college, soon to become independent. The meeting was scheduled to be an informal one in which all members would get to know each other. Among the board's first tasks would be the selection of a new name for the college.

On 26 May 1962 a list of sixty-eight suggestions for a college name to serve as a successor on 1 July 1962 to the name, Norfolk College of William and Mary, was submitted to the Board of Visitors for their consideration.

The combined endeavors of the president, faculty, student body, and leading citizens and organizations of the Tidewater Area, including Norfolk, culminated in the passage of a bill by the General Assembly and signed into law by Governor Harrison which gave the Norfolk College of William and Mary independent status, with its own governing board, effective 1 July 1962.

From the end of the 1960-61 session through the 1961-62 session, the comprehensive coverage by the Norfolk newspaper media was equal to that of the 1953-54 session, the most in 32 years of coverage. Fourteen editorials appeared supporting the concept of a four-year college while 16 editorials of general interest to the division also appeared. This was an increase of 20 editorials over
10 previously; there were 98 articles of general interest with regard to the division, up 72 from 26 previously; 2 articles which reported organizational endorsements, up 2 from none previously; and no articles which reported individual endorsements, the same as previously. This was a total of 130 editorials and articles, up 94 from 36 previously. This comprehensive coverage was due in no small part to an all-consuming endeavor involving the Tidewater Area, including Norfolk, to bring into reality a four-year, independent college with its own governing board, a reality which emerged in the early months of 1962.

The 1961-62 session, the last session as a satellite institution of The College of William and Mary, came to a close for the Norfolk College of William and Mary on 8 June 1962.
Post 1961-62 Session

Ms. Mary Alice Carhart, in a 30 June 1962 article in a local newspaper, said that Sunday [1 July 1962] was Independence Day for the Norfolk College of William and Mary. She pointed out that with independence came responsibility. One of the new Board of Visitors' first responsibilities was the naming of the new, independent college. Norfolk College would be the temporary name of the institution until a name was selected. According to Rector Frank Batten the choice of a name would be on the board agenda for its meeting on 2 July 1962. Batten said that the board was considering about eight name suggestions.  

At its meeting on 2 July 1962, the newly appointed Board of Visitors of Norfolk College appointed Mr. Lewis Warrington Webb, Jr., as the first president of the newly independent college. The board, however, failed to select a name for the college. Rector Batten said that three names were under consideration. President Webb's selection as the new president was not altogether unexpected, for he had been the guiding hand of the division since 1946 and had seen the school develop into a four-year, degree-granting institution and eventually into an independent college with its own governing board.  

On 10 July 1962 President Webb wrote the following letter to Rector Frank Batten:  

I feel that we are fortunate to have three of our Advisory Board members, you, Mr. Peyton May and Mr. Roy Charles to be selected by the Governor [to the Board of Visitors]. . . .
I feel that the Advisory Board has served its most valuable purpose in bringing our College to its present position and now, under the circumstances, reluctantly conclude that it should be dissolved. This comes as a very personal loss to me as I have enjoyed and profited from, as has the college, the years of sage advice and encouragement from each of you. No one could have had a more dedicated and loyal group of supporters than you have been as my 'Advisors.'

At its meeting on 19 July 1962, the Board of Visitors of Norfolk College still had not reached a decision on a permanent name for the college. Rector Batten said that the board would meet within a couple of weeks to give further consideration to the selection of a permanent name.

On 2 August 1962 the quest for a new, permanent name for Norfolk's four-year, degree-granting institution was concluded. According to The Virginian-Pilot of 3 August 1962, the name "Old Dominion College" was chosen for Tidewater's university of the future. Since 1 July 1962 the college had used the title given it by the General Assembly, namely "Norfolk College." The board had said that their first desire was to select a name which would definitely identify this college with Virginia. "The Old Dominion" had been interchangeable with "Virginia" since colonial times and had been used with affection and respect. The board issued the following statement:

In 1660, when Charles II was restored to the throne of England, his authority was promptly and enthusiastically recognized by the Virginia House of Burgesses. Thereupon King Charles elevated Virginia to the position of a "dominion."

The burgesses of Virginia, recalling that they were the oldest as well as the most loyal of the Stuart supporters in
the New World adopted the name "The Old Dominion." The Commonwealth continues to cling proudly to this title.

The main goal of the college's board is that this should be a Virginia college serving a broad area in the state. We know of no better way to express this in the name than to call it "Old Dominion College."

In an editorial entitled "It's Old Dominion College," the editors said the following:

In choosing a name for the former Norfolk College of William and Mary the board of visitors obviously had no easy time. It was a difficult task, involving a decision the college, the community and the state would have to live with for a long time.

It was a particularly vexing problem because some of the names which naturally suggested themselves were either too limited in geographical scope or were too closely associated with other interests and endeavors.

When all the names that would not be suitable had been ruled out the choice became very much restricted.

This all the more reason, however, to applaud the selection finally made - 'Old Dominion College.'

We can't think of a name of more respected lineage or one that could suggest more clearly the broad Virginia identification this could should have.

Historically, it is a treasured synonym for all that commends respect in this Colony - become - Commonwealth.

With ability and determination it can now be made a name to reckon with among the distinguished colleges and universities of the whole country.

The college sent out cards which stipulated a change of name.

The cards read:

NOTICE OF CHANGE OF NAME.

The College in Norfolk, Virginia, formerly known as The Norfolk College of the William and Mary and the Norfolk Division of The College of William and Mary has been recently established as an independent state institution by action of
the General Assembly of the Commonwealth of Virginia and has been renamed by the newly-appointed Board of Visitors OLD DOMINION COLLEGE.

The reverse side of the card contained the following:

OLD DOMINION COLLEGE.

The name "Old Dominion" is particularly appropriate for the designation of a Virginia college. Virginia is proud of its splendid heritage going back to the 16th and 17th centuries and the close ties with the English Commonwealth.

The first permanent English colony in America was in Virginia. In 1660, when Charles II was restored to the throne of England, his authority was promptly and enthusiastically recognized by the colony. Thereupon King Charles elevated Virginia to the position of a 'dominion.'

Some historians report that Charles himself, because of the loyalty shown by the Virginians when other dominions had deserted his cause, decreed that Virginia should be called the 'Old Dominion.' Others believed that the Virginians themselves, knowing that they were the oldest as well as the most loyal of the Stuart settlements in the New World, adopted the name 'Old Dominion.' Whichever is the case, the Commonwealth of Virginia clings proudly to the title and our college confidently looks forward to the continuance of honoring the name 'Old Dominion.'

While the liberal arts college had achieved independence, the status of the two-year engineering school operated by the Virginia Polytechnic Institute needed resolution. Initially, Virginia Polytechnic Institute was to have terminated its engineering program in September 1964. Because of developments in Norfolk, a termination date of September 1963 was advanced. Dean J. H. Lampe of the Old Dominion College School of Engineering wrote the following letter on 6 March 1963 to President Webb:
I am pleased to know that the Board of Visitors and you have now officially established a School of Engineering.

I know that a study is underway for the establishment of an administrative arrangement for Old Dominion College.

I look forward to, and would welcome suggestions, comments, and direction so that we can move the engineering program forward with the best possible speed.

President T. Marshall Hahn of the Virginia Polytechnic Institute received the following letter on 23 April 1963 from Dr. William H. McFarlane, Director of the State Council of Higher Education:

In accordance with our recent discussions and correspondence, the Council of Higher Education reviewed the Old Dominion College proposal that V.P.I. terminate its engineering program at Old Dominion College as of September, 1963, instead of 1964 as originally scheduled. The Council also reviewed staff reports on the development of the Old Dominion program, including the reasons why the proposed termination date is being advanced to 1963.

Because of developments and changes since the original advisory committee recommended the 1964 termination date, it is the Council's judgment that the Old Dominion request for an earlier termination date is justified. Accordingly, the following motion was unanimously adopted by the Council at its April 25 meeting:

The Council of Higher Education hereby requests the Virginia Polytechnic Institute to terminate its two-year program at Old Dominion College, effective September, 1963.

With the inauguration of the Engineering School in September 1963, Old Dominion College's complete independence was firmly and absolutely established. The College of William and Mary's connection with the college ended 30 June 1962 and Virginia Polytechnic Institute, which established a two-year engineering program which
began with the 1931-32 session, terminated its connection with the college in September 1963.

During this post 1961-62 session, the Norfolk newspaper media generated approximately 4 editorials and 24 articles of general interest concerning Norfolk College and Old Dominion College.
Summary of the 1950-51 through 1961-62 Sessions

This period saw two changes in the Presidency of The College of William and Mary. Dr. John Edwin Pomfret (1942-51) was succeeded by Vice Admiral Alvin Duke Chandler, United States Navy (Retired) (1951-60) who, in turn, was followed by Dr. Davis Young Paschall (1960-71). In 1960 President Chandler was elevated to the position of Chancellor of The Colleges of William and Mary. The Norfolk Division's leadership remained in the hands of Mr. Lewis W. Webb, Jr., (1946-62). In the spring of 1957 his title was changed from Director to that of Provost by action of the Board of Visitors. Following the organization in 1960 of The Colleges of William and Mary and the educational facilities in the Tidewater Area, Provost Webb's title was changed to that of President.

The enrollment for the 1950-51 session was 765 regular day students while it stood at 2,970 for the 1961-62 session.

The Director's Advisory Board, instituted in 1946 by Director Webb, became the Provost's Advisory Board in 1959 which, in turn, was succeeded by the President's Advisory Board in 1960. The William and Mary, Norfolk Division, Educational Foundation, another advisory group to Provost and later President Webb was incorporated during the 1954-55 session. Whereas, the Advisory Board concerned itself chiefly with advising Provost and later President Webb on academic and financial matters concerning the division, the foundation engaged itself in various philanthropic endeavors, such as raising faculty salaries, buying books for the library, etc.
During this period from the 1950-51 through 1961-62 sessions, the Norfolk Division had four names, namely, (1) The College of William and Mary and the Virginia Polytechnic Institute in Norfolk (1945-54); (2) The College of William and Mary in Norfolk (1954-58); (3) The College of William and Mary, Norfolk Division (1958-61); and (4) The Norfolk College of William and Mary of The Colleges of William and Mary (1961-62).

The then Provost Webb pursued throughout this decade his plans to have the Norfolk Division accredited as a senior college. A really earnest accreditation process did not begin, however, until the college began offering four-year, baccalaureate programs, beginning in 1954, and the new library opened in 1959. In December 1961 the Southern Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools notified President Webb that the division was fully accredited as a senior college.

Mr. William Holmes Davis's letters-to-the-editor and to the President of The College of William and Mary began to taper off with the onset of four-year programs in 1954 and became virtually non-existent at the end of the decade with the Norfolk Division granting baccalaureate degrees and with what appeared to be a movement toward independent status.

Throughout this decade pressure was exerted to change the Norfolk Division's status from that of a junior college to a senior one. In 1953, succumbing to pressure from the Norfolk Community, the Board of Visitors of The College of William and Mary authorized
Certain four-year programs. Subsequent to 1954, more and more programs were instituted.

Throughout this decade the Norfolk Commission on Higher Education continued to play an active and influential role in the affairs of the Norfolk Division.

In 1951 the Board of Visitors considered the feasibility of separating the Norfolk Division from The College of William and Mary but voted to retain the division and improve its academic offerings and physical plant.

Also in 1951 the division was fully accredited as a junior college.

President Chandler supported throughout this decade the Norfolk Division's desire to be of ever-increasing service to the Norfolk Community; however, he envisioned the Norfolk Division's role as a member of the Greater College of William and Mary System and later as a member of The Colleges of William and Mary, not as an independent institution.

For awhile, during the early part of this decade, there was pressure for the establishment of an independent, four-year college, but the City Council of Norfolk, when it expressed the desires of the Norfolk Community, felt that the wave of the future was with the expansion of the Norfolk Division facilities into a four-year college under the auspices of The College of William and Mary.

During this decade, the movement for a new library began in 1954 with a request to the General Assembly for the necessary
appropriations, followed by $100,000 and parcels of land donated by the City of Norfolk for the site and piling, and culminated in 1959 with the dedication of the new library. The construction of the library was closely associated with the division's bid for accreditation as a senior college.

In 1956 the State Council of Higher Education, created by General Assembly legislation, assumed the direction of Virginia's colleges and universities, a role formerly exercised by the State Board of Education.

From time-to-time during this decade, it was necessary to exert pressure and influence on the General Assembly when the governor's submitted budget for higher education failed to appropriate enough funds to carry out the division's plans for expansion and development.

In 1958 the Norfolk Junior Chamber of Commerce initiated a drive to have the U. S. Office of Education carry out a survey of the educational needs of the Tidewater Area. The State Council of Higher Education was also involved with this survey. The results of the survey were published in 1959 and were generally favorable to the idea of increased educational opportunities to meet the needs of citizens of the Tidewater Area.

In the spring of 1960 the General Assembly enacted legislation signed by the governor which created The Colleges of William and Mary, authorized a chancellor to head up the system, and
created other organizational changes which embraced the Norfolk Division as part of that system.

Two years later in 1962 the General Assembly passed and the governor signed into law, the provisions of which provided for the dissolution of The Colleges of William and Mary System as of 1 July 1962. On that same date the Norfolk College of William and Mary of The Colleges of William and Mary would become an independent, four-year, degree-granting college with its own governing board. The new board would have to choose a new name for the college.

From the end of the 1951-52 session through the 1961-62 session, there was generated an exceptionally large number of editorials and articles concerning the Norfolk Division and the concept of a four-year college. The number of editorials and articles for this period totaled 680. Of this number there were 126 editorials and 328 articles of a general nature, 36 articles describing organizational endorsements, and 38 articles describing individual endorsements. There were 74 editorials and 78 articles supporting the four-year college concept. This was a total of 680 editorials and articles, up 472 from 208 for the second decade (1940-50).

A summary of the essential features and data of the 1950-51 through 1961-62 sessions may be found in the Appendix, pages 541-43.
CHAPTER V

SUMMARIES, CONCLUSIONS, AND IMPLICATIONS
FOR FUTURE RESEARCH

Introduction

This final chapter included a summary of the 1930-31 through 1961-62 sessions and a summary of the political, educational, and economic factors which affected the growth and development of the Norfolk Division during its first three decades and beyond (1930-62).

Summary of the 1930-31 Through 1961-62 Sessions

The leadership of the Norfolk Division and The College of William and Mary both changed four times during this period. Director of the Norfolk Division, Mr. H. Edgar Timmerman (1930-32) was succeeded by Dr. Edward Gwathmey who remained as the Director for the fall 1932 semester only. He was replaced by Dr. William T. Hodges (1932-41) who assumed the title of Dean. Mr. Charles J. Duke, Jr. (1941-46) succeeded Dr. Hodges and reassumed the title of Director. In 1946 Mr. Lewis W. Webb, Jr., (1946-69) became the new Director and relieved Mr. Duke who returned full-time to his duties as Bursar of The College of William and Mary. The title of Provost was conferred upon Director Webb in 1957, and in 1960 it was changed...
to President as a result of the organization of The Colleges of William and Mary in the summer of 1960. When the division gained independent status on 1 July 1962, he was elected to be the first president of the new institution. The College of William and Mary President, John Alvin Carroll Chandler (1919-34), upon his death in 1934, was succeeded by Mr. John Stewart Bryan (1934-42). In 1942 Dr. John Edwin Pomfret (1942-51) assumed the presidency from President Bryan who became the Chancellor of The College of William and Mary (1942-44). Vice Admiral Alvin Duke Chandler, United States Navy (Retired) (1951-60) followed Dr. Pomfret as the Head of The College of William and Mary. In 1960 President Chandler was elevated to the Chancellorship of the Colleges of William and Mary (1962-74), while Dr. Davis Young Paschall (1960-71) replaced him as the President of The College of William and Mary.

The initial enrollment for the Norfolk Division for the 1930-31 session was 206 full-time, day students. By the 1961-62 session it had reached 2,970.

An Advisory Board, appointed by President J. A. C. Chandler in 1930, continued throughout President Bryan's tenure. In 1942 President Pomfret named the Council Committee on Higher Education to replace it. Director Webb of the division named in 1946 a Director's Advisory Board which later in 1959 became the Provost's Advisory Board. He also named The College of William and Mary, Norfolk Division, Educational Foundation in 1954 to assist him, along with
the Advisory Board, with the administration of the Norfolk Division. In 1960 it became the President's Advisory Board.

The Norfolk Division has twelve names during three decades and beyond from 1930-31 through 1961-62. They were (1) Norfolk Division, The College of William and Mary (1930-37); (2) The College of William and Mary, Norfolk Division (1937-40); (3) The College of William and Mary, Norfolk, Virginia (1940-42); (4) Norfolk Division of The College of William and Mary and the Virginia Polytechnic Institute (1942-43); (5) The Norfolk Division of the College of William and Mary and the Virginia Polytechnic Institute (1943-44); (6) Norfolk Division, College of William and Mary, Virginia Polytechnic Institute (1944-45); (7) The College of William and Mary and the Virginia Polytechnic Institute of Norfolk (1945-54); (8) The College of William and Mary in Norfolk (1954-58); (9) The College of William and Mary, Norfolk Division (1958-61); (10) The Norfolk College of William and Mary; (11) Norfolk College; and (12) Old Dominion College.

The 1931-32 session saw the inauguration of a two-year engineering school sponsored by the Virginia Polytechnic Institute. At the close of this period (1930-31 through 1961-62), the movement for a four-year engineering school met with opposition, principally from the University of Virginia and V.P.I. After a committee, formed to study engineering needs in the Tidewater Area, made its recommendations, a four-year engineering school was scheduled to open
I September 1964. By action of the State Council of Higher Education, this date was moved forward to 1 September 1963.

Throughout most of the three decades and beyond, the general feeling among Norfolk citizens was to develop a four-year college under the auspices of The College of William and Mary. Towards the end of the third decade, the beginnings of a movement were noted which advocated an independent, four-year college with its own governing board. During the Bryan vs. Hodges Affair, there was a definite movement on the part of the Norfolk Community to pass control of the Norfolk Division to another institution. The Board of Visitors' vote in 1941 to retain the division under its control forestalled any continuing movement on the part of the Norfolk populace. Another movement in the 1950s to make the Norfolk Division autonomous resulted in a decision by the board to authorize, beginning in 1954, certain four-year, degree granting programs.

The Board of Visitors authorized in 1939 a survey by Dr. George A. Works, the University of Chicago, of The College of William and Mary and its divisions, to determine its academic capabilities, faculty competence, and physical plant to carry out the future mission of the college. The survey resulted in an upgrading in 1941 of the parent institution and its divisions.

In 1951 the division became fully accredited as a junior college.

In 1958, towards the end of the third decade, the Norfolk Junior Chamber of Commerce financed a survey by the U.S. Office of
Education of the educational needs of the Tidewater Area. The outcome of the survey, published in 1959, resulted in legislation enacted by the General Assembly and signed into law by the Governor of Virginia in 1960. The bill authorized The Colleges of William and Mary and directed organizational changes that embraced all educational facilities in the Tidewater and Hampton Roads Areas.

A major impediment to the Norfolk Division's full accreditation as a senior college was resolved with the dedication in 1959 of the Robert Horton Hughes Library. Financing for the new structure was furnished by state appropriations and money and land by the City Council of Norfolk.

The challenge of budgetary constraints and shortfalls during the third decade was successfully met and overcome by the combined efforts of The College of William and Mary, the Norfolk Division, and various civic groups in the Norfolk Community.

In July 1960 The Colleges of William and Mary was organized with a chancellor at its head. The organization included the mother college, the Norfolk Division, the Richmond Professional Institute, and two junior colleges, Richard Bland and Christopher Newport. President Chandler was elevated to the position of chancellor with Dr. Davis Y. Paschall named as President of The College of William and Mary. Provost Lewis W. Webb, Jr. was named President of the Norfolk Division. The heads of all institutions reported to the chancellor.
The Board of Visitors gave the name the "Norfolk College of William and Mary" to the division in Norfolk.

A Three-Man Accreditation Team from the Southern Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools visited the division in the spring of 1961.

The State Council of Higher Education in the fall of 1961 recommended to the governor the dissolution of The Colleges of William and Mary, with The College of William and Mary, the Norfolk College of William and Mary, and the Richmond Professional Institute, all to be independent and with separate governing boards.

An exceptionally strong movement towards an independent, four-year college with its own governing board was exhibited by the citizens of the Tidewater Area during 1961-62. This movement culminated in legislation by the General Assembly to grant the division independent status on 1 July 1962.

In December 1961 the Norfolk College of William and Mary was notified by the Southern Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools that it had been fully accredited as a full, four-year, degree-granting, senior college.

The Board of Visitors of The Colleges of William and Mary vigorously opposed the State Council of Higher Education's proposal to dissolve the system; nevertheless, Governor Harrison, in a speech to the General Assembly in January 1962, enthusiastically endorsed, without reservation, the State Council of Higher Education's proposals. A bill to dissolve The College of William and Mary System
was introduced in the General Assembly three days after the
governor's speech. The bill was reported out in February 1962 and
sent to the governor for signature. Four days after passage of the
enabling legislation by the General Assembly, Governor Harrison
signed the bill into law. The bill provided for independent status
as a four-year college with its own governing board for the Norfolk
Division as of 1 July 1962. The bill also stipulated that the Board
of Visitors of the newly independent college would have to choose a
name for the school, a name which had no connection with William and
Mary.

During May 1962 Governor Harrison appointed the Board of
Visitors of the division to take effect 1 July 1962.

On 2 July 1962 the Board of Visitors appointed Mr. Lewis
Warrington Webb, Jr. to be the first president of the newly
independent, four-year college.

On 2 August 1962 the Board of Visitors publicly announced the
name of the new school: "Old Dominion College."

In April 1963 the State Council of Higher Education decided
that the four-year engineering program at Old Dominion College would
be inaugurated in September 1963 vice 1964.

While editorials and articles had appeared in the Norfolk
newspaper media during the first two decades (1930-50), the third
decade and beyond (1950-62) saw a veritable explosion of editorials
and articles concerned with the Norfolk Division and the concept of a
four-year college. A general movement towards a four-year college
was evidenced in the first two decades (1930-50). The third decade and beyond (1950-62) saw a virtual tidal wave of public sentiment for a four-year college. Local newspaper media coverage for the 32-year period from the 1930-31 session through the 1961-62 session carried 260 editorials, of which 76 supported the four-year concept and 184 were of general interest concerning the division; 748 articles, of which 78 supported the four-year college concept and 670 were of general interest regarding the division; 44 articles which contained individual endorsements of the four-year college concept; and 40 articles which contained organizational endorsements of the four-year college concept. This was a grand total of 1,092 editorials and articles for the period of the 1930-31 session through the 1961-62 session.

The Richmond newspaper media for the same period above carried a total of approximately 49 articles but no editorials which dealt with the Norfolk Division.

The Norfolk Division college newspaper media carried for the same period a total of approximately 5 editorials which dealt with the four-year college concept, and 18 editorials and articles of general interest which were concerned with the division.

The College of William and Mary newspaper media carried for the same period a total of approximately 16 articles and no editorials of general interest concerning the division.

There was also newspaper media coverage by the cities of
Portsmouth, Newport News, Hampton, Williamsburg, Suffolk, and other cities throughout the commonwealth and nation.

All of the above did not include the extensive newspaper media coverage which resulted from the Bryan vs. Hodges Affair during the 1940-41 session.

With the advent of television in the 1950s, there was coverage by that medium also.

As can readily be seen, there was relatively little or no interest shown by The College of William and Mary Flat Hat in the affairs of the Norfolk Division over the period of the 1930-31 session through the 1961-62 session.

Adding the approximate total of all known newspaper media coverage in Norfolk and Richmond and all known college newspaper media coverage in Norfolk and Williamsburg, there were 202 editorials of general interest to the division, 87 editorials which supported the four-year college concept, 765 articles of general interest to the division, 78 articles which supported the four-year college concept, 44 articles which contained individual endorsements of the four-year college concept, and 40 articles which contained organizational endorsements of the four-year college concept. This was a grand total of 1,210 editorials and articles for the period of the 1930-31 session through the 1961-62 session. The difference of 118 editorials and articles (1,210 minus 1,092) was the newspaper media coverage of the Richmond and college (Norfolk Division and The College of William and Mary) tabloids.
A summary of the essential features and data of the 1930-31 through 1961-62 sessions may be found in the Appendix, pages 544-46.

While this study concentrated on the liberal arts and engineering curricula offered by the Norfolk Division, the college during the period of the 1930-31 session through the 1961-62 session was engaged in various other educational endeavors. The following data was extracted from all Bulletins of the division from 1930 to 1962:

1. Civilian Pilot Training (1941-42)

2. Cooperative Education
   a. In college (1952-53)
   b. In industry (1952-53)

3. Defense Program Training
   a. Virginia Polytechnic Institute (1940-41)

4. Evening College
   a. Business 207-208 (1953-54)
   b. Certified Life Underwriters (1957-59)
   c. C.P.C.V. (1957-58)
   d. Day (1942-62)
   e. Extension (1949-52)
   g. Naval Supply (1953-54)
   h. Riverside Nurses - Psychology (1953-55)
   i. Richmond Professional Institute (1956-59)

5. Norfolk Extension (Afternoon and Evening, 1930-40)
6. Special Groups
   a. Medical Assistants (1960-62)
   b. Professional Engineering Refresher (1960-62)
   c. Richmond Professional Institute (1959-62)

7. Summer School
   a. Cooperative Education (1952-53)
   b. Day (1938-62)
   c. Part-time, Norfolk Naval Shipyard (1952-60)
   d. Richmond Professional Institute (1959-60)
   e. Special, Pennsylvania Railroad (1952-53)
   f. Technical Institute (Day and Evening, 1951-62)

10. Applied Music Extension (1953-54)
11. Life Underwriters Training Course (1954-55)
12. University of Virginia Extension (1951-55)
13. The College of William and Mary Extension (1953-54)
14. War Training Program (1942-45)

Indicative of the extent to which the Norfolk Division identified, since its establishment in 1930, with The College of William and Mary, the 1930-31 Bulletin set forth a brief history of the mother college; the 1931-32 through 1933-34 Bulletins contained a brief history of the priorities of The College of William and Mary; the 1934-35 Bulletin again set forth a brief history of the mother college; the 1935-36 through 1938-39 Bulletins addressed The College
of William and Mary's history, its chronological history, and its priorities; the 1939-40 through 1941-42 Bulletin covered The College of William and Mary's history and its chronological history; and in each of the 1942-43 through 1961-62 Bulletins there was a one-page historical note which set forth the beginnings and the relationship of The College of William and Mary with its Norfolk Division junior college and later with its four-year, degree granting, senior college.
Summary of the Political, Educational, and Economic Factors Relating to a Four-year College

Factors During the Norfolk Division's First Decade (1930-40) and the Times When They Occurred

Political

1. Norfolk-Portsmouth Chamber of Commerce, in a resolution expressed the hope that the division would expand and thrive to such an extent that it would soon be found advantageous and advisable to increase its courses to include four years of college instruction in the liberal arts (17 September 1930, Chapter II, pages 34-35)

2. In an address to the Cosmopolitan Club of Norfolk, Director Timmerman stated that the division would be expanded to include a four-year curriculum if supported in attendance and in public demand (19 September 1930, Chapter II, pages 36-37)

3. A Norfolk newspaper article which dealt with junior courses to be offered at the Norfolk Division asked Director Timmerman whether the extension of courses to the third year of work in the division's third year of operation meant that the full four-year course would eventually be added (9 June 1932, Chapter II, page 45)

4. In a commencement address at the division, Director Timmerman predicted that within a few years the division would have a commerce school, a school of law, a school of fine arts, and a great M.A. center. This implied the formation of a four-year college (10 June 1932, Chapter II, page 46)
5. A Norfolk newspaper quoted Dr. Gwathmey to the effect that he said he believed that there was a great future ahead of the college. This implied that he saw possibilities for the division beyond its status as a two-year, junior college (6 November 1932, Chapter II, page 48)

6. Director Edward Gwathmey, in a departure speech, said that he had complete faith in the future. He implied that the division was destined to be more than a two-year, junior college (11 November 1932, Chapter II, page 48)

7. In a High Hat editorial the paper hoped that the building program envisioned for the division would in the not too distant future mean a full four years of work (12 January 1934, Chapter II, page 52)

8. In a High Hat editorial the point was made that to logically fulfill its greatest usefulness the division must eventually expand to a four-year college. Local students who went on to other schools would continue work at the division if the work were available (24 September 1934, Chapter II, page 56)

9. In an interview with President Webb of Old Dominion University, he said that the topic of a four-year school had come up very strongly during the thirties. The faculty wanted a four-year program very much (November 1974, Chapter II, page 60)

10. The High Hat carried an article which stressed dignity, school spirit, and the eventual objective of a four-year curriculum (20 March 1937, Chapter II, page 63)
11. Dr. William Sanger, in a commencement address, stated that the time would come when a city population of 50,000 would have either a two-year or four-year college (5 June 1937, Chapter II, page 63)

12. A Norfolk newspaper editorial made the comment that it was certain as anything can be in an uncertain world that the Norfolk Division would continue to grow, acquiring more buildings as it acquired more students and that the city's pride in it would keep pace with its expansion (6 June 1937, Chapter II, page 63)

13. Mr. F. E. Turin, Manager of the Norfolk Advertising Board, urged the Norfolk Cosmopolitan Club to support his suggestion that the division be extended to offer full, four-year college courses (5 January 1940, Chapter II, page 76)

14. Director Timmerman voiced the hope that the Norfolk Division was but the first step in the greater development of an institution that would make Norfolk an educational center. He implied that the Norfolk Division was capable of being more than a two-year, junior college (1930-40, Chapter II, page 46)

Educational

1. The period of the 1930-31 through 1939-40 sessions saw the progressive growth of the division. Increases from the 1930-31 through 1939-40 sessions are shown in parentheses for the following: (1) budget (+91.7%), (2) governance (+60.0%),
(3) faculty (+46.7%), (4) faculty salaries (+15.9%), (5) courses of instruction (+7.3%), (6) programs of study (+81.8%), (7) student activities (+52.6%), (8) scholarships/loan funds (+80.0%), (9) awards (+300.0%), (10) number of buildings/facilities (+200.0%), and (11) acreage (+53.9%). Library facilities consisted of (1) 2,000 volumes, (2) 50 periodicals, and (3) reading accommodations for 60 students. The library staff consisted of one full-time librarian. While the foregoing are considered as educational factors, in essence, political considerations essentially dictated their generation. Community interest in the division and community political pressure resulted in the progressive growth of the division. Increased student body enrollment from 206 full-time, day students for the 1930-31 session to 522 for the 1939-40 session brought an ever-increased pressure on the division to provide the increases noted above (1930-40, Chapter II, pages 1-79)

2. With the demise of Atlantic University in 1932, the division was able to acquire equipment and supplies from the university for the division's Chemistry Department, as well as books for its library (February 1975 interview with Dr. Perry Y. Jackson, Chapter II, page 44)

Economic

1. The closing of Atlantic University in 1932 resulted in a transfer of students and subsequent rise in enrollment at the
division. While Atlantic University was a four-year college, many of its students from the Tidewater Area resided at home. These chiefly were the students who transferred to the division (1931-32, Chapter II, pages 41-46)

2. The growth of the student body enrollment from 206 full-time, day students for the 1930-31 session to 522 for the 1939-40 session resulted in large numbers of students who remained at home and attended the division for the first two years. This enabled many students who could not afford the expense of room and board at a four-year college to live at home and eliminate such expense (1930-40, Chapter II, pages 1-79)

3. The tuition and fees charged by the division were also considerably less than at a four-year college. This enabled many Tidewater Area high school graduates to attend a college they could afford (1930-40, Chapter II, pages 1-79)

It appeared that during the 1930-31 through 1939-40 sessions there was minimal activity on the part of the Norfolk Community for a four-year college; nevertheless, what political factors there were outnumbered the educational and economic factors which affected the growth and development of the division (1930-40, Chapter II, pages 1-79)
Factors During the Norfolk Division’s Second Decade (1940–50) and the Times When They Occurred

Political

1. A Norfolk newspaper article set forth the possibility of the Norfolk Division developing into a complete, four-year college from the nucleus which existed but stated that only Norfolk and the surrounding area could determine the future of the division (26 June 1940, Chapter III, page 81)

2. Dean William T. Hodges, in a speech before the Kiwanis Club of Norfolk, stated that it was not a question of the City of Norfolk being able to afford a four-year college, but a question of whether it can afford not to. He further stated that the most likely method would be the gradual development under William and Mary so that it would have state support and no question regarding its credits (29 November 1940, Chapter III, page 83)

3. A Norfolk newspaper editorial, commenting on Dean Hodges’s speech, said that there was plenty of local support for the four-year college idea, that a four-year college vacuum was being created in an area which the state’s educational arrangement would not permanently tolerate, and that a four-year college could be established on a stable footing only through state aid under the continued aegis of The College of William and Mary (2 December 1940, Chapter III, pages 83–84)

4. In a letter to President John Stewart Bryan, the Rector, J. Gordon Bohannon, of the Board of Visitors, The College of
William and Mary commented on the "Works's Report." He said, among other things, that he would welcome the eventual severance of all connection, in name as well as in fact, between the divisions and the college (6 March 1941, Chapter III, page 89)

5. In a letter to Rector J. Gordon Bohannon and the Board of Visitors, The College of William and Mary, President Bryan stated that Dr. Hodges, in sponsoring a three-year college at the Norfolk Division was using this as a preliminary suggestion for a four-year college (12 April 1941, Chapter III, page 91)

6. A Portsmouth newspaper editorial, commenting on the Bryan vs. Hodges Affair, made the comment that the whole affair could actually be the laying of an indirect foundation for the development of reasons to be found why the Norfolk Division should be divorced from the William and Mary System (30 March 1941, Chapter III, pages 97-98)

7. In a Board of Visitors' meeting, Mr. A. H. Foreman, a member of the board, said that it might be desirable for The College of William and Mary to consider severing its relationship with the Norfolk Division (12 April 1941, Chapter III, page 106)

8. Judge Shewmake, a member of the Board of Visitors, offered a resolution that a committee be appointed to consider the advisability of severing the relationship which existed between The College of William and Mary and its Norfolk Division (12 April 1941, Chapter III, page 106)

9. The Board of Visitors adopted a resolution that a Committee of
Three members be appointed to study the advisability of severing the relations which existed between The College of William and Mary and its Norfolk Division (12 April 1941, Chapter III, page 107)

10. A Norfolk newspaper article predicted that the severance of relations with The College of William and Mary appeared to be a probable outcome. The article further stated that students and supporters of the Norfolk Division foresaw the possibility of the expansion of the branch from its present status as a two-year school into a standard, four-year institution (13 April 1941, Chapter III, pages 108-9)

11. A Norfolk newspaper editorial commented on the Bryan vs. Hodges Affair, to the effect that a fundamental trouble was that, apparently, there was a strong disposition, if not a controlled disposition, at The College of William and Mary to sever the mother college’s relations with the Norfolk Division (14 April 1941, Chapter III, page 109)

12. The City Council of Norfolk authorized the mayor and the city manager to appoint a Committee of Five to look after the city’s interests in the pending separation/non-separation of the Norfolk Division from The College of William and Mary (15 April 1941, Chapter III, page 109)

13. The Committee of Five, after a general discussion, agreed that the best interests of the Norfolk Community would be served by a continuation of the Norfolk Division under the Board of Visitors
of The College of William and Mary (8 July 1941, Chapter III, page 111)

14. The Committee of Three recommended to the Board of Visitors that there be no severance of relations between The College of William and Mary and the Norfolk Division. They stated that it was neither advisable nor practicable to sever relations that existed. Instead, the relations which existed should be continued and strengthened. The board adopted the recommendation unanimously (10 May 1941, Chapter III, page 122)

15. The City Council of Norfolk enacted an ordinance which established the Norfolk City Council Committee on Higher Education. The council's duties included keeping in touch with the affairs of the Norfolk Division and working in mutual cooperation with the authorities and Board of Visitors of The College of William and Mary (15 July 1941, Chapter III, pages 131-32)

16. In a luncheon speech before the Norfolk Junior Chamber of Commerce, the Director of the Norfolk Division, Mr. Charles J. Duke, Jr., said that plans were underway which would broaden, strengthen, and increase the liberal arts school and would add courses in terminal education (13 August 1941, Chapter III, page 132)

17. The Board of Visitors met in Norfolk, Virginia, and considered the needs of the Norfolk Division and a program for its future operation which served the demands of the Norfolk Community.
The meeting was regarded as a step toward fulfillment of the objects of a resolution adopted by the board in the spring of 1941, namely, enlargement of the educational program at the division (13 September 1941, Chapter III, page 134)

18. A Norfolk newspaper article commented that a resolution adopted by the board in the spring of 1941 would mean enlargement of the educational program at the division (16 September 1941, Chapter III, page 134)

19. The Board of Visitors, in order that there be a clear and concise statement of its policy with reference to the Norfolk Division and of the relationship of the division to the mother college in Williamsburg, adopted a reiteration of the policy adopted by the board on 10 May 1941 (30 May 1942, Chapter III, page 149)

20. A Norfolk newspaper article reported that the Sixth District, Virginia Federation of Women's Clubs had set for itself the task of investigation and work toward making the Norfolk Division a full, four-year, accredited college (22 September 1945, Chapter III, page 167)

21. A High Hat editorial observed that the City of Norfolk was of a size which warranted a four-year college course (17 October 1945, Chapter III, page 167)

22. In response to Norfolk Division students' questions, President Pomfret stated that there would be no four-year college at the Norfolk Division. Apparently, student interest in a four-year
college must have been strong enough to have promoted a question concerning a four-year college (29 October 1946, Chapter III, page 182)

23. The Norfolk Community Council investigated the possibility of making the Norfolk Division a four-year instead of a two-year institution (21 January 1947, Chapter III, page 182)

24. The Director’s Advisory Board recommended a four-year college for the Norfolk Division (1947-48, Chapter III, page 189)

25. Director Webb applied to the Southern Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools for accreditation as a junior college (10 February 1950, Chapter III, page 195)

26. The Director’s Advisory Board went on record and favored the appointment of a committee by the Norfolk City Manager for the purpose of studying the need for a four-year college for Norfolk (6 March 1950, Chapter III, page 196)

27. Throughout the period of the 1940-41 through the 1949-50 sessions, Mr. William Holmes Davis, a leading Norfolk proponent of the four-year college for Norfolk, wrote many letters and sent many tracts to the Presidents of The College of William and Mary, all advocating the four-year college for Norfolk. In addition he wrote many letters-to-the-editor extolling the need for and the advantages of a four-year college for Norfolk (1940-50, Chapter III, pages 80-197)

28. Dr. George A. Works commented that The College of William and Mary had from time-to-time entertained the idea of abandoning
the Norfolk Division, but the step had not been taken because of the fear that a four-year institution would enter into competition with William and Mary and might be set up only forty miles from Williamsburg (1940-41, Chapter III, page 84)

Educational

1. Dr. George A. Works, in a "Preliminary Report" to the Board of Visitors, The College of William and Mary commented that the Norfolk Area, including South Norfolk and Portsmouth embraced a population of about 300,000 and could possibly support a four-year institution (1940-41, Chapter III, page 85).

2. The period of the 1940-41 through 1949-50 sessions saw continued progressive growth of the division. Increases from the 1940-41 through 1949-50 sessions are shown in parentheses for the following: (1) budget (percentage could not be determined), (2) governance (+100.0%), (3) faculty (+177.3%), (4) faculty salaries (+401.4%), (5) courses of instruction (+88.1%), (6) programs of study (+28.6%), (7) student activities (+30.4%), (8) scholarships/loan funds (+3.3%), (9) awards (+40.0%), (10) degrees/certificates/diplomas awarded (+200.0%), and (11) number of buildings/facilities (+333.3%). Library facilities consisted of the following: (1) 14,850 volumes (an increase of 197.0%), (2) 150 periodicals (an increase of 87.5%), and (3) reading accommodations for 115 students (an increase of
91.7%). The library staff went from 1 full-time librarian, beginning with the 1940-41 session, to 1 full-time librarian and 1 full-time assistant librarian in the 1949-50 session.

While one and two above are considered as educational factors, in essence, political considerations essentially dictated their generation. Community interest in the division and community political pressure resulted in the progressive growth of the division. Increased student body enrollment from 540 full-time, day students for the 1940-41 session to 615 (extrapolated) for the 1949-50 session was both the result of as well as the cause of the growth of the Norfolk Division. This growth brought an ever-increased pressure on the division to provide the academic services as indicated by the increases noted above (1940-50, Chapter III, pages 80-197).

3. In addition to the educational factors set forth above for the 1940-50 period, increases for the 1930-31 through 1949-50 sessions are shown in parentheses for the following: (1) budget (percentage could not be determined), (2) governance (+220.0%), (3) faculty (+306.7%), (4) faculty salaries (+474.5%), (5) courses of instruction (+101.8%), (6) programs of study (+145.5%), (7) majors offered (+300.0%), (8) student activities (+66.7%), (9) scholarships/loan funds (+240.0%), (10) awards (+400.0%), (11) degrees/certificates/diplomas (+200.0%), (12) number of buildings/facilities (+1100.0%), and (13) acreage
(+46.2%). Library facilities consisted of the following:
(1) 14,850 volumes (an increase of 642.5%), (2) 150 periodicals
(an increase of 87.5%), and (3) reading accommodations for 115
students (an increase of 91.7%). The library staff went from 1
full-time librarian beginning with the 1940-41 session to 1
full-time librarian and 1 full-time librarian assistant in the
1940-50 session (1930-50, Chapters II and III, pages 31-197)

While paragraph three above was considered as educational
factors, in essence, political considerations essentially dictated
their generation. Community interest in the division and community
political pressure resulted in the progressive growth of the
division. Increased student enrollment from 206 full-time, day
students for the 1930-31 session to 615 (extrapolated) for the 1949-
50 session was both the result of as well as the cause of the growth
of the Norfolk Division. This growth brought an ever-increased
pressure on the division to provide the academic services as
indicated by the increases noted above (1930-50, Chapters II and III,
pages 31-197)

Economic
1. A large stock of equipment at the St. Helena Extension, secured
through the War Assets Administration, was transferred to the
Norfolk Division (1947-48, Chapter III, page 187)
2. The growth of the student body enrollment from 540 full-time,
day students for the 1940-41 session to 615 (extrapolated) for
the 1949-50 session resulted in large numbers of students who remained at home and attended the division for the first two years of their schooling. This enabled many students who could not afford the expense of room and board at a four-year college to live at home and eliminate such expense (1940-50, Chapter III, pages 80-197)

3. The tuition and fees charged by the division were also considerably less than a four-year college. This enabled many Tidewater Area high school graduates to attend a college they could afford (1930-40 and 1940-50, Chapters II and III, pages 80-197)

It appeared that during the 1940-41 through 1949-50 sessions there was increased activity over the 1930-40 period on the part of the Norfolk Community for a four-year college. Political factors outnumbered the educational and economic factors which affected the growth and development of the division (1940-50, Chapter III, pages 80-205)

It also appeared that for the 1930-41 through 1940-50 sessions, the political factors outnumbered the educational and economic factors which affected the growth and development of the division (1930-50, Chapters II and III, pages 80-197)
1. President Pomfret commented to Judge Oscar L. Shewmake, a member of the Board of Visitors, that after eight years’ experience with the Norfolk Division he had come to the conclusion that it would be better if the division were turned loose from the college. It was his belief that the college [William and Mary] was probably losing more than it was gaining by maintaining a connection with the division. He wondered if he and Judge Shewmake could discuss the matter with Governor Battle, and if he acceded, steps could be taken to turn the division over to the State Department of Education (30 October 1950, Chapter IV, page 208)

2. An editorial in a Norfolk newspaper commented on Norfolk City Manager Harrell’s talk before the Norfolk Civitan Club. It said that his talk on a four-year college stuck the needle of suggestion into a subject which had exhibited going-concern power of its own in recent years. He pointed out that there were not many population concentrations in the United States, such as the Tidewater Area, that did not have a four-year college. He further stated that a four-year college was the biggest project toward which Norfolk should work (30 October 1950, Chapter IV, pages 208-9)

3. Director Webb, in a letter to President Pomfret, urged one of two possible courses of action, as follows: (1) that the
Norfolk Division be allowed to develop four years of college work under the auspices of William and Mary or (2) that the Norfolk Division be established as a separate institution under the State Board of Education (14 November 1950, Chapter IV, page 210)

4. Mr. C. A. Harrell, the City Manager of Norfolk, sent a letter to the City Council of Norfolk in which he recommended that all references concerning higher education received by the council and by the city manager be referred to the Norfolk Commission on Higher Education. The commission was to study any questions referred to it and make a report to the council. Any report should deal with, among other things, the question of whether a sufficient need existed in the City of Norfolk for a four-year college (6 March 1951, Chapter IV, page 211)

5. Mr. William Holmes Davis wrote President Pomfret a letter wherein he stated that the Norfolk Association of Commerce had set up a Special Committee on a Four-Year College in Norfolk (8 March 1951, Chapter IV, page 212)

6. President Pomfret, in a report to the Board of Visitors, stated that he felt that William and Mary would in no way suffer through a separation of the Norfolk Division from the mother college. Not only had William and Mary alumni expressed indifference toward the division, but large numbers of them were hostile to the relationship. He further recommended that the board authorize the president to consult with the State
Board of Education to see if that body was receptive to the idea of administering the division. If they were receptive the approval of the governor would be sought to arrange for a transfer (10 March 1951, Chapter IV, pages 212-13)

7. The Rector of the Board of Visitors appointed a committee to consider the advisability of the separation of the Norfolk Division from the mother college (10 March 1951, Chapter IV, page 213)

8. President Pomfret, in a letter to Mr. Harold W. Ramsey, the Chairman of the Special Committee to study the advisability of the separation of the Norfolk Division from the mother college, said that there had been a movement in Norfolk for a number of years which favored the establishment of a four-year college. He pointed out to Mr. Ramsey that the Virginia Legislative Advisory Committee had appointed Mr. Fred Killey, formerly with the American Council on Education, to study the feasibility of a consolidation of all state colleges and universities under a single board and a single chancellor (23 March 1951, Chapter IV, page 214)

9. The Board of Directors of the Norfolk Association of Commerce had joined in the movement for the establishment of a four-year college and had asked the council to locate a suitable site and call a meeting of representatives of other communities in the Tidewater Area (25 April 1951, Chapter IV, pages 214-15)

10. Director Webb wrote to President Pomfret that the City Manager
of Norfolk had asked him to appear before the City Committee on Higher Education to discuss in general the four-year college. According to him, the committee had received requests for the establishment of a four-year college on a site outside the city. He further stated that Mr. Harrell, the City Manager, did not believe the establishment of such a college met Norfolk's needs. He favored a community-type college in the city proper without the expense of dormitories, infirmaries, and faculty homes (4 June 1951, Chapter IV, page 216)

11. A Norfolk newspaper article reported that an invitation to establish a four-year college in Norfolk was sent to the Board of Visitors of the University of Virginia by the Board of Directors of the Norfolk Association of Commerce (9 August 1951, Chapter IV, page 218)

12. Mr. Charles T. Abeles, Chairman of the Norfolk Commission on Higher Education, wrote President Pomfret that the commission was going to undertake a survey regarding the establishment of a four-year college (21 August 1951, Chapter IV, pages 218-19)

13. President Pomfret, in a letter to Mr. Charles T. Abeles, Chairman of the Norfolk Commission on Higher Education, said that The College of William and Mary had no objection whatsoever to the Norfolk Commission on Higher Education undertaking a survey in order to determine the needs for a four-year college in Norfolk (22 August 1951, Chapter IV, page 219)
14. Mr. Charles T. Abeles addressed the Norfolk Lions Club. He expressed the opinion that the Norfolk public was in favor of a four-year college and that William and Mary had given no encouragement to the possibility of the use of the Norfolk Division facilities as a nucleus for a four-year college for Norfolk (30 August 1951, Chapter IV, pages 219-20)

15. A Norfolk newspaper article stated that the movement to establish a four-year college in the Hampton Roads Area was given impetus when the Board of Directors of the Norfolk Chamber of Commerce adopted a report submitted after a year of study by its Special Committee on Higher Education (20 February 1952, Chapter IV, page 227)

16. A Norfolk newspaper editorial stated that the House of Delegates' Special Commission, established to reexamine the situation regarding the Norfolk Division, College of William and Mary – V.P.I., appeared to be a substitute for legislation which had been suggested by Delegate Guy of the City of Norfolk to take steps to establish a four-year college in Norfolk. The editorial stated further that the Norfolk Commission on Higher Education had the matter under consideration and a report on the subject was in the making. The report of the commission would provide the basis for consideration by the City of Norfolk as to what it proposed to do about the future of higher education in Norfolk (20 February 1952, Chapter IV, pages 227-28)
17. The Director's Advisory Board made the following statement of beliefs regarding a four-year college: (1) Norfolk needs a four-year college, (2) it is too much for the city to undertake, (3) the four-year college should be operated by the state, and (4) it should be built on the foundation of the present school (18 March 1952, Chapter IV, page 228)

18. Dr. Flora of the Southern Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools' Accreditation Team stated that a four-year college could be operated in Norfolk with very little additional staff or equipment (18 March 1952, Chapter IV, page 228)

19. A Norfolk newspaper editorial reported that the Norfolk Chamber of Commerce had established a Special Committee for the Norfolk Region. The goal of the committee was to secure, if the study so determined, statewide recognition of the need in the area for the establishment of a four-year college with a concerted attempt to obtain legislative sanction at the 1954 Session of the General Assembly (20 June 1952, Chapter IV, page 230)

20. Director Webb wrote to President Chandler concerning the four-year college. In his letter he said that it was well known that there had been considerable agitation in Norfolk for the past 10 years or more for the formation of a four-year college. While the movement was not taken seriously because it seemed to lack backing among the influential citizens and organizations of Norfolk, and because William and Mary officials tended to constantly discount the threat of such a movement, the past
year had seen a change in the character of the movement, one towards improvement. The City Council of Norfolk had appointed a Commission on Higher Education and the Chamber of Commerce had come forth with a statement of policy backing the establishment of a four-year college. Many civic groups were steadily falling into line to back such a movement. He recommended that The College of William and Mary should institute a compromise program which would keep the control and development of the division in the hands of William and Mary and yet satisfy the educational needs of the community; otherwise, the state would find itself obligated to establish a number of basic degree granting curricula which would meet the Norfolk needs. Unless a compromise plan could be worked out, William and Mary would lose the division (16 July 1952, Chapter IV, pages 231-32)

21. The Norfolk Commission on Higher Education reported to the Norfolk City Council on the proposal to establish a four-year college in Norfolk. In its summary the commission stated that evidence at hand indicated, prima facie at least, a need for a four-year college in Norfolk. The commission recommended that, if and when a State Board of Higher Education was created, the city council and the Norfolk Delegation to the General Assembly should request that the board undertake a study to determine whether there was a need for a four-year college in Norfolk. Should the board find that a four-year college was needed, the
22. Director Webb met with the Mayor of the City of Norfolk, the city manager, the Chairman of the Committee on Higher Education, and the Chairman of the Chamber of Commerce Committee on the Four-Year College. He reported that the present thinking of the group was that there should be a gradual development of offerings in the third and fourth years of college. They felt that degrees should be given in a number of vocational fields as well as a general degree in liberal arts. The expansion of a higher educational program should be done from the Norfolk Division rather than to establish a separate institution (28 July 1952, Chapter IV, page 232)

23. The Norfolk City Council of Parents-Teachers Association named a committee to work with the Norfolk Council on Higher Education to study the feasibility of a four-year college for the Tidewater Area (27 September 1952, Chapter IV, page 236)

24. President Chandler, in a speech given to the Norfolk Rotary Club, stated that steps were being taken to make the division more fully reach up to its potentialities (11 October 1952, Chapter IV, pages 236-37)

25. The Board of Visitors stated that a monograph would be prepared on the Norfolk Division and that the mother college's
relationships in the Norfolk Area would be cleared up and published for the people of Norfolk. President Chandler felt that the mother college's position in Norfolk was not clear or thoroughly understood with respect to The College of William and Mary's purpose there (1951-52, Chapter IV, page 229)

26. The Board of Visitors reaffirmed its recognition of the educational responsibility of the Greater College of William and Mary to the youths of the Tidewater Area and its determination to discharge that responsibility with increasing effectiveness. It confirmed its abiding interest in the Norfolk Division and its purpose to assure its continued growth and development through the strengthening and expansion of its educational services and physical facilities. The board recognized that the future growth of the Norfolk Division was regarded as a matter of great importance in relation to the proper overall development of higher education in the Tidewater Area. The board proposed to promote the development of the Norfolk Division by every proper means available to it. The above action of the board was the result of a self-evaluation of the Greater College of William and Mary carried out earlier (24 January 1953, Chapter IV, pages 237-39)

27. Director Webb stated that the City of Norfolk had indicated its feeling that Norfolk needed a four-year college, that it was desirable to gradually expand the Norfolk Division program into three and four-year programs, and that a four-year, liberal
arts program would not affect the college at Williamsburg.

Students attended the Norfolk Division for financial reasons or because of family ties that kept him in the Norfolk Area (24 January 1953, Chapter IV, pages 239-240)

28. The Board of Visitors stated that William and Mary would do everything possible to assure continued growth and development of the Norfolk Division through strengthening and expansion of its educational services and physical facilities (25 January 1953, Chapter IV, page 237)

29. The Board of Visitors adopted a set of by-laws wherein the board was authorized to permanently establish a Committee on Divisions. The committee was empowered to make recommendations to the board on matters pertaining to the administration and financial operation of the Norfolk Division and on matters which pertained to the construction, maintenance, and operation of its physical plant and facilities referred to it by the president or the board (28 March 1953, Chapter IV, page 241)

30. The Norfolk City Council adopted a resolution which stated that there was an apparent need of a full, four-year, accredited college in the Norfolk-Portsmouth Area (7 April 1953, Chapter IV, page 241)

31. A Norfolk newspaper editorial stated that advocates of a four-year college for the Norfolk Area had reason to be hopeful in that President Chandler had declared that the division in
Norfolk must be developed in keeping with the needs of Tidewater, Virginia (16 May 1953, Chapter IV, page 243)

32. A Norfolk newspaper article covered President Chandler's address to the sixtieth graduating class of Norfolk General Hospital's School of Nursing. He stated that the growing demand for teachers, administrators, supervisors, head nurses, and clinical specialists made it seem logical that the division should go a step further than the three-year diploma and develop in the region as promptly as possible a program leading to a bachelor's degree in nursing. He also said he had accepted the Presidency of William and Mary with one, firm idea in mind, that idea was to determine the educational needs of the area and to develop the facilities of The College of William and Mary to meet those needs. It could be seen that the pressure for a four-year college had translated itself into the beginnings of a four-year program, namely, the four-year program which lead to a Bachelor of Nursing degree (23 May 1953, Chapter IV, pages 243-44)

33. A Norfolk newspaper editorial commented that the first, four-year degree program at the Norfolk Division was a first step that would lead to others. The step taken was on the road that would lead to the well-rounded development of the four-year college in Norfolk (25 May 1953, Chapter IV, page 244)

34. President Chandler spoke that the Norfolk Kivania Club where he went on record to the effect that the Norfolk Division was the
nucleus around which would be built the present and future educational needs of the Norfolk Community. He said that, if there was a definite need for more education, then the division was the place for it. He felt that the division should be developed by every proper means available (19 June 1953, Chapter IV, pages 246-47)

35. The City Council of Norfolk unanimously adopted a resolution with respect to the advisability of the establishment of a four-year college in the Norfolk-Portsmouth Area. The council resolved that the City of Norfolk believed that there was an apparent need for a full, four-year college and that it desired to cooperate with all interested groups or individuals to bring about the existence of a four-year college (30 June 1953, Chapter IV, page 247)

36. The Directors of the Norfolk Chamber of Commerce agreed that the Board of Visitors should be asked to increase the division from a two-year to a four-year college. There were only two alternatives to securing a four-year college. One was the development of the division facilities and the other one was the creation of one (9 July 1953, Chapter IV, pages 247-48)

37. A Norfolk newspaper article stated that the Norfolk Chamber of Commerce had abandoned the idea of starting a new, four-year college in Norfolk and had endorsed the plan for expansion of the division facilities. President Chandler stated that the recommendations of the chamber were in accord with his own
views as to the eventual development of four-year programs leading to a degree at the division. The Rector of the Board of Visitors, Mr. James M. Robertson, said that for some time President Chandler and his faculty committee, with the knowledge and approval of the board, had investigated the possibility of the establishment of additional degree courses at the division. The Democratic organization candidates for the General Assembly announced their approval of the program. President John S. Alfriend of the chamber announced that he would appoint a steering committee to consult with William and Mary authorities on how to best integrate and harmonize the plans of the two groups (10 July 1953, Chapter IV, page 248).

38. Governor John S. Battle announced that he would bring his Budget Advisory Committee to Norfolk for a hearing on proposals to seek legislative appropriations to expand the Norfolk Division into a degree-conferring, four-year institution (11 July 1953, Chapter IV, page 249).

39. Mr. S. S. Lampert, former Chairman of the Norfolk School Board, told a Norfolk Optimist Club gathering that he favored the expansion of the Norfolk Division into a four-year college rather than wait for the state to establish a new college in Norfolk (5 August 1953, Chapter IV, page 251).

40. Director Webb met with Dr. J. M. Godard, Executive Secretary of the Southern Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools, for the express purpose of clarifying accreditation policies with
reference to the proposed expansion of curricula at the division beyond the junior college level (24 August 1953, Chapter IV, pages 250-51)

41. The Board of Visitors issued a statement which explained that it would endeavor to expand the division with four-year courses which would lead to degrees in the fields of nursing and business administration and to a certificate in teaching (29 August 1953, Chapter IV, pages 251-52)

42. A Norfolk newspaper editorial stated that the development of a four-year college had gained strong momentum (1 September 1953), Chapter IV, page 252)

43. A Norfolk newspaper article stated that officials of communities throughout the south section of the Hampton Roads Area were apparently all in favor of the establishment of a four-year college by the expansion of the Norfolk Division (5 September 1953, Chapter IV, pages 252-53)

44. The City Council of Norfolk adopted a resolution which endorsed the Board of Visitors' program to develop the division into a four-year college (15 September 1953, Chapter IV, page 253)

45. Mr. Donald W. Shriver, Manager of the Norfolk Chamber of Commerce, stated that his board's proposed program to develop the division into a four-year college in stages was an opportunity that could not be passed up. It was noted that the City Committee on Higher Education had studied a proposal of the establishment of a four-year college in Norfolk from
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scratch and had advised against its feasibility (15 September 1953, Chapter IV, page 253)

46. Director Webb, in a speech to the Norfolk Cosmopolitan Club, stated that a potential of upwards of forty-five acres was available in the immediate area of the division. This was more than enough ground for buildings for the division for the next fifty years (25 September 1953, Chapter IV, page 254)

47. The Hampton Roads Chapter of the National Association of Cost Accountants adopted a resolution which endorsed the program of the Board of Visitors and requested that the General Assembly appropriate sufficient funds for the division to establish in the Tidewater Area a properly accredited, four-year institution (10 October 1953, Chapter IV, page 254)

48. A Norfolk newspaper article pointed out that the $750,000 requested for the library in the proposed budget to Governor Battle had not been included in the budget submitted by the governor to the General Assembly. A request for $100,000 for library books and $25,000 for library equipment also was not included in the budget. This proposed budget would definitely have affected the division's plans to seek accreditation as a four-year, senior college (19 January 1954, Chapter IV, page 255)

49. Director Webb wrote to Senator Robert O. Morris, Jr., Chairman of Appropriations, The Senate and House of Delegates, General Assembly of Virginia. He requested that the General Assembly
appropriate the $750,000 for a library and $100,000 for books. He pointed out that the current student enrollment justified a new library even if the four-year programs were not taught (1 February 1954, Chapter IV, page 256).

50. Mr. Charles T. Abeles, Chairman of the Norfolk Commission on Higher Education, wrote to Mr. Howard H. Adams, Chairman of the Appropriations Committee, House of Delegates. In the letter he stated that the commission, as a result of an investigation, had concluded there was the need for a four-year college in Norfolk and that the responsibility for providing additional funds rested primarily with the state. Because it recognized that expansion of the division facilities would be costly, the commission had recommended an interim program which provided four-year courses in certain fields. He requested that the House Appropriations Committee reinstate the request for $750,000 for the library (5 February 1954, Chapter IV, pages 257-58).

51. Director Webb, in an address to the Norfolk Woman's Club, urged that organization to back the request for $750,000 for a new library. He also pointed out that the growth of public school enrollment in Norfolk had increased the need for a four-year college (9 February 1954, Chapter IV, pages 258-59).

52. A Norfolk newspaper article stated that $375,000 in funds for the library had been wrested from tax credit funds by the House of Delegates. The division would now be able to begin its
four-year college program in the fall of 1955. While $750,000 was really needed, the $375,000 would allow part of the library to be built, enough to get accreditation as a senior college (15 March 1954, Chapter IV, page 259).

53. Approximately forty letters, telegrams, and resolutions were addressed to Governor Thomas B. Stanley from various individuals and organizations in the Tidewater Area. All of them urged the governor to establish a four-year college in Norfolk and restore the $750,000 appropriation in the budget to build a library. Some of the letters were from organizations which represented several hundred members (1953-54, Chapter IV, page 258).

54. In his annual report to President Chandler, Director Webb complimented the former who he said had acted as a stimulus to the development of the division. President Chandler's genuine interest was evidenced by the work he had done to obtain a hearing for the division by the Governor's Budget Committee and by the Finance Committee of the General Assembly (1953-54, Chapter IV, page 260).

55. Director Webb, in an address before the Portsmouth Rotary Club, said that a four-year college for the Tidewater Area was well on its way. The need for a four-year college was pinpointed by the fact that the school population in the area was expected to increase by eighty-two percent by 1975 (23 July 1954, Chapter IV, page 262).
56. The members of the Director's Advisory Board, Norfolk Division were advised by Director Webb that an adequate library was the only remaining barrier to accreditation as a four-year, degree granting institution (24 August 1954, Chapter IV, pages 262-64)

57. A "Capital Outlay Study for the Commission on State Capital Outlays" reported that the Hampton Roads Area had the largest population of any area in the state. While the school-age population in the United States for the period 1930-40 decreased 3 percent, the Norfolk Area increased by 36 percent. The Norfolk Division had, within a radius of 20 miles, over 1,000,000 persons living in the Norfolk-Portsmouth Area. Upon completion of the Hampton Roads Bridge Tunnel, an additional 200,000 persons living in the Newport News, Warwick, and Hampton Areas would be within commuting distance of the division (1 November 1954, Chapter IV, page 266)

58. A Norfolk Division newsletter discussed the drive for approximately 30,000 books and periodicals from citizens in the Tidewater Area. The purpose of the drive was to increase the holdings of the library, in order to meet the requirements of the Southern Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools for accreditation of the division as a four-year, senior college (1954-55, Chapter IV, page 271)

59. In a Norfolk newspaper editorial, which discussed a 25-year program for a four-year college, a statement was made concerning a program which had received the endorsement of the
Board of Visitors. The program called for an expansion of the division which would accommodate 3,000 students and a capital outlay of $6,000,000 above and beyond that already committed. This outlay would cover the erection of 12 buildings (8 September 1955, Chapter IV, page 276)

60. A Norfolk newspaper article reported that the book drive for the new library was a success. According to the article, the drive produced a concrete achievement, namely, the campaign itself acquired enough funds and books to assure accreditation as a four-year, degree-granting college. The public participation established the community character of the division and assured for it an increased contribution to the cultural life and welfare of the community over a long period of years (9 December 1955, Chapter IV, page 278)

61. A Norfolk newspaper editorial commented on the number (five) of degree courses which the division offered. It further commented that both the activities and facilities of the division were being expanded to meet the goal which the Board of Visitors had set for the division about two and one-half years ago. The first fifteen students ever to receive degrees would be graduated from the division in June 1956. Norfolk's long-discussed, four-year college was not materializing in any spectacular way, but it was materializing (21 February 1956, Chapter IV, page 279)

62. The State Council of Higher Education was authorized by the
General Assembly and signed into law by the governor. This council took control of the state-supported institutions of higher learning away from the State Board of Education. This new council was intended to be more responsive to the higher education needs of the citizens of Virginia (10 March 1956, Chapter IV, page 280)

63. In a report to the Board of Visitors, Dr. George J. Oliver, Coordinator of Divisional Activities, stated that during the administration of President Chandler the development of a four-year, degree granting program had begun at the Norfolk Division. President Chandler, in this development, had consulted continuously with responsible citizen groups and individuals in Norfolk, assessed the need for a four-year college, determined the type of degree programs to be offered, arranged for the necessary land and other physical facilities, and checked with the Southern Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools on all plans along the way. The development of the division was a complex task and the progress which had been made was a tribute to the quality of the vision and understanding of educational problems on the part of President Chandler (1955-56, Chapter IV, pages 273-74)

64. Director Webb, in his annual report to the Board of Visitors, commented on the division's amazing progress. He pointed out that the division had witnessed the awarding of its first baccalaureate degrees. He also pointed out how the City of
Norfolk had assisted the division with the purchase of considerable property and the donation of $100,000 for piling for the new library (1955-56, Chapter IV, pages 281-82)

65. A Norfolk newspaper editorial commented that the plan of William and Mary to add two, four-year degree courses to its curriculum at the division would mark another significant step in the progress of the division toward a full, four-year college (10 August 1956, Chapter IV, page 284)

66. President Chandler and Director Webb prepared a pamphlet entitled "The Development of the Four-Year College at the Norfolk Division, College of William and Mary" for the perusal of the Board of Visitors and administrative officers at The College of William and Mary. One of the conclusions reached was that every effort should be made to secure appropriations, gifts, and grants for expanding the faculty and physical plant of the Norfolk Division, in order that it may properly serve the state and the people of the Hampton Roads Area (September 1956, Chapter IV, pages 285-86)

67. The Norfolk Division prepared a pamphlet for the perusal of the State Council of Higher Education. In its summary the following statement was included:

a. The present enrollment of the Norfolk Division has already exceeded the capacity of the physical plant

b. There is a potential of future college students now crowded in the elementary and secondary schools of the
area which will overwhelm the present facilities even with the completion of planned additions to the physical plant (15 January 1957, Chapter IV, pages 289-90)

68. The Board of Visitors, in a reorganization of the Norfolk Division, recognized the administration of the division's growing responsibilities by changing the chief administrative officer's title from Director to Provost (13 April 1957, Chapter IV, page 291)

69. A Norfolk newspaper editorial commented on the striking growth of the four-year college idea in Norfolk. The graduates of the college receiving bachelor's degrees were four times larger than that of 1956 (27 May 1957, Chapter IV, page 291)

70. Provost Webb, in his annual report to the Board of Visitors, noted the increased conferring of degrees and that construction of the new library would begin in the fall of 1957, with completion estimated to be in February 1959 (May 1957, Chapter IV, pages 292-93)

71. In a Board of Visitors' meeting, President Chandler made, among other statements, one in which he said that William and Mary was committed to four-year programs in Norfolk and that it was essential that concentrations be developed which would give sufficient subject material to support the various professional courses which William and Mary had embarked upon in the Bachelor of Arts and Bachelor of Science degree programs (1956-57, Chapter IV, page 287)
72. The Norfolk City Manager, in a letter, stated that by city ordinance the city had conveyed to The College of William and Mary properties acquired by the city for the college library (18 June 1957, Chapter IV, page 293)

73. One hundred forty-four persons attended Governor Stanley's Budget Committee hearing at the Norfolk Division. This large number was indicative of the support from the Norfolk Community (7 September 1957, Chapter IV, page 296)

74. A Norfolk newspaper editorial stated that the expansion of the Norfolk Division into a full, four-year institution was assured of vital support as a result of the approval of such development by the Democratic nominee for governor, Attorney General J. Lindsay Almond, Jr. (28 September 1957, Chapter IV, page 297)

75. In his endorsement of a four-year college, Attorney General Almond did not mention specific appropriations. He said, however, that the demand for the service fully justified expansion into a full-fledged, four-year college (28 September 1957, Chapter IV, pages 297-98)

76. A Norfolk newspaper article stated that Provost Webb hoped the new library would be completed by February 1959 and that the General Assembly had appropriated $955,000 for the structure while the City of Norfolk had voted $100,000 for the piling (19 November 1957, Chapter IV, page 298)

77. Mayor Fred W. Duckworth of Norfolk, in a speech before the
Political Club of The College of William and Mary, said that the budget submitted by Governor Stanley did not provide Norfolk with a full, four-year college. He noted that Norfolk was the only city of its size in the United States that had no full, four-year college. The submitted budget fell short by $33 million of what had been asked for operation of the division. Mayor Duckworth pointed out that the city had given the division land valued at $260,000 and had contributed $100,000 for piling for the new library (18 January 1958, Chapter IV, page 299).

78. The General Assembly passed legislation and Governor Almond signed into law a bill which established the Norfolk Division as a four-year college in certain courses (3 February 1958, Chapter IV, pages 299-300).

79. A Norfolk newspaper editorial stated that approval by the House Appropriations Committee of the full budget request by the Norfolk Division provided virtual assurance that the expansion of the division into a full, four-year college would not be interrupted. Everything pointed to the continued, orderly enlargement of the college to meet the urgent and growing need for a four-year facility in Norfolk (18 February 1958, Chapter IV, pages 300-301).

80. Governor J. Lindsay Almond, Jr., authorized the Board of Visitors to proceed with the construction of a new library at the division (31 March 1958, Chapter IV, page 301).
81. A Norfolk newspaper editorial commented that only five years ago (1953) the Board of Visitors had authorized four-year courses at the division. A year later in 1954, the General Assembly made the first appropriation for the first, four-year course. In 1956 bachelor's degrees were conferred on 15 graduates of the division. In 1957 there were 64 degree graduates and in 1958 there were 104 (15 September 1958, Chapter IV, pages 303-4)

82. A Norfolk attorney, Mr. Albert Teich, Jr., circulated a pamphlet entitled "We Need a Full, Four-Year College." In the pamphlet he said that one of the greatest services which the Norfolk Jaycees could render to the City of Norfolk was to get behind the big push which was needed to firmly establish a full, four-year college in Norfolk. Progress had been fairly small considering the need which existed. Norfolk did not have a full, four-year college, nor would it have one in the near future unless there was some method devised which would not only push the city council but influence the General Assembly at its next session in 1960. The people of Norfolk were prepared for such a four-year college and would be behind such a movement but lacked proper leadership. The Norfolk Jaycees would furnish the leadership. There was a need for an independent survey of the Norfolk Area with respect to its needs and just how those needs could be met by the division. Mr. Teich stated that he had gone to Washington, D.C., to
inquire about the possibility of federal aid in obtaining a survey for the Norfolk Area. The U.S. Office of Education offered to do the survey. The legwork of such a survey would be done by the Jaycees. It was hoped that the information obtained through such a survey would be used to influence the General Assembly and the Norfolk City Council (October 1958, Chapter IV, pages 305-6)

83. Mayor W. Fred Duckworth of Norfolk wrote to Attorney Teich that the council was very pleased with his proposal to have the U.S. Office of Education conduct a survey of the Tidewater Area. Mayor Duckworth stated that the establishment of a four-year college in Norfolk was one of the original projects on which the council embarked when first elected (22 October 1958, Chapter IV, pages 306-7)

84. President Chandler wrote to Dr. Ernest W. Hollis, Chief of College Administration, Office of Education, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. In the letter he said he was pleased to learn from Attorney Teich of the projected Tidewater Area survey of educational needs and that The College of William and Mary would do everything possible to cooperate with the survey (30 October 1958, Chapter IV, pages 307-8)

85. Dr. William H. McFarlane of the State Council of Higher Education sent a letter to the U.S. Office of Education in which he set forth a tentative proposal for an educational
survey of the Tidewater Area (31 December 1958, Chapter IV, page 310)

86. A report prepared by the Bureau of Population and Economic Research of the University of Virginia demonstrated that a veritable tidal wave of high school graduates was cresting and threatened to engulf the higher education facilities in the Norfolk Area. It was imperative that preparations be made for this onslaught of college-bound students (January 1959, Chapter IV, pages 310-11)

87. A Norfolk newspaper editorial observed that the number of degree graduates had risen from 15 in 1956 to 160 for 1958. Four-year courses were not authorized by the Board of Visitors until 1953, and the first appropriation was not made until 1954. The five-year record of progress was remarkable. This was only a beginning for Norfolk's four-year college. The promise was for larger growth in the years ahead (7 June 1959, Chapter IV, page 313)

88. A Norfolk newspaper article carried the following statements:
   a. Separate accreditation for the division was believed virtually certain
   b. The new library and a strengthened faculty were expected to bring the division up to standards set by the Southern Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools
   c. With separate accreditation the division would draw near a crossroads. One road would lead to further development
as part of the Greater College of William and Mary. The
other road would lead to its establishment as a separate
state college (13 August 1953, Chapter IV, pages 313-14)

89. A Norfolk newspaper editorial commented, among other matters,
that there had been for a long time a significant body of
opinion in favor of a completely independent, four-year college
to serve the Norfolk Area. There was no reason to assume that
the connection with Williamsburg would be preserved forever (28
August 1959, Chapter IV, pages 315-16)

90. The State Council of Higher Education published a survey
authorized by the council and financed by the Norfolk Junior
Chamber of Commerce. The survey concluded that there was no
demonstrated need for an independent, four-year college. One
of its recommended alternatives was the modification of the
present structure to make it more truly an areawide governing
and administrative organization for strengthening higher
education in the region (September 1959, Chapter IV, pages 316-
17)

91. The U.S. Office of Education survey had the following specific
recommendation: There should be developed in the Tidewater
Area a Tidewater College System to be operated under the
present Board of Visitors of The College of William and Mary
(September 1959, Chapter IV, page 320)

92. The guest list for the dedication of the Robert Morton Hughes
Library totalled 420. This was indicative of a direct and
abiding interest in the library in particular and the division in general (17 October 1959, Chapter IV, pages 321-22)

93. A Norfolk newspaper article reported on the opening of the Robert Morton Hughes Library at the division. The cooperation of the commonwealth, the City of Norfolk, and the citizens of Norfolk had brought a dream into reality. The article stated that the library fulfilled an essential requirement for separate accreditation for the division (18 October 1959, Chapter IV, pages 320-21)

94. A Norfolk newspaper article said that the division hopes for independent accreditation for its four-year courses during 1960 would not materialize if a cut of $365,105 in its operating appropriation budget was not restored (17 January 1960, Chapter IV, pages 322-23)

95. Provost Webb and his Advisory Board appeared before the General Assembly and pleaded for an extra $365,000, an amount needed to get the division accredited as a senior college (4 February 1960, Chapter IV, page 324)

96. A Norfolk newspaper article reported that a bill had been introduced in the General Assembly which would set up a system of colleges in the Tidewater Area. This bill was in response to the recommendations of a Special Study sponsored by the Norfolk Junior Chamber of Commerce. The bill further provided for a Board of Visitors which would appoint a chancellor and
oversee the colleges as part of the Greater College of William and Mary (11 February 1960, Chapter IV, page 325)

97. Governor Almond signed into law bill that created The Colleges of William and Mary System, which included the division as one of the colleges in the system and provided for a chancellor to oversee the system (5 March 1960, Chapter IV, page 326)

98. The Board of Visitors adopted an organization for The Colleges of William and Mary which was implemented on 1 July 1960. Provost Webb's title was changed to that of President. The organization included the Norfolk Division, Richmond Professional Institute, The College of William and Mary in Virginia, Christopher Newport College, and Richard Bland College, the latter two being junior colleges (21 May 1960, Chapter IV, pages 329-30)

99. The Board of Visitors chose the name, "The Norfolk College of William and Mary," as the official name for the division (22 October 1960, Chapter IV, page 335)

100. A Norfolk newspaper editorial stressed Norfolk's need for a four-year, engineering school. The Virginia Council on Higher Education appointed a Committee of Three to study the need for a four-year, engineering school at the division (27 May 1961, Chapter IV, page 337)

101. The Tidewater Chapter, Virginia Society of Professional Engineers; the Engineers Club of Hampton Roads; the Norfolk Chamber of Commerce; and the Tidewater, Virginia, Development
Council presented a report to the State Council of Higher Education. The report concluded that the demands of business and industry; the numbers of students, actual and potential; the resources of laboratories and libraries; and the trained instructional staff in the area, all supported the conclusion that the Norfolk Division could and should develop bachelor degree programs in engineering (21 June 1961, Chapter IV, pages 339-40)

102. The State Council of Higher Education stated that if the state concluded that a four-year, engineering program was needed in Norfolk to meet the particular needs of students and industries in the Norfolk Area, they recommended:

a. A four-year program which led to the degree Bachelor of Science in general engineering should be established at the division

b. Third-year courses should start in September 1964 and fourth-year courses in September 1965

c. With September 1964 the engineering program should become a department of the division (31 October 1961, Chapter IV, pages 342-43)

103. Four members of the Board of Visitors met in Richmond with the State Council of Higher Education. The council presented a plan whereby they planned to submit a report to Governor Almond relative to recommended dispositions of the System of The Colleges of William and Mary. The proposed context of the
report would result in the dissolution of the system. They also recommended that a separate Board of Visitors be created to administer the affairs of the Norfolk Division. This meant the independence of the division (23 October 1961, Chapter IV, pages 342-43)

104. The President's Advisory Board unanimously supported a resolution which recommended the separation of the Norfolk Division from The Colleges of William and Mary System (28 October 1961, Chapter IV, pages 346-47)

105. President Webb wrote to the Board of Visitors. In the letter he categorically stated that he felt the Norfolk Division should be separated from the mother college in Williamsburg. He posed several questions, the answers to which all pointed to the need for an independent, Norfolk college (29 October 1961, Chapter IV, pages 344-46)

106. A Richmond newspaper article reported that the State Council of Higher Education would meet for a final review of its recommended reorganization of The Colleges of William and Mary which would be submitted to Governor Almond. It was expected that the Board of Visitors would meet jointly with them. The article concluded with a statement that extensive changes in the system would be a reversal of the council's thinking two years ago when they recommended The Colleges of William and Mary System (31 October 1961, Chapter IV, pages 347-48)

107. A Richmond newspaper article reported that the State Council of
Higher Education had voted unanimously to forward recommendations to Governor Almond which included proposals for a major reorganization of The Colleges of William and Mary. The article also reported that the Board of Visitors had met in joint session with the council. Included in the recommendations was the stipulation that the Norfolk Division, when granted independent status, would choose a name that did not include a reference to William and Mary (7 November 1961, Chapter IV, page 348).

108. The State Council of Higher Education recommended the establishment of a four-year, engineering program at the Norfolk Division. President Frank Batten of the Norfolk Chamber of Commerce said that the council’s support of an engineering school for Norfolk would have clear sailing through the General Assembly (10 November 1961, Chapter IV, page 350).

109. A Norfolk newspaper editorial commented that Norfolk had long recognized the probability and desirability of the eventual separation of the division from the college in Williamsburg. The State Council of Higher Education’s recommended sweeping changes had placed the time at hand (12 November 1961, Chapter IV, page 350).

110. A Norfolk newspaper article stated, that with reference to the State Council of Higher Education’s recommendations, the naked issue was whether the council or the Board of Visitors should decide the future of Tidewater Colleges. Dr. Dabney Lancaster,
Chairman of the Council, stated that the council was in error in 1960 when they recommended the establishment of The Colleges of William and Mary (16 November 1961, Chapter IV, pages 350-51)

111. A Norfolk newspaper editorial commented that from Tidewater's point of view separation was essential for the simple reason that the division could grow more rapidly and develop its special potentialities more fully on its own than under absentee direction (17 November 1961, Chapter IV, page 352)

112. President Webb wrote to Governor-Elect Albertus S. Harrison, Jr., and apprised him of the administrative officers and faculty's support by the division of the State Council of Higher Education's recommendations concerning the dissolution of The Colleges of William and Mary System. He said that the support was almost one hundred percent (20 November 1961, Chapter IV, page 353)

113. The Norfolk Chamber of Commerce adopted a resolution which gave its wholehearted endorsement to giving the Norfolk Division independent status. The resolution pointed out that the character and missions of the Norfolk and Williamsburg colleges were too dissimilar for continued, effective management by a central Board of Visitors (21 November 1961, Chapter IV, pages 352-53)

114. Governor-Elect Harrison replied to President Webb. In his letter he said that the recommendations of the State Council of
Higher Education would have his very earnest consideration. He thought the future of the Norfolk Division was without limit (25 November 1961, Chapter IV, pages 353-54)

115. The Alumni Association of the Norfolk College of William and Mary strongly endorsed the separation of the division from its mother college. It also encouraged active, public support of the separation on the part of its membership and of the citizenry of Norfolk (29 November 1961, Chapter IV, page 354)

116. A Richmond newspaper article offered the opinion that the granting of accreditation to the Norfolk Division strengthened the chances of the General Assembly going along with the State Council of Higher Education's recommendations that the division be separated from The Colleges of William and Mary System (7 December 1961, Chapter IV, page 354)

117. A Norfolk newspaper editorial, which commented on the Norfolk Division's accreditation, said the following:

a. The Norfolk Division had received its diploma, so to speak, as a four-year institution of higher learning

b. The diploma was 31 years in the winning

c. The Norfolk Division had come of age as an independent, diploma-granting college

d. The division's new status came appropriately at a time when the State Council of Higher Education had recommended that it be made a fully independent institution

e. The evidence was persuasive that the interests of the
colleges in Norfolk and Williamsburg and the commonwealth would be best served by granting independence to the division now (9 December 1961, Chapter IV, pages 356-57)

118. Mr. M. Carl Andrews of the Roanoke World News and a member of the Board of Visitors was made the Chairman of a Committee of Five by the board to investigate the advisability of the separation of the Norfolk Division from The Colleges of William and Mary System (15 December 1961, Chapter IV, page 354)

119. President Webb, in a letter to Mr. M. Carl Andrews, reported certain findings to him. Among them were the following:
   a. The Norfolk Division Faculty had voted by secret ballot 145 to 5 for separation
   b. The entire administrative staff at the division favored separation
   c. The Administrative Staff of The College of William and Mary felt very strongly for separation
   d. The College of William and Mary Faculty assured him (President Webb) that the move for separation would receive overwhelming support
   e. Not one citizen with whom he [President Webb] had been in contact had urged him to support continuation of the present system (15 December 1961, Chapter IV, pages 355-56)

120. The Women's Division, Norfolk Chamber of Commerce, Board of Directors voted to go on record as wanting the Norfolk Division
to be separated from The College of William and Mary in Williamsburg (27 December 1961, Chapter IV, page 357)

121. A Norfolk newspaper editorial said that the case for the separation of the Norfolk Division from the mother college in Williamsburg had grown stronger all the time. It stated that one reason for this was the magnitude and source of support which the independence proposal had won since the recommendations were put forward by the State Council of Higher Education. It further stated that the council had recognized that the 1960 adjustment was simply a step in a long-range development that would have led to separate status for all the senior colleges. Complete separation in 1960 would not have been appropriate (28 December 1961, Chapter IV, pages 357-58)

122. The Officers and Board of Directors of the Engineers' Club of Norfolk went on record and favored the proposed plan for the separation of the Norfolk Division from The Colleges of William and Mary. They further wished that their feelings in the matter be made known to the Board of Visitors, the General Assembly, and the Governor of the Commonwealth (December 1961, Chapter IV, page 360)

123. In an address to the General Assembly, Governor Albertus S. Harrison, Jr., endorsed the State Council of Higher Education's recommendations for the dissolution of The Colleges of William and Mary System as being basically sound. In his address he said that the Norfolk Division had increased 225 percent in
enrollment during the past ten years. From a small beginning it had become a four-year, degree-granting, accredited institution. It was destined to become a large and significant center of learning and would require the dedication of its own Board of Visitors (15 January 1962, Chapter IV, pages 365-66)

124. A Norfolk newspaper article reported that a bill to give independence to the Norfolk Division would be introduced in the House of Delegates. The bill was assured of passage by the house, and it looked as if it would get the blessing of the senate (17 January 1962, Chapter IV, pages 366-67)

125. A Norfolk newspaper article reported that the William and Mary separation bill had gone into the hopper, and its passage was virtually assured. All members of the House of Delegates from Norfolk were co-sponsors of the bill. There was no concerted opposition expected in the senate (18 January 1962, Chapter IV, pages 367-68)

126. A Norfolk newspaper article commented that for several days the Tidewater Area had been practically assured of the independence of the Norfolk Division. The idea of the creation of a major, four-year college on an independent basis had been a Tidewater Area dream for years and years. It was only the surge of enrollments and growth and attainment of mature status in the past decade that the Norfolk Division had become the best and most hopeful focus of these aspirations. The organizational changes of 1960 set the state for what was now taking place,
the final severance of the links with the mother college (31 January 1962, Chapter IV, pages 368-69)

127. The Senate by a 33-3 vote followed a House of Delegates' vote of 86-2, and the General Assembly sent a bill to Governor Almond which broke up The Colleges of William and Mary System and gave the Norfolk Division independent status as of 1 July 1962 (9 February 1962, Chapter IV, pages 369-70)

128. A Norfolk newspaper editorial said, in part, that the Norfolk Division had outgrown its parent institution in Williamsburg and that the division's four-year, degree-granting status put it in a strong position to begin a new chapter of life as an independent college, fully accredited. It looked forward to the addition of an engineering school (12 February 1962, Chapter IV, pages 370-71)

129. Governor Albertus S. Harrison, Jr. signed into law the bill passed by the General Assembly which gave the Norfolk College of William and Mary (the Norfolk Division) independent status as of 1 July 1962. The division would have its own Board of Visitors and its own president. The bill contained a proviso that the division would have to select a new name, one that was in no way connected with The College of William and Mary (17 February 1962, Chapter IV, page 371)

130. Governor Albertus S. Harrison, Jr., named the Norfolk College's first Board of Visitors. The interim name "Norfolk College" had been given to the division by the General Assembly bill
which authorized independence (11 May 1962, Chapter IV, pages 374-75)

131. The Board of Visitors, Norfolk College appointed Mr. Lewis W. Webb, Jr., as the first president of the newly independent college (2 July 1962, Chapter IV, page 379)

132. A Norfolk newspaper article reported that the Board of Visitors, Norfolk College had chosen the name "Old Dominion College" for the four-year, degree-granting, independent senior college (2 August 1962, Chapter IV, page 380)

133. Throughout the period of the 1950-51 through 1960-62 sessions, Mr. William Holmes Davis, a leading Norfolk proponent of the four-year college for Norfolk, continued to pen letters and prepare tracts advancing the four-year college concept. Only towards the end of the decade, when the division began offering four-year courses which led to degrees, was his output drastically reduced (1950-62, Chapter IV, pages 206-378)

While 21 editorials, which dealt with the four-year college concept, were summarized in the foregoing pages, there were an additional 60 articles which were not summarized. There were 19 summarized articles above which dealt with the four-year college concept, while 59 were not summarized. Summarized individual endorsements numbered 15, while 29 were unsummarized. Organizational endorsements accounted for 10 summaries, while 30 were not summarized (1930-62, Chapters II, III, and IV, pages 1-378)
1. Dr. J. M. Godard of the Southern Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools informed Director Webb that the Norfolk Division had been approved for an accreditation committee study (11 December 1950, Chapter IV, page 210)

2. The Inspection Committee of the Southern Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools carried out an accreditation inspection of the Norfolk Division. The division passed the inspection and met all standards of the association (18 October 1951, Chapter IV, pages 225-26)

3. The Southern Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools voted in December 1951 to admit the Norfolk Division as a fully accredited junior college (December 1951, Chapter IV, page 226)

4. President Chandler wrote to the Southern Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools and requested that the association appoint a Special Studies Committee to carry out an accreditation visit to the division during April or May 1960. He also requested a Regular Visiting Committee visit the division during October or November 1960 to check the division for accrediting as a senior college (1 February 1960, Chapter IV, pages 323-24)

5. Dr. Sweet, Executive Secretary of the Southern Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools, wrote to Provost Webb that he would like to visit the division on 18-19 May 1960, in order to quickly survey the operation in Norfolk. If he found the need
to recommend certain corrections and adjustments he would return
in September 1960 (21 April 1960, Chapter IV, pages 327-38)

6. Dr. Sweet in a letter to Provost Webb summarized his visit to
the division on 18-19 May 1960. Included in his summary were
the following comments:

a. The college had prospered to a great extent because of the
interest and support from the parent institution

b. The college had made an excellent transition in curriculum
from a junior to a senior college

c. Library facilities, service, and use by faculty and students
were excellent (31 May 1960, Chapter IV, pages 331-32)

7. A Norfolk newspaper article reported a study of standards at the
division which would lead to accreditation by the Southern
Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools as a senior
college (11 April 1961, Chapter IV, page 336)

8. A Norfolk newspaper article reported that the division had
received accreditation as a full, four-year, senior college from
the Southern Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools. The
article also offered the opinion that accreditation strengthened
the position of those who advocated the independent status of
the Norfolk Division (7 December 1961, Chapter IV, page 354)

9. Dr. Sweet, Executive Secretary of the Southern Association of
Colleges and Secondary Schools, wrote President Webb and
welcomed the Norfolk Division into membership as a senior
college (12 December 1961, Chapter IV, page 356)
10. The period of the 1950-51 through 1961-62 sessions saw further continued progressive growth of the division. Increases from the 1950-51 through 1961-62 session are shown in parentheses for the following: (1) budget (percentage could not be determined), (2) governance (+125.0%), (3) faculty (+136.4%), (4) faculty salaries (+216.5%), (5) courses of instruction (+324.6%), (6) majors (+360.0%), (7) student activities (+96.7%), (8) scholarships/loan funds (+209.1%), (9) awards (+85.7%), (10) degrees/certificates/diplomas awarded (+500.00%), and (11) acreage (+21.1%). Library facilities consisted of the following: (1) 45,000 volumes (an increase of +203.0%), (2) 400 periodicals (an increase of 166.7%), (3) and reading accommodations for 300 students (an increase of 160.9%). The library staff went from 1 full-time librarian and 1 assistant librarian for the 1950-51 session to the 1961-62 session which included the above, plus 2 full-time library assistants, 1 full-time catalogue librarian, and 1 full-time circulation librarian.

While the foregoing are considered as educational factors, in essence, political considerations essentially directed their generation. Community interest in the division and community political pressure resulted in the dramatic growth of the division. Increased student enrollment from 765 full-time, day students for the 1950-51 session to 2,970 for the 1961-62 session was both the result of as well as the cause of the growth of the Norfolk Division. This growth brought an ever-increased pressure on the division to provide
the academic services as indicated by the increases noted above
(1950-62, Chapter IV, pages 206-378)

11. In addition to the educational factors set forth above for the 1950-52 period, increases for the 1930-31 through 1961-62 sessions are shown in parentheses for the following: (1) budget (+3700.0%), (2) governance (+620.0%), (3) faculty (+940.0%), (4) faculty salaries (+2123.0%), (5) courses of instruction (+730.0%), (6) programs of study (+172.6%), (7) majors (+3500.0%), (8) student activities (+210.5%), (9) scholarships/loan funds (+580.0%), (10) awards (+1200.0%), (11) degrees/certificates/diplomas awarded (+1100.0%), and (12) number of buildings/facilities (+800.0%) and (13) acreage (+76.9%).

Library facilities consisted of the following: (1) 45,000 volumes (an increase of +2150.0%), (2) 400 periodicals (an increase of +700.0%), and (3) reading accommodations for 300 students (an increase of +400.0%). The library staff went from 1 part-time librarian, beginning with the 1933-34 session, to 1 full-time librarian, 2 full-time assistant librarians, 1 full-time catalogue librarian, and 1 full-time circulation librarian in the 1961-62 session (1930-62, Chapters II, III, and IV, pages 1-378)

While the foregoing are considered as educational factors, in essence, political considerations essential dictated their generation. Community interest and community political pressure resulted in the inexorable growth of the division. Increased student
enrollment from 206 for the 1930-31 session to 2,970 for the 1961-62 session was both the result of as well as the cause of the growth of the Norfolk Division. This phenomenal growth brought constant pressure on the division to provide the academic services as indicated by the increases noted above (1930-62, Chapters II, III, and IV, pages 1-376).

Economic

1. The growth of the study body enrollment from 765 full-time, day students for the 1950-51 session to 2,970 for the 1961-62 session resulted in exceedingly large numbers of students who remained at home and attended the division for the first two years, and later four years, of their schooling. This enabled many students who could not afford the expense of room and board at an away-from-home college to live at home and eliminate such expense (1950-62, Chapter IV, pages 206-378).

2. The tuition and fees charged by the division were also considerably less than at any away-from-home college. This enabled many Tidewater Area high school graduates to attend a college they could afford. (1950-62 and 1930-62, Chapter IV, pages 206-378 and Chapters II, III, and IV, pages 1-378).

It appeared that during the 1950-51 through 1961-62 sessions there was a momentous and overwhelming increase in activity over the 1940-50 period on the part of the Norfolk Community. Political factors unquestionably outnumbered the educational and economic
factors which affected the growth and development of the division (1950-62, Chapter IV, pages 206-378)

It also appeared that for the 1930-31 through 1961-62 sessions, the political factors far outnumbered the educational and economic factors which affected the growth and development of the division (1930-62, Chapters II, III, and IV, pages 1-378)
Conclusions

It was hypothesized in Chapter I that political factors were primarily the reason for the development of the Norfolk Division, The College of William and Mary (1930) into Old Dominion College (1962) from 1930 to 1962. This hypothesis has been proven by the study.

Political factors involved in the growth and development of the Norfolk Division, The College of William and Mary (1930) into Old Dominion College (1962) far outnumbered the educational and economic factors involved.

This study which dealt with the political, educational, and economic factors involved in the growth and development of the Norfolk Division, The College of William and Mary (1930) into Old Dominion College (1962) reached the following conclusions at the times indicated:

1. That, in order to evolve into an independent, four-year, degree-granting, senior college with its own governing board from a two-year, junior college, it is essential to have the following:
   (1) necessary accreditation; (2) an adequate budget; (3) buildings in sufficient numbers, including a comprehensive library; (4) a well-staffed faculty; (5) comprehensive courses of instruction, including sufficient majors; (6) adequate governance; (7) support of the local citizenry and government; (8) support of the state legislature; (9) support of an administrative agency which oversees development of higher education, if a state school; (10) support of the governor of
the state, if a state school. Support of the school's governing body is also helpful (1930-62)

2. That the support afforded by the Norfolk and college newspaper media editorials and articles contributed significantly to the raising of public consciousness of Tidewater Area residents regarding the Norfolk Division and its ultimate emergence as an independent, four-year, degree granting, senior college with its own governing board (1930-62)

3. That the Bryan vs. Hodges Affair led to the first significant movement on the part of the Norfolk Community to separate the Norfolk Division from The College of William and Mary (1941)

4. That the Dr. George A. Works's survey of The College of William and Mary, including the Norfolk Division, brought to the attention of the Board of Visitors, The College of William and Mary, among other things, certain improvements which needed to be made at the division (1940)

5. That the principal result of the Bryan vs. Hodges Affair was to forcibly bring to the attention of the Board of Visitors, The College of William and Mary the pressing needs of the Norfolk Division which resulted in a board that gave increased attention to the division and its desires (1941)

6. That the Norfolk City Commission on Higher Education was the result of the City Council of Norfolk's desire to protect its interests in all matters which related to the Norfolk Division,
It was authorized as a result of the movement generated by the Bryan vs. Hodges Affair (1941)

7. That the Board of Visitors, The College of William and Mary responded to the movement to separate the Norfolk Division from its mother college and voted to adopt a committee recommendation which continued and strengthened the bonds between the two schools (1941)

8. That the Board of Visitors, The College of William and Mary responded further to the movement to separate the Norfolk Division from its mother college and issued a reiteration of the policy adopted earlier which called for the relations between Norfolk and Williamsburg to be continued and strengthened (1942)

9. That a public movement during 1951-52 on the part of the Norfolk Community to separate the Norfolk Division from its mother college resulted in the appointment by the Board of Visitors, The College of William and Mary of a committee to investigate and advise on the feasibility/nonfeasibility of such a separation. The board adopted the committee's recommendation which advised against such a separation (1951-52)

10. That as a result of its decision not to separate the Norfolk Division from its mother college, the Board of Visitors, The College of William and Mary voted to prepare a monograph on the division which clarified the mother college's relationships in the Norfolk Area and to do everything possible which assured continued growth and development of the division through the
strengthening and expansion of its educational services and physical facilities (1951-52)

11. That as a further result of its decision not to separate the Norfolk Division from its mother college and as a result of a self-evaluation carried out by The College of William and Mary, including the division, the Board of Visitors voted to propose to promote the development of the division by every proper means available to it (1953)

12. That as a result of its decision not to separate the Norfolk Division from its mother college, the Board of Visitors, The College of William and Mary authorized the initiation of certain four-year programs at the division. The first of these programs was a Bachelor of Nursing degree program (1953)

13. That as a result of its decision not to separate the Norfolk Division from its mother college, the Board of Visitors, The College of William and Mary issued a statement which explained that it would endeavor to expand the division with four-year courses which would lead to degrees in certain fields (1953)

14. That public pressure and outcry resulted in the General Assembly appropriating sufficient funds for a new library after asked-for funds had been deleted by the governor when he submitted his budget to the General Assembly (1954)

15. That the State Council of Higher Education was created by the General Assembly and succeeded the State Board of Education, in
order to have a state agency more responsible to the increased needs of higher education in the state (1954-55)

16. That the public enthusiasm and support for a well-stacked library for the Norfolk Division resulted in a successful drive for books and donations (1955)

17. That the conveyance of city property and money for piling by the City of Norfolk did much for the construction of a new library for the Norfolk Division (1957)

18. That Governor-Elect J. Lindsay Almond, Jr.'s, endorsement of a full, four-year college insured vital support for appropriations to support such a college for the Norfolk Division (1957)

19. That the Norfolk Junior Chamber of Commerce was the prime instigator in a movement to carry out a survey conducted by the U.S. Office of Education, in order to assess the educational needs of the Tidewater Area (1958)

20. That the evidence of 15 degree graduates in 1956, 64 degree graduates in 1957, and 104 degree graduates in 1958 was proof of the commitment made five years previously by the Board of Visitors, The College of William and Mary to enlarge educational opportunities at the Norfolk Division (1958)

21. That the construction of the Robert Morton Hughes Library was the essential factor in the accreditation of the Norfolk Division as a full, four-year, degree-granting, senior college (1959)

22. That the movement on the part of the Norfolk Community to
establish a new, four-year college apart from the Norfolk Division was curtailed when it was effectively blunted by the Norfolk Chamber of Commerce when it abandoned the idea of starting a new, four-year college and endorsed instead the Board of Visitors, The College of William and Mary's plan to expand the division facilities (1959)

23. That the U.S. Office of Education Survey of the educational needs of the Tidewater Area was the principal document which led to the State Council of Higher Education recommending to the General Assembly the establishment of The Colleges of William and Mary System (1959)

24. That the Norfolk Division's accreditation as a four-year, degree-granting, senior college was instrumental in the movement for the separation of the division from its mother college (1960)

25. That there was a collective body of opinion among the Norfolk Community, towards the end of the third decade of the Norfolk Division's existence, that there was no reason to assume that the connection between Norfolk and Williamsburg should be preserved forever (1960)

26. That the surge of enrollment and growth and the attainment of mature status during the Norfolk Division's third decade of existence set the stage for separation of the division from its mother college (1960)

27. That the organizational changes of 1960 further set the stage
which led to the final severance of Norfolk’s links with its mother college (1960)

28. That Mr. William Holmes Davis, along with the Norfolk and college newspaper media, kept the concept of the four-year college in the forefront of public consciousness, by means of numerous letters and tracts to the Presidents of The College of William and Mary and letters-to-the-editor (1962)

29. That the public demand for education to be made available on a non-resident basis, as opposed to residence in an away-college, led to the steady and continuous increase in enrollment from 206 full-time, day students for the 1930-31 session to 2,970 for the 1961-62 session (1962)

30. That the State Council of Higher Education’s recommendations with regard to the dissolution of The Colleges of William and Mary System, along with public opinion and pressure from the Norfolk Community, led to the conclusions reached by Governor Albertus S. Harrison, Jr., and his message to the General Assembly wherein he supported the council’s recommendations (1962)

31. That Governor Albertus S. Harrison, Jr.’s, support of the State Council of Higher Education’s recommendations with respect to the dissolution of The Colleges of William and Mary System was the key factor in the overwhelming vote by the General Assembly which authorized those recommendations (1962)

32. That the bill, signed into law by Governor Albertus S. Harrison,
Jr., which authorized the dissolution of The Colleges of William and Mary System, was the culmination of a public movement, begun in the latter part of the Norfolk Division's third decade of existence and which involved the Norfolk and college newspaper media and organizational and individual endorsements to establish an independent, four-year, degree-granting, senior college with its own governing body (1962).

33. That Mr. Lewis W. Webb, Jr.'s, long association with the Norfolk Division, which began in 1946, as director, provost, and president led to his selection as the first President of Old Dominion College by its newly appointed Board of Visitors (1962).

34. That the selection of the name "Old Dominion College" for the newly independent, four-year, degree-granting, senior college was the result of the consideration of a wide array of potential names by the newly appointed Board of Visitors and a requirement by the General Assembly that a new name be chosen for the new college, a name that had no connection with William and Mary (1962).

35. That the initiation of a four-year engineering school at Old Dominion College was the result of a committee's study of engineering needs in the Tidewater Area and its recommendations to the State Council of Higher Education (1962).
Implications for Future Research

The primary purpose of this study was to identify those political, educational, and economic factors which affected the growth and development of the Norfolk Division, The College of William and Mary (1930) into Old Dominion College (1962). As a result of the summaries and conclusions drawn from the study, it seems appropriate to suggest the following topics which should be evaluated in future research:

1. A study of the relationship between land acquisition and building construction and the growth and development of the Norfolk Division, The College of William and Mary (1930) into Old Dominion College (1962)

2. A study of the relationship between the growth of educational services and the growth and development of the Norfolk Division, The College of William and Mary (1930) into Old Dominion College (1962)

3. A study of the political, educational, and economic factors involved in the growth and development of Old Dominion College (1962) into Old Dominion University (1969)

4. A study of the growth and development of graduate programs at Old Dominion College (1962) to the present

5. A study of the growth and development of residential facilities at Old Dominion College (1962) to the present
6. A study of the relationship between the Norfolk Housing and Development Program and Old Dominion College (1962) to the present.

7. A study of the relationship between the growth of the City of Norfolk and Old Dominion College (1962) to the present.
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Introduction

Only data which dealt with the day college were presented below. They showed the inexorable growth of a two-year, junior college, founded in 1930, and governed by the Board of Visitors of The College of William and Mary into a four-year, degree-granting, senior college, granted its independence on 1 July 1962, and governed by its own Board of Visitors. Data and registration figures for other educational endeavors, such as cooperative training, evening college, technical institute (day and evening), and summer school (day college) were not examined in this study, as the foregoing endeavors did not substantially affect to the same degree the movement for a four-year, independent college. The evening college and summer school used the same facilities, curricula, and employed many of the same faculty as the day college. The technical institute (day and evening) curricula was designed to train technicians on essentially a two-year basis (the three-year course in advanced electronics was the only exception), with the award of a diploma upon graduation.

This study presented brief descriptions of the essential features and data which characterized the Norfolk Division in its (1) 1930-31 through 1939-40 sessions, (2) 1940-41 through 1949-50 sessions, (3) 1930-31 through 1949-50 sessions, and (4) 1950-51 through 1961-62 sessions. The period 1930-31 through 1961-62 was
presented in Chapter V. These descriptions vividly showed the
dramatic growth throughout the thirty-two years from 1930 to 1962.
The brief descriptions included:

1. Budget
2. Governance (Officers of Instruction)
3. Faculty Size
4. Faculty Salaries
5. Courses of Instruction Offered
6. Programs of Study
7. Student Body Enrollment
8. Majors Offered
9. Student Activities
10. Scholarships/Loans Offered
11. Fees and Expenses
12. Awards
13. Degrees/Diplomas/Certificates Awarded
14. Number of Graduates
15. Number of Building(s)/Facility(ies)
16. Acreage
17. Library Facilities

Such items as Board of Visitors, Advisory Boards, living
accommodations, Honor System, Dean's List, Honors, Grading System,
admissions, graduation requirements, accreditation, registration,
laboratories, quality credits, attendance, absences, examinations,
course load, discipline, course changes, probation, suspension,
student assemblies, student communications, evaluation of credits from other schools, classification of students, public performance, parties, supervision of students, regulations, adjustment of college and preparatory courses, resident requirements, guidance and counseling, regulations for continuance in college, placement services, orientation, convocations, musical activities, registration changes, withdrawal from college, and transcripts were not described as they tended not to show any evidence of substantial growth or change over the period of thirty-two years, the period covered by this study.

1930-31 through 1939-40 Sessions

Brief descriptions were given below of the essential features and data which characterized the 1930-31 through 1939-40 sessions of (1) Norfolk Division, The College of William and Mary (1930-37), (2) The College of William and Mary in Virginia, Norfolk Division (1937-40), and (3) The College of William and Mary in Virginia, Norfolk, Virginia (1940-42). Increases, decreases, or no change at all from the 1930-31 session are shown in parentheses.

1. Budget (+91.7%)

   a. The College of William and Mary in Virginia, Norfolk Division

      (1) Went from $47,906 for the first line item for operating costs for the 1932-33 session of Norfolk Division, The College of William and Mary to $91,821 for the 1939-40 session of The College of William and Mary in Virginia, Norfolk Division.
2. Governance (+60.0%)
   a. Went from 5 officers of administration for the 1930-31 session to 8 for the 1939-40 session

3. Faculty (+46.7%)
   a. Went from 15 for the 1930-31 session to 22 for the 1939-40 session

4. Faculty Salaries (+15.9%)
   a. Went from $44,025 (extrapolated) for the 1930-31 session to $51,006 for the 1939-40 session

5. Courses of Instruction (+7.3%)
   a. Went from 55 for the 1930-31 session to 59 for the 1939-40 session

6. Programs of Study (+81.8%)
   a. Went from 11 for the 1930-31 session to 20 for the 1939-40 session

7. Student Body Enrollment (+153.4%)
   a. Went from 206 for 1930-31 session to 522 for the 1939-40 session

8. Major(s) (-100.0%)
   a. Went from 1 for the 1930-31 session to 0 for the 1939-40 session

9. Student Activities (+52.6%)
   a. Went from 19 for the 1930-31 session to 29 for the 1939-40 session

10. Scholarships/Loan Funds (+80.0%)
    a. Went from 10 for the 1930-31 session to 18 for the 1939-40 session
11. Tuition and Fees (+80.0%)
   a. Went from $50 per semester for 15 semester hours for the 1930-31 session to $90 per semester for 15 semester hours.

12. Award(s) (+300.0%)
   a. Went from 1 awarded in the 1937-38 session to 4 for the 1939-40 session.

13. Certificates/Diplomas/Degrees Awarded (0.0%)
   a. No recognition for completion of two years' college work was given during the 1930-31 through 1939-40 sessions.

14. Number of Graduates (+325.8%)
   a. Went from 0 for the 1930-31 session to 132 for the 1939-40 session.

15. Number of Building(s)/Facility(ies) (+200.0%)
   a. Went from 1 for the 1930-31 session to 3 for the 1939-40 session.

16. Acreage (+53.9%)
   a. Went from 0 for the 1930-31 session to 20 for the 1939-40 session.

17. Library Facilities
   a. Went from 1 part-time librarian starting in the 1933-34 session to 1 full-time librarian for 1939-40 session (+100.0%).
   b. Contained 2,000 volumes which were first recorded for 1938-39 session. Remained the same for the 1939-40 session (0.0%).
   c. Contained 50 periodicals first recorded in 1938-39 session. Remained the same for the 1939-40 session (0.0%).
d. Reading room accommodations for 60 students in the library, Administration Building and Gymnasium, The College of William and Mary in Virginia, Norfolk Division was first recorded for the 1938-39 session. Remained the same for the 1939-40 session (0.0%)
1940-41 through 1949-50 Sessions

Brief descriptions were given below of the essential features and data which characterized the 1940-41 through 1949-50 sessions of (1) The College of William and Mary in Virginia, Norfolk, Virginia (1940-42); (2) Norfolk Division of the College of William and Mary and the Virginia Polytechnic Institute (1942-43); (3) The Norfolk Division of The College of William and Mary and the Virginia Polytechnic Institute (1943-44); (4) Norfolk Division, College of William and Mary, Virginia Polytechnic Institute (1944-45); and (5) The College of William and Mary and the Virginia Polytechnic Institute in Norfolk (1945-54). Increases, decreases, or no change from the 1940-41 session are shown in parentheses.

1. Budget (percentage could not be determined)
   a. The College of William and Mary in Virginia, Norfolk Division
      (1) Went from $85,832 for the 1940-41 session to $1,590,839 for the 1949-50 session
         (a) The budget for 1949-50 session contained no line item for the operating costs for The College of William and Mary and the Virginia Polytechnic Institute in Norfolk. Hidden somewhere in the budget were the operating costs for The College of William and Mary's satellite institution.

2. Governance (+100.0%)
   a. Went from 8 officers of administration for the 1940-41 session to 16 for the 1949-50 session.
3. Faculty (+177.3%)
   a. Went from 22 for the 1940-41 session to 61 for the 1949-50 session

4. Faculty Salaries (+401.4%)
   a. Went from $50,445 for the 1940-41 session to $252,906 (extrapolated) for the 1949-50 session

5. Courses of Instruction (+88.1%)
   a. Went from 59 for the 1940-41 session to 111 for the 1949-50 session

6. Programs of Study (+28.6%)
   a. Went from 21 for the 1940-41 session to 27 for the 1949-50 session

7. Student Body Enrollment (+13.9%)
   a. Went from 540 for the 1940-41 session to 615 (extrapolated) for the 1949-50 session

8. Major(s) (0.0%)
   a. No change from 1940-41 session

9. Student Activities (+30.4%)
   a. Went from 23 for the 1940-41 session to 30 for the 1949-50 session

10. Scholarships/Loan Funds Offered (+5.3%)
    a. Went from 5 for the 1940-41 session to 20 for the 1949-50 session

11. Tuition and Fees (+28.9%)
    a. Went from $90 per semester for 15 semester hours for the 1940-41 session to $116 per semester for 15 semester hours for the 1949-50 session

12. Award(s) (+40.0%)
    a. Went from 5 for the 1940-41 session to 7 for the 1949-50 session
13. Degrees/Certificates/Diplomas Awarded (+200.0%)
   a. From 0 for the 1940-41 session to 2 for the 1949-50 session

14. Number of Graduates (-51.0%)
   a. Went from 153 for the 1940-41 session to 75 for the 1949-50 session

15. Number of Building(s)/Facility(ies) (+333.3%)
   a. Went from 3 for the 1940-41 session to 13 for the 1949-50 session

16. Acreage (-5.3%)
   a. Went from 60 for the 1940-41 session to 19 for the 1949-50 session

17. Library Facilities
   a. Went from 5,000 volumes for the 1940-41 session to 14,850 volumes for the 1949-50 session (+197.0%)
   b. Went from 80 periodicals for the 1940-41 session to 150 periodicals for the 1949-50 session (+87.5%)
   c. Went from reading accommodations for 60 students for the 1940-41 session to 115 students for the 1949-50 session (+91.7%)
   d. The library staff went from 1 full-time librarian for the 1940-41 session to 1 full-time librarian and 1 full-time assistant librarian for the 1949-50 session
1930-31 through 1949-50 Sessions

Brief descriptions were given below of the essential features and data which characterized the 1930-31 through 1949-50 sessions of (1) Norfolk Division, The College of William and Mary (1930-37); (2) The College of William and Mary in Virginia, Norfolk Division (1937-40); (3) The College of William and Mary in Virginia, Norfolk, Virginia (1940-42); (4) Norfolk Division of the College of William and Mary and the Virginia Polytechnic Institute (1942-43); (5) The Norfolk Division of the College of William and Mary and the Virginia Polytechnic Institute (1943-44); (6) Norfolk Division, College of William and Mary, Virginia Polytechnic Institute (1944-45); and (7) The College of William and Mary and the Virginia Polytechnic Institute in Norfolk (1945-54). Increases, decreases, and no change from the 1930-31 session are shown in parentheses.

1. Budget (percentage could not be determined)

   a. The Norfolk Division, The College of William and Mary

      (1) Went from $863,125 for the 1930-31 session\(^{73}\) to $1,590,839 for the 1949-50 session\(^{78}\)

         (a) The budget for 1949-50 session contained no line item for the operating costs for The College of William and Mary and the Virginia Polytechnic Institute in Norfolk. Hidden somewhere in the budget were the operating costs for The College of William and Mary's satellite institution.

2. Governance (+220.0%)  

   a. Went from 5 for the 1930-31 session\(^{75}\) to 16 for the 1949-50 session\(^{76}\)
3. Faculty (+306.7\%)
   a. Went from 78 for the 1930-31 session to 61 for the 1949-50 session

4. Faculty Salaries (+474.5\%)
   a. Went from $44,025 (extrapolated) for the 1930-31 session to $252,906 (extrapolated) for the 1949-50 session

5. Courses of Instruction (+101.8\%)
   a. Went from 82 for the 1930-31 session to 111 for the 1949-50 session

6. Programs of Study (+145.5\%)
   a. Went from 11 for the 1930-31 session to 27 for the 1949-50 session

7. Student Body Enrollment (+198.5\%)
   a. Went from 206 for the 1930-31 session to 615 (extrapolated) for the 1949-50 session

8. Majors Offered (+300.0\%)
   a. Went from 1 for the 1930-31 session to 4 for the 1949-50 session

9. Student Activities (+66.7\%)
   a. Went from 18 for the 1930-31 session to 30 for the 1949-50 session

10. Scholarships/Loan Funds Offered (+240.0\%)
    a. Went from 10 for the 1930-31 session to 34 for the 1949-50 session

11. Tuition and Fees (+132.0\%)
    a. Went from $50 per semester for 15 semester hours for the 1930-31 session to $116 per semester for 15 semester hours for the 1949-50 session
12. Awards (+400.0%)  
   a. Went from 0 for the 1930-31 session to 4 for the 1940-50 session

13. Degrees/Certificates/Diplomas Conferrerd (+200.0%)  
   a. Went from 0 for the 1930-31 session to 2 for the 1949-50 session

14. Number of Graduates (+141.9%)  
   a. Went from \( \frac{3}{4} \) for the 1930-31 session to 75 for the 1949-50 session

15. Number of Building(s)/Facility(ies) (+1100.0%)  
   a. Went from 1 for the 1930-31 session to 12 for the 1949-50 session

16. Acreage (+46.2%)  
   a. Went from \( \frac{3}{4} \) for the 1930-31 session to 19 for the 1949-50 session

17. Library Facilities  
   a. Went from 1 part-time librarian starting in the 1933-34 session to 1 full-time librarian and 1 full-time assistant librarian for the 1949-50 session (+300.0%)
   b. Contained 2,000 volumes which were first recorded in the 1938-39 session and went to 14,850 volumes for the 1949-50 session (+642.5%)
   c. Contained 50 periodicals which were first recorded in the 1938-39 session and went to 150 periodicals for the 1949-50 session (+200.0%)
   d. Reading room accommodations for 60 students in the library, Administration Building and Gymnasium, The College of William and Mary in Virginia, Norfolk Division was first recorded in the 1938-39 session and went to accommodations for 115 students for the 1949-50 session (+91.7%)
1950-51 through 1961-62 Sessions

Brief descriptions were given below of the essential features and data which characterized the 1950-51 through 1961-62 sessions of (1) The College of William and Mary and the Virginia Polytechnic Institute in Norfolk (1945-54); (2) The College of William and Mary in Norfolk (1954-58); (3) The College of William and Mary, Norfolk Division (1958-60); (4) The Norfolk College of William and Mary of The Colleges of William and Mary (1960-62); and (4) Norfolk College (1962). Increases, decreases, or no change from the 1950-51 session are shown in parentheses.

1. Budget (percentage could not be determined)
   a. The College of William and Mary
      (1) Went from $1,775,765 for the 1950-51 session to $1,820,450 for the 1961-62 session
         (a) The budget for the 1950-51 session contained no line item for the operating costs for The College of William and Mary and the Virginia Polytechnic Institute in Norfolk. Hidden somewhere in the budget were the operating costs for the College of William and Mary's satellite institution.

2. Governance (+125.0%)
   a. Went from 16 officers of administration for the 1950-51 session to 36 for the 1961-62 session

3. Faculty (+136.4%)
   a. Went from 66 for the 1950-51 session to 156 for the 1961-62 session

4. Faculty Salaries (+216.5%)
   a. Went from $309,210 (extrapolated) for the 1950-51 session to $978,756 (extrapolated) for the 1961-62 session.
5. Courses of Instruction (+324.6%)
   a. Went from 114 for the 1950-51 session to 484 for the 1961-62 session

6. Programs of Study (+0.0%)
   a. No change from 30 for the 1950-51 session

7. Student Body Enrollment (+288.2%)
   a. Went from 765 for the 1950-51 session to 2,970 for the 1961-62 session

8. Majors (+3600.0%)
   a. Went from 123 for the 1950-51 session to 36 for the 1961-62 session

9. Student Activities (+96.7%)
   a. Went from 30 for the 1950-51 session to 59 for the 1961-62 session

10. Scholarships/Loan Funds Offered (+209.1%)
    a. Went from 27 for the 1950-51 session to 68 for the 1961-62 session

11. Tuition and Fees (percentage could not be determined)
    a. Went from $116 per semester for 15 semester hours for the 1950-51 session to $120 per quarter for 12 or more quarter hours for the 1961-62 session

12. Awards (+85.7%)
    a. Went from 13 for the 1950-51 session to 13 for the 1961-62 session

13. Degrees/Certificates/Diplomas Awarded (+500.0%)
    a. Went from 7 for the 1950-51 session to 12 for the 1961-62 session

14. Number of Graduates (+217.6%)
    a. Went from 85 for the 1950-51 session to 270 for the 1961-62 session
15. Number of Building(s)/Facility(ies) (-18.2%)

a. Went from 1 to 9 for the 1961-62 session. This included the demolition of 7 temporary buildings and the addition of 5 new buildings. All 9 buildings were permanent structures. The increase of permanent structures was from 4 to 9 (+125.0%).

16. Acreage (+21.1%)


17. Library Facilities

a. New library building was added to the campus in 1959.

b. Went from 14,850 volumes for the 1950-51 session to 45,000 for the 1961-62 session (+203.0%).

c. Went from 150 periodicals for the 1950-51 session to 400 for the 1961-62 session (+166.7%).

d. Reading-room accommodations went from 115 for the 1950-51 session to 300 for the 1961-62 session (+160.0%).

e. Went from 1 full-time librarian and 1 full-time assistant librarian for the 1950-51 session to the 1961-62 session which also included 2 full-time library assistants, 1 full-time catalogue librarian, and 1 full-time circulation librarian.
Brief descriptions were given below of the essential features and data which characterized the 1930-31 through 1961-62 sessions of

1. **Budget (+3700.0%)**
   a. The Norfolk College of William and Mary of The Colleges of William and Mary
      (1) Went from $47,906 for the first line item for the 1932-33 session of Norfolk Division, The College of William and Mary to $1,820,450 for the 1961-62 session of the Norfolk College of William and Mary

2. **Governance (+620.0%)**
   a. Went from 5 officers of administration for the 1930-31 session to 36 for the 1961-62 session
3. Faculty (+940.0%)
   a. Went from 15 for the 1930-31 session to 156 for the 1961-62 session

4. Faculty Salaries (+2123.0%)
   a. Went from $44,025 (extrapolated) for the 1930-31 session to $978,756 (extrapolated) for the 1961-62 session

5. Courses of Instruction (+780.0%)
   a. Went from 55 for the 1930-31 session to 484 for the 1961-62 session

6. Programs of Study (+172.7%)
   a. Went from 11 for the 1930-31 session to 30 for the 1961-62 session

7. Student Body Enrollment (+1341.8%)
   a. Went from 206 for the 1930-31 session to 2,970 for the 1961-62 session

8. Major(s) (+3500.0%)
   a. Went from 1 for the 1930-31 session to 36 for the 1961-62 session

9. Student Activities (+210.5%)
   a. Went from 1 for the 1930-31 session to 59 for the 1961-62 session

10. Scholarships/Loan Funds Offered (+580.0%)
    a. Went from for the 1930-31 session to 68 for the 1961-62 session

11. Tuition and Fees (percentage could not be determined)
    a. Went from $50 per semester for 15 semester hours for the 1930-31 session to $120 per quarter for 12 or more quarter hours for the 1961-62 session
12. Award(s) (+1200.0%)  
   a. Went from 1 which was first awarded in the 1937-38 session to 13 awarded in the 1961-62 session.

13. Certificates/Diplomas/Degrees Awarded (+1100.0%)  
   a. Went from a certificate which was first conferred in the 1942-43 session to 11 degrees and 1 diploma which were conferred in the 1961-62 session.

14. Number of Graduates (+771.0%)  
   a. Went from 31 for the 1930-31 session to 270 for the 1961-62 session.

15. Number of Building(s)/Facility(ies) (+800.0%)  
   a. Went from 1 for the 1930-31 session to 9 for the 1961-62 session.

16. Acreage (+75.9%)  

17. Library Facilities  
   a. Went from 1 part-time librarian for 1933-34 session to 5 full-time librarians (1 librarian, 2 assistant librarians, 1 catalogue librarian, and 1 circulation librarian) for 1961-62 session (+900.0%).

   b. Went from 2,000 volumes first recorded in 1938-39 session to 45,000 volumes for 1961-62 session (+2150.0%).

   c. Went from 50 periodicals first recorded in 1938-39 session to 400 periodicals for 1961-62 session (+700.0%).

   d. Went from reading room accommodations first recorded in the 1938-39 session for 60 students in the library, Administration Building and Gymnasium, The College of William and Mary in Virginia, Norfolk Division, to accommodations for 300 students in the Robert Morton Hughes Library for the 1961-62 session, The Norfolk College of William and Mary of The Colleges of William and Mary (+400.0%).
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Abstract


Gerald Benton Anderson, Ed.D.

The College of William and Mary in Virginia, December 1988

Chairman: Chancellor Professor John R. Thelin

The purpose of this study was to both identify and analyze political, educational, and economic factors, particularly political factors, which had a significant impact on the development and growth of the Norfolk Division, The College of William and Mary (1930) into Old Dominion College (1962). The study was also designed to record a significant period (1930-62) in the history of a two-year, junior college and later a four-year, degree-granting college.

It was hypothesized that the development and growth of the college in Norfolk was based largely on decisions of a political nature rather than on those that were educational and economic. In addition, the effective application of politics enabled the college to survive several crises during the period 1930 to 1962.

The historical method of research was used to conduct this study. This method permitted the examination of primary and secondary source documents, the use of recorded oral testimony from participants and observers, and the scrutiny of relationships among peoples, places, and events.

The study concluded that political factors overwhelmingly influenced the development and growth of the college in Norfolk. The role played by local and state figures, as well as by local organizations and newspaper media, affected to a considerable degree the development of a two-year, dependent, junior college into a four-year, degree-granting, independent, senior college.

Further research into the post 1962 period is needed to analyze the changing educational needs of southeastern Virginia and to determine their effect on the growth of Old Dominion College (1962) into Old Dominion University (1969).