DONALD J. HERRMANN

Don Herrmann laughingly says he has made a career at William and Mary out of unpopular causes. He has held the varied posts of coordinator of the branch colleges from 1963 to 1968, head of the school of continuing studies (which included extension, summer school, and V.A.R.C. classes) from 1968 to 1971, and from 1972 to 1976 was director of information services. Since 1951 he has been on the faculty of the school of education (it was then a department). He describes his experiences in each role in this interview.
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Williams: I thought first of all I'd ask you about the education department (which became the school). When you came here in 1951, did you sense any particular interest on the part of Alvin Duke Chandler in education as a discipline? Some people have identified this. I wondered if you found this true?

Herrmann: Well, I think he was interested. When I came here what is now known as the school of education consisted of five people: Dr. Oliver was the department chairman then because, of course, at that time there were no schools. Even law was the department of jurisprudence; business was a department. There were three of us (plus) at that time, a part-time person, a woman in elementary education. I feel ancient when I realize of the group I'm the only one still living: Dr. Cleeton and Dr. Holland both died unfortunately; Dr. Holland in an accident and Dr. Cleeton of a heart attack, and of course Dr. Oliver died a few years ago, so I'm the only remaining one.

It was a very aggressive, professional group. We started to try to do some things and ran into some roadblocks along the way, but gradually...

Williams: Such as?

Herrmann: Well, of course there has been a constant resistance from the arts and science faculty to any such development over the years and it still continues. That was the primary thing, and as a
matter of fact, I think some of the dyed-in-the-wool arts and sciences people would probably roll over in their graves if they heard me say this, but really they had more to do with the development of the school of education and the school of business probably than anybody else because at that time William and Mary wasn't large enough to require that you have separate schools. You know, we only had 1500 students, give or take a few (I think when I came there were about 1400). But they were so set in their ways and so inflexible in their approach that the only way that we could get anything done was to set ourselves off on the side. And so that in the way of both business and education I don't know what would have happened to law; you might even be able to say the same thing about it, though it probably would have developed into a separate school anyhow. That was the only way we could do what we had to do and were mandated by the state to do, so over the years it developed almost inevitably into a separate school. I was the "COUNSELOR EDUCATION" program. I developed it almost from scratch and it had good ideas. This is true, I think of any program where you have a small staff. For example: people would get master's degrees in counseling and guidance, they'd have thirty, thirty-three hours, and they would probably take twenty-one, twenty-four from me! We used to laugh about the gospel according to St. Don, you know, because that's what they got!
They got me. I think in any program, I don't care how competent the individual may be, it's better if they have the opportunity to get a wider experience. I came in '51 and I think in '55, so it wasn't very long that I was pure. I got my first administrative assignment, which was summer session. Then I went through a period of years that got to be a joke because it seemed like every time I went home for a vacation, when I came back they had given me another job, not instead of, in addition to! So gradually I got the evening college and the extension program, and I believe somewhere along the line there I also became the liaison person with the branches. I can't remember where that came in. I think it was the blow that broke the camel's back when they also made me director of VARC. I think that was the time they developed it into a school.

Williams: A school of continuing studies? I think you're right.

Herrmann: Because I think I was liaison before that.

Williams: According to what I've found, yews, that's right. Let me ask you when you were pure education, as you say, how was it that the education department attempted to deal with or maybe they didn't attempt to deal with this resentment you've spoken of and that's apparent from arts and sciences?

Herrmann: At that time there was only one faculty. We all met over in Washington 200, anything we wanted to accomplish we had to do by majority vote of that faculty. Anything we wanted to
put up had to be put through the committee structure of that faculty or it just didn't go. I'm sure they did what they thought was the best thing but their viewpoint was a little narrow. And so more and more it became necessary to try to find other ways, of course by the time it actually became a school I was spending a good part of my time in administrative responsibilities by that time Dr. Oliver had gone up to be president of R.P.I., and Dr. Holland was the dean, so he got most of the brunt -- by that time Dr. Clinton had gone to Michigan too-- so it was Dr. Holland and some of the newer staff who were involved in the actual transition when the switch-over actually came when the school of education was created.

Williams: And have you found that the switch-over has been beneficial?

Herrmann: Oh, yes. But of course, who knows how it might have been if it hadn't happened. We have a much more diversified program, looking to a much broader range of students and that gives us a freedom of action. We are a professional school and we can act like a professional school. I think that might have been possible, maybe not as likely but possible under the old framework as well, given more freedom of operation.

Williams: There had been an attempt to set up education and business as separate schools back in about the mid-fifties and I took it from what I read that Dr. Oliver and Dr. Chandler were very much behind this but the board turned it down. Do you remember
Herrmann: Gee, I don't know. You know this was a developmental kind of thing and it carried on over a period of at least a decade, maybe more--fifteen years I don't know exactly. It may have been turned down more than once. I don't know why it was turned down. They might have thought we weren't ready. They might have thought ....

Williams: But this didn't hamper what you were doing? You said it just kept developing. That's what I'm looking for.

Herrmann: Yeah. Of course, there were many heartbreaks and disappointments along the way. It took a long time. ... That's why I made the point I did earlier that everybody, even including those of us who were trying to do it were rather reluctant in those days to take that step. We thought it would have been better with the size enrollment we had if we could have found another way to do it, but we just couldn't. I think that that probably was the reason--they thought we weren't big enough to have separate schools. It shouldn't be necessary. Well, we talked about the same things at our faculty meetings, but there was just no other way. And finally as it became more and more evident, one time they said: "The heck with it" and put it in. It's one of those things that just built up.

Williams: I think it's important to note that attitude because this was a new development as you say in William and Mary, and it had been just one faculty.
Herrmann: And I think too, a strong point in it was the attitude which was much more accurate in those days than it is now; the image of William and Mary as this highly selective liberal arts college, it would be very hard to maintain that image. If that is to be the only image, then professional schools don't necessarily fit into that image. As long as I've been at William and Mary there is this almost psychopathic fear that we're going to get too big, and you know, you get more schools and it gives a concept of bigness, whether you have any more students or not. I think probably that might have had something to do with it. They wanted to keep it small. Then of course the high selectivity concept that you have a higher quality program if you can keep more people out, I never quite agreed with it.

Williams: You mentioned one of your administrative tasks that was coordinating the branch colleges, and in interviewing people from the '60s, I realized that this was something that William and Mary didn't actually invite. Now when you became coordinator of the branches it was just after the separation of the system called the Colleges of William and Mary. Admiral Chandler was no longer the working chancellor; he was an honorary chancellor of the colleges, and he apparently had the function of coordinating the junior colleges himself. I was wondering why, when this position was created, when you got this position, why was it set up so that the directors of Christopher Newport and Richard Bland were not, say, reporting directly to the president of William
and Mary or to the Board of Visitors. Why a liaison person, in other words?

Herrmann: That brings some goodies back! Maybe I can back up a little bit. You asked about Admiral Chandler and his support of education and business. The one driving force of Admiral Chandler, I think --now whether he was consciously following his father's footsteps or whether he had developed his own quite similar philosophy, I don't know-- but in any case his primary concept of William and Mary (and I think he probably would have had the same frame for a public institution) was service to the people. I suppose you've picked up somewhere along the line that it was his father who really instituted the off-campus business and got R.P.I. and Old Dominion started, so we won't go back into that. Admiral Chandler had a lot of those same ideas. That's why I think this was strong in his support of things like education and business not so much that he had any great love for either field, but that these were fields in which there was a great demand from the public, and he wanted to meet those demands. That's also why he was a great supporter as was his father, of off-campus kinds of activities. Now I never knew exactly how we got into this; I have heard that it was a sort of a way of fending off V.P.I. I'm not sure that's true. I think there was some pressure on Admiral Chandler to do this. I don't think that pressure came from the governor's office or anything like that but from Petersburg and from Newport News and that
type of thing. Let me reminisce a minute.

One Thursday afternoon at three minutes to five I got a call from the president. He sort of had a way of calling about that time of the day. He said, "I want a capital outlay, maintenance and operations budget for a two-year college with 250 students." I said, "O.K., but I'm going to be out of town next week, and as soon as I get back, I'll start working it up for you." He said, "Hell, I have to make a speech Saturday morning and present all this stuff, and so in one day I got together a budget! I remember I called up Dr. GUY, "How much does it cost to set up a chemistry lab?" He'd say, "About so many thousands," and I'd write it down. In one day I'd set up a budget. I didn't know what it was for, you know. That turned out to be the budget that Scotty Cunningham used to open Christopher Newport. We laughed about it many times afterwards. It must have been all right because he got by with it.

They opened in the little old Greene School (I think it was called), downtown Newport News, an old beat-up building, and they were there for several years before they finally moved out to the present Shoe Lane campus with the buildings. And then a year or so later he asked me to go out to Petersburg and meet these two fellows and go out and look at this site. They were thinking about starting a two-year college over there. So I went over and met these two, one named Mr. Ernst and another man who was assistant to the president.
Mr. Ernst was the first gentleman that was really the "guardian angel" of Richard Bland, that new classroom building is named after him.

Williams: Was that Colonel Carson?
Herrmann: No, he took it over later. Have you ever been to Richard Bland?
Williams: No, I haven't.
Herrmann: Well, the old building that was the first classroom-administration building was a dormitory primarily for a school of sort of mentally retarded -- I think in those days entirely black -- population. This was a rainy day. We drove in there, and it was rainy enough so that those people couldn't be outside doing what I suppose they would normally have been doing, so they were all sitting on the edge of their cots. Everything on the outside -- well, it wasn't well landscaped at all -- and it was all kind of sand and mud. I have never seen such a dreary looking place. I thought, 'Boy, if we make it here it's going to be a miracle.' I don't think I've ever seen such a depressing place in my life. That was the beginning of Richard Bland. It's been quite a successful operation since.

For the first few years I guess they reported to Admiral Chandler, then when R.P.I. and Old Dominion were split off Admiral Chandler was no longer the active head of the system.
Herrmann: This put me in a sort of funny position.

Williams: I was going to ask what kind of position did this create for you?

Herrmann: Because supposedly I reported directly to the Board of Visitors. As I remember it, it was sort of the idea at first that I should have the title of chancellor or something, but then they decided to make the head man of the whole thing the chancellor, which is kind of backwards. Usually he's the president, but anyhow the idea was that all of the branches (and of course we never had more than two) should report through this individual directly to the Board. They had a similar kind of set-up at the University of Virginia and I don't know which came first the chicken or the egg.

They had a number of branches with a coordinator because a friend of mine — strange but we both finally wound up being Director of Institutional Research at the two schools — but in any case that was the idea. And I did. I would meet the Board and take anything that came from the branches. But that was a part-time job and the other part of my job was spent at William and Mary where I reported to the president. So you were in a sort of funny position because here you were supposed to be going directly to the Board but over here it wasn't likely that I was going to do very much to upset the president as long as my check came from his office. It was sort of a strange situation, but I didn't have too many problems with it.
Williams: So did you work with the president on the branch colleges? Is that the way it turned out?

Herrmann: Not too much. There was some sort of thing, and I guess this developed before I ever took over. There was supposed to be supervision of the academic program by the academic people at William and Mary, which has I think had both good and bad results. Good in that I think it did sort of help improve the quality, but less fortunate they tried to make from those two branches little William and Mary's, and they just weren't that kind of institution. It had some unfortunate circumstances to it.

Williams: You mean they tried to make them small selective schools as well rather than service institutions?

Herrmann: And they wanted every course to be just like the course at William and Mary -- no other courses. I think this limited them pretty drastically.

Williams: And that was the faculty here that wanted them that way?

Herrmann: I once read some author that was writing about two-year colleges, and his statement was that trying to operate like that was like trying to market the front half of the Cadillac. That was sort of what we were doing.

I think much more so than Christopher Newport and largely through Colonel Carson's efforts, he did manage to get in some terminal programs for people that weren't interested in transferring to a four-year school. Of course the whole setup was different. There's such a tremendous population potential in Newport News - Hampton that Christopher Newport had a built-in student population down there, particularly in the
'50s and '60s when there was pressure for college opportunities anyhow, while in the Petersburg-Hopewell area that wasn't necessarily true. There wasn't that much population.

Williams: How much weight would you assign to Scotty Cunningham's leadership at Christopher Newport, because he seemed to be a rather aggressive, dynamic sort?

Herrmann: Well, I found the most interesting thing in working with them, and I've always considered myself sort of a student of higher education but interested in watching it grow. I think that both Cunningham and Carson did a heck of a job in the setting in which they found themselves, and yet approached their work from a completely different view. Scotty worked almost entirely through the power structure; he worked with the service clubs, the country clubs, and the city governments and that kind of thing, but he sold the power structure from the area, the whole lot of socializing and that sort of thing, but he sold the power structure from the area they built buildings for him; they bought land for him; they did all sorts of things for him. They supported the school. I wouldn't say that the population of the area was that much behind the school.

Carson on the other hand worked through the public schools; he worked with the service clubs, too, but had the common people's approach. Probably although there wasn't nearly the structure over there, he had stronger support from a larger percentage of the population than Scotty did. So it was interesting
to watch how they both operated. I don't suppose Scotty Cunningham was ever in a public school in Newport News or Hampton. He just didn't approach it from that angle.

And yet if you had switched the two, I don't think either one of them would have been very successful. It was just a fortunate choice. I don't know what's going to happen to Richard Bland. I guess nobody does because of that court thing hanging over its head.

Williams: And Christopher Newport looks like it has already moved into an independent status. Was I correct in sensing that the Board was somewhat reluctant to let Christopher Newport go too far too fast? This would have been while you were still concerned with the branches. Did you ever get that impression?

Herrmann: I think there was a certain amount of concern that with the population potential on the lower peninsula that there was a possibility that the "tail might get to wagging the dog". I don't know that that was a general concern, but I think that some people did have those apprehensions. You don't combine that with the fact that William and Mary didn't want to grow and in fact very definitely resisted any move, and that made that even more possible I think than it might have otherwise been. You can say "Well nobody would go to Christopher Newport if they could go to William and Mary." Well, I don't know whether that's true or not, but if William and Mary turns them all away and they go to Christopher Newport, they're still down there.
Williams: From that position that you had, how would you say that being a branch of William and Mary helped those two schools more than being a branch of say V.P.I. or anybody else? Was there any status from being a branch of William and Mary that accrued to it?

Herrmann: I think undoubtably there is. Now whether there would have been as good to be a branch of U.V.A. or V.P.I. that would be arguable but at least in the beginning years, even now the name William and Mary carries a whole lot of prestige. Some of it rubbed off. There's no question about it. Of course there are also disadvantages; there are inhibitions that result from it, and whether enough rubs off to be worthwhile you can get some very strong arguments started, depending on who you talk to. Even if you go to a place like one of the branches there'll be a difference of opinion among the faculty and staff of the branch on what good it does to be a part of William and Mary, whether the good more than compensates for the restrictions that are placed on them as a result.

Old Dean Woodbridge of the law school, whenever we asked him about something he'd say, "Well, that is a point about which reasonable men might differ." That I think would be true in this case as well. Particularly in their formative years I don't think there was any question. Whether Christopher Newport needs William and Mary any longer -- I under-
stand that was one of the things that was discussed at considerable length in the Board and other places, and a decision was finally made to split them off with an independent Board. And I imagine there was a definite difference of opinion at that time.

Williams: Well, how has having branches helped William and Mary then would you say, conversely? or has it? For example, is there any great "pull" that Newport News and Petersburg have in the General Assembly that would help at appropriations time or anything of that nature, has expanded the concept of William and Mary's service?

Herrmann: That really is one about which reasonable men might differ! This is the thing that has followed me all the way through my whole tenure at William and Mary. I've said on a number of occasions, and it's fairly accurate, that I've made a career out of unpopular causes at William and Mary. So for that reason I've been sort of in the middle of it the whole way.

Let's take a perfect example of this: VARC. VARC was developed with great hopes and great expectations. Now you can say that VARC was oversold by the people that started it; maybe that's true, but the fact remains that NASA particularly, the military, and the whole power structure of Newport News and Hampton had great expectations for VARC. They never were developed, and I don't think there is any question that William and Mary is partially, not entirely but partially, responsible for the fact that it didn't develop. Now normally you would
say that having VARC down there as a part of William and Mary should get great support from the members of the General Assembly. Unfortunately it did the opposite! I think to a certain extent with certain people the same thing happened with the branches. I wouldn't want to point fingers unless I could point them accurately, and I don't know really whether there are any fingers to point. It was no body's fault in particular, but I think the result was pretty unfortunate. Some tremendous opportunities were just wasted! Now how much that hurt William and Mary over the long would be pretty hard to say, but we certainly lost a lot of support, and I don't know that that is good. It certainly isn't good. How bad it is, is hard to evaluate. Particularly in connection with VARC, I think, more than other two branches, some very influential people got very very unhappy with William and Mary. How much good the branches did William and Mary would be pretty hard to evaluate. I think in the Petersburg-Hopewell area in particular probably it did us quite a bit of good. Some of that I'm afraid is going to have to be balanced against what happened when they took out continuing studies. So I think your attitude towards this, and I'll admit to a pretty strong bias, depends on how important you think these reactions of the general public in the area is to William and Mary. Some people don't seem to think it makes any difference, and some of us think it makes all the difference. Probably somewhere in the middle is the more accurate evaluation. That might be good place to break over
to continuing studies which had developed with a lot of the same kinds of problems.

We were trying to meet the needs of the military, and I think we did a pretty good job, but you see we didn't (and I make no apologies for it) insist that they be 1200 college boards and be in the upper five percent of their class in order to enroll, and so the attitude of the faculty that there was no quality and that sort of thing. So again we did what we felt we needed to do in order to do the job. And I think if you go out now and try to get an evaluation of the off-campus part of continuing studies, you'll find out that everybody loved us except the people on our own campus. This was sort of disheartening because the people who should have been supporting you were the only ones who were giving you trouble. But in any case we developed to the point where we had something over 10,000 course registrations a year off-campus. Again, very similar to what we went through back with the school of education and the school of business, just couldn't get the job done because of the kinds of requirements that might have been fine for resident students on the campus but just didn't work off-campus. What I tried to sell (and I still think it was sound) was that if the campus people—particularly arts and sciences, but not entirely—would allow us to meet the needs for public service, then they could do anything they wanted to with the resident people on campus, and thereby the two of us could work parallel; we wouldn't get
in each other's way, and the whole program would be much stronger and the institution would be much stronger. They wouldn't buy it! The reason that they gave—and I suppose this was their idea—was that we were destroying the quality of the William and Mary degree. We weren't doing a thing to the Bachelor of Arts and the Bachelor of Science; we wanted no part of it. They wouldn't let us do anything else. "So we went to Dr. Paschall and Dr. Jones, Academic vice-president, to set up our own degree program and I think they were about to buy them again with about the same attitude that we encountered years back in connection with education, not that they were widely enthralastic about having a lot more degree programs but rather that if we're going to get the job done that would look like the only way to do it.

Of course about that time Dr. Jones retired, Dr. Paschall left, and brought in new people and about the first thing they did was to do away with it. I think the reverberation are still shaking through Eastern Virginia. It's been done and if President Graves and Dr. Healy didn't want to buy a separate degree and make it a full-fledged, effective program, then they did the right thing. If there is one thing I've found over all those years, there is no use trying to run a program with a noose around its neck all the time, and that was essentially the way we operated for years. It's that same thing we were talking about before; we try to meet the needs of the military, but all we do is make
them unhappy because we can't do what we need to do. because
the people up here wouldn't let us. We try to meet the needs
of the public school people -- we can't do it 'cause our hands
are tied. So instead of developing for the college, good pub-

clic relations and good public support all we get is resent-

ment, and it's no good! Now they appreciated my staff. I was
fortunate to have the best damn staff in the world. I
appreciated what we did for them and what we tried to do was improve
the quality of the program that we had.

They were great friends of ours but not of the college and I
think somewhere -- probably over in the president's office if
they haven't thrown them away -- there are file cabinets
support of that argument. The public school people,
the military were up here once a month meeting with the
president, trying to get something going and they were shot
down every time. I remember the attitude of the leaders of
NASA. They got bitter and that was so unfortunate and so un-
necessary. A tremendous opportunity and we just blew it!

Williams: So as you see it, the effect of the abolition of continuing
studies has been wholly a negative one?

Herrmann: I think so. Basically the faculty and more specifically the
arts and sciences faculty, which makes up most of the total,
and some members of the Board of Visitors particularly in
the past, see William and Mary and the future.
role of William and Mary as this small, highly selective, prestigious, elite institution of arts and sciences. The people of eastern Virginia don't necessarily see it that way. They see William and Mary as a public institution that ought to be meeting their educational needs.

Williams: Let me ask you how were the problems of VARC and extension and summer school and evening college similar enough to put them under the one office that was yours?

Herrmann: When I came to William and Mary, almost literally and understand before I came it had been even more so, we ran a ten-month school and a two-month school. When I became director of summer session which was my first one, I was president, dean, and bursar. I ran the summer session lock, stock, and barrel. And then somebody else ran it from September to June, so that in effect what developed into the school of continuing studies was sort of everything that wasn't directly involved in that September to June session. So that's kinda how summer and evening and extension... some of it was happenstance. When I came, Dr. Oliver was head of summer session and head of the education department. Well then he got some other assignments about the end of the athletic scandals and was shoved into the breach as an interim director of athletics and during that time they brought in Ken Cleton came in first and then he went to Michigan and that's when I came into summer school.
Then Dr. Oliver had what there was left — mainly in the school of education of the extension off-campus and he sort of ran that. Then when he left, I inherited all of this. It was sort of a thing that grew like Topsy as much as anything, but there was a certain amount of logic to it, too, in that it was all of these other things other than the regular academic year.

Then the VARC thing — that was sort of an accident. They had had Dr. MacFarlane, and he went up north. It had been a triumvirate of VP.I., U.Va., and William and Mary, and then William and Mary took it over. At that time they had to have somebody to be the director, and I guess I was handy. But that was a situation where they needed somebody to fill a slot, and they shoved me into it. We knew it was not really a part of the continuing studies program as the rest of it was; it was sort of an adjunct.

(Talks about was it Paul Clem who was liason or Jack Willis who was liason for the branch colleges)

That VARC thing was relatively short-lived and really wasn't a part of the rest of it.

Williams:

Was the role that IARC now plays, was that what was contemplated when you first took over? Would you characterize what you did as a holding pattern?
Herrmann: I don't think so. I don't know that VARC necessarily was in a holding pattern. I think my role in it developed because they needed someone rather quickly and I was shoved into the breach for awhile. That was interesting. The point I'm trying to make is that I think evening college, summer session, and extension and the rest of them had a cohesiveness. They were the same kind of business, VARC sort of sat over here, it really never was a part of them. It was just something else that we did.

Williams: Now you said you had been a champion of unpopular causes.

Has your work in the institutional research been the same?

Herrmann: Only one thing. I never made so many enemies in all my life as I did in one little aspect of that. As part of being Director of Institutional research I was also involved as an ex-officio member-- not even an official member of the committee-- on this space utilization committee. This was when Mr. Lowance was executive vice-president, and this was reporting to him. It was during that period that we developed the long-range space utilization plan. So we'd go to the meeting, and they'd say "Well, how many square feet of space does the Sanskrit department have in it," and so somebody would have to go find out. "What are they doing with those rooms down along that hall?"

Well, you know these vice-presidents aren't going over and look. I was the one that they saw, so everything that was unfortunate about that whole thing was blamed on me, a lot of people got pretty upset because they had to move into smaller quarters. Boy, they were
mad at me! And all I was was the leg man for the committee.

Aside from that I don't think that I developed any enemies in institutional research. However, I think there are people who no matter who is in that job or related jobs see that kind of activity as a threat and a danger and they are afraid of it. But there's no question that there's something happening that is going to continue and is going to get stronger.

And that is, that more and more the decisions about William and Mary and any other state institution are going to be made in Richmond and Washington, not on the campus.

And of course, the typical academician thinks that faculty ought to run the institution. They are also very jealous, and to a certain extent fearful, of academic freedom and all that sort of thing. They see this as a threat, and to a certain extent, they have some reason for it. However, I maintain they could take that same thing and use it tremendously for their advantage if they just changed their attitude a little bit. Instead of fighting it, adopt it to their own advantage. But there is a fear, a concern, I think all through higher education, not just William and Mary. But let's face it! There's continuing increase in controls, primarily within state agencies because the federal control, in many ways, is related primarily research grants. Now of course in some institutions that's what they love on! But at a place like William and Mary,
that makes relatively small business. But it's the state and of course at William and Mary that makes it a little tough.

One thing that the people that set up all these types of formulas and ratios that they use to distribute support and funding for various institutions— one thing they are coming to recognize more and more is that they were all set up to work very well as long as the institution was growing. You get more students, you get more space. You get more space, you get more money, you get more money...

but there is nothing to fix it when you get less students and money except that you just go down hill. Your costs are not necessarily less just because you have fewer students any more than they would necessarily more when we had more students but the formula made it real nice for us. There are going to be a lot of problems down there.

Now you take William and Mary, for example, who has a mandated steady state over a period of years. I was needing a friend of mine on the State Council staff one day that he didn't give us enough something and I was just kidding him — we kidded like this for years but that particular day somebody had been on his back or something and he didn't feel like kidding. He turned around and he looked me right in the eye and he said: "Damn it Don, you how it works as well as I do." He said: "You get money from students, more money for more students and you turned around and lost all." But he said it you know.
well if you don't take more students, you don't get any more money and it's about that simple.

Williams: Which goes back to the selectivity that you began talking about.

Herrmann: And of course one of the big problems (and they recognize this but don't know what to do about it) you also got more buildings for more students. Well now we have two kinds of things; it's bad at William and Mary, where we just say we're not going to grow any because we don't get any more buildings, but also at places like William and Mary and the University of Virginia where we've been here for generations, if you don't get any more students and therefore justify any more buildings, when in the world do you get any money to fix up your old buildings or to remodel them for a different use or that type of thing? There's no way! Somebody is going to have to come up with some sort of plan to be able to do that. We don't have it now. You can explain to the legislature that you need another building because you have a thousand or five hundred more students, but when you start telling them that we used to use this as a chemistry building, but now we don't need it for that any more and we'd like to make a geology building out of it something, it's tough. We don't have any money.

And of course in Virginia and I think you could say pretty much the whole country, this whole business of institutional research I think developed primarily to meet the needs or demands of all these state and federal agencies who asks for
more complex in frequent reports of increasing numbers of kinds. So finally they just developed an office primarily to take care of this, although that's not the classic definition of institutional research. I think it was about 1972, somewhere about then, when we had the first meeting of institutional research people in Virginia and every one of the state schools was represented. The person who had been there the longest had been there less than five years, so that basically within a five-year period every school in the state developed such an office. I don't think there was any copying in it; they just realized there was a need for it. Now, every year it is getting more and more complex. Now, with this costing program on one hand, program budgeting on the other, it's going to get more and more so.

And then also this is related but I don't think the same; the General Assembly became more and more interested in the financial aspects of the support of higher education, and they're asking a lot of very pointed questions. They're going to expect the institutions to have answers. I guess we'd better have those answers if we want any money! Before the amount of money William and Mary or the University of V.P.I. or Christopher Newport, for that matter, depended on how well you could sell your case to the General Assembly when it met, but now more and more this JLARC and all these various commissions of the state government go around and investigate and come up sometimes with accurate data and sometimes without. It can really make it difficult. I think more and more we're going to need better data
(I don't know whether we're going to get it or not. That is if we want to protect our own interest.

The thing I think that concerns me a little (and that's probably as big an understatement as has ever been made) is one thing I've consistently tried to do is to do my job as I saw it and as it was assigned to me to do. As old Dean Woodbridge said, there were matters about which reasonable men might differ, but now I've been out of continuing education for about five years at least -- as long as president Graves has been here -- and it seems as though there are still some people who are carrying grudges and will carry them to their grave, and I hate that. As far as I'm concerned when a meeting is over we left it in the meeting. It doesn't seem like it's going to be that way, so I might as well accept it I guess. There's nothing I can do about it now. It doesn't seem to me like a very professional attitude, but that's looking at it from my side.

Williams: Let me thank you for all your impressions and your views. You were kind enough to give your viewpoint.