

UNCG CENTENNIAL ORAL HISTORY PROJECT COLLECTION

INTERVIEWEE: Tommie Lou Smith

INTERVIEWER: William Link

DATE: September 18, 1990

WL: I'd like to start with memories that you might have had when you first came to campus. Do you remember the first time you came to Woman's College [of the University of North Carolina] campus? What sorts of first impressions you might have had when you first arrived? What kind of place was it? Under what circumstances did you arrive?

TS: I arrived as an instructor in 1946. I had interviewed off campus for the position which I was going to fulfill. It was not my first teaching job. I had taught at two other colleges before I came here. So it wasn't any tremendous impression that the Woman's College made on me. It was a very nice college, with very nice young ladies running around. The other colleges where I had taught had been coeducational.

WL: Oh, I see. Where did you come from originally?

TS: I taught at Campbell College [Buies Creek, North Carolina], and I taught at East Carolina [University, Greenville, North Carolina], before I came here.

WL: Are you a North Carolinian originally?

TS: Yes. And I did my undergraduate work at East Carolina.

WL: I see.

TS: So I went back there after having taught at Campbell, and then came here from East Carolina.

WL: I see.

TS: And I had interviewed during the summer, and then I came to work in September. And it was a very friendly faculty. Nice pleasant young ladies.

WL: Had there been a—what kind of reputation did Woman's College have before you came? Did you have any preconceived notions?

TS: Yes, oh yes, Woman's College had an outstanding reputation. It was supposed to be one of the best academic schools in the area. And I was well aware of this.

WL: What department were you with?

TS: I was in business education, which is now part of the School of Business [and Economics].

WL: Tell me about that department—how large your department was.

TS: Oh, gosh. It was, percentage wise, quite a large department at the time. In 1946 there weren't more than 2,500 students. And I don't recall exactly how many students we had in our department, but it was a good-sized department with a faculty at that time of probably ten, twelve people. And I was working in the teacher education end of the program.

WL: Did that involve teaching high school teachers?

TS: Preparing our students to teach in high school, yes.

WL: I see. To teach subjects, such as?

TS: Such as the business subjects in high school. At that time it would have been shorthand, typing, bookkeeping, basic business. [pause] Some schools taught business law. Some taught business communications.

WL: What kind of—how would you describe the faculty, in a little bit more detail, that you found in the late 1940s?

TS: Mostly females. In my department a lot of women, and there were a lot of women in the faculty of other departments also. How would I describe them? [pause] The ones with whom I came in contact with were very friendly and supportive. And [pause] they very much lived their profession. I was different from most of them, in that I had a boyfriend and was going to get married. And most of them did not seem to have that. So—

WL: There were a good number of unmarried women?

TS: A very great number of unmarried women. Correct.

WL: Did you find it, as a young person, a young faculty member—was it easy to break into the campus life? Did you find fellow faculty people accommodating and helpful? How did you find—did they greet younger people and try to bring them along? Mentor them, perhaps?

TS: I think so. I think they wanted very much to do whatever they could with a very young faculty member. To help them understand the politics of the campus, and the relation of the faculty to the students. Yes, it was a good relationship.

WL: How would you describe—you mentioned the politics of the campus—how would you

describe the way governance worked in those days, in the 1940s? There were strong faculty committees, I gather [from] talking to other people; faculty tended to be very much involved in administration? Was that accurate?

TS: Oh yes. It was a self-governing faculty. [pause] I did not get very involved in faculty governance or in college governance those first two years I was here. I was under 25. If I were to tell you how old I was, you'd know exactly how old I am now. I was very young and did not plan to stay in the profession. So I did not get too involved because I knew I was getting married and would not stay with the university. Fortunately for me, I came back, but those first two years, I did not get too much involved in the university. I got very much involved with the students. The students and I had very good relationships. And made excellent friends.

WL: There was a very strong tradition of faculty commitment to students in those days.

TS: Correct. Correct.

WL: Did you get that feeling as being as a young faculty member?

TS: Oh, yes. Oh. Yes. And this was still during the days of Dr. [Walter Clinton] Jackson. And he was the paternal chancellor. As an illustration, it was mandatory that all faculty members march in Commencement. Our Commencement was held on the same day, and the same hour, that my fiancé's Commencement was being held at Duke [University, Durham, North Carolina]. But I had to march in ours. Dr. Jackson heard of this and excused me. [laugh] And nobody was ever excused from Commencement in those days. But he excused me so that I could go to my future husband's graduation.

WL: He considered that a good enough excuse to—. Faculty also took part in other campus-wide events, such as chapel?

TS: We didn't have chapel at that time. '46, no, we didn't.

WL: You didn't have it?

TS: Not—I don't remember ever—I'm sure we did not have chapel then.

WL: But you'd have these campus-wide convocations, I suppose, that you would attend?

TS: Oh yes. Yes. Right.

WL: Was that considered mandatory too? To attend those?

TS: [pause] I don't remember that many of them, nor their being mandatory. The Commencement was mandatory. Founders Day, I don't even believe that was mandatory. I don't remember any being mandatory.

WL: Not as much as Commencement.

TS: No.

WL: Tell me about Commencement. They used to have it in front of Foust [Building]? Is that right? Where was it held? Aycock [Auditorium]?

TS: By the time—by 1946, it was being held in Aycock.

WL: I see.

TS: Yes.

WL: What sort of rituals—do you remember the ceremony, the kind of customs of Commencement, very well?

TS: Not really. I do remember there was a Daisy Chain. Has anyone else mentioned to you the Daisy Chain?

WL: Yes.

TS: Well, the Daisy Chain was still part of the tradition. The Commencement did not make much of an impression on me. The students did march across the stage to receive their diplomas. That's a little different from what is done now, isn't it?

WL: Yes. Right. They individually received their diplomas. You mentioned Walter Clinton Jackson. What kind of a person—would you tell me a little bit more about his personality? What kind of person he was? How would you describe his style?

TS: Paternal. He was a very gentle and pleasant, paternalistic man. At least to me, he was. Now I'm sure that many of his colleagues who were closer to his own age would not have perceived him in that sense, but that's the way I perceived him.

TS: Did you know him pretty well? Fairly well? I've heard that he was the sort of person who knew everyone on campus.

WL: I'm sure I was just one of those that he knew on campus. No, I was not a close—did not know him very well. Was not close to him.

TS: Who else would you describe as being some of the major figures in administration? This was a period before there was much administration.

TS: That's right.

WL: There are a few people, though, I suppose.

TS: Well, for me, the administration was the department in which I was employed. And Dr.

Jackson. And Vance Littlejohn was the head of my department.

WL: I see.

TS: And so far as I was concerned at that time, that was the administration.

WL: Yes. That was your direct contact with the administration.

TS: Right. Right.

WL: You left, you say, in 19—

TS: Forty-eight.

WL: Forty-eight. And returned in 19—

TS: Fifty-one.

WL: Fifty-one?

TS: Right. '51, '52. I was gone three years.

WL: And in what capacity did you return? The same?

TS: The same capacity that I left.

WL: The same position?

TS: The same position.

WL: Did you notice any changes when you came back in 1952?

TS: I don't remember being impressed with any changes. I remember being impressed with coming back home to the same job I had left. The same people.

WL: Was the department pretty much the same?

TS: Yes. The same faculty. As I recall, I was the only one that had left during that three years. And the person that replaced me, when she left, I came back to the same faculty that we were before.

WL: I see.

TS: There could have been a change, but I don't remember any.

WL: At that point, did you become more involved in—I mean, you were an instructor, but you were now looking toward the future a little bit more?

TS: I was now looking forward to a professional life. And became active on committees, and that's part of your administration, isn't it?

WL: Right.

TS: Still, mostly in the department in which I was teaching. I served on committees, as most faculty did. On one committee or another. [pause] I was a faculty advisor. You've run across that, I'm sure.

WL: Tell me more about that.

TS: Well, it was through my work as a faculty advisor that I really expanded and got to know other faculty outside the department, and eventually became one of the advisors in what was then called the Class Chairman's Office. And at that point, I became active in campus—all-campus committees and campus administration, rather than just departmental affairs.

WL: The Class Chairman's Office. Tell me what that was exactly.

TS: That eventually—that was the beginning of what is now, Dean of Academic Advising.

WL: I see. They would handle some of the functions that generally are handled today by Academic Advising?

TS: Yes.

WL: Coordinate advising?

TS: That's correct.

WL: Was there a registrar in those days?

TS: There was a registrar. Her name was Miss [Mary] Tennant. She was the registrar for many, many years.

WL: But the advising functions were decentralized, more or less, with loose coordination by Class Chairman's Office?

TS: The Class Chairman's Office. There was a class chairman for each class. There was a freshman chairman, class chairman for the freshman class. And she worked with all of the freshmen every year. Her name was Helen Burns. And she worked with the freshmen every year. Helped them get their schedules worked out, take the correct classes, work with them if they were having difficulty in their academic difficulties, patted them on the back if they were doing extra well. It was a close relationship there. Then when the class became sophomores, they picked up a new class chairman, and she worked with them

through their graduation. So the freshman class advisor worked with freshmen only. And then each class picked up a new advisor. I became one of those. And I became one of those after the office of class advisor had become the office of the associate dean. A little bit more structure to it. So that the associate dean, who was [Dr.] Laura Anderton [biology professor, associate dean of the College of Arts & Sciences], by now Mereb Mossman [Sociology and anthropology faculty, dean of instruction, dean of the College, dean of faculty, vice chancellor for academic affairs] is dean of the college, and Laura Anderton is associate dean. And she coordinates all the functions of the class chairmen, plus several other academic functions, such as a reading program, at that time, several different things of this sort. And I became one of the class chairmen. The class chairman was relieved of some teaching responsibility to take on the responsibility of advising a class.

WL: I see. What's going on, perhaps, is a kind of evolution into a different structure from the structure that had been around a long while, really.

TS: Yes. Right.

WL: This was in 1950s or later?

TS: This would be in the late 1950s. Yes. I've forgotten exactly when Laura first went into the office. But I was in the office as a class chairman for, I guess, three years, and replaced Laura as associate dean. Laura went back to full-time teaching, and I took over the office as associate dean. That was in 1963 that that occurred.

WL: That you became associate dean? And then let's just follow forward a little bit. How long did you continue underneath that title as associate dean? Did the position remain associate dean? To what point does it evolve into—?

TS: It evolved into dean of academic advising when I left. I stayed there seven years. And when I left—well, in all that seven years the title of associate dean is inappropriate because now Mereb had become chancellor for academic affairs. And the right title for this particular office never seemed to come about. And when I left and a new person was brought in, that was the logical time to change the title.

WL: I see. So you served as associate dean from 1963 to 1970, after which it became a full-fledged—the position became known as a dean of academic advising.

TS: Right.

WL: In that capacity you must have been very—well, it would be obvious that you would be very intimately associated with the curriculum.

TS: Yes.

WL: You would have to be an expert on the curriculum, really, to handle that.

TS: I was very much involved with it and worked on a multitude of committees—was elected to the curriculum committee; at that time there was an elected committee. Was elected to that committee, when I went back to full time teaching, so I never gave up my involvement with the entire committee—I mean, with the curriculum. The School of Nursing was established while I was in that office. And I was very much involved in that curriculum, in establishing that School.

WL: How would you describe the curriculum—the nature of the curriculum, say, in the '50s? What would an entering freshman, what would they face in terms of their alternatives, their options? How would you describe the curriculum of the 1950s? Fairly structured?

TS: The freshman year—freshman and sophomore years were pretty standard. And then when the students got to be juniors, they began to specialize. But everybody had to take History 101. That was a must. And English 101 and a foreign language and a science or a math. That about does it, doesn't it?

WL: Yes.

TS: That's pretty standard.

WL: Basic core?

TS: Basic core of courses. And we felt this was one of the strengths of our campus because all of the students did have this basic liberal arts beginning, no matter whether they went into—the department of business education, or whatever education they went into, they had the basic liberal arts for two years.

WL: And when does that begin to change? This fairly traditional—traditional isn't the right word—fairly structured curriculum. When does that begin to change? Does it change at all before 1970?

TS: Oh yes. There were major changes during the '60s—as with most of student life, great upheaval during the '60s. There was still—as long I was in administration, there was still basic core requirements, that the history and the English, and the science, and math was classified as a science, and foreign language, there was a great debate over foreign language. The curriculum was—there was great turmoil over the curriculum in the middle of the '60s. And it was loosened. I'm afraid I haven't—I did not think about these questions enough ahead of time to give you really good firm answers, but there was a tremendous curriculum upheaval while I was in the Advising Office. Now, of course, I was on the committee that was involved in that.

WL: Where did this turmoil originate? Was it from faculty, students?

TS: Probably students.

WL: Students.

TS: And we were trying very hard. Let's see, you would be quite aware of the student problems in the '60s. And we tried very—and also, remember that we became coed in '63. So we had a lot of student problems here. Not only the national upheaval, student upheaval, but going from coed—Woman's College to coed.

WL: Did that bring—that brought rather rapid change, did you see?

TS: Very. All of these major changes, not only on our campus, but nationally, very much affected us. And there was a great deal of student involvement in academic affairs as well as social regulations.

WL: Did you find that students were more assertive about what they wanted?

TS: Assertive?

WL: Assertive, yes. Did they, for example, if they were unhappy with their curriculum, were they more willing to tell you about it in the '60s, than they would have been, say, ten years before?

TS: Oh, good heavens yes. Yes. And we had some very bright young people, who had some very definite ideas about what they wanted their education to be like. And some very good ideas. And the faculty and administration listened.

WL: How would you describe, since you've mentioned coeducation, and since you would have been—well, you became associate dean in 1963, that was the year that coeducation officially began.

TS: I took my duties and began my duties the day that we went coed.

WL: July 1963, I guess?

TS: Correct.

WL: How would you describe the impact of coeducation? I gather the first couple of years, there weren't that many men.

TS: There weren't that many men. And everybody tried very hard to make the men feel welcome and part of the campus life. The attitude of students—let me think about that one. [pause] I don't know that the changes that I saw were so much because of us being coed, as just the fact that we had a broader base of personalities than when we were all one sex.

WL: There was greater diversity, different types of students?

TS: Right. [pause]

WL: Do you think that was a good change or a bad change or maybe both?

TS: Oh, I approved. I thought was a good change. A lot of the faculty, a lot of my contemporaries, did not want to see us go coed. And justifiably, we had many strengths, that being a one-sex school developed for us. However, it's always my attitude that it would be better to have the sexes, both sexes, in the student body than to have the seclusion of only one sex.

WL: And you'd always been associated with coeducational institutions, so you were familiar with them, I guess?

TS: Right.

WL: How, as associate dean, did you have to prepare for this big change? Was there much that you had to do, in terms of accommodating coeducation? I suppose the most important things were done in residence life and things of that nature. But as, in terms of advising and in terms of shifting from a women's college to a coeducational institution, did you—?

TS: From the academic point of view, I don't think there was so much of a change. You're advising people.

WL: Yes.

TS: So I never thought of it in that sense.

WL: One of the other big changes of the '60s, I guess, is the increasing presence of black students. Do you—desegregation came officially here in 1955. [Editor's note: the first black students were admitted in fall of 1956]

TS: Yes.

WL: If I'm correct?

TS: I don't remember the exact date, but it was before coeducation, I know.

WL: How much of an impact do you think that had? I wonder if you had any observations about the impact of desegregation and the entrance of black women students on campus.

TS: Again, I think the impact there would have been more social than academic. Of course, everyone—academic or social—was aware of the inclusion of the blacks, as we were aware of the inclusion of the men. I think most of us tried to be color-blind and sex-blind. Just, students are students. And from the academic point of view, let it not make a difference.

WL: Let me ask you about the administration and some of the changes, since in your various

capacities probably had a good bit of contact with the administration at the university and the changing nature of the administration. When you came—let's just perhaps talk about chancellors, to begin with. You served under a number of chancellors, and I wonder if you'd mind saying a little bit more. We started with Jackson. Some of the others that come to mind. See, [Edward Kidder] Graham [Jr.].

TS: Okay. Graham was chancellor—let's see, he was chancellor while I was gone. He was also chancellor one year before I left, I think. I was there for one or two years.

WL: He was chancellor when you came back too? I think he left in '56, or '7?

TS: Okay. I guess he came while I was gone.

WL: Okay. I think that's it. I think he came in '50, '49 or '50. [Editor's Note: Graham's tenure at Woman's College was 1950-1956]

TS: Do you mean my personal opinion of him? Is that what you're asking me?

WL: Well, starting with Graham. The Graham administration was quite controversial. Did that affect you at all? The divisions of the Graham years?

TS: No. I was too green, too inexperienced to be aware of these things. I was in my own little niche. And that's as far as I got, and as far as I wanted to be.

WL: You were able to avoid all that successfully?

TS: Right. Now the group—are you talking about the Jackson? The Graham administration? Oh, I was very much aware of that. [laughs]

WL: The Graham administration.

TS: Yes. I was aware of that controversy.

WL: Most people that I've talked to who were around then found it difficult to avoid that.

TS: Now, you said that earlier the controversy during the Jackson Administration. You didn't mean that, did you?

WL: Did I say Jackson? I'm sorry. I meant the Graham.

TS: Okay. Graham, you meant. Oh, yes. I was very much aware of that and, again, tried to avoid it. It wasn't easy to do. At that time, much of the faculty ate in the home ec[onomics] cafeteria. And we would eat at long tables that would seat eight or ten people. And you just went in and joined whoever you happened to see, that you wanted to visit with for that particular lunch. And Dr. Graham had a great habit of coming and joining those tables too. And they could be interesting lunches.

WL: Somewhat lively, shall we say?

TS: [long pause] Lively? Controversial?

WL: Controversial. I don't want to put words in your mouth.

TS: Yes. For example, during one campaign, I was wearing a campaign button that—for a candidate that Dr. Graham did not like. And the entire lunch hour with about a group of eight or ten people was spent with Dr. Graham telling me why I should not be wearing a campaign button for that particular candidate. That sort of thing. And I'm sure that's just a minor illustration of the sorts of things that happened to us.

WL: He—Graham succeeded in alienating a portion of the faculty, I gather. I mean, as a faculty person, sitting at lunch, and having somebody come and berate them about their button. You're not going to have positive feelings.

TS: Right. After all, you know, this is a free country. You can vote for whoever you choose, and you don't want to not be an underling, put in the position of not being able to argue back with your superior. And that sort of position one would be put in.

WL: Yes.

TS: So those things were not very nice.

WL: I gather the faculty was divided right down the middle? Or at least there were big divisions?

TS: Big divisions. Yes.

WL: Some supporters of Graham, or opponents of Graham?

TS: Now—but when did he leave?

WL: Well, I was trying to remember. I think it was '56 or '57. It may well have been '57. And he left in a cloud, I think, from what I gathered.

TS: Yes, yes. Again, on that particular point, not being politically motivated for or against him, I tried to be in the neutral camp. And it was a lonely place to be.

WL: Yes. Hard to be neutral.

TS: Yes.

WL: What about [Chancellor] Gordon Blackwell? Did he—Gordon Blackwell came after Graham?

TS: He came twice, didn't he?

WL: No. You're thinking of Pierson. W[illiam] W[hatley] Pierson. He served as acting chancellor for a year once, and then another time. Right, sort of, on either end of Blackwell, actually.

TS: Okay. Dr. Blackwell always impressed me as a gentleman, rather remote, so far as I was concerned. I never did get to know him well at all.

WL: Do you think that was true generally?

TS: I don't know. I don't know. I was still very much departmentalized.

WL: Oh, yes.

TS: And I knew faculty in other departments, but I did try to stay out of the politics.

WL: I see. How about [Chancellor] Otis Singletary?

TS: I got to know Dr. Singletary very well. He is the one that appointed me associate dean. And I considered him, both him and Gloria [spouse], good friends. Got to be good friends.

WL: How would you describe his leadership style?

TS: He was—his style was forceful. He had definite opinions and had the strength of personality to carry the day, if he really wanted to. I found him a good leader, an understanding one. One you could talk with, and one that would change his position if he thought it was—if you could convince him that it was desirable.

WL: Accessible? You must have found him accessible?

TS: Very. I did. Yes. I was saddened when he left. I thought it was a great loss.

WL: Was he popular among faculty, generally, do you think?

TS: [pause] I always thought he was. Of course, you remember, I'm in his camp. [laughs] I might not know.

WL: Yes.

TS: But I was definitely in his camp.

WL: And I gather a lot of people was [sic] in his camp?

TS: Yes. Right.

WL: There's no reason why anybody wouldn't tell otherwise now?

TS: I consider that one of our really good periods. And that was the '60s also, remember. And for the '60s to be a good period on a university campus, you've got to have some strong leadership.

WL: Yes. And he was succeeded by [Chancellor James S.] Jim Ferguson?

TS: Correct.

WL: Tell me a little bit about Jim. He was very different from Otis Singletary, wasn't he?

TS: Yes. He was the quiet type. He was able to accomplish very much the same sorts of things that Otis had accomplished, but in such a different way—very quiet, gentle man. [pause] A really fine mind. I think that both of those men had good minds.

WL: And he was equally accessible, do you think?

TS: Very accessible and listened to his council. He organized—well, it sort of happened that those of us in administration, he'd have a staff meeting every week or two, and we finally—he finally started to call us his council. And he went to most of the things that he needed help with in these meetings.

WL: Would you meet regularly?

TS: Yes.

WL: Every once or—

TS: Once every week or two. And he would have his agenda, these little things that are on my mind. And let's—help me resolve them. And if you've got things on your mind that you need help, just bring them up if the time allowed it, and that sort of thing. Very democratic.

WL: Where was your office located, in those days? When you were associate dean? Did it change over the years?

TS: In the Administration Building.

WL: In Foust?

TS: In Foust, yes. I had the—when you went in the front door, the first floor, the wing to the left. Most of that wing was mine. Mereb was in that wing. And the Dean of Women Sadie Dunn [Doxie, Class of 1957] [Editor's Note: Miss Dunn was dean of students], she was in that wing. And then, the rest of it was academic advising.

WL: I see. Since you mentioned Mereb Mossman, she's a person who spans this whole period—

TS: Correct. A very influential person, in the development of the university and an amazing woman. I worked directly under her.

WL: You did?

TS: Yes. And we worked very closely together.

WL: How would you describe her style of leadership? You described Jim Ferguson as being quiet, but effective. And Otis Singletary, as a person who was not quiet at all, I suppose. [laughs]

TS: I hate to say flamboyant, but almost—

WL: Otis Singletary was. Yes.

TS: Yes.

WL: How would you describe Mereb Mossman?

TS: Mereb Mossman had a forcefulness that was very, very difficult, not to carry through, but—she was so forceful that it was very difficult for anyone to deter her from her sight, the way she saw things. [pause] She would listen. And sometimes she would agree and incorporate your thoughts, but if they conflicted in any way with hers, hers were usually successful in being carried out. She was very, very gentle, in a very strong way. She could get across a point in the most genteel way, and then you realize, "Hey, I've been hit." But you might not realize it for several hours.

WL: So very determined and strong?

TS: And capable.

WL: Capable. I gather she worked very long hours, very hard worker.

TS: That university was her life. She worked day and night. Yes.

WL: Did she expect her—the people she worked with to have the same habits?

TS: Well, those of us who worked with her found ourselves working longer hours than most people work. Yes.

WL: As is often the case with people who—

TS: Right. Right. Yes, we worked very hard. Worked hours such as I didn't know anyone was capable and still maintain a home and this sort of thing. But we did.

WL: What sort of physical changes did you notice in the twenty-five or so years that you were there, almost thirty years that you were on campus? Did the campus change much, do you think, in the time you were there?

TS: It did. It changed a great deal. But nothing like it has changed in the past, since I've been gone. The expansion has just been sort of overwhelming to me. I remember when the little house that was the faculty center, when—a lot of the years that I was there, and that was the center of campus life because that was the student union.

WL: What is now the Faculty Center.

TS: I guess it's still the Faculty Center, I'm not sure. [laughs] That was at one time the Soda Shop for the students; it was the center of social life.

WL: I see.

TS: When Elliott Hall was built, of course, that changed that.

WL: Before that, it was—

[End Side A—Begin Side B]

TS: —and the business education department that was later housed in Forney [Building]. We were in Foust, all the way up to the third floor, which I think has now been condemned and nobody can get up there. We had classrooms up there.

WL: You had classrooms up there?

TS: Yes.

WL: Offices, as well? Did you have your offices up there?

TS: Yes.

WL: So Forney was the library, and everything was so close, really, in a way.

TS: Right.

WL: Old McIver, I guess, was right around the corner. The old McIver Building, you remember?

TS: Correct.

WL: You were there when McIver was reconstructed or actually torn down—a better word maybe?

TS: Gosh, I can't even remember old McIver.

WL: Do you remember new McIver going up?

TS: I think new McIver went up during those three years I was not there. During the three years I wasn't there, a great deal of change took place. Walker Avenue was closed off. At one time Walker Avenue was a through street. And there was a bridge across Walker Avenue, so the students could go from one side of the campus over to the other without having to cross the street. And while I was gone, Walker Avenue was blocked off, and construction started expanding the campus across Walker Avenue. And wouldn't that have been when McIver was built? I think that's when it was.

WL: Thereabouts, yes.

TS: So when I came back after three years, there were major changes.

WL: Major physical changes?

TS: Right. And then during the next twenty years, there were additional changes. When you're living with them, when you're living with the changes, they don't have quite the impact as when you go back once every year or two, and say, [gasps] "This building wasn't here last year." Then it has an impact on you.

WL: What would you describe as the biggest changes that took place in your—during your period there at UNCG? How was it most different in 1975, when you retired?

TS: From when I went there?

WL: Yes.

TS: [pause] When I went there, the student body was less than 2,500, all women. When I left, it was over 10,000, pretty evenly divided between men and women. When I went there, it was 2,500 white women. When I left, it was 10,000 white, black, men and women. When I went there, it was a liberal arts college. When I left, it was a university of Colleges and Schools. The [pause]—there're hardly any points that make it seem like the same place, except one or two old buildings—a few old buildings, an entirely different institution.

WL: With different problems?

TS: With different problems, yes.

WL: Did you notice different problems starting to arise in the area of academic advising than

had been the case in the '50s or even in 1963? Having—in other words, having this greater degree of diversity, did that change some of the problems an administrator of academic advising would face?

TS: I'm trying to—there were so many changes—I'm trying to identify in my thought what one or two would be good illustrations. [pause] Curriculum, of course, was a major change. And the development of Schools was a major change. The—when I left, the Advising Office was still responsible for seeing that students met degree requirements, even though a lot of the advising at the upper level had changed to the School itself. Not all of it, but the School itself had the right to say, "We want you to take this or that course." Or something. But the Advising Office was still responsible for seeing that degree requirements were met. And I suppose it became a lot more difficult. [pause] One of the major changes that I've not mentioned is computer. The amount of—the drastic change that the computer brought about, it's sort of overwhelming to look back at it because in the beginning, when I went into the Advising Office, everything was done by hand. And by then our enrollment was much more than 2,500, then. So the volume of work involved there was terrific. And then the computer came along, and it started making its mistakes, instead of our handwritten mistakes, which is a different ball game. I'm assuming that it's now easier, that everybody's learned how to use computers, but I'm not sure. [laughs]

WL: There is still ample opportunity for computer error. There must have been quite a labor to have managed records like that.

TS: Yes.

WL: By hand.

TS: Yes. It was.

WL: But at the same time, I'm sure you managed it quite well. Did you oversee the transfer to computer technology, or was this something that arrived one day on the doorstep?

TS: Oh, it was in process a long time.

WL: Already?

TS: You mean, before I left?

WL: Well, yes. While you were there?

TS: Yes. Oh, yes. It occurred while I was there. The Registrar's Office and the Advising Office worked closely together. Of course, the records that he kept, the Registrar's Office kept, and our records were the same, but arranged in different ways and used for different purposes. It was the Advising Office's responsibility to determine whether or not a student had met degree requirements. [telephone rings] I think that is not true a lot of

places; I think the registrar does that, does it not?

WL: I think that's right. Advising certainly advises them.

TS: And it may have changed at our university, I don't know. Do you?

WL: I'm not sure. I'm not certain about that. I think advising still does a good bit of, you know, for example, degree audits, and that kind of thing. That comes out of academic advising. I'm about ready to conclude. I just wanted to see if there is anything that we've left out that should be included for the record.

TS: I think you've covered it. You've covered that period of time quite well.

[End of Interview]