

UNCG CENTENNIAL ORAL HISTORY PROJECT COLLECTION

INTERVIEWEE: Gail Hennis

INTERVIEWER: William Link

DATE: January 18, 1990

[Begin Side A]

WL: I'd like to start today just by asking you how and what brought you to this institution, when you first arrived and what sort of background you brought with you when you came.

GH: Okay. Well, I was a—did my undergraduate work at Purdue University [West Lafayette, Indiana] and graduated from there in 1943. I taught in high school in Indiana for two years, then went to the University of Iowa [Iowa City, Iowa] as an instructor and working on my master's degree. I completed my master's degree in '47, stayed on and started work on my doctorate. But they had a plan for rotation of instructors on a three-year basis, so I left there and went to Wellesley College [Wellesley, Massachusetts] and taught at Wellesley for two years from '48 to '50. And while I was at Wellesley, I met a UNCG [The University of North Carolina at Greensboro] alum who was working on her master's at Wellesley. And there were a group of young instructors there who became good friends. She completed her master's and returned to Greensboro to the Woman's College [of the University of North Carolina] on the faculty. And after about a year she said, "Why don't you think about coming South?" So there was a vacancy that interested me in the fall of '50, and I applied for it and got the position. And I was interested because it was a dual position in the School of Education and in physical education, teaching half day at Curry School [elementary/high school on campus], which was the university laboratory, a college laboratory school, and the other half tied in with the physical education department. And I was also interested because there was an opportunity to begin a graduate program in physical education under the umbrella of the MEd [master of education] degree, which was the only way that we could move at that time. So those were the things that interested me.

I had never been in the South really, and I thought it would be an interesting experience being a Midwesterner who had gone to New England and came south. And the physical education department at the Woman's College was recognized nationally. That was also a big deal in college. Their graduates were placed, even with just bachelor's degrees, in colleges up and down the East Coast into the Midwest. Mary Channing Coleman, who had been the head of the physical education department for many years, had been a national leader and was one of the outstanding women physical

education people in the country. So she had really established a very strong department here, and so that was my real reason for making this choice.

WL: Who were some of the other people in the department that—?

GH: Well, Ethel Lawther [1989 Honorary degree] was at that time head of the department. Ellen Griffin, who was a UNCG alum [Class of 1940], was on the faculty; Marjorie Leonard [Class of 1939], Dorothy Davis. Virginia Moomaw was in dance within the department. And let's see, Rita Burdett, Mary Elizabeth Van Dyke [Class of 1947], who was the one that really sold me on the idea that this might be a good place to come, and there were probably one or two others. Oh, Jeannette Potter, I think, in the adaptive area.

WL: What kind of a feeling did the department have when you first came? Was it a harmonious department?

GH: Yes. I think that for most of the years I was there it was really a very harmonious department. I think part of it was that there was a pride in the accomplishments of the department, and any disagreements you had were going to be resolved because we were always going to present a united front—whether that's part of the whole team play ethic I don't know, but it may have been. Probably another factor was there were two or three people of one age group, and then everybody else was the same age. And whether or not that made a difference, I don't know. Possible.

WL: Sort of homogenous that way, so you didn't have differences that you might have with—age differences—

GH: Right. And I think the kinds of backgrounds, educational backgrounds we had had, made us much more homogenous grouping. I think that the emphasis at the university on teaching, working with students was something that had attracted this group.

WL: Very committed to students.

GH: Yes.

WL: Undergraduates.

GH: Right, right. And so that you had a different kind of atmosphere. I think the fact that it was a women's college, you had something of homogenous group of students actually. They were some of the best North Carolinian women students, and this institution drew from the whole eastern seaboard as far as its student population was concerned. Because at that time it was, I think, either the largest or the second largest women's college in the country.

WL: Period. Public or private.

GH: Right.

WL: As a public university, obviously it would have a larger enrollment.

GH: Yes. So that it—I think the institution attracted individuals whose primary commitment was teaching; they did not have a strong emphasis at all on research or other scholarly endeavors.

WL: Its national reputation was based on teaching also. Is that right?

GH: Yes.

WL: That seems to be a constant all through the—well, the last half century here.

GH: That's right.

WL: National recognition in the department here, physical education department. And that in the '50s was based on undergraduate and the graduates it send out as well as sort of ambassadors?

GH: Yes, they were. And that's why we had students coming from all over the country because we had alumni placed out all over the country. And I think that's what made our graduate program take off too, because alumni—we had some alumni return, but alumni sent their students here for graduate work. Then we started our master's programs.

WL: Sort of a network—

GH: Yes. It really was a network that recruited for you.

WL: Was the faculty here—was there a connection in terms of graduates from this institution that came back to teach or were they from—Midwesterners like yourself or were they mixed?

GH: It was a combination. It was a mix really because there were always alumni on the faculty. And we also had—well, I guess I would I'd say that there had also been a network of the woman in physical education who had all been students and their connection was Wellesley College because Wellesley was one of the first really strong women's graduate programs. And that network kept people coming back here. I was an undergraduate and at—my head of department was a Wellesley graduate where I went from. She was influential in my going to Iowa for there was another Wellesley graduate was the head of the department. That person had been a friend of Mary Channing Coleman's. See, it was that sort of networking that really supplied the faculty because they didn't have all the affirmative action bit, so they would just get on the telephone to one of their friends and say, "I need a good person in this area. Who would you recommend?" And they just would call you in and say, "I think this is a good place for you to go." And so it worked that way. It was—the telephoning was how you got your faculty.

- WL: What—there significant numbers of undergraduates in the program also, weren't there? Was this one of the larger programs in the institution?
- GH: Yes. Home economics and areas in home economics were probably larger, but, yes, it was a large group. We would have—which doesn't seem so large now—but out of a student population of under three thousand, we would usually have thirty entering freshmen in a class. Sometimes it would be as high as fifty. I don't think we had any—maybe one class of forty that graduated, but we started out with big classes.
- WL: What sort of general impressions did you have when you first got here from the Midwest and North?
- GH: Well, it was an institution that I found a very comfortable institution. I received my appointment from Dr. [Walter Clinton] Jackson [chancellor], but when I arrived here, Edward Kidder Graham [Jr.] was the—had also just arrived as the chancellor. It was a campus that I enjoyed. The faculty I met—it was, you were—it was small enough that you could get acquainted with cross-disciplines—which I like that.
- WL: Where would faculty interact? You mentioned the Home Economics Cafeteria; is that a place where people met?
- GH: Yes. People met there for lunch, but a lot of the young instructors would—we would do, participate, in recreation activities together. We would meet in our apartments, so that you had a nucleus. I mean someone from music, School of Education, physical education, history, we had—there were a group that were friends, and so that that gave us a chance to interact. And I had liked that very much. There was no real center, so that you had to make your own meeting spots and form your own groups actually. I think it was also an institution that—there were large numbers of women faculty. There were women faculty in leadership roles as department heads. I think for someone who was new in higher education or relatively new this was important in terms of the kind of role models that you had, so you saw yourself being able to advance if you wished.
- WL: There was a strong faculty leadership here too, wasn't there?
- GH: Yes. There was. And there was great involvement and, particularly in physical education, with the faculty at state, regional and national levels, and we were encouraged to participate in national organizations. No financial incentive at all, but time and recognition was given to that kind of participation. And that was also, I think, one of the things—one of our greatest recruiters because we met professional colleagues at meetings, and as you gain their respect then this was a spot that they encouraged their students to come to. So we were in a good position, I think, to start a graduate program because we had that kind of—another kind of networking from what had been younger faculty that had sort of grown up here.
- WL: What were some of the characteristics of, generally speaking, of student life in the 1950s?

You've already mentioned that as a preeminent women's college in the region and also the nation. What were some of the characteristics in the way students lived that were different?

GH: Well, I think that it was primarily a residential college, so that I would say probably 80 to 90 percent of the students lived on campus, so that makes for a very different kind of situation because you have the campus then being the center of all student life really. You—I think it's so much different when you have groups that are scattered. They come here for class, they depart and they do not have the same kind of a feeling for the institution that the students in the '50s had. There were close; I think for the most part close-knit groups. You had strong class orientation in the freshmen, sophomore, junior, senior class. There were many things that drew students together—first of all, required chapels [laughs], assemblies and things of that sort that they had to participate in. But I think there were not probably the other kinds of distractions. Distractions came on the weekends when either the men from the various college campuses arrived or the women went to their campuses. But you still had a large nucleus that was here for over weekends. There was strong student organizations and opportunities for the development of leadership among those students. Strong student government. There was close working relationship between student and faculty; the faculty serving as advisors to student organizations. And I think it was a kind of situation where the students appreciated and wanted that kind of support from faculty, so there was a great deal of interaction then among students and faculty outside of the classroom.

WL: Did faculty participate in campus activities much more than they might today?

GH: Yes, yes.

WL: For example?

GH: Well, to be an advisor of the student legislature, for example. The faculty—I mean, they were elected by the students to these positions, and I think most faculty considered it not a chore, but an honor that students wanted them to participate. I mean—the Media Board, for example. Well, I guess the Media Board came later, but there was always advisors to the student newspaper, yet there was not a feeling, I think, among the students that this was in any way someone clamping down on them. It was someone that was there to help them. So that it was that kind of collegial atmosphere.

Of course, as you know, in the mid '50s we did have some divisiveness as far as the faculty was concerned; it was frequently referred to as the "Graham Episode." And it was—that made for an interesting time for people in the higher education circles here. It was a time—I think there was, nationally, interest in curriculum, college curriculum and some changing. I think that was the real basis for disagreement among faculty with many of the older faculty being—wanting traditional—to continue with the traditional pattern that they had established and programs that they had developed. And you had a chancellor that came in with some very different ideas. He was—I think saw the Harvard [University, Cambridge, Massachusetts] general education pattern as a model.

WL: How did that differ from the, what Woman's College had had?

GH: Well, I think Woman's College had had a very traditional program of a major—you had, yes, a nucleus of liberal arts, but in—. Departments were very protective of their territory and their requirements and to look at a broader spectrum where something like a course in Western Civilization would be something that crossed disciplines. I don't know whether it was thought of as threatening or what, but they were not overly interested, I think, in the program. And Dr. Graham, I think, was not the most diplomatic individual.

WL: How so?

GH: Well, if he wanted something, he was going to plow right on; he was a very informal man. I think he horrified them initially when he would come to faculty meetings with his pipe. He might sit up at the table and he might have his feet on the table or he might not. Or he might parade up and down smoking his pipe during a faculty meeting. He pushed; he was not politically astute. He didn't try to win over the opposition; he just was determined to go regardless. I always felt that maybe part of his problem—he might have been more successful if he'd been a foot taller. He was a short guy, but was cocky as all get out. Very bright. And he probably was just ahead of his time here in terms of programming and in curriculum revision. But—

WL: In most institutions curricular affairs have always crucially been faculty—have been a faculty concern, so in a sense he was violating that.

GH: Well, not really because he had faculty that were very supportive.

WL: Such as? Who would be some of the people?

GH: Well, Mark Friedlaender in English. I think Gregory Ivy in art. Lyda Gordon Shivers in sociology.

WL: These would be people who were—

GH: They were department heads.

WL: —department heads who wanted things to change a little bit maybe?

GH: Well, no, not necessarily that they were for change, but they saw this a way that the institution should go and felt that it—I think that it was forward looking. But—as far as I were concerned, they were some of the brightest faculty members which made—had probably influenced my thinking more to be favorable to the directions that he was going. The thing that you couldn't quite understand was why he pushed like he did.

WL: So he had, perhaps, a good idea that he—his style, it became a question of style?

GH: I think so.

WL: As a young instructor, how were you able to handle this very increasingly polarized situation? Were you in the—were you about to receive your doctorate at that point or—?

GH: It seems like about '55—yeah, mid '50s—about the time he left, I guess. Well, you found it sounds amusing in one way that people would get so polarized. I think there were a group of us that still felt that his ideas were right, and we couldn't understand why you couldn't deal with ideas rather than be so involved with personalities and that concerns you, I think. But the one thing that you learned was just to—in some groups just not to discuss. And you tended to polarize a little bit too, so that most of my friends on the faculty, we had like ideas. We weren't in a position to express them much, and we didn't. We might in our own groups, but not in as far as the general faculty was concerned.

WL: So you had to stay discreet?

GH: That's right. And you tried to do that.

WL: Tell me a little bit more about the people who were against Graham, his main opponents?

GH: Well, there were some very strong faculty members. Let's see—Dr. Barton; Helen Barton was head of mathematics and was a woman you had to respect. She was an excellent department head; she was a strong woman leader, so that, yes, she is one. Let's see, Dr. [Leonard B.] Hurley, who was head of economics. I think it was economics. [Ed. note: Dr. Hurley was a member of the English department faculty.]

[recording paused]

GH: Let me think who else. Mereb Mossman [sociology and anthropology faculty, dean of instruction, dean of the college, dean of faculty, vice chancellor for academic affairs]—she was—

WL: She had to play it the right way I suppose. She was technically an aide of Graham, wasn't she?

GH: Yes, she was. I can't remember what her title was at that point. Dean of instruction, right. Who else? Shafts—Dr. [Archie] Shaftsbury in biology. I would say a lot of department heads. And these were people who had been at this institution, many of them twenty, thirty years and had been faculty leaders. And it—I think it didn't set well to have somebody come in as a chancellor that was probably—he was considerably younger than many of these individuals, had much less experience in higher education and come in and just sort of plow through. And they had been used to a chancellor that consulted a great deal more.

WL: How did—what was the tradition of faculty governance before the time of Graham? Was—faculty meetings—I guess they were pretty important?

GH: Yes. Yes. And it was total faculty—

WL: And everybody came to the faculty meetings?

GH: Not like they did during the Graham episode! [laughs] I don't know—well, they did. But I don't really know that I recall too much.

WL: But there was a tradition of faculty—?

GH: Yes, of faculty involvement. And I think that department heads were strong. You had a dean of instruction; you did not have—you had a School of Music and a School of Education, a School of Home Economics. Period. And then they were not really much different than department heads in terms of the university's function.

WL: If there had been a poll of the faculty during the Graham episode, do you think most faculty were against him? I suppose this changes every time. Perhaps by the end—in other words, is there a large amount of significant majority opposition?

GH: I don't know. I think it was hard to tell. The antis were much more vocal, which is normally the case. Pros go along and do their thing; it's the antis that make the noise and so it's very difficult to tell. And I really wouldn't want to predict.

WL: Let's talk a little bit about some of the changes that are coming to Woman's College in the 1950s. Are there any male students in the '50s? Do you recall?

GH: Let's see—yes, we had some male students in graduate—in some of the graduate programs. There were male students in summer school, but not—I don't think they were undergraduates during the academic year.

WL: So male students could have come through the back door and would take [an] individual class?

GH: They would take classes in summer school. Very frequently there were large numbers of male students there. At the graduate program—most of those programs were in the '50s were in education; it was the master's in education.

WL: Were they in degree programs or—?

GH: Yes, they were. There was—let's see, the MFA [master of fine arts] program came in around '48 or '49, and there were master's programs in home economics. But the—everything—music—but everything else I think at that point came through the master in education degree. And I don't know when the Master of Arts in teaching came in because we had that for a bit before there became individual programs. But you're beginning to see a change in terms of programs trying to evolve at the master's level in the graduate school.

- WL: As early as—we're talking about the '50s here—
- GH: Yes, because, you see, your MFA was a very strong program during the '50s, and that brought a lot of recognition to this institution. It was a different kind of MFA than we have now because it was a coordinate MFA, so that you had a major in one of the art disciplines, and everybody had a minor in another so that you had dance, creative writing, art and music at that point, yes.
- WL: So it was sort of an interdisciplinary kind of MFA, a general degree that would apply—
- GH: Yes it was. And it was governed really by a committee of faculty representing the disciplines. And they brought in—they had arts festivals that brought in individuals from all over the country really. And at the same time—so that you'd had really a week—art week, anyway, every year that was very strong. So it was an interesting program that attracted students from all over also. But as that program developed, it tended to go into the separate disciplines. That was probably in the late '50s or even into the '60s. You saw that kind of change.
- WL: Is there much demand for a doctorate in the '50s? Were there departments that want to go on to that level?
- GH: Probably not, though they may have wanted to, but probably not in the '50s. I don't think we were looking—very many places were looking in that direction [talking to herself, unclear]. No, I think in the School of Home Economics probably they were obviously looking at programs in the late '50s and probably psychology and English, all of those at that—
- WL: But they were even thinking about it at that point?
- GH: Yes, I think they probably were thinking about it. And that probably was a result of English being very strong because of creative writing that attracted a lot of people. So I think that the '50s would be the period of developing master's programs and really beginning to see—although I would say the largest expansion probably came in the '60s, early '60s, where we began to see the development of programs in almost all disciplines.
- WL: What—originally, we were talking about coeducation and the first men that are here in the '50s. Officially, this institution becomes coeducational in 1963. What sort of effect does that have? How do people—how does the students and faculty react to that? Is that a decision that comes from within the institution or does it come from without?
- GH: It—that decision came from—well, it came from without, I think. There may have been some administrators who wanted to move that direction. I think it was not a faculty, I mean faculty—no; students—no. There may have been a limited number that wanted to move that way, but I would say as a whole the faculty would have done anything to keep it, at that point, a women's college. Probably. Realistically, I think that coeducational is

the only way to go, but you hated to see something that was good and an outstanding institution—and you knew that the process of change was going to go take you down and you had to build up again.

WL: There was a clear sense that the institution would lose its distinctiveness as a result of—

GH: Yes, that's right. Because then what were you? We had been as the Woman's College one of the top three among—within the top three. Not in funding, but in terms of academic recognition and in terms of the kinds of students. We were protected in one sense because enrollments in the other—at NC State [North Carolina State University, Raleigh, North Carolina] and [University of North Carolina at] Chapel Hill—at least in the first two years, the enrollment of women students was limited. So that, in a sense, was a nice safe kind of position to be in to attract good students and—granted that some transferred—you still kept a lot of your best students. It was distinctive in that, as in any one-sex institution, you have an opportunity to provide leadership without what I think sometimes occurs where women are likely to give up even the opportunity. And it isn't that the male—necessary that male students take it over; the women give it up.

WL: Is that what happened here you think?

GH: Yes, because you have a period where you didn't even have—when the ratio was very one sided, that you'd get a male student government president every year. And they weren't the best—necessarily the best leaders.

WL: It was just this tendency to allow men to do it.

GH: Yes. That's right. So I think that you hated to see change, but it was inevitable. And I think that it probably—the situation probably would have changed earlier if it hadn't been for segregation because even the male students that had been coming in the summers were ruled out there for a while.

WL: Oh, right. At a certain point didn't they actually went completely single sex because of segregation?

GH: It's bound to have been.

WL: Yes. Explain that. A fear that if you get integration, you might get black males and—?

GH: Well, but black males—predominantly. I don't know—well, they wouldn't have come out and said that, but I—it was very obvious that was the reason. Because the minute that we— what was it, it must have been in '55 or '56 that we had the first black students here, the first black women. I think the minute they knew that we were going to have black students that all of a sudden the males couldn't come anymore, so what else could you assume? You know, it's sort of logical.

WL: The first black students came as early as 1955 or '56?

GH: Two.

WL: Two. We're talking about very small numbers all through this period?

GH: Yes.

WL: One or two a year, something like that?

GH: Well, I don't know—

WL: Single digits?

GH: Yes, for several years, but fortunately they were good students and they adjusted well.

WL: How well were they accepted? Was there any difficulty in—?

GH: Well, sort of strange. I don't know how—of course it would be difficult for us to say how they really were accepted. I think those students would have to say—it's interesting to me that one is a very loyal alumna. I see her at—she comes back for the McIver Conferences every year.

WL: Who is that?

GH: Her name was JoAnne Smart [Class of 1960], and I can't remember what her married name is [Ed. note: Drane], a very attractive young woman that was in the [North Carolina] State Department of Education.

WL: Right. We have her name. That's the one I'm thinking of—she was one of the first. Wasn't she about the first—?

GH: Yes. She and Betty Tillman [Class of 1960] I think were the two.

WL: Betty Killman?

GH: Till—I don't know that I have seen her since, but I have seen—I do see JoAnne occasionally. They were—it was difficult to say how they were accepted. First of all, they were put in one wing of a dormitory.

WL: Segregated wing?

GH: Oh, yes. First floor of Shaw Hall. Two students on the first floor. Everybody else was on the second, third floor, of that wing, so that would indicate that there was not general acceptance at least by individuals who were making decisions about students. So that the students might have been accepted more by other students easier than—by some students anyway.

WL: Except they would wake up every morning and realize they were in a separate wing and—they were of the special status and any class they'd be in, they'd be in the—visibly the only black students.

GH: Right.

WL: Let's get back for a minute to coeducation. Presumably [Chancellor] Otis Singletary is a great advocate of coeducation.

GH: Yes. And he probably, but I don't think if—whoever had been here could have stopped it. I think Otis—and I think Mereb Mossman also was an advocate—and where the decision appeared to come down from on high from General Administration [of the University of North Carolina System], which I think that ultimately it really did. I think they were probably more receptive than many of the faculty, and yet this did not become a divisive thing because it was an accomplished fact, and “If you didn't like it, go somewhere else,” sort of thing.

WL: In the long run, certainly inevitable. A public institution has to—. It's against the law, right?

GH: It's against the law now.

WL: But I think that it ultimately would have occurred anyway. I can't—I think it changed the nature of the institution. It's been a long time in getting the kinds of change that we probably should have had, but if you take—contrast our change with Florida, what is it now Florida State University [Tallahassee, Florida]. The State of Florida dumped—that's the wrong term—put a lot of money into that transition from a women's college to Florida State University. The State of North Carolina didn't put an extra dime. So that any change came as a result—the changes that have come— [tape goes silent]

[End of Side A—Begin Side B]

WL: UNCG's essentially been underfunded over the years, especially the critical—during the critical period that it made this transition from an all-women's college to a university.

GH: And to a university where the emphasis—I mean we have to emphasize research and a scholarly endeavor and to make that switch from what had been a teaching college. I emphasize that it is a teaching college, not a teacher college because it was different then.

WL: Why do you think that's so? Why did UNCG not get a larger share of resources as compared to other institutions in the state?

GH: Well, I think we had traditionally been the “little sister—that we will take care of you” sort of thing. Now don't upset any apple carts or any waves. We'll pat you on the head;

you do really great things, but big brother needs the—and gets the money.” And I think it’s kind of a situation that when they became teenagers then they really didn’t know what to do with us. And at that point there were too many other demands within the state, and we were still within the university system at a time when there was still the State College, as in a system. Then all of a sudden you wake up one day and everybody’s a university by legislative action. And there wasn’t a lot of money to go around, and we had never been an institution that had gone out and fought for money either. If you—I think Dr. Jackson was not a chancellor that ever—he trusted that somebody would take care of him. During the Graham era there was so much going on. The whole ’50s after the Grahams were interim chancellors. I think if Otis Singletary had not been wooed to Washington [DC, where he helped create Job Corps]—I think he was an individual who might have been able to do a better job of getting funds.

WL: What did you think of Singletary? What sort of person was he? What kind of chancellor was he?

GH: I thought he was very good. He was dynamic; he was an individual who I think was very good for this institution in terms of “town and gown.” He was respected in the community, and he knew his responsibilities as a chancellor to get the support of the community. And I think this had—I don’t think the institution ever has had the real support of Greensboro. You know, it’s been taken for granted.

WL: Yes. It’s been isolated.

GH: Well, partially isolated, but I think just taken for granted too—that it was here and it was nice that it was here, but the city of Greensboro never took a great deal—felt a responsibility to push to support financially. Part of the difficulty is the number of other institutions that are here. It’s difficult and, particularly in more recent years, to push for UNCG with A&T State [North Carolina Agricultural & Technical State University] here. And then you’ve got Greensboro College and Guilford College and Bennett College, and so it’s a different situation where you have one institution that the community can rally around.

WL: What about Jim [James S.] Ferguson as a chancellor and as a leader—a very different style from Singletary’s.

GH: Very different style. Probably—a very kind, gentle man, one that listened to—was a great listener. Looking back, he was a very comfortable person to have in an administrative position. When you look in retrospect he probably—we would have been better off with an Otis Singletary because he was a pusher, and I don’t think Jim Ferguson was a real pusher; he was too nice a guy. And I think you can’t always—and I’m not sure he was a real fighter. I think sometimes you have to have a fighter to push for an institution.

WL: Singletary had a something of an idea of what he wanted to do. I suppose, didn’t he? He realized that lack of distinctiveness was a problem; there needed to be a new kind of distinctiveness for the institution.

- GH: Right. And I don't think that we ever really progressed with that. I'm not sure we have yet. I think we had some ideas, but I don't think we've ever got them off the ground yet.
- WL: What sort of changes took place? A lot of changes took place during the 1960s and '70s. What would you say the most important changes that took place on campus? You've been here since the late '50s.
- GH: Well, okay, coeducation was a very—extremely important change and with coeducation came curricular changes, for example the School of Business [and Economics].
- WL: That was a product of coeducation?
- GH: That's right. We had a nice BSSA [Bachelor of Science in secretarial administration] degree sort of thing. I think that that was a factor. I think that an emphasis on trying to—and again as part of coeducation—attract male students and not only the program thrust, but the activity thrust. I think the—
- WL: Such as—
- GH: Athletics. We were so eager to get athletics going, and I think we bought dozens of cross country track shoes and never had anybody run in them. That sort of thing. [laughs]
- WL: Was that early on perceived as a way to attract male students?
- GH: And I think Otis—that was one of Otis' ideas that we had to have athletics.
- WL: Intercollegiate athletics?
- GH: Right. We had had a form of intercollegiate athletics for women for many years, but you felt that that was the way that we would have to go and—but again, money wasn't put, and at Florida State money went in to it and they became big time immediately. Of course, they did it earlier where they were getting a lot of veterans in. But then I think the graduate programs and the push for a graduate education at this institution.
- WL: That was connected to coeducation also or at least the—
- GH: I think it was a—I'm speculating, but it may have been a trade-off for coeducation. Trade-off is probably not the right word, but this was—something we'll give you so you may not be as happy with the other kind of thing. But again, except for little money that was pumped in to start the PhD [doctor of philosophy] program in psychology, again we did not get funding other than once we were able to offer graduate programs, our ratio became different as a doctoral-granting institution. And that was really the only way that funding increased for us.
- WL: Student-faculty ratio? Has this always been the case? And, of course, you've had

extensive experience in the graduate school. You're well qualified to comment on this. Were graduate programs—were they created essentially on the backs of existing resources—?

GH: Yes. I think so.

WL: —rather than the additional or even adequate resources being provided?

GH: Yes. And it was dedicated faculty, I think, that were willing to work under adverse conditions in terms of developing their programs, but they felt that this was important and it would help attract good colleagues and well-qualified colleagues to have the graduate programs. And that that was the way that we were going to need to go to maintain strengths, existing strengths, in undergraduate programs. Sometimes I think that may be a false assumption because too much emphasis in programs can then go to the advanced degree students at the expense of undergraduates. And I think that could be one of our unique uniquenesses as an institution, if we were able to maintain a—very strong programs at the undergraduate level, particularly in those areas where we have doctoral programs. And I think that we would be—could be unique in that.

WL: As a—you're involved with the graduate school plan in 1975?

GH: Yes. That's when I moved in as the assistant vice chancellor for graduate studies. I had been from the inception of the physical education master's program—I had been involved in planning that program, both at the MEd level and then at the Master of Science [MS] level.

WL: And that would have been in the '60s?

GH: Well, let's see—no, we started the planning of the MEd program in the early '50s. And we had our MS program by '58 or '59. And we already had within the department the MFA in dance. So that we went in that direction. And we started planning our doctorate in the early '60s, late '50s, early '60s. That was a battle royal though because you had to fight Chapel Hill for everything we got at that level.

WL: In terms of getting the program at all?

GH: Yes.

WL: You were opposed by Chapel Hill?

GH: Yes, because we started out with PhD degree proposal. And the only way we got in the door at all was to switch to an EdD [doctor of education] and come in with the School of Education in their counseling and guidance program and their administration program. And so did music come in the same way. And our program proposal was not one bit different. We had in essence a PhD program, but to get it—because Chapel Hill did not have one. They did not have a doctorate; they had a PhD degree in education, and they

could get an emphasis in physical education or a major maybe even under that. But it was not in physical education, and we didn't want that; we wanted our own degree. So what we got really was separate from education, but came in under the same umbrella.

WL: Yes. And then much later you actually added the PhD—well, recently.

GH: Yes, recently.

WL: '85 or '86.

GH: Yes.

WL: As assistant vice chancellor, what sort of situation did you find in 1975 in terms of graduate programs and graduate needs?

GH: Well, our greatest need were in assistantship because we had very, very limited funds.

WL: Where does that kind of money come from? Does it come from our own administration?

GH: Yes. Because it really is—most of that comes under—from faculty salary allotments, and it's what your commitment is to that kind of a program. And the monies that we had were so pitiful that you could hardly think about it.

WL: Even for the—

GH: From the graduate school level allotment to the—

WL: —the flagship programs, the phys ed [physical education] programs, English and psychology and were pretty badly funded in terms of assistantship.

GH: Yes. Everybody was underfunded, and you were stretching every dollar. In fact, that was—I would say was true until about the '80s. More money came from—has come to the Graduate School from Chancellor [William E.] Moran in allocations. Of course, there have been more monies too that have come to the institution, but as the institution increased in size, you had at least a bigger pot to play with. Even though you're trying to maintain your faculty-student ratio, you've still got opportunities to shift funds around a little bit more than you did even in the early '60s. So we were hard pressed in many programs to really be competitive nationally to attract students, and yet we were able to do it. But I think that was because of the caliber of the programs because we sure didn't have the monies to have any kind of decent stipends. Some of them are five hundred dollars, which is a real pittance now but was not much then. A student couldn't live on it, that's for sure. So that I think in that period we did see some increases in funding, and we certainly saw tremendous growth in programs through the mid-'60s and through the—into the '70s. And I would say our real growth came in the '70s in terms of numbers, and we haven't changed. In fact, we're probably a little bit lower in numbers.

WL: Of course, this period of growth was—

GH: —was true everywhere.

WL: Yes, but also coincided with the depression [global economic recession during late 1970s and early 1980s] and—at least in terms of doctorates in arts and sciences. In the case of English, English's program started a little later than psychology's, didn't it? Am I correct in that? Couple of years later?

GH: Yes, a little but not much.

WL: How does those two programs—those are the only two doctorate programs in the College of Arts and Sciences—how do they compare in terms of their history?

GH: Well, psychology had some money put into it to start—

WL: What kind of money? Additional positions?

GH: Well, they had additional positions, and then they got some funding, some additional funding, to start up on that program that could be used for assistantships too, where I don't really think English did. And I think that psychology was able to get more grant money than English was, so I'm not sure really that they can really be compared because psychology started out with a good number of students and have maintained their numbers of students. English has always been very, very small—probably not five students at a time.

WL: PhD-level students?

GH: Yes, I would say probably now. I'm not sure that the English people really cared either. I don't know that—their program has been more local. Their students are more local. And they've had some very good students, but a lot of them have been women whose husbands worked here or the male students have been—I don't know that many male students with PhDs in English come to think of it. Most—they were affiliated with another institution in this area. And I think they've been good students, but, on the other hand, psychology has drawn nationwide and internationally has drawn students.

WL: Why did psychology get the initial resources? How do you explain that?

GH: Well, I think to get the degree that General Administration was granted some additional funding.

WL: Maybe that was part of their original program at that particular time?

GH: Yes, and they—and I think they had built a faculty; they were ready for it, and they were into going to their specialty in behavioral modification really was their big thing at that point, and this was not in conflict in any way with the programs at State or Chapel Hill.

So I think they were willing to go this route in a very different program and were willing to put—allocate additional funds to the university. So that helped get them off the ground, and they were going for a national reputation. And I think—I never felt that English was very—the faculty in English was too excited about the program—about pushing. And maybe part of it is that there are more doctorates, maybe not the same kind of demands at least at that period of time for doctorates in English. And if they couldn't—if somebody didn't give them something, they weren't going to push for that. I may be wrong on that; that is a feeling I had—that they were glad they had it, but it was maybe more of a chore.

WL: Where psychology made it sort of an integral part of the whole departmental mission.

GH: Right; that's right.

WL: And they had, I guess they had the clinical program they could fall back on.

GH: That's right. I guess as I see it, psychology is different too from the other—many of the other disciplines in the College of Arts and Sciences. Because it is really—their program is really professionally oriented, and I think most of the—I guess most of the doctorates were, but they were primar—in English, but they were interested in teaching. I think that probably made a difference, makes a difference too. And the fact that we had no other doctorates in the Colleges of Arts and Sciences that would be comparable to English as a discipline makes a—could make a difference too.

WL: What do you think the future of this institution is? How would you view—what do you think some of the alternatives are? How do you think the—what's the institution got to look forward to? What are some of the problems it has to face?

GH: Well, I think there are lots of—but no, I think there is a direction that the institution can go. I think that hopefully we would maintain size. I think if this institution can maintain this size, I think this is a real advantage not to be at least any larger than 15,000. I think—

WL: Maintain size in the sense of not getting too big?

GH: That's right. I think anywhere from below, much below 10,000, I think you have difficulty in giving the breadth to students. We could become more local and regionally centered than I would hope we would, but, again, that depends on what we do as far as maintaining our maximum out-of-state recruitment, and that we get our maximum at both undergraduate and graduate levels. I think that's going to be essential to the institution and the quality of the institution. The state's going to make us—they're going to set the ratios for us for in and out, but I think to—that we need to be sure we are at the maximum. I would hope that we could perhaps even turn around a little bit and become a little bit more student centered than I think we are at the present time. I think that is a factor that could make us unique in a state institution of this size with the kinds of programs that we have from undergraduate to graduate.

WL: Student centered in what sense? More oriented toward serving students?

GH: Yes, and I'm not sure we are right now. I would like—I would hope that we could develop a collegiality that would not be back where we were at the Woman's College, but that to establish a better atmosphere for faculty in which to work. I think sometimes we are—we find situations at cross purposes for faculty and the administration and students. And I think that we could be, because of our size and the kinds of programs that we have, should be able to be an institution where we could have what I think is a smoother working relationship than we have at the present time. And from my observation not being involved in the faculty right now, I think that that is an area that needs work. That because—then I think it could be the kind of place the students want to come to, faculty would enjoy working in and with both students and faculty because I think the faculty is the key here of being the thing that should pull everything together. But I think administrators have to let faculty do that, and I think that students have to see faculty as being concerned about them. And I'm not sure right yet now that I feel that there is that commitment because I think that too much is put on the faculty from above that makes them go one direction. Their energies are exerted in one direction, and I think students feel this, so I think we need to be more student centered than we are at all levels—probably our best student centered are at our doctorate programs, but that's because of mentorship. I think that we need that at the undergraduate level, too, because we're not going to be a primarily graduate institution.

WL: And over the last three decades or so, the institution's lost it's—what you described earlier—the [unclear] and focus on students.

GH: I think so. Right. And I think we need to shift back to that because I think we will draw better students if we do that. The students know when they're getting the kind of attention—and we've got good faculty. I wouldn't quibble about the caliber of the faculty that we have, but I think they are put in a position where they cannot always function as they would like because I see an institution that there ought to be a place for the individual whose primary interest is teaching. And at the same time within the same department there ought to be a place for somebody whose primary role is research. And I'm not sure that a whole lot of people can really give equal emphasis to each. And that ideally I would like to see an institution in where—or even where you allocate within the department that you're going to have so much research that's going on, but maybe one or two people do most of that research. And the research that the others are doing are in relation to their own teaching and increasing their knowledge that they'll transmit to their students in other ways without being the great researcher. And yet by those combined efforts, that's the kind of working together that I would foresee that might produce in an institution like this the balance that is needed. But, I don't know, that may be very idealistic. But you've got to recognize people equally, if you do that.

WL: Which is not being done now?

GH: Not at all in my view.

[End of Interview]