“Four Years Now”: The Conversion to Senior-College Status

From its opening in 1966, Kennesaw Junior College worked quietly to achieve senior-college status. Hiring and promotion policies favored advanced degrees over teaching experience, and by the early 1970s the faculty seemed qualified to teach upper-level courses. The campus community bought into the notion that Kennesaw would earn its way up the academic ladder by maintaining high academic standards, regardless of the drop-out rate. Most programs of study prepared students to transfer to senior colleges and universities. To meet a critical need in north Georgia, Nursing, the main “terminal” associate degree program, gained Board of Regents approval in December 1967 and its first students enrolled the following fall.96

While Jimmy Carter was governor (1971–1975), state officials seemed to favor the community college concept where two-year schools would offer vocational as well as transfer programs. In December 1971, the Board of Regents approved a plan whereby junior colleges would offer vocational courses funded partly by the State Board for Vocational Education. By 1974, Brunswick, Dalton, and Bainbridge Junior Colleges had Vocational-Technical Education Divisions. To counter pressures to move in that direction, Kennesaw developed a limited number of cooperative programs with the Marietta-Cobb Area Vocational-Technical School. Secretarial science, for instance, allowed students to receive an associate's degree after taking a year of typing and similar courses at the Vo-Tech School and a year of academic classes at KJC. However, the college kept such programs to a minimum.97

President Sturgis and his leadership team had to be careful what they said in public, because Chancellor George L. Simpson and the Board of Regents envisioned Kennesaw as a permanent feeder institution for Georgia State University. The chancellor's long-range plan was for junior colleges in metro Atlanta to surround Georgia State from the northwest (Kennesaw), northeast (Gainesville), south (Clayton), east (DeKalb) and west (today’s Atlanta Metropolitan College). Their two-year
graduates were expected to come together for upper-level classes in Georgia State University’s more diverse, cosmopolitan atmosphere. President Sturgis thought that this concept was plausible in principle, but not very practical, due to the immense amount of congestion on all roads leading to downtown Atlanta.98

His perspective was prophetic. The nontraditional adult students, who comprised a large segment of the enrollees at suburban two-year colleges, were often resistant to continuing their educations downtown. They and their unmet educational needs were instrumental in the conversion of Kennesaw into a four-year institution. In turn, the decision to grant Kennesaw four-year status forced the Chancellor to come up with a new plan for the metropolitan Atlanta area. Harry Downs, the president of Clayton Junior College, was quick to see that Kennesaw’s transformation held promise for his institution.

Downs had coordinated the junior colleges for the regents in the 1960s and had helped forge the old plan of metropolitan feeder schools. Shortly after the regents announced Kennesaw’s conversion, he told a reporter that Georgia needed a new plan, with a new tier of metropolitan junior and senior colleges. His institution would be the next to add upper-level courses, although Clayton had to wait until 1985 before it happened. As table 3 reveals, the expanded vision for higher education
led, in time, to the development of four-year programs at the older two-year schools and the creation of a new four-year college in Gwinnett County.99

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>First Year in USG</th>
<th>4-Year Approval</th>
<th>University Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Georgia State</td>
<td>1933</td>
<td>1955</td>
<td>1969</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Georgia</td>
<td>1933</td>
<td>1957</td>
<td>1996</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Armstrong (Atlantic)</td>
<td>1958</td>
<td>1963</td>
<td>1996</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Augusta</td>
<td>1958</td>
<td>1963</td>
<td>1996</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgia Southwestern</td>
<td>1932</td>
<td>1964</td>
<td>1996</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Columbus</td>
<td>1958</td>
<td>1966</td>
<td>1996</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southern Tech (Poly)</td>
<td>1948</td>
<td>1970</td>
<td>1996</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kennesaw</td>
<td>1963</td>
<td>1976</td>
<td>1996</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clayton</td>
<td>1965</td>
<td>1985</td>
<td>1996</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Macon</td>
<td>1965</td>
<td>1996</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dalton</td>
<td>1963</td>
<td>1998</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gainesville</td>
<td>1964</td>
<td>2005</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgia Gwinnett</td>
<td>2005</td>
<td>2005</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gordon</td>
<td>1972</td>
<td>2007</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brunswick (Coastal Georgia)</td>
<td>1961</td>
<td>2008</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In KJC’s first decade, two obstacles to four-year conversion stand out. One was Cobb County’s lack of racial diversity at a time when the regents were under pressure from the federal courts to desegregate the university system. Kennesaw’s successes in the early 1970s in attracting African American students turned out to be crucial to the case for conversion. The other obstacle was the political opposition from nearby senior colleges and their representatives. Campus and Cobb community leaders had to engage in persistent lobbying over a period of several years to convince the chancellor and the Board of Regents that a four-year college in
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northwest Georgia was needed and justified. The regents’ plan for KJC to remain a feeder school to Georgia State University had to change, and that plan was well entrenched, politically.

The Higher Education Achievement Program and the Changing Campus Culture
Building a racially diverse student body, faculty, and staff was a major challenge everywhere in Georgia in the 1970s. In the aftermath of the civil rights movement, however, colleges that wanted to grow realized they had to change with the times. By the 1970s the population of Atlanta was majority black, while the surrounding suburbs were almost entirely white. Percentage-wise, the African American portion of Cobb County’s population had dropped throughout the twentieth century, reaching a low point of about 3 percent in the middle of the 1970s before rising back to 4 percent at the time of the 1980 census. The University System of Georgia had been slow in developing affirmative action guidelines, but was under pressure from the courts and the federal Department of Health, Education, and Welfare (HEW) to do a better job of integrating its college and universities. So it was necessary for KJC to make the case that a four-year school in the northern part of Cobb County would not undermine the system’s efforts at diversity.

During its first five years of operation (1966–1971), Kennesaw had one Asian instructor, no African American faculty members or secretaries, and very few black students—only 10 in the fall quarter of 1970, out of a total enrollment of 1,570 (0.6 percent). According to a 1972 report, edited by English instructor Belita M. Kuzmits, KJC had “gained a reputation in the community as an institution with narrow purposes and with a white, relatively well-to-do student population.” Efforts to recruit African Americans and low-income white students were often frustrated by the common perception that KJC provided few options beyond the liberal arts and was a “difficult institution” with few support networks for minorities and others with special needs.100

As early as August 13, 1968, President Sturgis told the members of his Administrative Council that KJC needed to recruit qualified black faculty members.101 But affirmative action was not a high priority, and Kennesaw’s first successful effort to diversify the faculty and student body began not in the president’s office but in that of dean of the college Robert H. Akerman, who replaced KJC’s first academic dean, Derrell Roberts, in the fall of 1970.102 Akerman held a PhD in history and political science from American University. At age forty-two, he was a veteran journalist and educator. In the mid-1950s, he had served as associate editor of the Florida Times-Union. In 1958 he joined the faculty of Florida Southern College in Orlando, and rose to the chairmanship of the Social Sciences Division by 1967, the year in which he earned his doctorate. He would serve as Kennesaw’s academic dean for
only three years before returning to the newspaper business as editorial associate of the *Atlanta Journal*, where his columns appeared daily on the editorial page.\footnote{103}

About the time he arrived at KJC, Akerman heard about a unique project designed to improve educational opportunities for low-income and minority students at southern junior and community colleges. The US Office of Education was in the process of starting a Higher Education Achievement Program (HEAP) and had selected the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools (SACS) to assist in developing and administering it. In the fall of 1970, Akerman filled out the grant application to bring the program to campus. Toward the end of that academic year, on April 27, 1971, he received word from the Office of Education that Kennesaw had been awarded a $113,000 grant to implement HEAP during the 1971–72 academic year, with the understanding that the grant could be renewed for two additional years.

HEAP began operations in 1971 with a consortium of nine schools, public and private, stretching from North Carolina to the Florida Keys to Laredo, Texas.\footnote{104} Each institution was expected to recruit and provide special counseling and skills instruction each year for approximately one hundred high-risk students. SACS already was involved in a similar experiment at fifteen historically black institutions called the College Education Achievement Project (CEAP). If these pilot programs succeeded in removing class and racial barriers to higher education, then they hopefully would be the model followed by higher education systems throughout the South.\footnote{105}

The Office of Education’s announcement exposed a serious lack of communication (and possible lack of trust), as Dean Akerman had not informed President Sturgis about the application before the official letter arrived. In later years Sturgis said he was delighted when he found out. Regardless of his feelings at the time, the president later found HEAP useful in making the case to the Board of Regents that Kennesaw was taking diversity seriously and would not undermine the system’s desegregation plans if it became a four-year school.\footnote{106}

Dean Akerman had from April to September to find a coordinator, two counselors, and an instructor for each of the HEAP subject areas of mathematics, reading, speaking-listening, reaction writing, and reaction ideas (the study of current and controversial issues). He discovered the resume of the first coordinator, Stewart G. Phillips, in a list of potential administrators circulated by the chancellor’s office. Akerman attempted to recruit minority faculty by asking SACS to provide referrals of CEAP professors from the black colleges. When it became obvious that none of them wanted to work at Kennesaw, Akerman went through the stack of letters he had received from applicants making general inquiries about job openings at Kennesaw. Whenever he found minority candidates or anyone with successful experience working with at-risk students, he sent a brief description of HEAP along with a request that they consider applying for vacant positions.\footnote{107}
Akerman initially wanted to offer the coordinator job to an African American candidate from Minnesota. However, KJC was unable to meet his salary demands. The grant from the Office of Education funded a salary of only $14,000, some $4,000 less than this individual was earning already. Thus, the dean had no choice but to offer the coordinator opening to the most qualified white applicant. He had more success in filling the two counselor posts, for which several African Americans applied. Ultimately, he selected a white male, James E. Conley, and a black male, Bobby L. Olive, the first African American professional on the KJC faculty or staff.

To Akerman's chagrin, the candidate pool for the teaching positions contained no African Americans with the required master's degree in the teaching field. Nonetheless, he managed to fill the posts with talented, young, white idealists. Ronald D. Carlisle, for instance, was offered the job as math instructor at age twenty-nine, based on his background as a PhD candidate in mathematics at Emory University, two years as a Peace Corps volunteer in the Philippines, and experience as an associate director of a summer institute that prepared math teachers to work with disadvantaged youth. He would receive his PhD in 1972. Similarly, the speech instructor, Elaine M. Amerson, at age twenty-seven was an EdD candidate at the University of Kentucky, had worked in a day camp in Harlem, and had taught in the Pan American Institute of the Republic of Panama. She would be awarded her doctorate in the spring of 1974. Of the original eight HEAP professionals, four were male and four female; two were in their early thirties and the rest in their twenties.\(^{108}\)

The HEAP coordinator and one of the counselors spent the summer recruiting one hundred students who probably would not have been accepted at KJC otherwise. Much of their time was spent contacting metropolitan area principals and school counselors, seeking referrals. They tried to achieve a balance of African Americans, rural whites, and high-risk students, regardless of income. To reach the goal of one hundred, the last group was essential because Kennesaw, in 1971, offered little financial aid and had few work-study positions.

KJC's Office of Administration and Records helped by giving Coordinator Phillips the names of applicants that did not qualify for the regular program because their projected grade point averages were less than 1.6 on a scale of 4.0. By enrolling some of these students, HEAP effectively turned Kennesaw into an open-door college. The initial class consisted of forty-three blacks, fifty-six whites, and one Asian American. Reflecting the student body as a whole, males outnumbered females about two to one.\(^{109}\)

Many of the HEAP students came from downtown Atlanta. For those of limited income, transportation was a major problem. Cobb County lacked public transit at the time, and I-75 would not reach the campus for several more years. So the campus
seemed remote to those traveling from Atlanta. Fortunately, the HEAP faculty was able to contract with a bus service to transport students from the inner city in the morning and back to downtown in the afternoon. While President Sturgis vetoed the idea of KJC operating its own bus, he allowed the Student Activities Committee to subsidize the bus rides through the student activities fee. The Southern Education Foundation, several inner-city agencies, and private donors contributed as well. Meanwhile, a prominent Marietta couple, M. J. and Kathryn Woods, donated a car for the students to use. The system worked well until the bus company tripled its rates in March 1974, forcing HEAP to operate on a three-day-a-week schedule for the last quarter of its existence.\textsuperscript{110}

HEAP operated as a separate division reporting directly to the academic dean. Prior to the Board of Regents’ approval of faculty statutes in December 1972, Kennesaw had a hierarchical, top-down administrative style with relatively little faculty involvement in decision making.\textsuperscript{111} HEAP operated outside that model, creating a team concept that included students as well as faculty in planning and evaluation. Throughout the academic year, the faculty and four elected student representatives met for staff meetings at least once and often two or three times a week. Anyone was free to put items on the agenda, and all important program decisions resulted from these discussions. From a staff perspective, the system worked well, at least for the first two years of the program.

HEAP’s final report noted that student participation in time-consuming staff meetings fell off in the last year after policies had already been well established. By that time, however, HEAP students had become integrated into the life of the college in other ways. Eddie Jackson, for instance, became KJC’s first African American student elected to an executive office in the Student Government Association when he served as vice president during the 1973–74 academic year. Jackson also became involved in the system-wide Student Advisory Council as the chairman of the Junior College Committee.\textsuperscript{112}

Kennesaw’s stated purposes had always included serving the needs of the community through developmental, as well as transfer and terminal degree programs. Prior to 1971, however, the Special Studies Program operated primarily in the summer quarter and was limited to sixty students per year. While students could take developmental math, English, and psychology-orientation courses in the summertime, only the math class was offered during the academic year. The first annual HEAP report noted that a 1972 institutional self-study described the developmental program as a “token effort of what is needed.” Stimulated in part by HEAP’s example, KJC began in 1972 to expand its remedial offerings during the academic year.\textsuperscript{113}

After Stewart Phillips headed the program for its first two years, he accepted a position as the SACS coordinator of the region-wide HEAP consortium. Ron Carlisle became his replacement at KJC. In the final annual report in 1974, Carlisle
argued that HEAP “represented a major attempt of the college to be more nearly what it had professed” to be. He asserted that HEAP had helped students overcome “motivational and academic barriers to success” and had started to change the campus culture by creating a more inviting atmosphere and converting at least some of the regular faculty to a sense “that the many and not merely the few could profitably attend college.”

As the program wound down, the HEAP staff grew increasingly pessimistic about their accomplishments. The 1974 annual report concludes that while HEAP had a number of success stories, “objective measures of student success [had] not revealed spectacular results,” and the achievement gap did not seem to close significantly between HEAP and regular admission students. The report praised Kennesaw for seeking the advice of the HEAP faculty in planning a Special Studies Program for 1974–75, but expressed doubt that Special Studies would receive sufficient backing in the absence of federal funding. It also noted that none of the HEAP staff was asked to work in the new program. Most of them took their expertise to other colleges in metropolitan Atlanta, particularly Georgia State University and the newly-opening Atlanta Junior College (today’s Atlanta Metropolitan College). Their loss was particularly unfortunate because three years of work in a pilot program had given them a wealth of experience in dealing with high-risk students. By 1974 they shared a sense that three years were not enough to accomplish all their program goals and that they were just beginning to learn which teaching and motivational techniques worked best.

An independent evaluation was conducted during the final year by a team headed by Robert Stolz of the Atlanta office of the College Entrance Examination Board, and including a SACS staff member, George Rolle, and Kennesaw HEAP instructor Elaine Amerson. The evaluators credited HEAP with improving students’ self-esteem and helping students adopt realistic goals. The team seemed to suggest that if HEAP could attract and retain minority and disadvantaged students at Kennesaw, “with its history, image and location,” then similar programs could succeed anywhere. The evaluators gave HEAP credit for transforming “the campus image from an all-white rather elite institution to an integrated institution with a broad service interest.”

Unlike HEAP, Special Studies had few faculty members other than reading instructors dedicated to that program alone. From 1973 to 1979 Morgan L. Stapleton served as coordinator of the Special Studies Program, while continuing to teach and be evaluated in the Division of Natural Sciences and Mathematics. Until 1978 he lacked a clear role in the administrative hierarchy, and Special Studies struggled for respect and recognition. A number of instructors were outstanding teachers and genuinely cared about developmental students, but others were less interested and less successful.
On January 5, 1978, President Sturgis received a letter from an exasperated vice chancellor, John W. Hooper, who described Kennesaw’s Special Studies Program as “inadequate and unacceptable.” He reminded Sturgis that staff from the central office had expressed their concerns to him a number of times. Hooper asked the president to appoint, by spring quarter 1978, a coordinator who reported directly to the academic dean, and to set up by fall quarter 1978 a department with “at least a minimum ‘core’ faculty.”

Stapleton coordinated the program for one more year before becoming the academic dean at Brunswick Junior College. Before he left, he persuaded English professor Mary Zoghby to take his place. She would serve six years (1979–1985), the first four as coordinator and the last two as chair of the Department of Developmental Studies. Throughout her tenure, the Special (or Developmental) Studies Department had its own budget and a small core faculty, supplemented by many others borrowed from English and math.

When Mary Zoghby first accepted the position, her office was in the Administration Building next to Dean Eugene R. Huck. She was the first woman to serve as a department head and one of only two women on the dean’s staff (along with Assistant Dean Betty J. Youngblood). On the college Tenure and Promotion Committee, she would be the only woman meeting with Huck and the various division chairmen. It did not take her long to realize that students were reluctant to drop into her office in the Administration Building, so she asked to move to the top floor of the new library, where there was also room for math, English, and reading labs. A number of instructors volunteered their time to help students in the labs. They were uncompensated for their efforts, but Zoghby was able to pay a few top math students to serve as tutors. For a number of years after Kennesaw became a senior college, the Developmental Studies Program played a vital, if underappreciated, role.

The Developmental Studies Program was particularly valuable in helping Kennesaw’s nontraditional students adjust to college life. Many of them had been out of school for years and needed a refresher course or two to put them on an equal footing with their younger classmates. While Kennesaw had no intentions of abandoning that clientele, its mission would change after it became a senior college, and in the late 1980s it would self-impose higher freshman admission standards to curb the enrollment of under-prepared traditional-aged students, diverting them instead to area junior colleges.

A perception existed on more elite campuses that Kennesaw used the Developmental Studies Program in the 1980s to grow its enrollment and gain greater formula funding from the Board of Regents. Table 4 argues the opposite. At the start of the 1980s, some 18 percent of all Kennesaw students took developmental studies courses, a percentage typical of Georgia junior colleges. By the end of the
decade, the percentage had dropped to just 7.2 percent, a proportion well below the senior-college average. The de-emphasizing of developmental studies coincided with Kennesaw’s maturing into a full-fledged metropolitan college. Yet, the original emphasis of HEAP on diversifying the campus culture would never stop being a major institutional goal. 119

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Developmental Studies (DS) Program Enrollment, University System of Georgia, as Percentage of Total Headcount (HC) Enrollment, 1980–1989</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>University System of Georgia, as Percentage of Total Headcount (HC) Enrollment, 1980–1989</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kennesaw</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>DS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1980</td>
<td>703</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1981</td>
<td>704</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1982</td>
<td>800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1983</td>
<td>845</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1984</td>
<td>880</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1985</td>
<td>1,102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1986</td>
<td>907</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1987</td>
<td>1,027</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1988</td>
<td>902</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1989</td>
<td>656</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Additional Efforts at Diversity and at Making Higher Education Affordable
There is little question that the campus was never quite the same after the HEAP experience. Minority enrollment remained low, but not quite as low as it once was. In fall quarter 1975, for instance, 59 African American students constituted about 2 percent of the overall campus enrollment of 3,098. This number was considerably above the 10 (less than 1 percent) enrolled in the fall of 1970, but below the 79 (4
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percent) enrolled in the fall of 1972, during HEAP’s middle year. Of course, African Americans were extremely underrepresented in most other units of the university system with the exception of the historically black colleges. By way of comparison, Georgia Tech’s African American enrollment in 1969–1970 was under 1 percent, and Georgia State University’s in the fall of 1974 was just 12 percent (2,101 of 17,510) in a city with a population that was majority black.¹²⁰

During this era, Kennesaw made a few significant efforts to integrate the workplace as well as the student body. In January 1971 Charles Williams became only the second black employee and first in a management position as food services supervisor. The first African American secretary, Terri Ferguson [Arnold], was hired in June 1971. Her father, Charles Ferguson, started working in 1951 at the Lockheed plant in Marietta and by the 1960s had become one of the first blacks at Lockheed to move into management. Her uncle, Lewis Scott, was a history teacher at Lemon Street High School, which Terri attended until 1967, when the city school system fully integrated. After graduating from Marietta High School in the class of 1969, she attended Morris Brown College for a year. She then worked in Atlanta for six months before hearing from a family friend that Kennesaw Junior College was seeking minority applicants for a secretarial job with HEAP. At the time, she had no idea where the college was located and had always assumed that “they don’t want us any more than we want to go there.” Nonetheless, she decided she had nothing to lose by applying.¹²¹

While she was on campus for her HEAP interview, the dean of student affairs, Carol L. Martin, told her he was losing his secretary and asked if she would interview with him. Since he could pay her a higher salary than HEAP offered, she went to work in his office. Thus began a career at Kennesaw that lasted over forty years, first in the Office of Student Affairs, then as an administrative assistant for Controller (later vice president) Roger E. Hopkins and his replacement B. Earle Holley, and finally in a post–retirement part-time job as a manager in Arlethia Perry-Johnson’s Office of External Affairs. Her entire career would be spent in the old Administration Building and Kennesaw Hall where she recalls that she never had to work her way up. Except for an unhappy two years at Marietta High School, she had never spent much time around white people, and she admits that she was as curious about them as they were about her. She recalls that everyone was extremely nice and greeted her with open arms, and another secretary in the Administration Building, Barbara Blackwell, quickly became her “best buddy.”¹²²

A number of additional African American hires followed. Betty Jackson was employed as HEAP secretary in July 1971, but left shortly afterwards and was replaced by Phyllis Baker. Paulette Long was hired as secretary for the Social Sciences Division in September 1971. The first two African American members of the teaching faculty, Karen Maples in Biology and Ruth Rundles in Economics,
started in September 1972. HEAP added a clerk-typist, Karen Bullock, in October
1973 the first three black custodians, William Johnson, George J. Milton Sr., and
George J. Milton Jr., and the first black groundskeeper, James L. Echols, began
work in 1973. Including HEAP counselor Bobby Olive, KJC, over a three-year
period, succeeded in adding thirteen African Americans to the faculty and staff.
In the absence of support networks, Kennesaw had a difficult time retaining black
employees in what must have seemed a sea of whiteness. Only Terri Arnold stayed
for an entire career. Nonetheless, the modest increase in African American students,
faculty, and staff allowed the administration to claim that blacks would feel less
conspicuous and isolated in the future and that the number of African American
students and employees should continue to grow.123

All colleges and universities found it easier to attract minority and disadvantaged
students after Congress, in 1972, amended the Higher Education Act of 1965 to
create Basic Educational Opportunity Grants, renamed Pell Grants in 1980 in
honor of their chief sponsor, Rhode Island Senator Claiborne Pell.124 President
Truman's Commission on Higher Education called for affordable tuition as far
back as 1947, but the federal government only now put massive amounts of money
into student aid. Historian John R. Thelin credits a cadre of little known student
lobbyists in prodding Congress into action, much to the displeasure of the Asso-
ciation of American Universities and the American Council on Education. In the
Great Transformation in Higher Education, Clark Kerr noted that such mainline
organizations wanted federal subsidies to go directly to member schools and were
lukewarm about portable financial aid that followed students to any accredited
institutions they chose to attend.

Since World War II, federal support of higher education had come primar-
ily through grants for competitive research and capital expenditures of the type
that the Higher Education Facilities Commission gave the university system to
construct KJC's original buildings. After the campus turmoil of the 1960s, public
faith in universities diminished, and members of Congress saw little political gain
in putting money in the hands of college administrators to spend as they saw fit.
Nonetheless, congressmen saw immense political advantage in making students
and parents happy through grants that went directly to pay tuition bills and other
college expenses.

The Basic Educational Opportunity Grants (BEOG) had the virtue of being
democratic—they were available to all full-time students from low-income families
as long as they were in good academic standing at any accredited college. It did not
matter whether they enrolled at an elite university or a junior college because the
amount of the grant varied depending on how expensive it was to attend a particular
school. Thelin notes that the program "helped promote the appeal of 'going to col-
lege' to a new generation of students at a time when colleges needed this boost."125
Tuition and fees were low at junior colleges in the University System of Georgia; so the Pell Grants, arguably, were less important in attracting students to KJC than to more expensive institutions. At the time, tuition at KJC was only $85 a quarter for in-state and $205 for non-resident students. The student services fee was ten dollars a quarter, and the parking fee was four dollars a year. Nonetheless, starting in 1974–1975, the official campus catalogs consistently list the Basic Educational Opportunity Grants as an attractive form of financial aid. According to the catalogs, BEOG was a federal program that helped with tuition, books, and other college expenses, less the amount that the student and his family could pay, based on income. In the fiscal year 1974 (July 1, 1973 through June 30, 1974) Kennesaw enrolled its first thirty-three students on Basic Educational Opportunity Grants. They received an average award of $240.30, about enough to cover tuition for a year. By fiscal year 1977 the numbers had risen to 142 students (about 4 percent of the student body) and the average grant to $568.11. In the latter year Kennesaw awarded 391 grants, loans, or work-study opportunities (roughly one per every eight students) totaling $200,623—a small amount compared to future years, but still highly significant for the students most in need.126

Along with BEOG grants, Supplemental Educational Opportunity Grants provided $200 to $1,000 to students of exceptional financial need who would otherwise be unable to remain in college. These were just two of a number of government grants and loans that originated in this era to help students with college costs. According to the KJC catalog for 1974–75, the Georgia Higher Education Assistance Corporation (GHEAC) allowed students to go to a bank and borrow up to $1,200 a year with GHEAC paying the interest on the loan while the individual was still in school. National Direct Student Loans and Nursing Student Loans enabled students to borrow up to $2,500 for the first two years at 3 percent interest. The National Direct Student Loans were provided jointly by the federal government and KJC through matching funds provided by the KJC Foundation and various civic groups.127

In early 1969, President Sturgis invited a few civic leaders to help create a KJC Foundation to raise funds for such things as student scholarships. One of the first people he approached was Superior Court judge G. Conley Ingram, who had just completed a four-year term on the bench and was back in private practice. He would later serve on the Georgia Supreme Court. Ingram attended at least two small gatherings that winter, the first at the home of his next-door neighbor, Marietta businessman R. Steve Tumlin; the second at the residence of a local dentist and past Kiwanis International president, Dr. R. Glenn Reed Jr. Others involved in those initial meetings included Dr. William H. Dunaway, a pharmacist who owned a chain of north Georgia drugstores; and Robert T. Garrison, the recently retired president of the Arrow Shirt Company. Ingram volunteered to prepare and file the
incorporation papers with the Georgia secretary of state. Since Garrison had more free time than his colleagues, he agreed to become the first chairman of the board.128

Once the legal paperwork was completed, the first official meeting of the KJC Foundation took place on April 17, 1969. By that time, the group of charter trustees had grown to twenty-three. Ingram recruited one non-Cobb County trustee, Judge William A. (Bud) Foster Jr., a superior court judge in Paulding County. Soon afterwards, State Representative (and future governor) Joe Frank Harris provided a Bartow County presence. At the April meeting, Garrison appointed a fundraising committee to conduct the first annual campaign. It was chaired by Marietta businessman Sidney Clotfelter, and included Campbell Dasher, Howard Ector, and Ed Massey.129 In the junior-college years, a typical campaign raised only about $20,000 to $30,000 a year, but it was a start in adding to the funds available for student scholarships, aiding faculty members with the costs of completing their dissertations, and supplementing administrative salaries, among other projects.130

Probably the most conspicuous beneficiaries of government financial aid programs in the 1970s were the police officers who enrolled in criminal justice and attended class in their uniforms. The Justice Department’s Law Enforcement
Educational Grants (LEEG) paid tuition and books for any police officer wanting to attend college. When these grants first became available, Kennesaw Junior College lacked a criminal justice faculty, but operated a program with instructors provided by Georgia State University. The college asked Professor J. B. Tate to be their on-site advisor and contact person. According to Tate, the officers intimidated faculty and students when they walked into the classroom with guns strapped to their waists, but, in fact, the officers themselves were terrified to be in a college environment. Most were first-generation college students, and the campus seemed an alien place. So they clung to Tate “like a security blanket” and took every history class he taught.

One of Tate’s vivid memories is of an encounter one night between his policemen and the guests of KJC’s lone psychology instructor. That instructor had been hired in part for his apparent respectability. He was an ordained clergyman as well as a psychologist. What the administration apparently did not know was that his ministry was on Fourteenth Street when that was the center of Atlanta’s hippie culture. The instructor thought his students would benefit from actually meeting some hippies, so he asked several to come to campus. As Tate recalled:

All these guys came rolling up on motorcycles, and they had turbans, naked from the belt up except for little halter tops, with big earrings…. I didn’t see them come in. I heard all those motorcycles, but I had already started my class. [The psychology professor] gives them a break at the same time I give my policemen a break, and they converged out there on the hall…. That was the longest ten minutes of my life. They were cussing each other, and you can imagine the epithets going back and forth. The policemen didn’t really like the idea of being called pig and particularly when you add a few more adjectives to go with it. So I finally got my policemen back in the classroom, and they are hot. They are hot! You know, somebody could have gotten killed out there real easy. It took me twenty or thirty minutes to get them settled down enough that we could get the class going again. Well needless to say [the psychology instructor’s] days are numbered.131

By making higher education more affordable, Pell Grants, LEEG grants, and similar types of aid probably did as much to diversify student bodies throughout the nation as all the conscious efforts at affirmative action. Until the mid-1970s,
the police officers taking advantage of LEEG grants were all white, but most of them came from a social class and nontraditional age group that had not gone to college in the past. On October 27, 1976, President Sturgis submitted to the Board of Regents an Impact Study on the Proposed Conversion of Kennesaw Junior College to Senior College Status. In it he argued that the main impact of conversion would be the expansion of educational opportunities to a large number of north Georgians who otherwise would be denied the opportunity to pursue a bachelor’s degree. The report particularly emphasized nontraditional students—not only the older students, but the 62 percent of the student body who held full- or part-time jobs and the third, roughly, who were married. Such students, he maintained, could not easily give up their jobs or leave their families to go off to residential colleges.

Sturgis argued that suburban Cobb’s median family income in 1970 may have been fairly high, but the nearby rural counties of Bartow, Cherokee, and Paulding were below the state average. Since the Seventh Congressional District of northwest Georgia lacked a public, senior college, the people of the area would especially benefit from an affordable school in commuting distance. Moreover, he noted that minority enrollment in several area school districts was quite significant (for the 1975–76 school year 12.8 percent in Bartow County, 20 percent in Cartersville City, and 7.3 percent in Paulding). While enrollment in the Cobb County School District was only 3.2 percent black, that of Marietta City Schools was 27.8 percent. These data, he maintained, gave one “reason to believe that the conversion will be attractive to minority students in the service area.”

**The Politics of Conversion**

Diversity was just one of the challenges that four-year advocates had to overcome in making their case. Perhaps the greatest problem was alleviating the fears of Georgia State, West Georgia, Columbus, and other public institutions that a senior college in Cobb County would take away their students and vital funding. In addition, downtown business leaders appeared concerned that the core of Atlanta would crumble if the suburbs were dotted with dynamic four-year schools that pulled students away from Georgia State and economic development from the central city. They wanted Georgia State to be “the” metropolitan university around which the region revolved. Chancellor George Simpson shared their vision and feared the possible domino effect if he let any more junior colleges (especially those in metro Atlanta) advance to four-year status.

In the 1960s the Board of Regents had created a number of four-year schools across the middle and southern parts of the state. Three of them (Augusta, Armstrong, and Columbus) were nonresident, commuter schools of a model that Kennesaw hoped to adopt. KJC’s service area by the 1970s was much larger than that of any of the three, and there were no public senior colleges anywhere in northwest Georgia’s
Seventh Congressional District. Therefore, the task for President Sturgis was to show that population growth in an underserved area made a new senior college essential, and that Kennesaw’s elevation would not adversely affect anyone in other parts of the state. Meanwhile, local powerbrokers realized they would have to use their considerable political skills to outmaneuver a chancellor, other area colleges and universities, and the Atlanta business elite. The story of how they did so is at least as dramatic as that of the previous decade when some of the same leaders managed to take Southern Technical Institute from DeKalb County and Kennesaw Junior College from Bartow.

The legislative delegation, Cobb Chamber of Commerce, and local educators were committed from the beginning to turning Cobb’s two-year schools into senior colleges. Southern Tech gained the right to offer upper-level courses in 1970 (although it had to wait ten more years before gaining independence from its founder, Georgia Tech). Whenever President Sturgis spoke to civic groups, he invariably fielded questions about when Kennesaw would become a four-year college. In public, he was always careful to remember his loyalties to the chancellor. His standard response was that the decision would be made by the Board of Regents when Kennesaw could justify the need for a four-year liberal arts college in northwest Georgia.

Much of Sturgis’s role in the four-year campaign was in writing research reports on the impact that conversion would have on the region and other university system institutions. While these internal reports were for the chancellor and board, he quietly circulated them to local leaders such as Representatives Joe Mack Wilson and Joe Frank Harris, attorney Harold Willingham, charter KJC Foundation president Robert T. Garrison, and newspaperman Bill Kinney, telling them he was sure they would be interested in the findings. When these individuals spoke subsequently in public, they took their talking points straight from the president’s reports.135

Three local delegations addressed the Board of Regents without success. The first made its presentation on January 13, 1971. Its spokesperson was Senator Cy Chapman. Others present were Hubert Black of the Cobb Chamber and virtually the entire legislative delegation: State Senator Jack Henderson and Representatives Hugh Lee McDaniel, Howard (Red) Atherton, A. L. Burruss, Bob Howard, Gene Housley, George Kreeger, and Joe Mack Wilson. Chapman argued that Cobb’s tremendous population growth and economic progress justified the conversion and that Cobb Countians were united in their support. Board of Regents chairman T. Hiram Stanley thanked the delegation and promised the matter would be considered carefully. But, while the board was polite, it took no action, and, for all practical purposes, the matter went no further.136

A second delegation, headed by Senator Jack Henderson, made its appeal to the board on October 10, 1973. This time the delegation included a broad group of
political, educational, and business leaders, including the press. Henderson introduced Harold Willingham who used the same arguments that Cy Chapman had employed almost three years earlier, along with a new point that the planned construction of I-75 by the campus would increase accessibility and demand for higher education in north Cobb County. Again, board chairman William S. Morris III thanked the group and promised that the regents would study the issue, and, again, the board took no further action.\textsuperscript{137}

Before another delegation addressed the regents, Joe Mack Wilson and his colleagues in the legislature pursued another approach. In January 1974 they pushed through both houses of the Georgia General Assembly resolutions calling on the Board of Regents to elevate Kennesaw Junior College to senior-college status.\textsuperscript{138} When the resolutions proved insufficient to catch the regents’ attention, Wilson and a united local leadership played politics expertly in the 1974 gubernatorial election. With Governor Jimmy Carter about to leave office, three major contenders vied for the nomination of the Democratic Party: Calhoun banker and state highway director, Bert Lance, a close friend of Governor Carter; Lieutenant Governor (and former governor) Lester Maddox; and Georgia House majority leader George Busbee of Albany.

As Busbee campaigned in Cobb County, he met privately with Wilson, Burruss, Willingham, and others, and asked what he needed to do to gain their endorsement. His strength was in south Georgia, and he was not well known outside that region. So he was willing to offer a lot to gain some north Georgia support. Wilson and Burruss, of course, had served with him for a long time in the Georgia House. They asked for three things: the conversion of KJC to senior status, the governor’s support in persuading the federal government to complete the last segment of I-75 from North Marietta Parkway to Cartersville (and by the Kennesaw campus), and the construction of a Western and Atlantic Railroad bridge over what would become South Marietta Parkway, so that traffic could move freely during rush hour from west Marietta to US 41 and I-75. Busbee gave his support to all three projects, and in exchange the local power elite went all out to help elect him. Just before the general election, the Marietta Daily Journal threw its support to Busbee, calling him the best man for the job and citing his endorsement of the three local improvement projects.\textsuperscript{139}

Roy E. Barnes was a young politician at the time, running his first race for the state senate. He was not part of the meeting with Busbee, but heard about it immediately and recalls how remarkable it was that all major factions of Cobb’s Democratic Party came together in support of one candidate and one set of issues. In a 1976 article journalist Bill Kinney made a similar observation, arguing that not since the Southern Tech fight fifteen years earlier had there been such “unanimous and determined” local support as there was for Kennesaw’s conversion. In the final years
of the Democratic Party’s domination in Cobb County, before the Republican Party’s takeover, the old guard scored one of its last major victories in electing Busbee and holding him to his campaign promises.140

A. L. Burruss managed the Busbee campaign in Cobb County and for the next eight years would be Cobb County’s “ear” in the governor’s office. In the months following his election, Busbee continued to assert his support for Kennesaw Junior College. In December 1974 he told a Marietta Daily Journal reporter that KJC would be the “next junior college in the state to be elevated” to four-year status. In February 1975 he told a local delegation that Kennesaw’s conversion would have little impact on other institutions, and that “we should have four-year colleges where the students are.” The fight, however, was not going to be easy. In the weeks following the general election, the Atlanta Constitution editorialized against those who tried to exert political influence over the university system and threw its support behind Charles A. Harris, the chairman of the Board of Regents, who had come out against the conversion of junior colleges into senior institutions. Harris said that the university system had just begun to “work as we had planned,” and did not see any possibility in the next few years that Georgia would create more four-year institutions. Instead, he wanted to direct resources to the existing upper-level and graduate programs. The board chairman was also on record as saying that the state and national economies were too weak at the time to think about diverting precious resources to junior-college conversions.141

In early 1975 the Cobb Chamber of Commerce formed a select committee, chaired by former Arrow Shirt president Bob Garrison, to make the case to the Board of Regents that the county needed a nondormitory, four-year school. Harold Willingham served as vice chair, and other members included Cobb Commission chairman Ernest Barrett, Marietta mayor Dana Eastham, chamber president Stan St. John, and the entire Cobb legislative delegation. Using information fed to them by Horace Sturgis, Garrison sent a letter to the regents, noting that Cobb County
had grown from about 62,000 in 1950 to an estimated 260,000 in 1974, and that 55,000 pupils were enrolled in Cobb County schools in the current academic year. Garrison noted that there were only three non-resident senior colleges in the university system—Augusta, Columbus, and Armstrong—and that Cobb was larger and growing faster than the counties of Richmond, Muscogee, and Chatham, where those institutions were based. Further, he argued that conversion would cost the university system very little, because Kennesaw’s facilities were adequate to handle the initial expected enrollments and because operating funds would be the same whether KJC’s associate’s degree graduates finished their upper-level work in Cobb County or elsewhere in the university system. According to Garrison, the main cost would be in providing access to upper-level degree programs for students who otherwise could not afford to complete their education.⁴²

On March 12, 1975, the chamber’s select committee made Cobb’s third presentation to the Board of Regents. Garrison introduced Harold Willingham who did most of the talking, repeating the arguments made by earlier delegations and Garrison’s letter. Three Kennesaw Student Government Association leaders (President Howell Swain, Secretary Pat Loyd, and Senator June Rowland) accompanied the committee. Prior to the meeting, the Student Government Association had gone out to Cumberland Mall and other shopping centers and asked people to sign a petition supporting Kennesaw’s elevation to senior-college status. Now, Swain presented the petition with nine thousand signatures. Described as a “clean-cut” young man who held down a full-time job while going to school, Swain lamented that he could not afford to go into Atlanta to Georgia State and would have to drop out if Kennesaw did not go to four-year status. However, as before, the delegation received only a polite “thank you” from Chairman Charles Harris, who told them that the regents would take the matter under advisement.⁴³

Meanwhile, Joe Mack Wilson, A. L. Burruss, and Joe Frank Harris tried another strategy, putting funds in the state budget to pay for the conversion. Future governor Harris was chairman of the House Appropriations Committee, on which Wilson also served. They made up two of the five members of the powerful “green door” group that largely wrote the appropriations bills that came out of the House. Originally, they designated $350,000 as a line item for the Board of Regents that could be used only for the conversion of Kennesaw to four-year status. Although the amount was later reduced to $250,000, they, according to one reporter, cleared “more hurdles than an Olympic sprinter” in keeping the funds in the final budget.⁴⁴
The regents chose not to spend the quarter million dollars during the 1975–76 school year, but Wilson and his colleagues resolved to keep the money in the budget until they came around. Meanwhile, President Sturgis’s correspondence makes clear that he was taking a more aggressive role, perhaps under prodding from Wilson and others. In addition to his private letters to a variety of policymakers, he was becoming more assertive in his discussions with the chancellor. George Simpson could seem overbearing at times, and it took some courage to stand up to him. By August 7, 1975, however, Sturgis wrote to him stating that while there might be some logic to his argument that the system should not take on new projects during a recession, yet, “I believe we must be very much concerned about the number of individuals in our geographic locality who, under present conditions, are being denied educational opportunities because they cannot afford the cost of attending another institution in the System.” The president went on to say that the cost of conversion would be “nominal” as the data in his enclosed Profile proved. He concluded that
he understood all junior colleges could not be converted, but the data supported “an affirmative decision” in the case of KJC.\textsuperscript{145}

Two months later, pressure on the chancellor and board increased when state leaders gathered in Cobb County for the dedication of the James V. Carmichael Student Center. Carmichael was one of the outstanding statesmen and business leaders of twentieth-century Georgia. He played a central role in bringing the Bell Aircraft plant to Marietta during World War II and was its general manager at the end of the conflict. He also served as the first general manager when Lockheed reopened the plant in 1951 and was president for over a decade of the Atlanta-based Scripito pen company. In 1946 he was the progressive candidate for governor against Eugene Talmadge, winning the popular vote, but losing in the antiquated county-unit system, by which ballots in the Democratic primaries were counted at the time. He was also involved in a host of community organizations.

Carmichael was perhaps most admired for his tremendous courage, having come close to death as a teenager in 1926 when he was hit by a speeding motorist on the Dixie Highway in front of his parents’ general store. His back was broken and the spinal cord all but severed. He spent a year recovering, first at Crawford Long Hospital, and then at home, with his mother staying constantly by his side, reading and singing with him sometimes all night while Jimmie learned to endure the intense pain that would never leave him. The next several years were marked by minor victories, advancing from a wheelchair to crutches and then to a cane by 1933 when he earned an Emory University law degree.\textsuperscript{146}

He returned home to a successful legal career, two terms in the legislature, and tenure as county attorney before his role in the aircraft industry. Appointed to the
Board of Regents by Governor Carl Sanders, he helped direct the university system until his death in 1972. In declining health, he performed one last service for Kennesaw Junior College in May 1971 when the Board of Regents met on campus to consider whether the growing school needed a new student center. According to President Sturgis:

He was very, very instrumental in the college getting a Student Center, influencing the members of the Board.... The man was just a brave, brave person.... They had the Board meeting, and then the next morning they had a breakfast on campus here for the Board of Regents. Mr. Carmichael was in front of the Library, and he said he didn't know whether he could make it—it took him three hours to dress in the morning. He was just terribly in pain. But who would be the first one at that breakfast next morning? Mr. James V. Carmichael. It was really a great, great effort.

When the thirty-six-thousand-square-foot Student Center was completed, the board voted unanimously to name it for Carmichael. It became the first building on campus to be named for an individual. The dedication was scheduled for October 2, 1975 on what would have been his sixty-fifth birthday. Governor Busbee came to deliver the major address, and Carmichael’s widow and children, the chancellor and the Board of Regents, the legislative delegation, and many other dignitaries were invited. Prior to the official half past nine opening, Governor Busbee addressed an early-bird breakfast of the Cobb Chamber where he asserted, “Without any doubt, we believe we will have a four-year college at Kennesaw.” Chairman Charles Harris of Ocilla, in south Georgia, skipped the early-bird meal, but responded to a reporter’s question that Kennesaw was playing a fine role as a junior college, and since the system had Georgia State and West Georgia, it did not need more four-year schools in this area; therefore, the regents, he claimed, intended to devote their limited resources in a down economy to professors’ salaries. 147

At the actual dedication, the governor did not mention four-year conversion. However, shortly after his address, the matter came up unexpectedly. June Rowland [Krise] was sitting on stage in her capacity as Student Government Association president to present a plaque to Mrs. Carmichael; so she was in an excellent position to see what happened. Behind the audience, on the balcony of the Student Center, a number of students had gathered. As the program neared its end, Randy Krise (June’s future brother-in-law), Wayne Carter, and roughly a half-dozen others, unfurled a huge banner that read, “Four Years Now.” Some of the people on stage began clapping, and then the audience turned and erupted in applause. Rowland noted that Governor Busbee smiled sheepishly and nodded, and Joe Mack Wilson looked very proud.
Students releasing the Four Years Now banner at the Student Center dedication.
President Sturgis had worried that students might try to disrupt the program with some type of demonstration and he met with the SGA ahead of time to urge them not to “embarrass the college or the community or the governor.” He had no idea what the students planned to do, but he quickly realized that, without saying a word, they had made the perfect appeal, demonstrating to state leaders that Kennesaw students were solidly behind the four-year effort. He noted that the students were “just great,” that it “broke up the meeting,” and that Governor Busbee seemed as happy as anyone. Immediately afterwards, he wrote a note to June Rowland saying, “I could not have been more proud of you and our students than I was this morning during the dedication of our James V. Carmichael Student Center.”

In January 1976, as V. Fred Aiken was sworn in as Cobb Chamber president, he asserted that his top priority was four-year status for KJC. At the ceremony, he recognized Chancellor Simpson in the audience and told him, “We will not give up until four year status for KJC has become a reality.” Governor Busbee held a press conference in February where he presented a two-page report on why Kennesaw needed a senior college. At the conference he revealed that he was talking directly with Chancellor Simpson, urging him to support the project “in the interest of better education.” He also indicated that if the general assembly put another quarter million dollars in the budget for Kennesaw’s conversion, he would not exercise a line-item veto. Using data that originated with President Sturgis, he noted that one of the big issues was 62 percent of KJC students were working people who needed educational opportunities closer to home, and that the cost of conversion would be “very nominal.” Moreover, he asserted, traffic on I-75 and US 41 had made commuting into Georgia State “almost impossible.”

With clear support from the governor, Joe Mack Wilson, A. L. Burruss, and Joe Frank Harris beat back attempts in the House to strip the $250,000 for conversion from the fiscal year 1977 budget. After heated debate, an amendment to strike the item lost, 104-56. A few weeks later, Representatives Wilson, Burruss, and George Kreeger escorted four Kennesaw student leaders into the governor’s office. Their main spokesperson, Richard Krise, a twenty-five-year-old Woodstock resident and KJC graduate, told Busbee, “I may have to quit school because it just costs too much to travel downtown, pay for food and parking, and go to classes at Georgia State.” The future high school principal remarked that if Kennesaw offered upper-level courses, he would definitely transfer back.

Joining Krise were incoming SGA president Pat Ashcraft and outgoing president June Rowland, along with Larry Croft, a twenty-eight-year-old night student from Acworth, who said he could not afford to drive downtown for classes. Rowland added, “I know there are a lot of housewives who can afford to go to Kennesaw because it’s close to their homes, and they can take their children there to sit in the
back of the classroom. Those women won’t go on to Georgia State simply because it’s too far and not convenient.”

Political pundits credit the second $250,000 appropriation as the tipping point in bringing influence-makers on board. For instance, the Seventh Congressional District regent, Judge James D. Maddox of Rome, had stayed largely on the sidelines until this point, but now he became active. An ardent Jimmy Carter supporter, he began lobbying fellow regents who had also been Carter appointees. In Cobb County, Judge Luther Hames suddenly got on the bandwagon, working through his long-time friend Lester Maddox to sway a vote. Governor Busbee also called his four board appointees, asking for their support.

Bob Garrison had been working for some time on two regents, especially a good friend from Albany, Charles T. Oxford, with whom he went bird hunting. Horace Sturgis also lobbied Oxford. After receiving one of Sturgis’s Annual Reports, Oxford wrote the president that Kennesaw had a good chance of gaining senior-college status, and “I hope this can be accomplished.” Garrison claimed to make a personal call on another board member, apparently Lamar Plunkett, a clothing manufacturer from Bowdon, in Carroll County, near West Georgia College. This individual, he said, had a practical reason to oppose Kennesaw’s conversion, yet he spoke up at the crucial board meeting, saying, “What Garrison tells you is the truth.” According to a newspaper account, Plunkett entered the April 1976 board meeting with “reservations,” but after hearing a report on KJC’s many accomplishments, was convinced that Kennesaw would “make a good senior college.”

Joe Mack Wilson was always proud of his role in orchestrating contacts with regents and legislators. He persuaded President Sturgis to make a phone call to Clarence Vaughn of Conyers, the majority leader in the House and a friend for many years of Horace and Sue Sturgis. DeKalb Junior College was in his district, and it was important to make sure that Vaughn did not raise an objection to a four-year public college going into Cobb before DeKalb County received one. Sturgis and Wilson hoped to persuade Vaughn to say a good word about Kennesaw to Regent John R. Richardson, who was also from Conyers. In addition, Wilson involved Marietta Daily Journal editor Bill Kinney and his wife Alberta in the campaign. Mrs. Kinney was originally from Madison, and newspaper editor Carey Williams Sr., of nearby Greensboro, was a regent. So, Wilson claimed, “we sent her home” to talk to him. Meanwhile, Regent John R. Robinson of Americus was approached by fellow physician Alfred Colquitt of Marietta, who wrote him that KJC was a “wonderful cultural asset,” due to the nationally-acclaimed Cobb County Symposium, held each year on the Kennesaw campus. He told his friend “Bud” Robinson that “the people of the area interested in quality education are behind [the four-year conversion] 100%.”
The Vote on Four-Year Status and the Ending of an Era

With the issue coming to a head, President Sturgis journeyed to Rome before the April 1976 board meeting to talk personally to Regent Maddox. After discussing a number of institutional needs, he brought up the four-year issue and suggested that it was time to give Kennesaw’s supporters an answer. He did not ask that the item be placed on the agenda, but that was the crucial final step to force a vote. No decision could be made without first placing the question on the agenda. Maddox agreed that it was time, and promised to have the matter added. When the first agenda was circulated among college presidents a few days before the meeting, Sturgis noted with alarm that the four-year question was not there. So he placed a frantic call to Maddox, who said he would handle it. When the revised agenda came out, the Kennesaw question was included. 155

At the April 14, 1976, meeting, Bob Garrison again headed the local delegation. After Chairman Charles Harris said that the Kennesaw matter had been studied in detail by the chancellor’s staff, he recognized Garrison, who spoke a few words about the growth in number of college-age students in north Georgia and the “pressing need” of a senior college at Kennesaw. Next, Representative A. L. Burruss argued that the financial recession was reason to take action rather than delay, and that upper-level classes were needed hopefully as early as the fall. Appropriations Committee chairman, Joe Frank Harris, followed with a few remarks about state funding, offering assurances that revenues would be available to meet the expenses of all operations of the university system, including the upgrading of Kennesaw Junior College.

The regents discussed the matter for two hours. Lamar Plunkett asked about the potential impact on enrollment at other university system colleges. Plunkett and Milton Jones of Columbus urged that the proposed change be reported to HEW to determine whether the federal government would approve Kennesaw’s change in status. Regent Erwin A. Friedman asked Chancellor Simpson to review his office’s planning principles for the five-county Atlanta metropolitan area. After reporting the old plan of feeder junior colleges supporting Georgia State University and emphasizing that any change would have serious implications, Simpson, surprisingly, made a case for conversion.

The chancellor conceded that the Cobb County area was quite capable of supporting a senior college, that the board had always tried to place institutions where they were needed, and that northwest Georgia had not been fully served. He concluded that the real question was whether a new four-year school should go in Kennesaw or somewhere further north. After further discussion, Regent Maddox made the motion to approve Kennesaw’s change of status, effective fall quarter, 1978. The reason for the two-year delay, apparently, was so HEW would have time to comment on whether the change would have an impact on the system’s
desegregation plan. After receiving a second from Regent John Richardson, the motion passed, 11–2. The two negative votes were cast by David H. Tisinger of Carrollton, who feared the impact on West Georgia College, and Milton Jones of Columbus, who, according to the Marietta Daily Journal, launched “a vicious attack” on what he considered an “ill-advised,” unnecessary proposal. Interestingly, neither of the African American members voted against the plan. Elridge W. McMillan was absent, and Jesse Hill Jr. voted yes.  

Howls of protest emanated almost immediately from Central Atlanta Progress, the Georgia State University student newspaper, the Signal, and the Georgia State Conference of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People (NAACP). GSU students wondered why the regents could find new revenues for Kennesaw, but apparently could not find sufficient funds to start Georgia State’s promised law school. The NAACP asked how the regents could find resources for Cobb County, when they were dragging their feet in complying with a court order to upgrade the historically black Fort Valley State College. The critics wondered whether anyone had looked at the needs of the rest of the state.  

President Sturgis prepared an Impact Study on the Proposed Conversion that the Board of Regents accepted in November and forwarded to the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. When, after almost a year, that agency had neither approved nor disapproved, the university system took its inaction as evidence that Kennesaw’s change in status had passed federal inspection. None of the protests lasted long or went very far. As one of the regents explained, “The wheels were already well-greased,” and the governor had the votes.  

For the next two years the Kennesaw faculty worked to prepare senior-level courses and programs. President Sturgis invited several consultants to campus, such as Jack Anderson, an academic dean at Columbus College, who gave advice on how his institution handled the transition a decade earlier. As a junior college, Kennesaw hired faculty to teach core curriculum courses, with especially high demands in areas such as English, history, music, mathematics, biology, and business administration. Not surprisingly, these became the original baccalaureate programs, joined quickly by education and political science. Recognizing that business administration and education would be popular fields of study, Kennesaw created two new divisions and began hiring faculty under the direction of original chairpersons William P. Thompson (business administration) and Robert L. Driscoll (education).  

It was an ideal time to be a Kennesaw College professor. The various disciplines caucused and democratically developed upper-level course proposals. Since no one had been hired to teach narrow specialties, it was not always clear who had the inside track to teach a particular junior or senior class. Among historians, the standard practice was to let individuals volunteer to teach what they wanted, and if two or
more expressed interest in the same course, they taught it in rotation. For some professors, this liberal policy provided an opportunity to develop new specialties or hone old ones.

Possible institutional name changes were discussed in faculty meetings, and President Sturgis asked the advice of foundation trustees, alumni, students, and the Cobb Chamber. His preference was simply to drop “junior.” He never liked “state” in the name of an institution, remembering a time when “state” implied a teacher’s college or agricultural and mechanical school. So he was happy when a consensus emerged around Kennesaw College (KC). In September 1977 the regents approved the name change, in time to order new stationery and ask the state to change the road signs.161

A final step in the conversion process was to elevate salaries to a senior-college level. When Southern Tech became a four-year school, the faculty had to wait three or four years before salaries came up to par with other senior institutions. President Sturgis did not want Kennesaw’s professors to have to wait that long. So he met with Regent Maddox and wrote a letter to the Chancellor, arguing that if students were paying senior-college fees, faculty should receive senior-college salaries. Once again, he was successful, and 1978–79 proved to be a banner year, with professors enjoying the opportunity to teach upper-level classes and to receive the largest percentage raise of their careers.162

Junior-level courses began in fall quarter, 1978, with senior classes initiated the following year. The first bachelors’ degrees were awarded in June 1980. Having overseen Kennesaw’s transition, Horace Sturgis announced his retirement, effective December 31, 1980. The institution had just completed a successful accreditation visit from the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools. The new library (eventually named for Dr. Sturgis) was almost complete. After forty-six years in education, he felt the time was right to bow out. In looking back on his accomplishments, the president took greatest pride not in individual achievements, but in the growth of the college he was privileged to head—particularly the growth in quality of faculty and students that made the four-year conversion possible. As he said when announcing his retirement, “We set out to build a quality institution and I think we have done that.” Thus, the first major era of Kennesaw’s history came to a close. Sturgis was clearly the right person to lead the institution through its junior-college years and the conversion to a four-year school. But now faculty and students yearned to move in different directions, and they soon would have a dynamic new president with an expansive vision of how far the college might go.163
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A New President and a View of the Future

Kennesaw’s accomplishments in the Sturgis era were impressive. But they paled in comparison to the growth of the college under the next president. When administrations change, colleges have an opportunity to seek and secure presidents who bring different visions, talents, and leadership styles. In some cases, they make one-hundred-eighty-degree turns. That was certainly true when Betty L. Siegel became the University System of Georgia’s first woman president. Soon afterwards, the pent-up energies and ideas of KCs talented faculty and staff, liberated by Siegel’s invitational leadership, produced a new view for the future that changed the course of Kennesaw’s history in positive and rewarding ways.

A History-Making Search
Horace Sturgis’s retirement gave the campus an opportunity to reflect on its progress from junior to senior college and its hopes for the future. In many ways, Sturgis’s top-down style of administration had served the young institution well. In the early days, when most of the teaching faculty lacked doctorates and instructors outnumbered tenured professors, no other approach was perhaps practical. By 1980, however, the growing four-year school was a much different place than it had been just a decade before. The faculty had matured with the college and demanded a greater role in decision making. It also yearned for a president with solid academic credentials and national reputation who could spread the word about Kennesaw College beyond its immediate service area.

Despite the charter president’s solid record of outreach to Cobb County, he was virtually unknown beyond Atlanta, and the same could be said for the faculty and the institution as a whole. The quality of Kennesaw College’s programs seemed a well-kept secret even in greater Atlanta. While some students and professors took pride in calling Kennesaw a “Little Harvard in the Pines,” others perceived that the college was too cloistered and hoped the next president would champion a broader vision of faculty involvement beyond the yellow brick walls of an insular campus.
Chancellor Vernon Crawford made a visit to Kennesaw early in the fall of 1980 to listen to anyone who wanted to share an opinion on the qualities needed in a new president and how the search should be conducted. A number of students and professors took advantage of the opportunity, and Crawford’s calendar was booked solidly for two days with fifteen-to-twenty-minute appointments. Afterwards, he selected a nineteen-member search committee that, surprisingly, was not headed by a high-ranking administrator. The sessions apparently made Crawford aware of a growing chasm of distrust between administrators and the teaching faculty, and that the campus community would be deeply suspicious of any committee moderated by a dean or division head.

Crawford’s choice as chairman was S. Frederick Roach Jr., a history professor, who had served on the faculty since 1968. While teaching a full load, Roach had managed to complete his dissertation at the University of Oklahoma in 1972, writing on the humorist Will Rogers under the supervision of the noted western and agricultural historian, Gilbert C. Fite. After earning his degree, Roach had taken on some administrative responsibilities in the Social Sciences Division, helping the chairman, George Beggs, with class scheduling, book orders, and other details, but continuing to teach a full load and never exercising a supervisory role over other faculty.164

The search committee’s vice chairperson was charter faculty member and Business Division chair, William P. Thompson, a retired US Army major and an accountant with a PhD from Georgia State University. His fellow committee members were fortunate to have a detail-oriented person of his background, because most of them had never served on a search committee of any type. In the past, the administration had filled academic slots with little input from the teaching faculty. Consequently, the committee members had little experience in developing procedures, forms, and questionnaires that would stand legal challenge. Thompson took the leadership in these areas. Meanwhile, Roach took responsibility for meeting with committee members individually in their offices or at local restaurants to listen to their concerns and try to build esprit de corps.165

One appointee to the committee, alumni president June Krise, met with Roach at a McDonald’s a few miles from campus. When Roach asked her how she would describe the perfect college president, she responded that she wanted someone well grounded like Dr. Sturgis, but also good looking, charismatic, and “on fire.” Since the university system had never had a woman president, she described her ideal male candidate. Later, Krise concluded that the search produced precisely
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the type of person she envisioned, although she had the gender wrong. During his meetings with faculty members, Roach heard again and again from the women of the search committee that they resented the lack of females in high places. He, therefore, suspected from the beginning that, everything being equal, at least one female would make the final list.

Like the chancellor, Roach was impressed by the degree of faculty distrust of the current administration and the likelihood that the committee would reject internal candidates and seek outsiders with new ideas and a strong record on shared governance. As the years went by, Sturgis and his administrative team had become more open to bottom-up leadership from students and faculty. After 1972, when the regents approved Kennesaw’s first set of statutes, the top administrators usually took the advice of the Academic and Student Affairs Councils, on which elected faculty members and student government officers had major voices. But the circle around the former president consisted of white males who tended to be “old school” in their preferences and resented the lack of respect for authority of many young scholars who were products of the rebellious 1960s.166

One of the reasons for faculty distrust was the total power that the administration held over tenure and promotion decisions. The campus Tenure and Promotion
Committee had no elected members. The academic dean presided over unannounced, closed meetings where the only ones in attendance were the five division chairs and the chair of the Developmental Studies Department. Faculty members had no formal way to initiate a request for tenure or promotion and did not always know they were under consideration until after the fact. Political science professor Helen S. Ridley remembered the process:

George Beggs came by to see me one day and said, “Dr. Ridley, we’re not going to tenure you this year.” I had prepared nothing—you prepared nothing [at that time]. I said, “Okay. Is there a particular reason?” He said, “Some think you have a bad attitude, and you need to correct it.” Who, me? I said, “Okay, give me some examples so that I’ll know what to correct.” He said, “I’ve never seen it, and your colleagues have never seen it; but, nevertheless, you have to correct it.” I said, “Well, rest assured I will.” In any event, about a week later he came back and said, “Dr. Ridley, we’ve realized that if we don’t tenure you, we can’t keep you.” I said, “Well, that’s a relief.” So I got tenured. And that was the way the decisions were made.¹⁶⁷

Thanks largely to Chancellor Crawford, the 1980–81 presidential search was remarkably open and democratic. The search committee reported only to the chancellor and included faculty from a variety of disciplines; three chief administrators; and student, staff, alumni, and community representatives. Allowed to develop its operating procedures, the committee spent the fall getting organized and agreeing on the language of the job announcement. The deadline for submitting applications was February 27, 1981. An unusually large number of individuals applied—Including one resident of a psychiatric hospital in a nearby state. After many hours of labor and often heated discussions, the committee winnowed the original 147 applicants down to about a dozen semifinalists, nine of whom visited campus for interviews during May and early June. At that stage, faculty, staff, and students were given the opportunity to meet the candidates and provide input.¹⁶⁸

Faculty members packed a lecture hall in the new Humanities Building for their chance to interact with the candidates. Several of the semifinalists were already presidents of sister institutions; the rest were deans or chief academic officers. Most of the sessions were informative, but not terribly exciting. All the candidates were qualified, but few articulated an inspiring vision of what Kennesaw could become.
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The one exception was Betty Lentz Siegel, Dean of the School of Education and Psychology at Western Carolina University, who made her visit to campus in early June. Her meeting with the faculty quickly became spirited and interactive as candidate and audience engaged in a lively discussion. Siegel remembered that: “I loved your questions. I really loved the people. I think I was so smitten that I really wanted the job. I had been at other interviews at which I had been halfheartedly interested. I might be interested; I might not. But I remember saying to my husband afterwards, ‘Oh, this is wonderful. Those people are wonderful.’ It’s people that make the difference. I’ve always been blessed by liking the people with whom I find myself. I really thought [the interview at Kennesaw] was great. It was marvelous.”

Siegel seemed to make a good first impression on everyone she encountered. James D. (Spec) Landrum was serving at the time as Coordinator of Development and Alumni Affairs, having come to Kennesaw after a successful career as a college football coach and president of the Georgia Conservancy. His wife, Mildred, was a professor of Business Education and a member of the search committee. Spec had agreed to let the presidential candidates use his office in the Administration Building if they needed a work space during the breaks in their schedules. He volunteered his services to take candidates on campus tours and, in general, to make them feel at home. Most of the visitors were polite, but did not take advantage of his offer. The exception was Siegel. When she arrived, Landrum told her:

“Dr. Siegel, here’s my office, and it’s yours. Anything I can do for you, let me know. I’ll be outside or somewhere in the building if you need me for anything . . . .” And I started out the door. She [said], “Wait a minute. I want to talk to you.” I’d gotten back in my chair behind my desk, and I got up, and I went around to get in another chair, so she could sit at her own desk if she wanted to. She said, “No, you stay over there.” So she sat down and she quizzed me about Marietta, everything you can imagine.”

Along with two full days of meetings, each applicant experienced a major social event, a dinner with the committee and friends of the college at such popular Atlanta restaurants as Ray’s on the River. Bill Thompson’s wife, Mary, accompanied her husband to a number of the dinners. She later recalled that she became so bored with the conversations that she begged out of the one where Siegel was the honored guest. Instead, she asked Bill to take his secretary, Barbara Blackwell. When they
came back to the house raving about Betty Siegel, Mary realized she probably had missed an opportunity to meet Kennesaw’s next president.171

Siegel managed to dominate every meeting she attended, including the critical exchange with the search committee in the late afternoon of the second day. According to Chairman Roach, committee members had become experts at asking probing questions that stripped candidates of their pretensions and got to the heart of what they believed and what type of temperament they had. Siegel, however, seized the initiative before anyone had a chance to start grilling her. As Roach recalled,

She said, “Before we get started, let me tell you what’s happened to me…. [Just before this meeting], I went down to the bookstore, and there were two students …so I went up to one of them and said, ‘Why did you choose to come to Kennesaw?’ And they told me because they were a business administration major and that Kennesaw had the best Business Administration Department in the state.” Well, the assistant chair of the search committee was the [chairman] of the Business [Division]. And then she went over and talked to the other student and said, “Why did you come to Kennesaw? What’s your major?” And she said, “I’m a history major, and I came to Kennesaw because Kennesaw’s got the best History Department in the system.” So she took the lead in the interview away from us on that last day.172

After all the candidates had left town, the committee decided upon three finalists: Siegel, President John Pilecki of Westfield (Massachusetts) State College, and Acting President Richard Carl Meyer of Texas A&I University. On June 19, 1981, those names were submitted to the chancellor. Crawford and his staff then spent the next month conducting their own interviews and background checks. The process took so long that Betty Siegel had about concluded she was out of the running.

On July 29, 1981, Betty and her husband Joel were vacationing at their beachside condominium. They arose early to view the televised wedding of Charles, Prince of Wales, and Lady Diana Spencer. Afterwards, they went for a walk on the beach. Betty remembers confiding in Joel: “I guess I didn’t get the job…[but] I don’t define myself in terms of this job. I want it, but I don’t think it was meant to be. It’s okay…we have such a good life at Western, such a happy place and the jobs are so good. The children are happy. It’s okay. It’s wonderful.” As they returned to the condominium, she heard the phone ringing. It was the chancellor. He said, “Betty, we want you to take the job.” She instantly responded, “Yes!” She later remarked, “I didn’t ask what it paid. I took the job, just like that. So in the space of one hour I’d gone from thinking that my life was absolutely fine and that I didn’t define myself in terms of that job. On that day, I remember, that’s what happened.”173
The board and chancellor’s office kept the appointment a well-guarded secret. The only person notified on the Kennesaw campus was the chairman of the search committee, Fred Roach, and he was instructed not to tell anyone. The publisher of the Marietta Daily Journal (MDJ), Otis A. Brumby Jr., was determined to print the name of the new president before the chancellor made the official announcement. Roach received numerous calls from reporters, but neither Roach nor anyone else in Georgia talked. So Brumby told his staff, regardless of cost, to call the campuses of all the finalists to see if any of them had talked to anyone or submitted their resignations or had plans to be in Atlanta for the board meeting on August 19.174

The MDJ broke the story on August 18, 1981, with a front page headline, “Woman to be Named Kennesaw President.” Reporter Donna Espy reached Betty Siegel at her Western Carolina office. While Siegel would neither confirm nor deny her selection, she admitted that she expected to be in Atlanta the following day. She also volunteered that she had enjoyed her campus interviews and that she would enjoy serving as president. After the article appeared, the usually affable Crawford phoned Roach to chastise him for divulging the secret. Roach, however, denied that he was the source, and by the next day Crawford had calmed down, realizing that his search committee chair was telling the truth.175

The appointment became official at the monthly meeting of the Board of Regents on August 19, 1981. The chancellor introduced Roach, who gave a brief report on the process by which the search committee made its choices. Then Crawford explained how he reached his decision to recommend Siegel. He said her selection was a “milestone” for the university system. The meeting was a mere formality, and with virtually no discussion, the board voted unanimously for the first woman president in the history of the university system. Fittingly, the board in 1981 was headed by its first female chair, Marie W. Dodd of Roswell, a vice president of the Ivan Allen Company. Later, Siegel said that the opportunity to be the first woman president was “very significant to me,” but she looked forward to the day when such appointments would not be considered unusual.176

At age fifty, Siegel had already had a remarkable career. She grew up in eastern Kentucky, where her father went to work out of high school shoveling coal in a local mine. Through hard work and determination, he saved his money, bought a saw mill and then a coal mine, and continued accumulating other small mills and mines. The women in her family were strong role models. Her maternal great-grandmother was a Republican Party chairperson and the owner of a large farm. Her grandmothers were shrewd businesswomen, one running several family farms and the other a boarding house. At the same time, they engaged in many community services and supported the local schools.177

Siegel’s introduction to higher education came at Cumberland College in Williamsburg, Kentucky, where her great-great-uncle, Lloyd Creec, had just retired
as president. Cumberland had a liberal curriculum that allowed her to take anything she wanted, so she concentrated on English and history. After receiving an associate’s degree in 1950, she enrolled at Wake Forest, where she received a BA in 1952 with a dual major in those two areas. The following year, she earned a MEd at the University of North Carolina. After teaching high school for three years and then college at Lenoir-Rhyne in Hickory, North Carolina, she took a leave of absence for two years to complete a PhD at Florida State University.

By this time her interest had shifted to developmental psychology. Her major professor, Herman Frick, played a prominent role in helping Florida school systems develop desegregation plans in accordance with the Supreme Court’s *Brown* decision. She recalls that she learned from him that academics have an obligation to help society see “what is the righteous, good thing to do.” As Frick’s assistant, she traveled with him on Southern Association of Colleges and Schools accreditation visits and learned the importance of group thinking and long-range planning.178

After earning her doctorate in 1961, Siegel returned to Lenoir-Rhyne for three years, then went to Indiana University for a postdoctorate where she gained child psychology clinical experience and worked with Boyd McCandless on intervention strategies that were effective in the psycho-social development of culturally and economically disadvantaged children. She also was able to teach as a visiting professor in the Indiana University Graduate Program.

In 1967 she was offered a job teaching psychological foundations at the University of Florida (UF) in a department that was otherwise all male. She had met
her husband, Joel, at Indiana University and showed up in Gainesville, Florida for the start of her first fall quarter six months pregnant. She recalls that the men in the department were all panicky, but she told them not to worry and that it would not interfere with her teaching. On the last day of exams, she went to the hospital, had her first child, and graded the student papers while still recovering. Joel ran them back to the department office before any of her colleagues had graded their finals. When classes began again in January, she was back in the classroom and did not miss a single day. Among the University of Florida's 3,500 professors, her reputation spread quickly as "that woman." Despite having given birth over fifteen months to two children, she became, in 1969, one of the first three recipients of UF's Outstanding Teacher Awards. 179

In 1972 she was invited to become dean of academic affairs for continuing education, the first woman dean in the history of the University of Florida. Soon, President E. T. York gave her the task of heading the committee that wrote the institution's first affirmative action plan. She recalls that it was the hardest year of her life, but President York and federal officials in Washington approved the plan that set Florida's flagship institution in the direction of greater diversity. York became a significant role model, teaching her that a university can be a force for social change. She later recalled that, "what I learned from that job and from him was that an institution that is cloistered would not be an institution of the future. I give him the credit for being a significant moving force in my life and leading me to see a deeper, more inclusive way of looking at higher education rather than being exclusive." 180

In 1976 Western Carolina University asked Siegel to head its School of Education and Psychology. Excited by the opportunity to be an academic dean in her research and teaching field, she accepted the offer. A believer in the Clark Kerr admonition that "if you're not heard outside your institution, you're not heard inside," she used her new position as a vehicle to engage in outreach throughout North Carolina and beyond, speaking to any group that invited her and becoming an educational consultant in several southern states, New Mexico, and Washington. 181

As her reputation spread nationally, she was soon being nominated for a number of presidencies and was a finalist at Valdosta State College. She, therefore, knew that Georgia had an outstanding university system. Someone nominated her for the opening at Kennesaw, and the committee sent her a letter asking her to consider applying. She had never heard of Kennesaw College and left the letter in a stack on her desk. One day she heard a colleague at Western Carolina raving about a trip she had just taken to Marietta and to a wonderful little college there. Siegel began thinking, "Marietta, Georgia, where have I heard of it?" A quick search of her desk located the job advertisement, but the deadline to apply was that day. So she called Chairman Roach and asked if their phone conversation would suffice to
initiate her candidacy. He agreed, and by this fortunate circumstance she was able to submit her application papers.182

By the time she came for her interview, she had done her homework. According to Siegel, the literature on up-and-coming colleges described the institution of the future as a college in the Sunbelt, in a major population area, along a major economic thoroughfare, that catered to nontraditional students. She began thinking that Kennesaw College fit that description exactly. Recognizing Kennesaw as a prototype
of the college of the future, she arrived on campus excited by the opportunity to help shape its growth. Thus, a developing college and a developmental psychologist found in 1981 their perfect match.¹⁸³

View of the Future
With her extensive background at a variety of research and teaching institutions, Betty Siegel came to Kennesaw College with a clear vision of what needed to be done for the relatively new school to reach its full potential. She knew, however, that some of her mentors had alienated people by being too “hard-hitting” in trying to impose their vision on others. Her goal was to invite faculty and staff to participate in forging a plan for the future that would have broad support. While her detractors believed that real leaders rule with iron fists, she perceived the campus community was more likely to follow her direction if everyone thought they had a chance to participate in shaping policy.¹⁸⁴

Siegel spent the first year of her presidency meeting with students and faculty and talking to some 161 different civic groups. From these numerous conversations,
she reached several major conclusions. One was that local people were proud of their college, but wanted to see it more community-engaged, with faculty offering their expertise in meeting the needs of metro Atlanta and rural northwest Georgia. A second was that the emphasis of the junior-college era on high academic standards had created a culture where low retention rates were the norm and where too few programs helped students succeed. Siegel wanted to create a climate where teaching was personalized and invitational, and student retention and graduation were the expectations.
Another conclusion was that Kennesaw gave students few reasons to stay on campus for purposes other than attending class. Siegel believed that Kennesaw could create a residential campus feel, even while it continued to be a commuter college. But to do so, it had to focus more on campus life and the unique problems of target audiences such as first-year and nontraditional students. Finally, the president realized she had a talented, young faculty, but one burdened with heavy teaching loads and little support for scholarship. There was probably little she could do at that time about teaching loads, but to build faculty morale and unleash creative abilities, she believed that the administration needed to find innovative ways of facilitating faculty development.185

The 1981 academic year began with a faculty retreat at Unicoi State Park where President Siegel announced the establishment of an annual distinguished teaching award, given to one faculty member each year, based on student nominations and the input of a special awards committee.186 About a month later, on October 15, 1981, President Siegel asked Dr. Helen S. Ridley to head a major ad hoc committee called the View of the Future that would involve the total faculty in a year-long institutional study.

Ridley was in her seventh year at Kennesaw College, having joined the faculty in 1975, shortly after receiving her PhD from Emory University. A political scientist, she was an expert on constitutional law; her dissertation had been on plea bargaining in Fulton County. Not long after joining the faculty, she became the parliamentarian for monthly faculty meetings until she started making rulings that President Sturgis did not like. As she recalled, she was removed from her post for insisting on Robert’s Rules of Order rather than “Horace’s Rules.” A reputation as an “uppity woman” was not a good thing under the old regime, but apparently was more socially acceptable after Betty Siegel’s arrival. When Siegel came for her job interview, Ridley had the opportunity to meet her and serve as her guide, taking her to various places on campus. After one of the sessions, Siegel followed Ridley to her office, and they had a chance to engage in casual conversation. They established a rapport that carried over to the View of the Future study.187

Siegel charged the committee to be a conduit through which faculty concerns and perceptions were channeled to the president and her leadership team. The final report was to include both short-term and long-term recommendations that the president promised to study and implement. Siegel and Ridley worked together in choosing a committee composed of four associate professors, four assistant professors, and three members of the staff.188 All five academic divisions were represented, along with the library, counseling, and personnel.189
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Throughout the 1981–82 year, the View of the Future Committee investigated four major topics that President Siegel asked it to study. The first was the quality of professional life at Kennesaw College; the second was the publics served by Kennesaw; the third was the mission of the institution; and the fourth was personalized teaching and learning. The first two topics were divided into a variety of subcategories to be studied by task forces of up to ten people, each appointed by President Siegel and chaired by a View of the Future Committee member. Task forces were charged with producing written reports on their particular subjects.\textsuperscript{190}

The regularly-scheduled monthly faculty meetings became forums in which the entire professoriate gave input into the various task force topics. In the first general faculty meeting, a few top administrators dominated the discussion in ways that intimidated some people. When Ridley brought the problem to the president’s attention, Siegel agreed to exclude from future forums the president’s staff (the dean of the college, dean of students, controller, and director of development and public service). However, Siegel and the committee thought that division chairs needed to hear what the faculty thought. They were allowed to participate, with the admonition that they be on their best behavior.\textsuperscript{191}

The Task Force on Missions had the assignment of envisioning a more democratic, inviting campus culture for faculty and students. The group was headed by View of the Future Committee members Judy Mitchell and Pamela J. Rhyne. While the specific language of their recommendation was never officially adopted, the statement seemed to catch President Siegel’s spirit of interactive leadership, sprinkling expressions such as “mutual respect and trust” and “collegial environment” throughout the brief document. The most specific change embedded in the proposed mission statement was a shift in focus to “instruction in career and professional areas to prepare students for their life work.” In explaining this emphasis, the task force conceded the need for a liberal arts foundation in all programs, but argued that Kennesaw had to expand the number of courses and majors in business, education, and nursing to meet both student and community demand. The report also advocated an increased emphasis on internships and cooperative programs and on career counseling and placement.\textsuperscript{192}

The proposed mission statement was significant in promoting a greater sense of community for students and faculty. To meet that end, it called for more personnel and improvement of facilities that could help improve school spirit. Specifically, it recommended the establishment of fraternities and sororities and, at least, hinted at intercollegiate athletics. It also advocated increased interaction between students and professors, increased services and activities for evening students, and support for a strong Student Government Association.\textsuperscript{193}

The various task forces were often quite specific in listing improved ways of meeting faculty needs. For example, the Faculty Development–Research Task Force,
chaired by Duane Shuttlesworth, went to the heart of faculty members’ concerns over lack of support for research. Eight years before Ernest L. Boyer’s landmark study, *Scholarship Reconsidered: Priorities of the Professoriate*, the group noted that virtually everyone on campus was teaching heavy fifteen-hour loads. With multiple class preparations, papers to grade, and students to mentor, and with growing service expectations, faculty members had little or no time for traditional scholarship. Shuttlesworth’s discussion group noted that the professoriate was further hindered by inadequate secretarial support, travel funds, and assistance in applying for grants. Moreover, the science faculty had to operate without adequate research labs.

Given the budget constraints under which state colleges functioned, the task force called for a broad definition of research as “creative behavior leading to scholarly
excellence.” Such a definition would allow one to receive tenure and promotion credit for activities other than publications and presentations. Recognizing that Kennesaw’s primary mission was teaching, the group suggested that Kennesaw’s definition of research include something as basic as mathematicians retooling to teach computer science. It also suggested that one should be given scholarship credit for such service activities as assisting community agencies in writing grants or doing contract work for businesses.

Among its short-term recommendations were flexible scheduling and reduced teaching loads, awarded on a competitive basis. It also called for the hiring of a grants officer, internal faculty development grants, and lowered service expectations for those with tangible research achievements. A Faculty Development-Skills and Techniques Task Force, headed by Associate Librarian Marty Giles, seconded the idea of an Office of Campus Development, staffed by a full-time director who would be responsible for seeking funds for faculty development and assisting professors in writing grants. This group also suggested that the director serve as a confidential advisor to those seeking assistance in improving their teaching evaluations. These proposals seemed to point the way to the eventual establishment of an Office of Sponsored Programs and a Center for Excellence in Teaching and Learning.

The idea of flexible scheduling was championed by a special Scheduling Task Force that called on the campus to abandon daily-fifty-minute classes for a longer time period that would allow classes to meet only two or three days a week. The idea appealed to students as well as faculty. It would help the parking problem if all the students did not have to be on campus every day. They could make use of their class-free days to work off campus to help pay for their education. For faculty, the main advantage was blocked times on non-teaching days to conduct research or engage in community service.

The View of the Future found that academic freedom was generally well-respected on campus, but problems existed in a few divisions where rigid rules, designed to govern a handful of irresponsible instructors, limited faculty members’ rights in textbook selection and testing. The Academic Freedom Task Force recommended that faculty members be free to determine the number of tests appropriate to their style of teaching and when they would be given. With regard to textbooks, the book store had an ironclad rule against changing books in the middle of the school year. The task force noted that such a rigid policy prevented instructors from abandoning texts that proved ineffective. Further, the task force called upon the divisions to remove obstacles in the way of instructors who wanted to experiment with different materials and teaching techniques.

There were no students on the View of the Future Committee or any of the task forces, so it should not be surprising that the reports were far more specific on faculty concerns than student needs. However, President Siegel was an advocate
of personalized, invitational education long before she arrived at Kennesaw and in the summer of 1982 founded, with her former University of Florida colleague, William W. Purkey, and other American and Canadian educators, the International Alliance for Invitational Education. Siegel's interest was reflected to some degree in the task force's Personalized Teaching and Learning Reports.

The Personalized Teaching and Learning Task Force, headed by Duane Shuttlesworth, and including Ed Bostick, Gail Walker, Diane Willey, and Nancy Zumoff, stopped short of calling for radically new styles of teaching, but it made several recommendations that would ultimately be adopted. Most importantly, it called for an instructional resources facility, similar to that proposed by the Skills and Techniques group, that became one of the inspirations for Kennesaw's Center for Excellence in Teaching and Learning. The task force envisioned a full-time director who would organize workshops and forums to help faculty improve their teaching methodologies. The group also championed an Honors Program, flexible scheduling for experimental courses, and travel support to teaching conferences.¹⁹⁸

At about the same time, the Board of Regents mandated a statewide needs assessment study to chart the course of higher education in Georgia. In his history of the university system, Cameron Fincher describes the final report, The Eighties and Beyond: A Commitment to Excellence, as the “most relevant statement on public higher education since the 1963 Governor's Commission to Improve Education.” Vice chancellor for research and planning, Haskin R. Pounds, directed the research staff that put together the final report, with the help of the colleges and universities, each of which produced its own needs assessment report. Kennesaw’s study was headed by a sociologist, Vassilis C. Economopoulos, assisted by fellow sociology professor B. Edward Hale, history professor Linda M. Papageorge, and a very busy Helen Ridley. The institutional report supplemented the conclusions of the View of the Future Committee.¹⁹⁹

Economopoulos and his committee provided sociological data on the steady rise in student population as a byproduct of the increased number of people living in Cobb and neighboring counties. They described Kennesaw College as unique because: it was growing at a time when other schools in the university system were experiencing retrenchment; it was a commuter school without any students living on campus; and it catered to nontraditional students, as seen in the fact that 62 percent were age twenty-three or older, 75 percent worked while going to school, and about 33 percent were married.

Noting the large number of students majoring in professional areas, the researchers found the most critical instructional need to be additional faculty slots in Division of Business Administration. They found classroom and conference space to be totally inadequate. At the time, Kennesaw ranked thirty-second out of thirty-three university system institutions in square feet per equivalent full-time student. The
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greatest shortages in classroom space were in business, science, math, and nursing. The report also found critical staffing deficiencies in the library, counseling, and placement and noted “an urgent need to move into the world of computers.”

Haskin Pounds’s *The Eighties and Beyond* recommended that all colleges “utilize fully” the results of its institutional needs assessment. The conclusions and statistical data of the Kennesaw study complemented the findings of the View of the Future Committee and fit nicely with President Siegel’s vision for Kennesaw. In later years, she reflected, “That bright faculty, that very, very wonderful group of long-marchers, were the architects for the new view. You didn’t need an outside voice to do that. It was here, just waiting to be orchestrated. I felt my role as president was to point the way.”

In late May 1982, Siegel took her staff, the division chairs, and the View of the Future Committee on a two-day retreat to discuss its recommendations. Half of the twenty-two invitees were committee members, the other half were the president’s staff, the assistant dean, and the division chairs. The minutes of the retreat provide a
lesson in leadership for anyone trying to break recalcitrant senior administrators of old habits. One can see in the minutes that not everyone was on board the first day, but by the end, a positive faculty-administrative consensus seemed to have developed.

Years later Siegel reflected on the opposition she received from her presidential staff—most of them holdovers from the previous administration—especially after she excluded them from faculty meetings during the school year while the View of the Future was being discussed. She recalled that they considered her interactive style naive and questioned her abilities, asking, “Are you out of your mind? You’ve opened up a can of worms. Isn’t this just like a woman?” The president reflected:

I wasn’t really operating as a woman. I was operating as a psychologist, as a person who’s comfortable with that. I mean, I was a dean ten years before I became a president. People think I just emerged out of the classroom and then became president. I was a dean at a major university—University of Florida…and dean of a college [Western Carolina]. So I know what it’s like to run a school. And our school was stellar, I thought. So it wasn’t that I came in foolish or naive. But they really thought, “Oh, you’re asking for it. You’re going to get it.” Then when suggestions came out of the faculty…. “Ah, they don’t know what they’re talking about!”

Noting that the View of the Future Committee championed many of the things she would have recommended, she added:

When I think in terms of the View of the Future, I think that it was a fantastic clarion call and that it was implemented. If you were to go back and look at the View of the Future—and I do that periodically—I am just amazed at how well y’all did. To see what you all prompted; it was easy for me to sell. I said, “Hey, this came from all over the college. How can we as deans and administrators not be listening to this? How can we not be more facilitative? We have no choice.”

The president opened the retreat by talking about the importance of the process in bringing together faculty and administrators and faculty and faculty. She called it an “exercise in understanding” that showed how faculty could facilitate learning and the administration could facilitate teaching. She then took on a role as group facilitator for everything that happened over the next two days. As the task force chairs presented their reports, she asked the attendees to listen in silence without questions or comments. After the first set of reports, she assigned people to five different groups and told them what she wanted them to discuss.
On the first day, each discussion group was given the task of coming up with one question it wanted to ask, offering one complimentary statement about the process or recommendations, making one critical observation, and filling in the blank of “I wish . . . .” Most of the group reports praised the View of the Future Committee and the faculty for their hard work and courage in tackling controversial topics. However, critical voices occasionally emerged. For example, one group asked whether the participants recognized that resources were limited and complained about inconsistent data, half-truths, and lack of historical context.

On the second day, President Siegel asked the discussion groups to look at the proposals of the View of the Future task forces and reach a consensus on at least three recommendations. At the close of the day, she committed her staff to consideration of a number of specific proposals. She also instructed the division chairs to review the View of the Future findings with their faculties and send her a memo by midsummer on a plan of action. At this point, according to the minutes, everyone supported the process and agreed upon the need for further dialogue. As the retreat adjourned, Siegel promised to present their findings at the June faculty meeting.205

Social Sciences Division chair George Beggs submitted his memo regarding View of the Future recommendations on August 11, 1982. He revealed extensive discussions during the summer with the two committee members from the social sciences (Ridley and Shuttlesworth), along with one member from outside the division (Hugh Hunt), and assistant chair Fred Roach. They worked out an elaborate plan for flexible course scheduling and agreed that the chair would hold a face-to-face meeting with every faculty member to discuss his/her written performance evaluation for the 1982–83 school year. Subsequent opportunity to respond to their evaluation in writing was afforded to all faculty. Moreover, Beggs indicated that he would include the entire division in debating the evaluation process, and he urged the development of a campus-wide instrument and the creation of a campus-wide Tenure and Promotion Committee, including at least some members of the teaching faculty.206

On September 20–21, 1982, President Siegel sent out a series of memos to members of the president’s staff, asking them to give her written reports on what they were doing to address a variety of View of the Future recommendations. Dean of the college, Eugene Huck, received four memos dealing with additional secretarial support, improvements to the faculty evaluation process, academic freedom, and flexible course scheduling. Controller Roger E. Hopkins, dean of student affairs Carol Martin, and director of development and public services Cullen M. Harper
received similar memos requesting progress reports on View of the Future recommendations in their areas of responsibility.207

A final memo went to Edwin A. Rugg, the newest member of the president’s staff and first to be appointed by Siegel. Employed in August 1982 as the Executive Assistant to the president and an associate professor of education, Rugg was given a wide range of assignments, including line responsibilities for the computerization of the campus. In her September 20, 1982, memo to Rugg, Siegel noted that the View of the Future Committee had recommended that the administration: define the relationship between academic and administrative computer functions; hire a coordinator for academic computer services; establish guidelines to assist the data processing staff in setting priorities; and computerize registration. By this time, Rugg had already given Siegel his thoughts on these items. She asked that he keep the View of the Future Committee informed as he developed his plans of action.208

Rugg earned his PhD in 1975 from the Psychology Department of Peabody College in Nashville, with a dissertation titled “Ethical Judgments of Social Research involving Experimental Deception,” written under the guidance of educational researcher Ray Norris. While still a student, he began teaching statistics and working for the administration in number crunching and analysis for upcoming National Council for the Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE) and SACS reaccreditation reports. After completing his degree, he continued at Peabody as coordinator of management information and assistant professor of education. One of his tasks was facilitating the college’s evolution from batch data processing to distributed computing access. He also taught graduate courses in statistical analysis and helped expand institutional research functions that supported planning and decision making.

In a short time span Rugg moved up to a position as assistant to Peabody’s chief academic officer, prior to the merger with Vanderbilt University. After helping with the merger process, Rugg took his invaluable experience in institutional research and practical campus politics to the University of Mississippi, where from 1979 to 1982 he taught statistics, research methods, and computer applications in the Educational Administration Department. He also took on administrative responsibilities as associate director of the Bureau of Institutional Research and Planning.209

Despite the advantages of being on the faculty of Mississippi’s flagship institution, Rugg discovered that the town of Oxford and the university carried a huge burden of history. Not only did he encounter disturbing remnants of race and gender discrimination, but he grew concerned about the limited educational and social opportunities for his young children. Located in a rural area of a poor state, Ole Miss had difficulties competing with peer institutions in enrollment growth and faculty recruitment. In fact, Rugg learned later that KC’s salaries, rank by rank, exceeded those at Ole Miss in 1982, despite the latter’s doctoral programs and law school. Furthermore, Mississippi was beginning to experience reentrance
challenges similar to those that led to Peabody’s merger into Vanderbilt. So, Rugg began looking for other opportunities.

By chance, he heard from a former Peabody colleague about a dynamic college president in metropolitan Atlanta, Betty Siegel. The friend had just become a dean at Kent State University and had invited Siegel to speak to her college faculty. During casual conversation, she learned that Siegel was trying to fill a new position for an assistant to the president. The dean told Siegel that she knew of someone from her Peabody days who would be an ideal candidate. Knowing that Ed’s wife, Sharon, was from Rome, Georgia, the Kent State dean called him and suggested that he consider applying. Based on that phone call, Rugg submitted his application, as one of nearly two hundred candidates.

The search committee was impressed with Rugg’s qualifications and invited him for a job interview on Memorial Day 1982. On the Sunday afternoon before the interview, Ed and Sharon decided to drive around the campus. They came away disappointed. Compared to the grand campus of the University of Mississippi, Kennesaw College appeared architecturally unimpressive and still looked very much like a small junior college. Consequently, Rugg’s first comment to Sharon after parking the car in front of the old administration building was, “I don’t think so, sweetheart.”

However, Rugg’s initial impression changed the following day after meeting President Siegel and the search committee. He later remarked, “There was an energy here. There was an optimism about the future. There really was opportunity to grow and develop as an institution.” His previous experiences had been at established institutions that were set in their ways, stagnant in their growth, and increasingly unable to compete for nontraditional students. In contrast, Kennesaw was “a place that hadn’t developed much history yet and could make choices and choose to be a contemporary place.” So, when given the opportunity, he jumped at the chance to work for Betty Siegel. He soon was involved in helping to implement a host of changes growing out of the View of the Future.210

Memories have grown murky over the years as to exactly what initiatives came directly from the View of the Future. When asked a quarter century later for specifics, Helen Ridley had to pause to think and then proposed, “A different style of governance. I think it helped [Siegel] realize that some drastic changes were going to have to be made if she was going to have the successful tenure that she wanted.”211 The two major governance changes of the era were the development of an elaborate tenure and promotion policy and the creation of a Kennesaw College Senate to replace the older system of Administrative, Academic, and Student Affairs Councils.

Not long after the View of the Future report, the faculty worked out detailed guidelines for tenure and promotion, specifying what to include in a portfolio, when one could be eligible for tenure or promotion, and what the expectations were at each rank. Under the new plan, the process began at the departmental level with
independent evaluations by the chair and by an elected department committee. Then the portfolio went to a school committee composed of department chairs and two elected faculty members from each department. Next, the school dean issued a fourth written assessment. If opinion was divided at these levels, the portfolio went to an appellate college-wide committee, consisting of deans and elected faculty members. Then the vice president for academic affairs and the president made the final decision and submitted a recommendation to the chancellor’s office. Compared to the old system, where the administrators acted in virtual secrecy, the new tenure and promotion policy was remarkably democratic.²¹²

In the late 1980s, the faculty revised the Statutes, placing campus governance in one body, the Kennesaw College Senate. The senate’s virtue was that it brought all constituencies (faculty, staff, administrators, and students) together in advising the president on policy matters. Its weakness was that it contained more than seventy members, making it unwieldy at times. Forty-two seats on the senate went to the teaching faculty (one elected member per department plus at-large tenured, untenured, and graduate faculty representatives). Fourteen members came from the administrative faculty (the dean of each school, one elected department chair per
school, and various other administrators). The staff had eight elected representatives (two from each administrative unit: academic, business affairs, student affairs, and college advancement). The students had six seats (the SGA president and five other representatives). Finally, the president, vice president for academic affairs, vice president for business and finance, vice president for student affairs, and chief college advancement officer attended as ex officio members.

To facilitate the decision-making process on issues primarily affecting the faculty, the Statutes permitted the faculty representatives to convene as a Teaching Faculty Caucus and the staff delegates as a Staff Caucus. Recommendations from the two caucuses were then forwarded to the full senate. In the late 1990s, the names were changed to Teaching Faculty Council and Staff Council, and the total representation on the senate was reduced slightly, but remaining above sixty voting members. At the very end of the Siegel era in 2006, the senate would be replaced by a smaller University Council that could assign issues to four senates (faculty, staff, university administrators, and the SGA, respectively). But for a long while, the governance system growing out of the View of the Future seemed to provide an adequate vehicle for the expression of campus opinion.\textsuperscript{213}

In a 1993 interview, President Siegel made the following observation about the work of the faculty in creating the View of the Future:

I give our people, all of our people in 1982, a great deal of the credit because it was they who explored tough questions. And look how visionary they were! Think about that! Think about that! They weren’t schooled in colleges. Many of them, their first-time college experience was here. But you all came up with it. To me, all along the way, those first four or five years afterwards — remember the View of the Future? You all said that you wanted a CAPS Center.... You wanted a hearty ten-year process. You wanted to offer graduate school. You wanted to teach in your discipline. You didn’t want to be just a generic teacher. Remember those things? Okay, now, you’ve got to do that.... It was a wonderful time because it was a small college. I felt so intimately involved in the life of the college.\textsuperscript{214}

Siegel’s vision and the faculty effort led, during the 1980s, to a remarkable number of initiatives including: the establishment of departments and schools; expanded professional programs in business, education, and nursing; intercollegiate athletics; the computerization of the campus; and such innovative programs as CAPS (Counseling, Advisement, and Placement Services), CETL (Center for Excellence in Teaching and Learning), the Kennesaw College Freshman Seminar (KC 101), and a chair of private enterprise, one of just fifty in the nation. Such initiatives and
President Siegel’s leadership abilities received national recognition when Kennesaw was featured in a 1986 book, *Searching for Academic Excellence: Twenty Colleges and Universities on the Move and Their Leaders*.

Published for the American Council on Education, *Searching for Academic Excellence* highlighted Siegel’s role in achieving a more inviting campus atmosphere. The authors, J. Wade Gilley, Kenneth A. Fulmer, and Sally J. Reithlingshoefer, argued that Kennesaw’s strategic location in an affluent growth area and its catering to career-oriented, nontraditional students were the primary reasons for its unprecedented ability to become “a model contemporary college.” They noted that the excellence of its academic programs could be measured by such outcomes as a five-year 98 percent passing rate for teacher education graduates on the Georgia certification test, a 95–100 percent annual pass rate for nursing graduates on the state board examinations, and a high success rate for KC graduates in gaining admission to graduate and professional schools.

Siegel told the book’s interviewers that Kennesaw could have assumed “the posture that had served us well in a less demanding time or we could aspire to become a contemporary college in a contemporary setting for contemporary students.” She expressed her desire to “recruit talented, inviting, caring teachers and help them to create a nurturing, stimulating environment that exemplifies college-wide commitment to excellence in teaching.” Siegel concluded, “As someone who has been excited by what is happening here at Kennesaw College, I sincerely hope that this institution will never lose its dynamic qualities, its spirit of adventure, and its can-do attitude.” The president spent the next decade attempting to translate the institution’s “dynamic qualities” and “can-do attitude” into specific programs, departments, and centers designed to help Kennesaw reach its lofty goals.215