July 17, 1984

Dear Jim:

I commend the Board of Trustees of Washington and Lee University for having the courage to make the momentous decision to go coeducational. I have confidence in the wisdom of the trustees who made the decision and I know we will chart new courses and be successful in our endeavors. Washington and Lee is an institution with a unique tradition and will continue to have outstanding leadership and a fertile alumni and constituency from which to draw its student body and future leaders.

As I came to work this morning, I was reminded of another momentous decision made by the Board of Trustees which occurred at the end of my freshman year in the summer of 1954 when they gave up "big time football." Many of the students and alumni thought that their Washington and Lee world was coming to an end.

[signature]

joins me in supporting the Board, Dr. John Wilson, and the Washington and Lee family in pursuing perpetuation of this great institution. If we can be of any assistance in this area, please know that we will offer support and assistance.

Best regards,

[signature]

cc: Board of Trustee:
    Mr. Farris P. Hotchkiss
    Mr. Richard B. Sessoms

bcc: Mr. Peter A. Agelasto, III
To: Alumni, students, parents, faculty and friends

From: James M. Ballengee, Rector

This past weekend my fellow trustees and I met in special session in Lexington. The purpose of our meeting--after a nine-month study--was to decide whether Washington and Lee should admit qualified women as undergraduates as we do now as law students.

Our fundamental question was whether the admission of undergraduate women would help ensure that Washington and Lee will maintain its reputation and heritage as one of the finest institutions of higher learning in the United States.

After the most careful deliberation, the Board decided that the admission of women as undergraduates is best for Washington and Lee. Therefore, the trustees directed the administration and faculty to extend the undergraduate degree program to women beginning in the fall of 1985.

The Board made its decision not unmindful that a large proportion of our alumni would wish that the determination might have been otherwise. But the majority of those who voiced their preference for all-male status said that they would prefer coeducation to the possibility of academic deterioration.

The trustees believe that Washington and Lee will provide an increasingly distinctive service to the Nation by educating both men and women. Women are already achieving some of the highest positions of leadership in business, the professions, the arts, and in government. In the future, Washington and Lee will share in the preparation of some of these outstanding young people for their eventual careers.

I encourage you to read the next and subsequent issues of the Alumni Magazine. We expect to tell you in the greatest detail possible how the decision was reached, the factors that weighed upon it, and what we learned in the process.
Dear Peter,

Hooray! I don't know how you voted but I am delighted with the decision to date. It will take a lot of effort to make it work, but I think it was the only way to maintain academic standards.

I'm ready to redouble my efforts as class agent and do whatever else I can to help.

Yale sends best to you and Betsy.

Cheers

July 15
Mr. Peter Agelasto, III
P.O. Drawer 1039
Norfolk, VA 23501

June 29, 1984

Dear Peter:

I sent the attached letter to Dick Sessoms, along with my Annual Fund donation, this past week. It voices many of the concerns which I have had about the recent discussion of coeducation at the school. The letter follows up another long (and long forgotten) one that I wrote President Wilson last August. Shortly thereafter, I received a long and thoughtful response from President Wilson which I appreciated. Copies of the attached letter have been sent to Rector Ballengee and President Wilson as well. I thought about copying the entire Board, but I do not know if that would have any benefit.

I know that you must be rather busy at the moment (and have received countless letters on the subject), but I hope that you have a few minutes to read the letter. It is not meant to create scapegoats, but I do believe that it makes a number of valid points.

Sincerely,
Mr. Richard Sessoms
Alumni Secretary
Washington & Lee University
Lexington, Virginia 24450

June 27, 1982

Dear Richard:

The enclosed donation is larger than the one I gave last year, but it is
given with much less enthusiasm on my part. Though you are not responsible
for it, the way in which the recent discussion of coeducation has been han-
dled disturbs me every time I think of it. The following are some of my ob-
servations on the discussion.

The opinions of the vast majority of alumni (with the excep-
tion, I assume, of those considered "influential") were vir-
tually ignored for almost a year after President Wilson raised
the subject in earnest at the May 1983 Alumni Weekend. Two
things to note here: a) when I saw him in Atlanta in April
'83, President Wilson made no mention of what he, a month
later, felt was a problem to be confronted, b) President Wilson
raised the subject after a brief period of exposure to his new job
and the school.

The Alumni Survey, which was the Board's effort to involve
more alumni in the discussion, had an insulting amount of bias
in it. Answers given for most of the questions could (and I'm
sure may very well) be used to support any position (particu-
larly one in favor of coeducation) which the Board chooses to
take.

It appears that the January issue of the Alumni Magazine was meant
to bring to light some distressing admissions information to add
fuel to the fire. The issue of declining college enrollments was,
and is compelling. However, the decline has been taking place
since 1978. When elected in September of 1982, President Wilson
made no mention of this as a potential problem for the school. It
is interesting to note that there has been an overall improvement
in many admissions figures since 1978. The "Admissions" article
did point out that some admission statistics have declined (though
not precipitously) since the heyday of small liberal arts schools
in the 1960's. This seems to be a fairly common occurrence among
many smaller liberal arts schools (even those which have adopted
coeducation).

In truth, I think the January Magazine showed that the school
still is what it has been for some time, one of the best small
liberal arts schools in the 1050 to 1200 SAT category (for
lack of better classification). The efforts of the admissions
staff are commendable, particularly in light of past prac-
tices, but I still believe that more can be done. Currently,
I believe that the college applicant pool is approximately 1.5
million (approx. 50% male/female). Given this, W & L now demands 1500+ applications from the 750,000 males available, or .20% of the pool. When the decline of college age students has run its course in the 1990's, a 25%+ drop, an all male W & L would demand only .26% of the male applicant pool to maintain a base of around 1500. I have to believe that with the help of some of the school's 16,000 alumni and the work of the admissions office, a 6/100ths percent increase might be possible. Would quality suffer an unbearable decline, probably not. The problem does not appear to be insurmountable. With work, the school should be able to attract quality students.

The March Alumni Magazine read like a P.R. brochure for coeducation. I guess that Jack Warner's January letter, and the few others against, have been assigned the duty of speaking out against the change. I also noted that the heated discussion at, and the agitated departure of alumni from the alumni dinner in San Francisco this past February, were not mentioned I'll certainly never forget that evening, nor I'm sure, will you or President Wilson. In any case, there has been a lot of publicity for the case in favor of coeducation, both in the Alumni Magazine (November's "Background Paper" is another eloquent example) and from President Wilson in his speeches at alumni functions.

Though alumni involvement and open lines of communication have been publicized, I wonder if they have had any effect on the decision which, from all indications (and despite protestations to the contrary) seems to have been made for quite some time, at least by some Board members. I don't see overwhelming evidence of a true open discussion of coeducation. No other ideas, such as reducing the size of the school somewhat, while reducing staff size through attrition and retirement, seem to have been publicly or actively considered. Would the school be irreparably damaged if some marginal programs were eliminated? Would the students get appreciably less attention if the faculty/student ratio were increased from 10:1 to 12:1? Probably not. Could some programs be expanded to increase the school's appeal? Would a larger endowment and the resulting lower costs increase appeal? Possibly. I remember the last time coeducation was brought up. I also remember it as an idea which was analyzed and discussed (along with alternatives) rather than an issue being forced, as in the recent discussion.

Beneath the rhetoric about the declining student population I have sensed something which may, in fact, be the true nub of the issue: a desire to change the school for the "better". I cannot judge this point completely (though I believe that a school like W & L still has a place in our educational system), but I can make a couple of statements about this as an idea.
If the school had been coeducational during my time at it, I doubt that the friendships I made would have been as strong or would have lasted as long. I wonder if the informal relationships I had with faculty members would have developed. I also doubt that I would have met my wife, nor would we have been able to share in the long term friendships we developed at both schools. A "better" school with coeducation, possibly; more subdued, probably; more like other small liberal arts schools, definitely. I tend to feel that when coeducation is brought to the school, it will lose much of the character which it has developed and has helped it survive and prosper for many of its 235 years. I am not against the question of coeducation being raised (I do not like the status quo for its own sake), but the way in which it has been handled has not helped me become a great supporter of the idea. I am not against coeducation per se (all of my other education, including graduate, was at coed schools), but I have yet to be convinced that it is right, or necessary for W & L at this point. Most of my alumni friends share the same opinion. In any event, I doubt that the manner in which the subject has been handled would win a public relations award.

I have been a consistent alumni donor and participant in alumni affairs since my graduation. In the past, I often gave more than my income said I should, but I gave because I wanted to and felt it was necessary for the continued success of the school. I gave because I so thoroughly enjoyed my time in Lexington and wanted to help others enjoy the unique experience it provided. With the experience changed so fundamentally, I am not sure I will feel this way in the future.

The way in which coeducation has been rammed through (once again despite protests to the contrary), makes me wonder how much the school really values its alumni. It will certainly be no surprise if the Board votes in favor of coeducation in July. I will be surprised if anything else is announced. I think the timing of the announcement is a good reflection of the manner in which much of the recent discussion has been handled. The announcement will occur when the students who give the school life are not on campus (and not around to express opinions, as they did in May). Thank you for your attention to this rather long letter.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

cc: President John Wilson
Rector James Ballengee
Mr. Peter A. Agelasto, III
February 7, 1984

Mr. Peter A. Agelastro III, '62
President
Washington & Lee Alumni, Inc.
Lexington, VA 24450

Dear Mr. Agelastro:

I have thoroughly read the last several Alumni Magazines, attended the outrageous Washington Chapter dinner (reported in the January issue) and have followed the recent unfavorable Washington Post items about W&L (dress code; coeducation, etc.).

As a result, I would like to express three suggestions which reflect my position insofar as the current furor over subverting W&L into a coed campus.

1. It is once more very evident that you can take the boy out of the country but you can't take the country out of the boy. I propose, and will be the first volunteer to contribute, that a one-way ticket back to Lapeer, Michigan, be immediately purchased for Dr. Wilson.

2. From what I read, hear and observe in the press, we have reached another point in time where the faculty has put itself on a pedestal and wants to dictate the University's policies. Damn the faculty; the Board and Alumni should and MUST dictate policy.

3. Get the message over to the Board of Trustees that there is overwhelming sentiment against converting W&L to coeducation. I need not bore the reader with the negative facts we all know: housing; toilet facilities; parking; curriculum; athletics; ad infinitum. Allegedly the only benefits are "broadening of in-class discussion" and increased revenue potential. I would rather see the University shut down than destroy our 230-year-old all-male tradition!

Very truly yours,
Thursday, June 21, 1984

A Vote For Women

University Club Amends Membership Bylaws

By Carla Hall

The University Club, a longtime Washington stronghold of the male elite, has voted to allow women members.

The club's break with tradition follows its much-publicized rejection in March of an applicant who was the daughter of a club member, Virginia architect Jo Anne Murray, 32, turned down for membership after being sponsored by her father, real estate executive F. Aden Murray, and another member, real estate company president John C. Walker.

The private club, founded in the Red Room of the Willard Hotel in the winter of 1904, has a membership list that includes House Minority Leader Robert Michel, Archbishop James A. Hickey and several Supreme Court justices. It has barred women by tradition although it never had a law expressly prohibiting women. Now, bylaws of the club, which is located at 1136 16th St. NW, have been amended so that they provide for women in all membership categories. "We added some

University Club

CLUB, From B1

fearful that we can't offer women the same facilities. We hope in time we can."

Watson said that athletic facilities, with the possible exception of the squash courts, would not be available to women members. As it is, male members are charged a separate fee to use the athletic facilities, which Watson called "old and very limited." According to Watson, there is a 20-yard, five-lane pool, a steam room, a sauna, a workout room "the size of a small living room," and a locker room. Members have traditionally swum without suits, and "there's no way to get to the pool without going through the men's locker room," Watson said. "We'd have to spend half a million dollars to change the locker room."

The squash courts, he said, are already available on Sundays to wives of members. The women change in a fourth floor guest room.

Watson, the president of the Ferraro's Association, also spoke of his own feelings, with a slight chuckle: "Undeniably I must confess that I would like to keep it all male. I don't know why. It's like a men's bowling team."

Jo Anne Murray, club members believe, was the first woman to apply for full membership. Another woman applied for non-resident membership some four years ago, but her sponsors resigned before the application

Chandler. "We had a drink in the men's bar right afterwards... His first question was is [Jo Anne Murray] still interested in belonging? I said that I talked to her and... yes, very definitely, she was still interested."

Murray said his daughter had been "wooed by a number of other clubs" since her turn down by the University Club. "The International Club wanted her right away," he said. "Then the Army Navy Club was talking to her. But she felt the University Club satisfied her needs more for a dining and social club."

Asked why she was interested in reapplying after having been rejected, Jo Anne Murray said, "I just feel like the ballgame is different. I'm just glad my application brought on that rethinking."

Chandler downplayed any connection between the club's decision and reaction to the original decision. "The move to admit women, he said, "is something we'd been considering for many years."

Watson agreed: "Over a period of time we've been thinking about this thing very seriously—even before we had a woman applicant," he said. "With pressure for equal employment and equal opportunity for women, why not?"

The change was approved last Thursday at a club meeting attended by 200. Over two-thirds of those present voted in favor of accepting women. (The club's by-laws say that at least two-thirds must approve a by-law can be changed.) The club's 1,250 resident voting members (total membership is 2,550) were sent letters informing them of the special meeting.

The club not only wrote the acceptance of women into the bylaws,
VOTING IN FAVOR OF COEDUCATION
AT WASHINGTON AND LEE UNIVERSITY

When the coeducation issue began to be considered again last year for the third time in fifteen years, I did not really know what I personally would decide on the issue. I am a traditional, conservative person who is comfortable with traditional male-female roles and who, in 1975 while on the Washington and Lee Alumni Board, said that I would be opposed to coeducation unless it was the only way to maintain the academic quality of the institution.

When the issue was raised by President Wilson, we were coming out of a period of "inactivity" that occurred at the end of a long capital fund drive and after a one and a half year transition to a new president. I believe President Wilson saw quickly the magnitude of a problem (as conveyed to him by the faculty and the admissions office) and sought to act quickly to find a solution. While there has been concern about the manner in which the issue reached this Board of Trustees, I do not doubt the need for the issue to have been raised.

President Wilson was correct in saying to us in his initial communication to us last October that "we are worried about maintaining the quality of this place...worried about trying to make a fine university better." He then said "I earnestly believe...
there lies a serious danger for the future health and usefulness of this venerable institution. And as a member of the Board of Trustees, sharing with my colleagues a deep fiduciary responsibility for one of America's precious assets, I feel duty bound to place my calculation of that danger squarely before you." It gives me no comfort to question the timing - when I consider the nature and magnitude of the problem.

During the last ten or so months, I have:

1. Read and considered every letter sent to me by alumni, faculty, students and friends of W&L.
2. Read virtually every word of the 1970 and 1975 coeducation studies as well as the multiple pounds of other material sent to us. That material included reports from the Academic Affairs, Campus Life, and Budget and Audit Committees as well as numerous other reports of many kinds.
3. Spoken on the telephone or in person with dozens of W&L alumni around the country.
4. Visited with several dozen other persons who are or have been associated with Sewanee, Davidson, Williams, Amherst, Dartmouth, Colgate, Princeton, Harvard, Notre Dame, University of Virginia, Yale, Haverford, and others - all of which are institutions that have become coeducational in the last fifteen or so years. The persons with whom I spoke were former trustees, university
presidents, alumni, admissions representatives and students.

5. Finally, I have spoken with a few individuals who are college admission counselors at public high schools and private preparatory schools.

I have agonized over many aspects of the coeducation issue and have examined and reexamined my feelings and thoughts.

I would try to write a case for remaining all male - then one for going coed - then pick them apart and start over. Like the rest of you, I have spent hundreds of hours talking, thinking and wondering what is best for this special place. Even Trustee Emeritus Jack Warner, whose generosity to this institution which he loves is among the greatest of all of W&L's sons, challenged me with his letters. While I sharply disagreed with the nature and quality of many of his comments, his letters forced me to re-think, re-examine, look deeper and think harder about all aspects of the issue. In that sense, his letters served a positive purpose.

About two months ago, I reached my conclusion, and I made no secret of my feelings at the May Trustees' meeting. It is my intention to vote in favor of coeducation - because I believe firmly that it is the correct decision for us to make for W&L in 1984.

There are what I would call "positive" and "negative" reasons supporting my decision. It is very hard to separate them from each other since all are valid but represent different viewpoints of the problem. The "negative" reasons relate to believing that we
should respond to worrisome demographic trends as well as increasing competition from other universities for students in a shrinking market, and also the recent trends relative to the quality of what is referred to as our student body's "soggy bottom". In addition, I do not believe that W&L should go coed solely to add the female point of view to the campus - although I believe it would be a plus to have it. I also do not believe that W&L breeds a chauvinistic or "warped" view of the world. Finally, it may be a negative reason to support coeducation on the basis that if we have to reduce our institutional size, we will spread our fixed costs over fewer units, thereby increasing our costs of production, so to speak, as competitive pressures rise - and we do this in a world that is likely to remain very volatile and in which risk-taking can quickly create economic disasters. Shrinking our size is not a viable option.

I do not call these reasons "negative" because they are not true. (They do remind me of Satchel Paige's addage, "Don't look back - someone may be gaining on you!"). Rather it is because they do not permit proper attention to be given to positive reasons for becoming coed. That is to say, it is a way of saying "Look what happens if we don't become coeducational" - instead of saying "Look what happens if we do."

The positive reasons for becoming coeducational are
strong indeed, in my opinion. I believe that our mission here is an educational one - splendidly expressed in our Statement of Institutional Philosophy with which we are all familiar and which it is our duty as Trustees to see is implemented in every aspect of university life.

I believe that we should aspire to be the best small university in the south - and one of the best in the nation - not elitist in a negative sense, but a fine school with strong human as well as educational values. I believe we have generally been successful in the past in doing this - and that this is a great part of the "intangibles" to which so many refer.

It is significant to me that a great majority (admittedly, not all) of the people to whom we entrust the teaching, training and care of our students are in favor of coeducation. And it is significant to me that while 60% of the alumni who responded to the survey expressed opposition to coeducation, 94% believe "quality of the faculty" is a "most important" factor in their consideration of W&L's reputation - and that 87% believe "academically selective in admissions" is also a "most important" factor - and that 86% believe "W&L's goal should be continued academic excellence, regardless of the gender of its students". On the other hand, I must confess that I am sorry to learn from the survey that 23% of the respondents are willing for W&L to remain all male even if it would "require some downward adjustment of W&L admissions standards" - a preference which is unacceptable to me as a Trustee.
Relative to student attitudes toward coeducation, it is significant to me that even though 53% of our current students are opposed to coeducation, 62% believe coeducation is in the best interests of the institution - while only 25% believe it is not.

Finally, it is significant to me that of the dozens of persons with whom I spoke who have a relationship with institutions that became coeducational, there were only two who believed we should remain all-male - and their reasons were more nostalgic than any other - and none expressed to me that they regretted their institutions had become coed; most said it was the best thing that had ever happened and that the net effect of the change had been extremely positive.

I strongly believe that the educational experience at W&L will improve if it becomes coeducational at the undergraduate level. The overall student quality will improve as a dramatic increase in applications permits a more selective admissions policy. These better students will be more motivated and will be better able to respond to the tougher curriculum that already is planned to be implemented. Most important, the absence of academically poorer students who are less motivated and less participating in the life of the university will result, I believe, in a lessening of the disillusionment that is growing among faculty members and which is reducing the effectiveness of the educational process. The better classroom experience will encourage
the faculty and bring better motivation and competition to all aspects of campus life and behavior. Not least, it will serve to strengthen the "close faculty-student relationships" about which we talk so much but which are being damaged by the poor quality of academic performance and social behavior presently on campus. We must maintain an outstanding teaching faculty, and we can do that only if we provide the proper environment in which it can exist.

In addition to an improved academic environment, I believe there would be a greatly improved social environment. In that regard, you will recall my lengthy report to you at the May Board of Trustees' meeting in which I conveyed my sub-committee's conviction that "coeducation would result in strongly positive changes occurring throughout the social and extracurricular life of the university". This conviction is shared not only by most faculty members but also by the administration and probably by most of the students.

Without questioning for a moment the sincerity and depth of feeling conveyed to all of us by the dozens of alumni who have written to express their views, I believe that our responsibility as Trustees is not to protect the alumni's perception of what W&L was like when they were here - although I think we hope we do that. Rather, it is to do whatever is necessary to foster an atmosphere and experience which best results in our institutional
purpose being achieved. After all, would not those same alumni who oppose coeducation so vocally now be even more upset if we permitted W&L to decline in quality? And are they not likely to be more proud and supportive of a high-quality coeducational university than a mediocre all-male university?

We must find a way, as Dr. Coulling suggested in his faculty letter to President Wilson, to properly combine the concepts of being "distinctive" and "distinguished". We could be "distinctive" as an all-male institution that was second- or third-rate, but we would not be "distinguished". We can be "distinctive" as a coed institution if we "distinguish" ourselves by the quality of our academic program and by the encouragement and appreciation of the values and traditions which we all believe are so much a part of the W&L experience which we desire be preserved - and which frequently are not a part of the experience found at other institutions.

Therefore, when Jack Warner says, "Dare to be different!" - I would respond "At what cost and at what loss of opportunity?" Do we invest our energy and our talent and our funds trying to be better - or use them up trying not to get worse?

Perhaps those who say "if it ain't broke, don't fix it" are really saying that nothing has changed at Washington and Lee.

1. But it is a change that the academic quality of our students is declining. Our SAT scores are down more than the national average and
more than our competition. The comments about student quality contained in faculty letters to President Wilson, and subsequently conveyed to us, are alarming.

2. And it is a change that, sociologically, the role of the female in the United States during this last third of the 20th century is dramatically different than ever before in the history of this country - indeed, in the history of the world - and there is no suggestion that this is only a fad that will go away. In that regard, a case can be made and should be made that it is poor judgment (and maybe worse) to deny W&L's special qualities to talented, effective females who are and will be so important a part of the leadership of this nation in the future.

3. And it is a change, demographically, that the number of college-bound students will be in a dramatic decline for many years ahead - and that the competition for that smaller number of students is increasing. The financial aid packages available to students from private and state universities are impressive - and are an indication of what the marketplace will reflect even more intensely in the future.
4. Finally, but importantly, it is a change, again sociologically, that there is less and less interest among college bound students - especially males - in attending single sex institutions - especially all-male institutions. In this environment, W&L is increasingly perceived to be weird, not just different, and not just an educational alternative. Young people today are more sophisticated and aware than ever before - and they feel a need to be compatible with this changed world.

What do I believe it will mean to Washington and Lee University to remain all male?

1. Basically, that we will spend our energy and our funds simply trying to hold on - trying to prove to the world and to ourselves that we are something special - and having fewer and fewer believe us - as our own self-doubt increases.

2. We will lose market share and be forced to take more students of lesser quality - then we will begin to lose our fine faculty - and eventually we will lose our reputation. Already we have alumni telling us that they are not impressed by the fact that the company we keep in the all-male school category includes Hampden-Sydney, Wabash, a technical school, and
two military schools - while the company they want us to keep includes the University of Virginia, Williams, Dartmouth, Princeton, Amherst, Brown, Yale, Duke, Vanderbilt and a host of others.

3. Finally, the same - and even more - alumni who said "Don't go coed!" will begin to say "Why did you let this happen to my school?"

It has been said that young men choose Washington and Lee for every reason except for its gender. I believe that we should offer an institution which both young men and young women choose for non-gender reasons. I believe we should emphasize academic quality most of all - as found in close student-faculty relationships and the diversity and excellence of our academic program - and I believe we should emphasize the traditions and values which we have here and which we offer to all who are a part of the W&L community.

I believe that we should make clear - beginning today - that it is our intention that those values and traditions found here are to be pursued and supported in a spirit of renewed commitment, and I believe we accomplish this by conveying in a tone of confidence, conviction and caring a decision to become coeducational at the undergraduate level of our academic program.

I believe we should announce that decision to our alumni and our other constituencies in a positive, forceful way - with emphasis on our belief that the best way to keep intact those special qualities
that most alumni and faculty and students and administrators really think are important, is to become coeducational - and that this Board of Trustees believes this is the best way to insure our continued meaningful role as one of the better small universities in this country.

I believe we should go to work immediately - carefully planning what we want to say to our future male and female students - telling them of the traditions, academic excellence, values and codes of conduct that are found at this special place - and, finally dealing from strength and not being afraid to do so, we tell them what we expect relative to their behavior and performance.

We communicate to our president, and ask him to communicate to his staff and faculty, that we are going to have a first rate institution here - an institution that reaches out to young men and young women who have exhibited the abilities and talents which we want to nurture and encourage here - and we bring these young people into this community which we call Washington and Lee University.

We educate them splendidly - we reinforce the values and traditions that we believe are so important - strong character, a sense of honor and integrity, responsibility, leadership, and most of all academic proficiency - and we send them out into this volatile, changing world to be successful individuals in their
personal, family and business lives, leaders in their communities and professions - as W&L prides itself on doing - and we ask them to be loyal and generous to the institution which educated them - and which reinforced the ideals that caused us to bring them here in the beginning - and which are within this Board and this administration and this faculty.

Deep down inside of me, I believe that a coeducational Washington and Lee will permit this to happen. I believe that the academic, sociological, economic and political realities of the world that we are living in - and will be living in - will not permit that to occur at an all-male Washington and Lee. Will Washington and Lee change? Of course it will - as it has done so many times in the past. Do I have concerns about our future? Yes, I do.

1. I am most concerned that the disenchantment among many of our alumni might be more severe than we realize - and that the absence of support will be greater than we expect, not just support of the pocketbook but support of the spirit. I take some encouragement from knowing that similar situations were overcome so quickly at other institutions, and I know of no reason why Washington and Lee alumni are less loyal or less understanding than alumni of other institutions which we admire.
2. I am concerned that we will not make the
transition as smoothly as we hope - that we
won't plan for it as well as we should - or
execute it as well as we could - and that this
will cause anxious moments. This concern must
cause us to make doubly certain that it is not
warranted.

3. I think it is likely that we will lose a little
of the intangible quality that we have trouble
totally defining - but which we know is there -
and which we and so many alumni fear will be lost.

But with these concerns having been expressed, it is my firm
belief that the advantages and benefits and positive aspects
resulting from coeducation will greatly outweigh the disadvantages
and the problems - and that this will become apparent to us quickly.

We have the burden and the privilege of being in a position
to act at this time on this critical issue. It will take courage
to vote in favor of such a dramatic change, but in my heart of hearts,
I believe we will have made the right decision for the future of
this institution to which all of us are devoted.
SELECTIVITY OF SOME INSTITUTIONS,
INCLUDING WASHINGTON AND LEE,
BY PERCENTAGES OF APPLICANTS ADMITTED IN 1983

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Harvard</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Princeton</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brown</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yale</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dartmouth</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amherst</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Williams</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bowdoin</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Davidson</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duke</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U. of Virginia</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middlebury</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lafayette</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Union</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wesleyan</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colgate</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trinity</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bucknell</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haverford</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swathmore</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hamilton</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wake Forest</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colby</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lehigh</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U. of Richmond</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington &amp; Lee</td>
<td>57*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sewanee</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vanderbilt</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hampden-Sydney</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Furman</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southwestern</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>at Memphis</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*At its strongest point in 1965, W. & L. accepted only
40% of its applicants. For the most current three years--
1982, 1983, 1984-- there has been a declining trend: 49%,
57%, 60%.
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ACADEMIC STATISTICS

WASHINGTON AND LEE

College Board Scores

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>1965 Verbal/Math</th>
<th>1975 Verbal/Math</th>
<th>1983 Verbal/Math</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Duke University</td>
<td>626/652</td>
<td>587/634 (-57)</td>
<td>604/648 (-26)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Davidson</td>
<td>607/658</td>
<td>594/624 (-47)</td>
<td>603/627 (-35)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College of William &amp; Mary</td>
<td>582/594</td>
<td>581/613 (+18)</td>
<td>577/615 (+16)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Virginia</td>
<td>606/646</td>
<td>587/619 (-46)</td>
<td>577/614 (-61)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vanderbilt</td>
<td>603/641</td>
<td>555/608 (-81)</td>
<td>548/607 (-89)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southwestern at Memphis</td>
<td>567/584</td>
<td>549/567 (-35)</td>
<td>563/578 (-10)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington and Lee</td>
<td>608/643</td>
<td>537/587 (-127)</td>
<td>546/591 (-114)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wake Forest</td>
<td>529/569</td>
<td>558/597 (+57)</td>
<td>544/591 (+37)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tulane</td>
<td>504/526</td>
<td>511/563 (+44)</td>
<td>536/588 (+94)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sewanee</td>
<td>556/597</td>
<td>547/577 (-29)</td>
<td>531/562 (-60)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hampden-Sydney</td>
<td>530/580</td>
<td>490/540 (-80)</td>
<td>495/543 (-72)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Average</td>
<td>466/492</td>
<td>434/472 (-52)</td>
<td>425/468 (-65)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SAT Scores and Other Academic Information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SAT Verbal</td>
<td>555</td>
<td>546</td>
<td>543</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAT Math</td>
<td>602</td>
<td>591</td>
<td>589</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English Achievement</td>
<td>544</td>
<td>538</td>
<td>520</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Percentile Rank</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valedictorians &amp; Salutatorians</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Merit Finalists</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sons of Alumni Yield</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>52%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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**WASHINGTON AND LEE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>1965</th>
<th>1984</th>
<th>Decline</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Admitted who enrolled</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applicants in top 20% of HS class</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applicants in top 20% of HS class who enrolled</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applicants with SAT Verbal over 650</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applicants with SAT Math over 650</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applicants admitted with SAT/V over 650 who enrolled</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applicants admitted with SAT/M over 650 who enrolled</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freshmen with SAT/V over 650</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>-65(-70%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freshmen with SAT/M over 650</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>-97(-60%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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