

While a president is an adviser and a planner, he is, after all, an executive officer working under a board of trustees who are the ultimate authority. To know these members well is a matter of wisdom; for it is the president's place to instruct them in, and inspire them with, the purposes of the institution. This cannot be done in meetings alone; his efforts to develop and maintain friendly relations must go beyond such formal contacts.

2.

The President and the Trustees

McVey and the Trustees

When I joined the staff of the University of North Dakota in 1909, the board of trustees consisted of five members, two of whom were lawyers, one a banker, one a farmer, and one a businessman. On the whole they were an able board. None of them was an alumnus of the university, but they were interested in the stability of the institution, its buildings and finances. They were conservative in their attitudes and opposed to any show of radicalism among the student body. It was taken for granted that the faculty would stay in line.

On one occasion some student views were reported at a session of the board. I took occasion to say that students should show some interest in political, economic and religious controversies. "In fact," I said, "if you gentlemen were as conservative when you were young as you now are, no one knows how impervious to new ideas you would be today." They took my comment in their stride, but I had no way of discovering their inner feelings.

When a political revolution took place in North Dakota and the Non-Partisan League came into control, the party leaders wanted and got a central control board which had the direction

of nine institutions — penal, charitable, and educational. The board met from time to time in the towns where the institutions were located. At these meetings each president was given about two hours to present the finances, policy, appointments and other matters of importance to the institution of which he was head. Many matters were left to the president, and he in turn had many decisions to make without the help of the board. It was an impossible situation and so recognized by the board and the president. After I left to go to the University of Kentucky, two boards were created, one for the educational institutions and another for the penal and charitable enterprises carried on by the state. Later, the legislature abolished the control board and placed the university under a single board, to the great relief of everyone interested in higher education. In the course of twenty years, North Dakota went through a series of experiences from single boards to a control board for all institutions; and then as a third step to a single board for the university, a board for the teachers colleges, and a board to care for the affairs of charitable institutions.

My conclusion is that there is no ideal system, since boards are no better than the men who comprise them. Centralization looks well on paper but has not turned out to be much of an improvement in managing state institutions. The University of Kentucky comprised all the departments usually associated with a central university. There was no competition with a separate agricultural and mechanical engineering college. The board consisted of three ex-officio members, three alumni, three members of the agricultural board and six citizens appointed by the governor — fifteen in all. The executive committee of five met monthly.

The appointment by the governor of board members to the managing body of a public institution made out quite well on the whole, but now and then there was a slip. On one occasion I asked the governor why he had appointed a certain man to the university board after a meeting attended by the new member. "Do you know," the governor said, "I never saw that fellow before. I evidently got him mixed up with somebody else." An excuse

showing a lack of inquiry into the facts pertaining to an important matter.

When I was appointed president of the University of Kentucky in 1917, I stipulated that I should be present at all board meetings, without exception. As I was not a member of the board I held a position of neutrality. If I had had a vote on controversial matters, I would have been an advocate and a partisan. In my experience of many years, a half-dozen rejections of my recommendations would cover the differences of opinion. If there was marked opposition to an appointment, based on good reasons, I withdrew the recommendation and made another one. I have heard of presidents who stated that if their recommendations were not accepted by the board, they would resign. This is a quixotic attitude that overlooks the relation of board and president.

In a paper read at a meeting of the National Association of Universities, William Lowe Bryan said, "The president of a university can be compared with the prime minister and the House of Commons in the British system of government. If he cannot hold a majority of the Commons, he resigns his post." There is much to be said on this point, but the comparison does not cover all aspects of the problem. However, where important issues clearly separate the trustees and the president in matters of policy, the president should resign. His chances of winning out in a fight before the public are slim under our system of control. The president in such a case should make it clear to the public what the issues are and what his stand is on the questions that are before the board.

M.

Hughes and the Trustees

When I was acting president of Miami University in 1911, the board consisted of twenty-seven trustees (as it still does). Nine of these were appointed every three years by the governor. At that time nearly all trustees were alumni of the institution, and perhaps half of them were seriously interested in Miami.

The entire board met once a year in June, with a few meetings of the executive committee during the year. During the preceding ten years Miami grew from an enrollment of one hundred to five hundred students, with corresponding increases in budget. During my administration, 1911-1927, the enrollment increased to fifteen hundred. During all this twenty-five year period, the labors of the trustees increased, and additional committees were appointed which carried on much of the business. During the presidency of the board by Walter H. Coles of Troy, Ohio (1930 to 1944), the committees were entirely reorganized, and the executive committee was made up of the chairmen of the several committees. While most of the committees are those common to other boards, two have proved useful and are somewhat unusual.

The Committee on Efficiency and Co-operation has had repeated meetings over the years with groups of faculty members, usually members from one or two departments at each meeting. This has gone far to increase confidence and understanding between the trustees and the faculty. The Committee on Student Affairs has brought a group of board members in contact with students and their problems and has proved to be valuable.

The entire board still meets once a year in June, but the great bulk of the work is done by various committees which convene when necessary and with the executive committee's meeting six or eight times a year.

About four-fifths of the present board are Miami graduates or former students. Frequent meetings of the various committees result in a larger proportion of the members becoming interested in the college. When organized into committees with authority, a large board can operate with efficiency. This board was concerned only with Miami University. It was a "Nourishing Board," keen to develop and strengthen Miami in any way it could.

All this was in marked contrast with the State Board of Education, under which I worked in Iowa. It was, in the language of Dr. Walter A. Jessup, then president of the State University of Iowa, a "Judicial Board." Under it were five institutions, including The State University of Iowa, The Iowa State College of

Agriculture and Mechanic Arts, and The Iowa State Teachers College. The board was concerned largely in seeing that each institution confined itself to its own major lines and did not unnecessarily duplicate work done elsewhere. It endeavored to see that each institution was adequately supported but that none held an undue advantage. It was a "Judicial Board."

This board consisted of nine members, three of whom were appointed every two years by the governor. The board held ten regular monthly meetings. It employed a finance committee of three full-time members who carried on the minor and detailed work of the board. This committee visited each of the five institutions monthly, and acted on all minor appointments and other routine matters. The board itself was thus left free to consider the more serious problems of the several institutions. The president of each institution attended all meetings of the board. He presented his own recommendations to the board in the presence of the other presidents.

Two things contributed much to the sound working of the board during my administration, 1927-1936. The president, Mr. George W. Baker, was always reluctant to accept any but a unanimous vote, so when an action was passed one realized it had the support of the entire board. This proved to be an excellent policy. If the board did not agree, the matter was put aside or postponed. Dr. W. R. Boyd was elected president of the finance committee when the State Board of Education was formed in 1909. He was deeply interested in education and in the welfare of Iowa. He was deferred to for his wisdom, his wide acquaintance among leading men in the educational world and his good judgment. In his forty years of service, while the personnel of the entire board and the other two members of the finance committee changed, Dr. Boyd remained a wise and stabilizing figure. He gave a continuity to the policies of the board it could not have had otherwise.

Dr. Boyd invited Dr. Henry Smith Pritchard, president of the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, to meet with the new board of education shortly after its appointment and to discuss with them their duties and relations to the

several institutions. The influence of these conferences undoubtedly prevented members of the board from meddling with the administration of the several institutions.

Dr. Boyd was active in securing the appointment of a survey commission in 1914, which spent several weeks at the various institutions under the board. This commission made a report which redirected the thinking of the board somewhat. Dr. Boyd later brought back the chairman of that commission, Dr. S. P. Capen, then president of the University of Buffalo, to resurvey the several institutions and to offer a final report.

Prior to the establishing of this board, the pressure of the several rival institutions upon the legislature had become so serious as to result in the establishment of the central state board. Not more than one alumnus of each of the three major institutions could serve at one time. The appointment of this board effectively stopped the rivalry of alumni for funds, and reduced duplication of work.

The three larger institutions today enroll more than 20,000 students. The university and the college together conferred 738 Doctor of Philosophy degrees during the five years 1937-1942, a record exceeded only by three other universities. In a state of two and one-half million population, with an income in proportion to population which places Iowa in the middle of the forty-eight states, these two accomplishments afford ample proof that such educational institutions under one board will thrive.

H.

The President and the Trustees

The following outline will give a starting point for this discussion:

The trustees of the college are responsible to:

The governor of the state — The trustees desire his good will and prefer that complaints about the college not be made to him.

The legislature — The trustees wish to be on friendly terms with the members; appropriations come from the legislature.

The people of the state — The trustees wish them to be

informed about the college and its work; their taxes support the institution.

The parents of students — The trustees want them to be satisfied with what the college does for their children.

The faculty — The trustees expect the faculty to be contented and they do not want them criticized for radical statements or misconduct.

The students — The trustees desire them to be orderly, attentive to business and reasonably well satisfied.

The alumni — The trustees seek the confidence and approval of the alumni.

While the above applies to land-grant colleges and universities, slight modifications will make it apply to any specific college. The trustees look to the president more than they should to keep their relations with each of the above groups harmonious.

With what matters do the trustees concern themselves?

1. The President — The trustees select and elect the president of the college.

2. The Policies of the Institution — The trustees are responsible for their formulation and establishment. This should be their chief concern.

3. Finances — The endowment and all resources of the institution are in the charge of its trustees. A loss of endowment funds is perhaps the most unpardonable offense of which a board can be guilty. A board of trustees should be deeply concerned over the annual budget and earnestly desirous that estimates of income be conservative and that the total expenses do not exceed the total income.

4. Buildings — The board selects an architect, approves plans, lets contracts and supervises all building. The president should see that the plans embody the needs concerned so far as the funds permit. The board should insist that all buildings be kept in repair and painted. The latter is often overlooked.

5. Land — It is the business of the board to acquire adequate land. Often great effort by the president is required in order to give the trustees a true vision of the future.

6. Faculty — Usually the actual employment of the staff is

only technically a function of the board. As a matter of fact, in a large institution, the board should delegate this matter wholly to the president and hold him responsible. They are not sufficiently informed about each new candidate. (In one midwestern college, in 1949, a total of 777 people were newly employed to fill vacancies on the entire staff.) On the other hand, the board wishes to be proud of its faculty. Boards are made up chiefly of conservative men and women. They are sensitive to criticism regarding radical statements or actions by faculty members. The writer believes the able president will see that such persons are not appointed to his faculty. Also, such a president will protect faculty members unfairly accused of offensive radicalism from action by the board.

7. The Course of Study — While the trustees cannot well act on the details of any course of study, the authority to do so is often within their rights. They should certainly so define the policies of the institution that no new course of study obligating the college for additional expenditures can be adopted without their full approval. However, all detail in revising authorized courses of study should be in the hands of the faculty concerned.

8. Students — In some institutions the trustees have set a definite limit on the number of students who may be enrolled; this number is related to the endowment income. University trustees have been known to fix a limit on graduate student enrollment. In some institutions, on the recommendation of the president and faculty, standards for admission have been fixed by the board. Any board desires a large enough student body to justify the expenditures involved. On the matter of admission requirements there should be close co-operation between the board, the faculty and the president. It is fortunate when a board is able to set such limit on enrollment as to authorize the exclusion of unfit students.

H.

A New President's Opportunity

A new president entering on the complex duties of his office should certainly have in mind what he can contribute to the institution over which he presides. No man can hope to do all

the things the trustees expect of him. He will be largely absorbed in routine work. If he is to leave the institution the better for his service after five or ten years, he must definitely determine what he can hope to do best with his abilities. It is well to recall that the average term of service of a college or university president is six or eight years and that very few serve fifteen or more years.

In general, five large fields of improvement are open to a new president. They include the student, faculty, finance, building and public relations areas.

In the *student* area, the president may raise the standards for admission and graduation in order to turn out a more select product. He may widen or restrict the college offerings of courses, as circumstances demand. He may resolve to see that the students are served as individuals, and he may determine to become acquainted with the members of the student body personally.

In the *faculty* area, he may hope for improvement through careful appointments. With an average turnover each year of something like 20 per cent of the teaching staff, any faculty can be strengthened if enough effort and intelligence is used each year in securing the very best men available at the salaries paid. A president can improve the faculty morale by a happy, cordial attitude on his part and by the development of social and professional co-operation within the faculty. He may reorganize the administration and so secure more effective service.

The *financial* field offers opportunities to secure a larger income from the legislature and from private gifts. Money may be raised for current income or endowment; or by concentrating on economy and careful spending, more ground can be covered within the normal income.

Buildings always seem to be needed on every campus. Some men are gifted with the ability to secure funds for the erection of new buildings and so leave a permanent monument to their efforts.

The *public relations* of an institution offer great opportunities for service. A gifted speaker can do much to create good will and to educate the people in regard to the value

of their institution. This can be done through writing and publishing wisely. Also, by developing strong athletic teams. A president with certain gifts can make many friends among influential people who will be loyal to the college.

The college president, besides presiding over important meetings of the faculty and interpreting the college to the trustees and the trustees to the faculty, is expected to prove an inspiring leader in many areas of the college life. Where he leads, he must lead enthusiastically.

So far as possible the president must educate the trustees in the work, aims, teaching and research of their institution. He must acquaint them with the foremost men and women of the staff. I found a monthly letter to each trustee, covering current matters of interest, to be well worth while. Arranging for the trustees to meet the leading professors and their wives at dinner proved pleasant and advantageous.

I believe the president should use all his ingenuity to relieve the trustees of detail and to persuade them to delegate everything that can be properly delegated. Then, as time affords, he should focus their attention on the importance of defining proper policies. Sound policies, understood and unanimously approved by the trustees, will go far toward building a strong institution of both character and influence.

H.

The Size of the Board

In our American institutions, boards vary in size from three to one hundred. While, as has been said, a large board can operate efficiently if properly organized, it has little advantage. I believe that seven is the ideal membership for such a board, with one member appointed each year for a seven-year term.

Seven people will engage freely in a discussion. It seems to be the largest number of which this is true. The fewer the members, the greater the pressure for capable, worthy appointments. An increase beyond seven adds nothing to the strength of the board.

Fewer than seven scarcely give a wide enough spread of responsibility.

However, a board is extremely difficult to alter, regardless of size, once it is established.

In Ohio, with six state-supported educational institutions, each with a separate board of trustees, rivalry before the legislature has been very largely eliminated through the formation of a joint committee which presents the needs of the several institutions. The legislature finally appropriates a lump sum for salaries and operation which is then apportioned on the basis of enrollment.

H.

Relations With the Legislature

The matter of securing adequate funds for a satisfactory program must always remain a problem with every institution. My own experience has been confined to state institutions. Outside of these, I have been directly acquainted with only one private institution which had a sound and definite program for raising money. This was Oberlin College under President Henry C. King.

During Dr. King's administration, Oberlin had on its staff a very able and resourceful man, Mr. William Bohn, who was in charge of raising funds. He had carefully prepared a list of all possible donors to Oberlin and in his own way kept in contact with them. When one of his prospects would show a real interest in giving to the college, Mr. Bohn said to him, "Perhaps you would like to talk this over with President King. I can arrange to have him see you." Mr. Bohn did all the preliminary work, and when he had a really interested prospect, President King would meet and talk with the man. This proved a successful procedure.

In regard to the legislature, I have seen a tremendous change in attitude since 1905 when I made my first contact. I had accompanied President Guy Potter Benton, of Miami University, to the Ohio legislature that year. He had an appointment with the

Finance Committee of the House or Senate, and I remember when we were called in we were told very bluntly, "The Senate has little time. We can give you ten minutes." We were quickly hustled out when the ten minutes were up!

In recent years, both in Ohio and Iowa, I have been given considerate hearings before both Senate and House committees, and while the appropriations were never up to my hopes, they were reasonably good under all the circumstances.

As I am not a particularly impressive speaker, I always confined myself to the facts. I learned early in my administration, from President Hollis Godfrey of Drexel Institute, the great value of charts in making financial matters clear. I placed charts before the legislative committee showing what we had spent and what I regarded as needful, in as much detail as I could, considering the time I had at my disposal. I ran through the charts rapidly but covered all questions as well as I could. I felt that my presentation by charts gave a clearer idea of our condition and needs than could have been given in a speech.

At Miami, the business manager of the university, Mr. Wallace P. Roudebush, was of enormous help with the legislature. He followed the appropriations carefully and made friends with such senators and representatives as he could. I was always accompanied when going to a hearing by two or three trustees and by Mr. Roudebush. I made the main speech with my charts.

One of my associates in Iowa was Dr. Walter Jessup, then president of the State University of Iowa, who was certainly one of the most impressive speakers before a legislative committee I have ever heard. However, it is difficult to talk convincingly about three to five million dollars in twenty minutes. Usually I fared as well as Dr. Jessup.

In Iowa, we had one board for the three state educational institutions. The finance committee of this board occupied an office near the state house and kept in close touch with the legislature. A legislative committee of the board made up of men thought to be most influential with the legislature and usually including the president of the board was responsible for the presentation of askings for the appropriations. At hearings,

the presidents of the three major institutions were always present and were carefully listened to. Aside from the regular hearings I had no contact with the legislature unless individual members called on me. In Iowa, the central board did away with all friction between the institutions in regard to appropriations.

The Iowa board has definitely stated that no member of the several faculties may go before the legislature or present any matter whatsoever to individuals in the legislature unless so authorized by the board. This is a good rule.

H.

Relations With the Legislature

An institution of higher education dependent for its income upon public taxation has a different financial problem from those of a private college. For instance, the trustees are appointed by the governor of a state or by the mayor of the municipality. Such appointments, by the nature of their selection, are apt to have a political tinge. Taken all in all, the appointments will run from average to high grade. The whole list of such appointments will range in the "B" class or better.

As a public institution, the college or university depends for support upon the governor and the legislature of the state in which it is located. The president and the board of trustees are faced with the responsibility of presenting the needs of the institution not only favorably, but effectively. Careful planning, able argument, and some political activity are required to obtain acceptable results. The first step is to learn and understand the political setup of the state government.

All the states but one, Nebraska, have bicameral legislatures. The house may have as few as one hundred members or it may consist of as many as three or four hundred; the senate will consist approximately of one-fourth as many members as the house of representatives. Both houses have presiding officers, and the work preliminary to the voting of budgets is done in committees. There are committees on budget and on education. The important one is the budget committee composed of from twelve to

twenty members. Sometimes the budget committees of the two houses will meet together and make the same report to the house and senate. In the last twenty years, much of the work formerly done by these committees has been done through a budget commission composed of the governor, lieutenant governor, speaker of the house, and several members from the senate and house. This body meets a month or so before the date of the legislature session and is expected to have a bill fully prepared by the time of its opening. Prior to the first meeting of the budget commission, heads of public institutions and state departments are notified and asked to furnish information so the commission may act intelligently. In the course of the meetings, the presidents of public educational institutions are given the opportunity to present the needs of their institutions, together with the reasons for requests.

In compiling the institutional budget, much work will have been done on the campus in collecting, tabulating, and screening the requests and needs of the departments making up the institution. A mere guessing at needs is a dangerous procedure and should be regarded as a genuine breach of academic ethics.

When the institutional budget has been tentatively formed, the results are compared with possible income which must always be estimated conservatively. The president, accompanied by the comptroller and a dean or two, then goes before the commission. The facts and figures should be clearly presented with illustrations in graphic form. Long speeches should be avoided in this meeting and attention should be directed to the facts and reasons. Orations about education may be listened to; but the observation of President Arthur Hadley, referring to long sermons in the Yale college chapel on Sunday mornings, that "there are no conversions after the first twenty minutes," should be kept in mind.

Usually the budget bill is the first one presented to the legislature for consideration. Political strategy is employed to get the bill through and out of the way. The college president and his board may learn by the middle of the first month of the assembly meeting what provisions have been made for their

needs, and so the president's sleep need not be disturbed by figures and statistical forms for another two years.

It is taken for granted that the president knows the members of his board and is on good terms with them. In addition, early and late he has given them a clear picture of the institution and has impressed them with the importance of the position they occupy. It is quite as necessary to know the leading men in the legislature and to acquaint them with the needs of the institution. To do this requires some travel and considerable visiting which will be of additional value to a college president by increasing his knowledge of the state he serves.

The alumni should be alerted so they will know something about the college beyond its record in the field of sports. To do this requires a good deal of effort by the college press and the public relations department. Alumni in each legislature and senatorial district should be asked to see and talk with prospective members of the assembly before election, not after! When the time comes for the vote on the budget bill, the institution has thus made some real friends who understand its needs.

Throughout this campaign, if it may be called such, there must be consistent fair dealing. The policy of padding budgets on the supposition that the legislature will inevitably cut down the appropriation, regardless of its validity, is a mistaken one. A reputation for making fair and reasonable requests will win the increased confidence of the legislature in the administration of a college.

On the whole, legislative members want to do the best they can. They have their own problems. Reduced income from taxes, changes in economic conditions as well as variances in the backing of the public, force them to give ground.

As I look back over fifteen legislative sessions that I have attended and before whose committees I have appeared, I realize that I was always treated with courtesy and consideration. Promises were not always kept, but in at least half of the sessions, larger support and more capital funds were appropriated for the institutions I represented.

M.

Formulation of College and University Policy

While I was president of Miami University, I was annoyed by a joking remark often repeated by a trustee, "The trustees are again assembled to okay the recommendations of Raymond Hughes." As a matter of fact, that was largely what they did do and what I expected them to do. That is why the joke hurt.

As this situation continued to worry me, I finally realized that the trouble was due to the fact that the efforts of the trustees should have been devoted chiefly to the consideration of *policies*. Certain of the actions taken, such as appointments made during the year, did require formal approval and recording in the minutes of the board. This, however, could have been made a blanket approval of the action of the executive committee, or a general authorization of authority to the president. In any case, the time of the twenty-seven members of the board at the annual meeting should have been spent in the consideration and formulation of general policies that would control Miami University and within which the university's affairs would be operated by the president, the business manager and the staff.

When I assumed the presidency of Iowa State College, nine men and women constituted a board which controlled the five educational institutions of the state. Here, again, the time was spent at the monthly meetings of the board discussing and approving a long list of matters submitted by the several executives, so that at the end of the year, no advance had been made in formulating a clear-cut policy.

To me this procedure did not appear to be sound. I regret that only after twenty-five years' experience and ten years' contemplation has the matter become clear. I now see that the chief duty of a board is to formulate the controlling policies, with the guidance and assistance of the president, and to evaluate how well the current incumbent is operating the institution under those policies.

Every university that has operated successfully over several years is in fact controlled more or less by policies written or unwritten, and its presidents carry them through as best they

can. However, I am sure many presidents will bear me out when I say that during a good part of the time they have been in doubt as to what the policy was relative to many matters.

The board members assemble for meetings, whether monthly or yearly, for the most part with little consideration of the problems before them. They must depend largely upon the president and the business manager to present the business in hand. If matters of policy were regularly made a part of the responsibility of the board, and if such policies as were adopted were recorded and from time to time codified, a valuable document would result.

These policies would of course vary from one board to another and from institution to institution. They would inevitably deal, for example, with some of the following:

Selection of staff	Investments
Appointments	Incurring indebtedness
Dismissals	Financing buildings
Tenure	Dormitory facilities
Salary scale	Boarding facilities
Rating value of faculty members	Room and board rates
Admissions	Basis of estimate of income
Number of freshmen to be admitted	Preparation of budget of expenses
Selection of freshmen	Reserve
Ratio of men to women	Deficit
Scholarship standards	

If policies relative to these and other matters were regularly put in writing by the board, the president could be given authority to act within them.

Particularly in our larger institutions, it appears essential to depend more and more upon the president but to restrict him by fixed policies. Where exceptions are called for, reference should be made to the board.

In some cases the policy could be definite and fixed, as for example the maximum indebtedness which might be incurred in building dormitories to be amortized from total room rent. In other matters such as appointments, more flexibility would be necessary.

As one looks back over fifty or sixty years to the unimpressive size of colleges and universities then, it is clear that almost

everything possible was brought to the board to justify its meeting. The entire annual income of Miami University from 1824 to 1873, a brilliant era in her history, never reached \$20,000. The times have so changed that a very different policy is now called for if our institutions are to continue to move forward, or even to hold their present status.

H.

The President as Chairman of the Board

I have wondered how such a relation works out in practice. It seems to me that this method of organization is not in accord with the best type of procedure. In no instance, so far as I am aware, does a president of an educational institution supported by public funds act as chairman of the board; yet there are numerous instances where a president occupies the place of chairman on private college boards.

The objection to this practice is that the president is an executive officer, paid a salary, selected by the board, and subject to its rules and regulations. As chairman, he passes upon what he is to do as president. He could, in fact, vote on his retention in office, determine and raise the question of his own salary. As a gentleman, he would vacate the chair when such matters came before the board; otherwise he would be judge, a member of the jury and advocate before the court.

There is in this dual position much to be questioned. In fact, the responsibility for the welfare of the institution's progress rests too heavily upon one man. The board is, after all, a policy-making body and such policies are carried out by the president; in consequence, the responsibility for money raising, investments, construction of buildings, and many other important matters is placed on the shoulders of one man.

It is more responsibility than one individual should be asked to assume. It can be argued that the president runs the place, and knows more about it than the board can know; therefore, turn it over to him, and the members of the board can stand back of him. In the law, the board is responsible for the main-

tenance of property and the management of the institution. In case of trouble, the board would find itself in a questionable situation.

In another place, Hughes and I have written about the value of a wise counselor for the president, a need that exists even in the administration of a board. As an executive officer, a president must have advice and counsel. A board is supposed to bring to his help the experience of its members and their knowledge of conditions, business relations and trends.

When he is chairman, the president is in an anomalous position where he is the adviser, director and servant. The fact is that a rubber stamp board is not much help to a president and can't be because it is not independent. Where the members are free to discuss problems, the contributions made by the members to the welfare of the institution they serve are sure to bring better results than in the case where one man determines the course of the institution. It may be said that one man, even in the case cited, does not control the institution. To that my reply is that he can and often does.

M.

Assistants Whom the Trustees Should Provide for the President

I am convinced that the executive assistants provided for the president have not kept pace in recent years with the growth of colleges and with the increasing demands which are made on them by the public. While some presidents have the wisdom and courage to ask for adequate help, others, not fully realizing the burdens of the office, hesitate to ask for more aid than was provided for their predecessor. It seems appropriate to discuss this matter for the benefit of both presidents and trustees.

No two institutions are exactly alike and many differ enormously. Some are small and others are very large. Some devote their entire efforts to undergraduate instruction, and in others there are more graduate students than undergraduate. In some, practically no research is attempted while in others vast amounts of research are carried on in many fields. Some confine their

work to the campus, while others have extension courses and correspondence courses. It is certainly difficult to lay down rules about the assistance the presidents of such varied institutions will need. However, some statements can be made.

One great reason for providing adequate assistance is the fact that the overworked president almost invariably neglects his most important duty. The quality and character of the members of the faculty are the president's responsibility. However, the initiative in these appointments usually rests with department heads and the college deans. When overpressed, the president is forced to approve these recommendations with little or no personal knowledge of the men appointed.

Furthermore, the attention of the dean and department head is strongly focused on the professional fitness in training, research and experience of the person appointed. The character, generosity of spirit, manners, integrity, and interest in students of the candidate are often not adequately canvassed. It is right here that the president's judgment is needed.

Let us first consider the needs of institutions based roughly on size and then consider the functions of some vice-presidents under consideration.

Roughly, in the staff from instructor to full professor there is a turnover of about 20 per cent a year. In colleges with less than 1,000 students, certainly a president with a competent financial officer should be fully able to deal with all matters and give full attention to the new appointments, which would not exceed from five to twenty a year.

With institutions enrolling from 1,000 to 2,500 and employing staffs of from one hundred to two hundred and fifty there would probably be from twenty to fifty appointments to be made each year. A competent vice-president in many of the larger of these institutions could easily earn his salary in securing abler, finer men for the staff. In some cases he would not be needed.

In institutions enrolling from 2,500 to 5,000, and employing from two hundred and fifty to five hundred teachers, there would be from fifty to one hundred staff appointments, and probably from ten to twenty-five graduate assistants to be appointed. It

seems quite certain that a vice-president in charge of faculty and curriculum would be necessary.

In larger institutions engaged in much research and graduate work, more vice-presidents will be required but rarely more than five or six. Their functions and number will depend on the needs of each institution.

Some consideration of the function of the proposed vice-presidents will further explain their use.

Every institution must have a competent financial officer. In all the larger institutions he may properly be ranked as a vice-president in charge of business. In small institutions he is variously called bursar, treasurer or business manager, but in all cases he carries the financial responsibilities of the institution. He reports to the president. The work is variously divided in the larger institutions as follows:

Collections are under a cashier; accounts are under a chief accountant; purchasing is under a purchasing agent; buildings and grounds, under a superintendent; dormitories and boarding departments, under a director; erection of new buildings is under the architects' supervision; and all student activity accounts are under a supervisor. The payments of salaries and bills are made through the treasurer. The vice-president in charge of business retains no specific duties to himself. All the regular work of his office is dealt with by one or another subdivision. The vice-president consults with the president and is subject to call by him. He settles all problems that arise in his office. He prepares the financial reports for the trustees and has a large part in the preparation of the budget. He must see that no expenditure is made exceeding the amount appropriated for that purpose.

Evidently, with such a mass of business routine, efficient methods of handling it must be adopted. It is through the infringement of these routine methods by faculty members that most of the trouble arises with the faculty. A business manager who can get along amiably with the faculty members is a rare person.

While the president may be relieved of financial affairs under a vice-president, there remain burdensome faculty and

curriculum problems with which to deal. Let us consider placing these, as well as the library, under another vice-president in charge of faculty and curriculum.

He might have under his charge from five to twelve colleges and easily from fifty to one hundred departments with a staff of from 500 to 2,000 persons. Theoretically, a department would fill a vacancy, subject to the approval of its dean. But deans and department heads will vary in their capacity to choose wisely and to search exhaustively for the best man available at the salary. A president does not dare to accept without question all recommendations that the deans may present. This whole matter could be turned over to a provost or to a vice-president in charge of faculty and curriculum who had the full confidence of the faculty. While the president should be kept informed of all major appointments, the vice-president would have power to act. This would save not only the president's time, but would largely remove his gravest source of anxiety, criticism by faculty members.

In order to more fully understand the importance of staff appointments, let us consider a large university with a faculty of 1,650:

<i>Rank</i>	<i>Number</i>	<i>Appointed Each Year</i>	<i>Salary</i>	<i>Estimated Years of Service</i>	<i>Total Salary for Esti- mated Years of Service</i>
Full Professor.....	250	10-15	\$8,000	20	\$1,600,000
Associate Professor.....	200	18-20	5,000	15	1,350,000
Assistant Professor.....	300	45-60	4,000	5	900,000
Instructor.....	400	100-150	3,000	3	900,000
Fellow and Graduate.....	500	200	900	3	540,000
Total.....	1,650	\$5,290,000

Assume that the total salaries of those employed each year, during the entire remaining years of service was \$5,000,000. If an able man by careful supervision could improve the quality of appointments 10 per cent, it would be worth \$500,000; if only 1 per cent, it would be worth \$50,000 a year. Further, if he

were able to improve the quality of appointments at the level of instructors and below, the fact that able young men were already on the staff would make possible the filling of nearly all vacancies of professional grade through promotion. If this were done, it would insure better appointments since such an appointee would be well known. Certainly the institution could afford to employ such a man.

The complete interlacing of loyalties in an educational institution often makes it very difficult to be frank. The department head must be loyal to his staff, to the dean and to the president. How can he recommend the discontinuance of some work in his department, regardless of how useless it is, when such a move will involve one or more staff members? He might talk this over with the vice-president in charge of faculty and curriculum.

A third vice-president should have charge of other activities including publicity, radio, athletics, alumni, infirmary, rooming and boarding departments, YMCA and YWCA, and student affairs.

A president should be able to find out what economies can be made. He needs a financial expert qualified to evaluate the expenditures of the university and to report his findings to the president. Such a man need not be a Ph.D. in education, although he might hold that degree. He should be a man the faculty members would trust, one to whom they would talk freely and honestly, realizing that he is working for the welfare of the university. He should report to the president, and his work should always be at the points of interest to the president.

There is increasing concern over public relations, and many feel that a man with the rank of vice-president should devote his time to this field. It is true that in a great university the complexity of the work and the diversity of the research carried on should be kept before the public. Also, the donors and members of the legislature should be kept informed and their questions should be answered. The wisdom of appointing a full-time man to this position and rank must be carefully considered.

With such a staff as has been recommended here, a president should be able to devote his time to the larger concerns of the university. He would work closely with his chief assist-

ants. The knowledge which he acquired through them concerning the institution would be of great value in administering a ten or twenty million dollar a year enterprise, and the cost of such help would be small in proportion to the increased effectiveness of his work.

H.

The President's Need for a Wise Counselor

During the years I was president of Miami University, when any serious problem arose I went to Hamilton, a nearby town, and spent the evening in consultation with Mr. Walter L. Tobey, president of the board. Such conferences always cleared up my troubles to an astonishing degree, and I returned to Oxford with a sound idea of how I should proceed.

When I came to Iowa State College, I was already well acquainted with Dr. W. R. Boyd, president of the finance committee of the board. He came to the college once a month and usually spent a night with me at the president's home. I would go over my accumulation of problems with him then, to my great comfort and satisfaction.

A president cannot afford to develop an intimate relationship with any one faculty member. If one or more vice-presidents were on duty, the president could discuss the problems in their respective spheres with them. It has been suggested that a faculty committee advisory to the president might well serve as a consulting body. This idea may have merit, yet one would hesitate to discuss a very perplexing, serious situation with such a committee, some members of which might betray the confidence.

I believe, however, that a faculty-elected committee advisory to the president would be safer to consult with than any single member of the faculty who would soon come to be regarded as the president's confidant.

Of course, most problems would fall naturally within the province of a dean or a department head, and the president would naturally turn to him. Unfortunately, problems arise from time to time that cannot be cleared through a conference

with another administrative officer. There should be some person on the board of trustees in whom the president can confide.

President Edward C. Elliott of Purdue was exceptionally fortunate in having as a trustee entirely devoted to that university, Mr. David E. Ross, who lived in Lafayette. He would often drop into Dr. Elliott's home or office, and the two would talk freely together.

I have been exceptionally fortunate in my own experience. Were I embarking again as a college president, I would try to consult with the president of the board; but if he were not readily accessible, I would try to select some chairman of a committee of the board who was truly devoted to the institution. If neither of these outlets were available, I would ask the faculty to elect a committee advisory to the president, and I would counsel with this committee, trusting its discretion.

I am convinced that a college or university president must have some person or persons whom he trusts and with whom he may consult confidentially.

H.

The President's Need for a Wise Counselor

Indeed, we all need a wise counselor, but where is such a one to be found? If he is from the faculty, there is a possibility the selection will be looked upon as showing favoritism, and the creation of a kitchen cabinet imminent. The counselor may be a member of the board of trustees or a man or woman interested in the college. Sometimes great comfort and help may come from a brother-in-arms who heads an institution not too far away. Wisdom is to be sought wherever it can be found.

In my own experience, I sometimes employed a method called "sending up a trial balloon" to encourage comment among board members, faculty, and alumni. This can be done by informal conversation, in small meetings or even in a newspaper interview. Still the wise counselor may not be clearly in evidence, and the resulting returns from the balloon test must be screened, weighed, and formulated. The wise counselor is greatly needed at this point.

As the new president settles down in his office, he has time to look around and even to test some of the men and women close to the college for the purpose of choosing a wise counselor. If the goddess of luck supervenes, he may form a friendship that will be of the greatest value to him and the college. The wise counselor must have what is far too rare, a thing called wisdom, also discretion, the ability to weigh evidence, and all in all he must be able to see the problems realistically, free from personal bias. The president of the board of trustees is the logical candidate for the place of wise counselor, but many times he does not measure up to the requirements.

As Dr. Hughes writes in his comment on this topic, "A president must have some person or persons whom he can trust and with whom he may consult." I agree with this. Perhaps the president has in his own household such a wise counselor in the person of his wife. But in the world of affairs there are relations involving finance, administration, discernment, and a broad view point on educational problems; all so varied and complicated that the wise counselor should be a man of wide experience, of philosophical turn of mind, broad vision, and thoroughly honest in mind as well as in money matters. Given time, such a person, possibly several, may be found. Then the president is indeed blessed.

M.

The Age and Origin of Three Hundred Presidents on Election

A study published in *School and Society*, Vol. 51 (March 9, 1940), p. 317, gives the age of the 300 presidents then holding office, at the time they entered upon their duties. They are as follows:

<i>Age</i>	<i>Number</i>	<i>Percentage</i>	<i>Age</i>	<i>Number</i>	<i>Percentage</i>
30-34	31	10.1	50-54	48	15.6
35-39	52	16.9	55-59	21	6.8
40-44	67	21.8	60-64	11	3.6
45-49	73	23.8	65-68	4	1.3

Eighty per cent were between thirty-five and fifty-four years of age when appointed.

If sixty-five is fixed as the age at which a president retires, it is unwise to consider a man more than fifty-five or fifty-six, as an institution should be able to hope for eight or ten years of service.

On the other hand, if a man younger than forty-five years of age is appointed, he may desire to transfer, when opportunity offers, to a more attractive post.

The Previous Employment of Presidents

In the study quoted above, the positions held just prior to their appointment were tabulated for the 300 presidents studied:

	<i>Number</i>	<i>Percentage</i>
President of another institution.....	52	17.3
Dean: within the institution (51).....	79	26.5
of another institution (28).....		
Professor: within the institution (28).....	68	22.5
of another institution (40).....		
College executive other than above.....	18	6.0
Clergyman in active pastorate.....	27	9.0
Business executive.....	12	4.0
Executive in national post.....	13	4.3
Executive in minor public post.....	9	3.0
Superintendent of schools.....	12	4.0
Editor.....	4	1.3
Miscellaneous.....	6	2.0
Total.....	300	99.9

H.

The Selection of a President

Occasionally a retiring president is asked for aid in finding a successor, and more frequently he is asked to suggest a man to fill a vacancy in another institution. It is a matter of great interest as to how to select a college president. Some suggestions can be made.

It is important to secure a list of all men or women, so far

as possible, who may be qualified for the post. It is a rather simple matter to eliminate undesirables from the list; but if the best man available is not on the list at all, he cannot be appointed. In an effort to assist a board of trustees in selecting a president, I once thoroughly canvassed the current "Who's Who in America." The biography of every college president and dean under fifty-four years of age was cut out; about five hundred names resulted. These clippings were pasted alphabetically on letter-sized sheets. All those born in the same year were placed on the same sheet or sheets.

From this collection I selected those who were most promising for the particular position, a list of thirty-three names. Twenty-three of these held more attractive posts than that under consideration. This left ten men in the preferred list.

Photostat copies were made of the entire list and copies were given to the committee of the board. While several men on the select list were not interested when approached, and while a number of men not on this list were also conferred with, no one was considered who had not the necessary qualifications.

I believe my list tended to keep the level of consideration high. The man finally selected was a dean fifty-five years of age and so was not on my list.

Of course, many men worthy of consideration are not employed in the academic field. However, about 70 to 75 per cent of appointments are made from this field. Usually many names from non-academic fields are suggested by alumni when asked for suggestions.

If the board would prepare a written statement of the qualifications it desires in a president, that would be of great help in finding the right man.

I am convinced that a faculty committee can make a valuable contribution to the trustees in the selection of a president. Such a committee should be elected by the faculty; it should be small.

Its contributions would be along several lines. It could nominate to the trustees names of several men worthy of consideration. When the trustees had acquired all the names they desired, the faculty committee could help in eliminating the less desirable

ones. The faculty members would be able to get confidential estimates on any men in academic work.

Finally, when the board had narrowed down the men whom they regarded as most desirable to a list of five or ten, the committee could indicate which men would be most acceptable to the faculty. They could also get sound estimates from friends in colleges and universities where these men on the preferred list had served.

The faculty, more than any other group, would be continuously and seriously affected by the appointment, for good or ill. They would have more confidence in the final selection by the trustees, knowing that a faculty committee was working with the trustees throughout the search resulting in the final appointment.

One point voiced years ago by Dean Carl E. Seashore of the State University of Iowa is that you can never size up a man accurately as an administrator until he has done administrative work. You can judge how he will use power only when power is given to him. Especially in a large institution, the chances of a man's making good are far greater if he has exercised administrative responsibility and if he has been carefully investigated than are the chances of a man who does not thus qualify. Power often goes to a man's head and makes him a dictator. No dictator can succeed on a college campus.

H.

Evidence of a Good President

The trustees regard him as absolutely honest and frank. They trust him and accept his recommendations as being sincerely made after careful consideration. The president's success in satisfying the trustees will depend in large part on his unselfish devotion to the welfare of their institution, on his executive skill, on his honesty and courage and on the organization of the institution.

The faculty trusts him. They regard him as an honest, reliable man, interested in their work and their welfare. A university, in order to function properly, must be operated as far

as possible on a democratic basis, not as a dictatorship with the president as dictator. The faculty believes the president desires the maximum individual and departmental freedom compatible with the proper control of the institution.

The students feel that he will safeguard their interests. If they present to him a matter of importance, they believe he will give it his careful consideration and will go as far as he can to satisfy all reasonable demands. They realize that he is trying to provide good teaching on the campus.

The college public respects him. They feel that he is a suitable man for the position. They are proud of him.

The alumni like him. If he is unable to provide winning athletic teams, they will be fairly well satisfied if the department from which they graduated is maintained at a high level. They want to be proud of their university, their college, their department. While many of the most outspoken alumni urgently demand a winning team, a great portion are deeply concerned for the standing of their university among comparable institutions.

In a relatively small college enrolling 1,000 or fewer students and employing 100 or fewer teachers, an honest, sympathetic man can by intelligent devotion to the institution and hard work attain good standing with these various groups.

However, as the size of an institution increases to 5,000, 10,000, 20,000 or even 40,000, this task is impossible for any one man to accomplish. The president's job must be shared by an increasing administrative staff. The logical thing is to provide a number of vice-presidents, each with authority in his own field. These men must be chosen with great care and must satisfy those with whom they deal by their honest fair-mindedness and concern for the right. Otherwise, everyone with matters which come under him will wish to consult directly with the president. If the wrong man is inadvertently appointed to one of these posts, he must be replaced promptly.

A university or college consists theoretically of a faculty of scholars and a body of students, all of whom are ladies and gentlemen. Together they seek truth. Any member of the group who is not a lady or gentleman may disturb the whole structure.

He does not belong. A gentleman is considerate of others; does his full duty; never takes personal advantage of a situation; is fair and just.

If faculty appointments were made more carefully, the men who are not gentlemen would be excluded, or if such a one were appointed, he would be removed promptly. As student bodies now stand, it must be the aim of a college to make ladies and gentlemen of them as far as possible during their four years' residence. However, I fear many are graduated who could scarcely be so ranked.

A good president, in order to satisfy those with whom he works, must have time free from fixed, demanding duties for the careful consideration of problems constantly arising. He is usually the authority of last resort, and his decisions must be just. The trustees should see that sufficient administrative assistance is provided to give the president this necessary free time.

The board should also insist that the president take from four to six weeks' vacation from all duties each year. His work is wearing, and he needs time free from all responsibility for rest and meditation and to give detached consideration to the problems of his office.

H.

Undesirable Presidents

At one of the meetings of the National Association of State Universities, President William Bryan of the University of Indiana said the mediocre president may be forced out of his job at the age of fifty-five. "There he is," said Dr. Bryan, "all dressed up with no place to go." Dr. Hughes feels that such a man should be able to find a position where he can make a living for himself and family. Maybe so, but the experience through which he has gone has done something to his spirit that leaves him depleted. He is never again the same man. It is easier to avoid appointment of an undesirable president than it is to get rid of one.

In selecting a president, it is essential that the faculty, trustees,

and alumni should be satisfied. But the man who is selected should submit himself to real soul searching; he must take an inventory of his capacity and talents as he considers the job which he has been asked to assume. Perhaps this is too much to expect of any human being, for there are few men who are so intellectually honest that they will not rationalize such a situation. Many a good scholar has been lost and an excellent teacher blotted out by accepting a college presidency. Administrative officers are needed in our system of higher education; and consequently, selection becomes necessary, although a difficult and harassing task.

The very fact that so many presidencies are vacant each year raises the question in the mind of many a good man, why he should take on a job in which the tenure is uncertain. Yet he is attracted by the new prominence he will have and by the larger salary which a presidency will bring, as well as by the challenge of the service he can render. Here is presented a dilemma of considerable proportions that can be solved only by a more careful consideration of the problem.

As Dr. Hughes writes in his last paragraph, the fault may rest with boards of trustees and faculties. Neither group knows much about the problems and difficulties of the office. Many a president might be saved for a useful tenure if the board would talk frankly with him as problems and criticisms arose.

There is much dangerous gossip reaching boards that frank talk would eliminate. A kindly and helpful attitude on the part of all creates a wholesome atmosphere in an institution.

There is, however, no remedy other than change in the personnel of the office, if grandiose ideas and love of power get into the mental processes and individual attitudes of a president. He may be able because of toughness to hold on, but the institution will suffer in its morale under such circumstances.

Many a president has been faced with the "behind-the-scene method" sometimes used by board members to pump the faculty about the president's popularity; and in reverse order, some faculty members, not many surely, will go around the president to get the ear of the board of trustees, thus violating a fundamental principle of organization. When this is permitted, the president

is placed in an impossible position. Many difficulties would not arise in college administration if the principles that go with the titles of lady and gentleman always guided the policies of a university. It may be quite as important to save a president as to fire him.

M.

How Can an Undesirable President Be Removed?

With 1,850 colleges and universities in the country, probably between two hundred and three hundred presidents are appointed each year. It is not possible that all of these appointments will be wise ones. In many cases, one trustee will press persistently for the selection of a certain man and will finally secure his election, rather than allow the whole board finally to unite on one man.

The position to be filled is so difficult and the qualifications desired so numerous that rarely is a man selected who is fully qualified. If he does fail, it is generally through his inability to work comfortably with the trustees or the faculty. If he is unable to win the confidence of the trustees and faculty, it is for the good of the institution that he be retired from office. The welfare of a college or university is far more important than the sensibilities of any one man.

However, over the thirty-five years during which I have followed the careers of college presidents, it has surprised me greatly to observe how reluctant boards of trustees are to remove a president. Many able men are kept far beyond their age of usefulness. Many more clearly prove their inability to serve acceptably within two or three years, yet are retained. Why is this?

I suppose boards dislike to admit they have made a mistake, for one thing. For another, as they are not professional educators, they hesitate to act on their own judgment. Also, they remember the labors involved in selecting the present incumbent, and are loath to undertake the quest again. In any case, trustees almost always set about making a change very reluctantly.

How serious a detriment to an institution is a president who

lacks the confidence of trustees and faculty? Certainly he is a serious embarrassment that each year will grow more serious. If the institution includes in its administrative staff a vice-president who has the confidence of the faculty, considerable damage will be obviated. However, any board should promptly remove a president who is unsatisfactory. The question is, how may this be wisely accomplished?

I feel that several matters should be observed in such a case. The board should first learn the attitude of the faculty toward the president. This knowledge may best be obtained by consulting with a committee elected by the faculty. It would be undesirable to have a committee elected especially for such a purpose, but if there are faculty committees already elected, one such committee should be consulted.

Certainly, the president of the board should have a frank talk with the president of the college as soon as his failure to measure up to the board's requirements is evident. He should then be advised to find another berth within two years.

Depending upon the institution, its resources and the age of the president, suitable financial adjustment should be made. If he is given two years in which to secure another post, he should be told that at the end of the two years if he has not found a position, he will be granted a year's leave at full salary which will terminate his connection with the institution. Such treatment seems entirely fair to any man under fifty-five years of age. It must be remembered that regardless of his lack of suitability for a particular post, practically any man elected president of a college is outstanding in certain ways and can quite certainly secure another position if he tries.

For an older man who has served five years or more, the question of his employment by the institution in some other capacity or of his eligibility for a pension arises. His employment might be a definite handicap to his successor, and that possibility should be avoided. His pension may well be a matter of conference between him and a board committee. Any man under fifty-five years of age should be able through his friends to secure further employment. If so, no pension is necessary, or at any rate

a small pension only. A man over fifty-five should have employment or a pension adequate at least for himself and his wife to live on modestly.

A president's post is precarious for many reasons and will always remain so. Many of the reasons arise from the character of the board itself and from that of the faculty. Just as a new president is largely an unknown quantity to the board and faculty, so are these bodies largely unknown to the president. If I were to live my life over again and undertook to serve either as a president or as a football coach, I would certainly put a certain percentage of my salary each year into an annuity. Regardless of the present wide promise of pensions, I should take steps at once to protect myself upon accepting such a precarious position.

H.