

DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 038 955

JC 700 094

AUTHOR Morgan, Don A.
TITLE Perspectives of the Community College Presidency.
INSTITUTION California Univ., Los Angeles. Junior Coll.
Leadership Program.
REPORT NO UCLA-JCLP-OR-14
PUB DATE Mar 70
NOTE 115p.
AVAILABLE FROM UCLA Students' Store, 308 Westwood Plaza, Los Angeles, California 90024 (\$2.00)

EDRS PRICE MF-\$0.50 HC-\$5.85
DESCRIPTORS *Administrator Characteristics, *Administrator Role, Administrator Selection, College Administration, Educational Administration, *Junior Colleges, *Presidents

ABSTRACT

The office of the community college president and the individuals who serve in it are the concern of this monograph. Data were initially obtained through questionnaires answered by 438 community college presidents. Subsequent information was received from the presidents' wives, secretaries, and second-ranking administrators; deans, presidents of faculty associations, and state directors of community colleges or vocational education also provided information. The following topics were among those considered: (1) selection criteria and procedures, (2) initial activities, (3) sources of information and assistance, (4) functions, (5) personal characteristics, (6) most pressing problems, (7) reasons presidents remain or leave their office and where they go, (8) characteristics of the successful president and what could have been done to help those in difficulty, and (9) future areas for study. (J0)

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE
PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS
STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION
POSITION OR POLICY.

Perspectives of The Community College Presidency

ED0 38955

by

Don A. Morgan

Occasional Report Number 14

Junior College Leadership Program
Graduate School of Education
University of California, Los Angeles

March 1970

JC 700 094

UNIVERSITY OF CALIF.
LOS ANGELES

APR 09 1970

CLEARINGHOUSE FOR
JUNIOR COLLEGE
INFORMATION

© 1970 BY THE REGENTS OF THE UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS
COPYRIGHTED MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED
BY C. WAYNE GORDON (ACTING DEAN OF
EDUC. - UCLA) FOR REGENTS OF UNIV. OF CALIF.
TO ERIC AND ORGANIZATIONS OPERATING
UNDER AGREEMENTS WITH THE U.S. OFFICE OF
EDUCATION. FURTHER REPRODUCTION OUTSIDE
THE ERIC SYSTEM REQUIRES PERMISSION OF
THE COPYRIGHT OWNER."

CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES	7
FOREWORD	9
PREFACE	11
CHAPTER I.	
INTRODUCTION	15
The Community College	16
Growth of the Community College	19
The President	19
A Basic Position of the Monograph	20
Assumptions	21
Method	22
Organization of the Monograph	23
Limitations	24
CHAPTER II.	
A STRATEGY FOR ARRIVAL IN THE PRESIDENCY	25
Selection	26
Who Is Selected	27
What Is a President?—Definitions and Descriptions	28
Findings of the First Survey	30
Summary	32
CHAPTER III.	
THE NATURE OF THE PRESIDENCY: BASIS OF A STRATEGY	
FOR SURVIVAL	35
Role of the President	38
Results of the Survey	39
Summary	42
CHAPTER IV.	
A STRATEGY FOR DEPARTURE	45
The Survey	46

Results	46
Summary	52

CHAPTER V.

PERSPECTIVES OF THE PRESIDENCY AS REPORTED BY THE SECOND-RANKING ADMINISTRATOR	54
Who Is the Second-Ranking Administrator?	54
Ambitions for the Presidency	55
Perspectives Held of the Presidency	56
The Principal Function of a President	57
Pressures on the President	58
Conclusions	60

CHAPTER VI.

PERSPECTIVES OF THE PRESIDENT AS REPORTED BY THE PRESIDENT'S SECRETARY	61
Pressures on Secretaries to the President	63
Perspectives of the President	65
The President's Off-Campus Work	66
The President's On-Campus Work	67
Success Traits in Presidents	69
Future Problems Facing Presidents	70
Summary and Conclusions	72

CHAPTER VII.

PERSPECTIVES OF THE PRESIDENT AS REPORTED BY FACULTY ASSOCIATION PRESIDENTS	73
The Survey—Method and Responses	77
Results	78
What Kinds of Faculty Associations Are There?	78
Faculty Perspectives of the President	80
Summary and Conclusions	85

CHAPTER VIII.

PERSPECTIVES OF THE PRESIDENT: MRS. PRESIDENT SPEAKS	87
Role of the President's Wife	87
The Survey of Presidents' Wives	88
The President as Seen by the President's Wife	89
Summary	94

CHAPTER IX.

THE NATURE OF SUCCESS IN THE PRESIDENCY	95
The Survey	96
Results of the Survey	97
Summary	103

CHAPTER X.

**FUTURE CHALLENGES FOR NEW PRESIDENTS: SOME
PERSPECTIVES OF THE MORE SUCCESSFUL PRESIDENTS . . . 105**
 Crises 105
 The Matter of Faculty 109
 Board Problems 110
 What Is the Best Training or Preparation for a Presidency? . . . 111
 Summary 112

CHAPTER XI.

PERSPECTIVES ON PERSPECTIVES 113

BIBLIOGRAPHY 119

LIST OF TABLES

CHAPTER II.

I. What Should the President-Elect Do?	30
II. What Should the Newly Arrived President Do First?	31
III. Key Person for Acclimating New President	32

CHAPTER III.

I. Whom Does the President "Lean On"?	40
II. Three Greatest Sources of Pressures on the President	40
III. On-Campus Work—Most Pressing	42
IV. Off-Campus Work—Most Pressing	43

CHAPTER IV.

I. Where Departing Presidents Go	47
II. Why Did Preceding President Leave?	48
III. Sources of Pressure on Presidents to Leave	49
IV. What Presidents Would Prefer to Do If Not Remain President	49
V. Motivation to Leave Presidency Reported by Presidents	50
VI. Motivation to Stay On as President Reported by Presidents	50

CHAPTER V.

I. Positions Held by Second-Ranking Administrators	55
II. Frequency of Types of Second-Ranking Administrators	56
III. The President Does, or Should Do, as Reported by Second-Ranking Administrators	56
IV. The Principal Function of a President as Reported by Second-Ranking Administrators	57
V. Greatest Source of Pressure on President as Reported by Second-Ranking Administrators	58
VI. What Should the President-Elect Do as Reported by Second-Ranking Administrators	59
VII. What Should a Newly Arrived President Do as Reported by Second-Ranking Administrators	59

CHAPTER VI.

I. The Three Greatest Pressures on the President as Reported by the President's Secretary	64
---	----

II. What Takes the President Off-Campus as Reported by the President's Secretary	66
III. Kinds of Meetings Requiring President to Leave Campus as Reported by the President's Secretary	67
IV. What Does the President Do When On-Campus as Reported by the President's Secretary	68
V. Characteristics Helpful for Success in the Presidency as Reported by the President's Secretary	70
VI. Problems for Presidents Increasing in Severity as Reported by the President's Secretary	71
 CHAPTER VII.	
I. Kinds of Faculty Associations Responding	79
II. The Principal Pressures on the President as Reported by Faculty Representatives	80
III. The Principal Function of a President as Reported by Faculty Representatives	81
IV. Characteristics Helpful for Success in the Presidency as Reported by Faculty Representatives	82
V. Problems for Presidents Increasing in Severity as Reported by Faculty Representatives	84
 CHAPTER VIII.	
I. Why Presidents Become Presidents as Reported by Their Wives	90
II. Success Characteristics of Presidents as Reported by Their Wives	90
III. Pressures on the Presidents as Reported by Their Wives	91
IV. Would You Prefer the President Had Another Position?	92
V. Will the President Eventually Want Another Position?	93
VI. The Presidents' Greatest Satisfactions as Reported by Their Wives	94
 CHAPTER IX.	
I. Characteristics of Successful Presidents as Reported by Their Peers	98
II. Characteristics of Successful Presidents as Reported by State Directors	99
III. Could Troubled Presidents Have Been Successful Elsewhere or in Another Time Period?	100
IV. What Could Have Helped President Who Had Difficulties as Reported by Presidents	101
V. Problems Increasing in Severity for Presidents as Reported by State Directors	103

FOREWORD

The surveys reported in this monograph were launched by Don A. Morgan while he was president of Big Bend Community College, Washington. During a year of post-doctoral study at the University of California, Los Angeles—under a Fellowship financed by the W. K. Kellogg Foundation—Dr. Morgan has continued his surveys. In particular, he has written this monograph in which he analyzes and reports some of the data he had previously assembled.

In surveying perspectives of the junior college presidency, Dr. Morgan has wisely included the president as well as others associated with him—the “number-two man,” the president of the faculty association, the president’s secretary, and the president’s wife. *Not* included—as pointed out in the report—are surveys of members of boards of trustees, community leaders, and students. Studies of the views of these groups, as well as further examination of the role and functioning of the junior college president will, it is to be hoped, be undertaken by Dr. Morgan.

An important chapter in this monograph deals with perspectives of the presidency held by ten of the twelve presidents most frequently reported, in Dr. Morgan’s survey, as the outstanding junior college presidents of our nation.

This monograph is the third recent publication of the University of California, Los Angeles, Junior College Leadership Program to deal with the junior college presidency. Others are:

William A. Harper, *Like It Is*, Report of a Workshop for New Junior College Presidents and Their Wives (Los Angeles: Graduate School of Education, University of California, 1968).

B. Lamar Johnson, ed., *The Junior College President*, Report of a Conference sponsored by the University of California, Los Angeles, Junior College Leadership Program, the American Association of Junior Colleges, the California Junior College Association, the ERIC Clearinghouse for Junior Colleges, and the University of California Office of Relations with Schools (Los Angeles: Graduate School of Education, University of California, 1969).

B. LAMAR JOHNSON

PREFACE

An old toast goes, "Here's to hell! May the stay there be as merry as the way there!" The community college presidency, when viewed from the pressures and heat common to that office, can be regarded, at times, as the very vortex of hell. Certain days (usually preceding a board meeting!), as when a controversial speaker has appeared on campus, a student delegation has presented a series of "unnegotiable demands" and the faculty salary committee has met secretly, are unforgettable. However, the study reported in this monograph does *not* deal directly with the paths to this particularly interesting purgatory nor does it concern itself unduly with the joys of the descent. The main task set for this study is an examination of certain aspects and perspectives of the "stay there" part of the toast that requires, in turn, some concern be directed at determining the sources of heat and pressure.

I launched this study largely because I had been elected president of a community college and felt that I really did not know enough about that office, though I would not have admitted this at the time. Additionally, I was aware of others who felt they should or could move on to a presidency and that they too needed or would welcome help in finding out as much as possible about this position before arriving in it. There was also the possibility that even presidents who had enjoyed some length of service could profit from the shared experience of others.

Regardless of how much they know about the position, or of how or why presidents arrive there, it is reasonable for them to turn to the available literature, as I did, for information to augment personal experiences. It is hoped future presidents will not, as was my experience, find so little in the literature about the position. Cohen and Roueche point to the need for literature: "It is difficult to assess educational leadership (or, for that matter, any other intangible dimension of the junior college) by perusing the published literature. Journal searches reveal little because junior college educators tend not to write."¹

Having found so little available and meaningful literature on the presidency, I had a conviction that something ought to be done about it. Also as a novice president, I had an erroneous impression that time was available for constructive professional activity beyond the discharge of immediate and pressing presidential duties. This illusion was partly the result of ignorance; more particularly, it was because various line administrators had, during the interval between my election by the board and my physical arrival on campus—a period of nearly

¹ A. M. Cohen and J. E. Roueche, *Institutional Administrator or Educational Leader? The Junior College President* (Washington, D.C.: American Association of Junior Colleges, 1969), p. 14.

two months—assumed responsibility for many duties normally thought of as being the president's concern, and here referred to as "marbles." These newly acquired marbles were hoarded, squirrel-like, in discreet corners and guarded jealously, while the new president (me): (1) learned that the marbles were missing and tried to find out who had them; and (2) tried to get them (administrators and marbles) back where all players had access to them and where all were playing in the same ring again under the same rules.

Over an ensuing three-year period of gathering marbles, my spurious feeling of having readily available time during which to conduct research while functioning as president was corrected. However, a research program had been set in motion that first year, and though it continued mostly on the considerable strength, patience, and skill of the president's secretary, rather than on any similar qualities of the president, the point is that it continued. Initially my studies consisted of directing inquiries about the presidency to other practicing presidents.

I had known some presidents after whom I might, possibly, model my behavior. However, I learned from personal experience—first as an instructor and later as a dean of instruction, and from attendance and participation at various regional and national conferences—more about what I ought to avoid as a president than what I ought to do. I also met a number of presidents who were quietly doing sound jobs and attracting little attention. Possibly I overlooked these administrators as models for behavior. Later experience, however, suggested that in aping the behavior of some of these "quieter ones" I ran the risk of irritating someone who may have been quietly doing nothing.

Shortly after assuming the presidency, I launched the study reported in this monograph. I began it out of simple curiosity and with the simplest possible approach—the questionnaire. The first one was sent to "all" other community college presidents in the country, where "all" referred to those listed in the *1965 Directory, American Association of Junior Colleges*.² In this initial inquiry, I asked what a new president ought or ought not to do in various prescribed situations.

Later, as I sought also the views of others close to the presidency—deans, secretaries to the president, presidents of faculty associations, state directors of community college or vocational education, and wives of presidents—a mass of information was assembled. I had, however, no longer any illusions, spurious or otherwise, about the amount of time a president can divert from the conduct of his office to the study of it. In short, this president had determined in part why there is so little written about the presidency by presidents. They are far too busy doing what they have to do to have time to analyze, describe, and write down what they do do.

Soon after beginning the study and particularly after reporting preliminary findings to the presidents (*all* of them and not just those who had responded to the first questionnaire), a steady flow of encouragement came from the field to continue it. Kenneth MacKay, President, Union Junior College, New Jersey, wrote, "I have enjoyed your progress report on a most fascinating project.

² W. A. Harper, ed., *1965 Directory American Association of Junior Colleges* (Washington, D.C.: American Association of Junior Colleges, 1965).

Good luck and continue it." From W. L. Gragg, President, Fulton-Montgomery Community College, New York, came, "Thank you for the report on your first questionnaire . . . Good luck on Phase 2." Ralph Gauvey, President, Roger Williams Junior College, Rhode Island, asserted, "Needless to say, I think your readers will be waiting with bated breath for chapter two dealing with the predecessor." And from Cowley County Community Junior College, Kansas, President Paul Johnson observed, "Thanks. I thoroughly enjoyed your summary. This is at once the most frustrating and rewarding job in the business." On the other hand, from William Dwyer, President, Massachusetts Board of Regional Colleges, came a realistic remark, "After receiving your latest inventory request, I wondered whether you had a job or a position. How can a guy find time to fuss with questions that may be important but not critical?" The truth, of course, was that I *was* running out of time!

At about this time in my study, a fortunate course of events resulted from a visit by Professor B. Lamar Johnson of the University of California, Los Angeles, to the college of which I was president. He told me of a new program of post-doctoral study at the University of California, Los Angeles, aided by a recent grant from the W. K. Kellogg Foundation, a major purpose of which was to prepare university professors to specialize in the field of the junior or community college. I gave this unexpected possibility (which would allow me to continue the study of the presidency, among other things) the immediate and considerable attention it deserved. After careful deliberation, I applied for and was granted a post-doctoral fellowship at the University of California, Los Angeles, for 1968-69. It would be untrue to say there were no longing looks back at the presidency, just as it would be untrue to say there were no sighs of relief.

The following work depends almost totally on the views of experts—presidents in the field who took time from incredible schedules to fill out the questionnaires I sent them and who felt, in many cases, moved to add letters of their own. My gratitude to them is impossible to describe. When president, I had been tempted most often to "junk" the many questionnaires crossing my desk in favor of dealing with more pressing affairs. The fact that so many presidents resisted this temptation with my questionnaires is greatly appreciated. It would be only fair to note in this connection that the presidents were asked to share these labors with deans, secretaries, presidents of teaching faculty associations, and their wives. Equal gratitude is given to these busy associates of the presidents as well as to the state directors of community colleges or of vocational education who also participated.

Having invited myself to share in this wealth of others' experiences, a letter Don Marquis wrote to Christopher Morley concerning plans for an "egobiography" came frequently to mind. He wrote: "It is quite true that I have invented for myself a good many experiences which I never really had. But they were all experiences belonging to my by right of temperament and character. I should have had them, if I had but had my rights. I was despoiled of them by the rough tyranny of circumstances." The "rough tyranny" has meant

³ Christopher Morley, "Introduction," *The Best of Don Marquis* (Garden City, N.Y.: Doubleday, 1946), p. xviii.

to me that we each cannot know all that is to be known or experience all that is to be experienced. That so many have contributed their experiences here is the heart of this monograph.

The continued support, criticism, and editorial advice of B. Lamar Johnson has proved essential to the completion of this report. Possessing an absolute genius for making people seem better than they really are, Professor Johnson has contributed enormously to this report. It has been an honor and privilege to work with him.

D. A. M.

INTRODUCTION

The objective of the surveys reported in this monograph is to present perspectives of the community college presidency. The outcome sought is primarily to give newly elected presidents and those aspiring to be presidents a better understanding of the dynamics of this position. Given this information, which came chiefly from presidents, the performance of new presidents should be influenced positively. It is also hoped that the report will be of value to presidents in service, to those working closely with presidents—administrators, staff, and boards specifically—and to students of educational administration and the community college.

Underlying all discussion and information is an awareness of three basic situations that face any new president. Reduced to essentials, these are: the president arrives, stays, and leaves. New presidents are advised to develop three corresponding strategies—by which is meant a plan of action following analysis and study. He should plan (1) a strategy for arrival as president, (2) a strategy for survival as president, and (3) a strategy for leaving the presidency. From information developed later, perhaps the last is the most painful of all strategies for presidents to contemplate. Involved is the gamut of election by a board, physical arrival on the scene of a college to assume the office, operating in the vortex of forces that are the presidency, and then passing the job on to someone else, willingly or not.

Not attempted in this monograph is a prescriptive outline of “good” or “bad” administrative practices or personal characteristics of presidents. The last two chapters deal with characteristics of presidents that seem to lead to success, as rated by their peers. However, there are too many other differences when a given college is compared with another. Also varying, unpredictable conditions and situations—often involving the personality of the president—are simply not responsive to “recipe treatment.” Findings presented here can be applied to specific situations only after close scrutiny of local conditions and lavish applications of common sense.

The American community college—a generic term that includes junior colleges and is expanded on page 17—has emerged in the twentieth century as a major segment of the national higher educational system. Although there are roots in the nineteenth century, the most extensive and continuing growth has occurred since the close of World War II.¹

However, the simple founding of large numbers of colleges is *not* a new phenomenon in the United States, and growth by itself is *not* proof of success.

¹ E. J. Gleazer, Jr., *This Is the Community College* (Boston: Houghton-Mifflin, 1968).

In writing on the number of colleges formed in the United States in the second quarter of the nineteenth century, Jencks and Riesman observe:

College founding and college building were outlets for a variety of talents and dreams... Some ill-conceived colleges were still-born, and others died with their founders. Those that survived and flourished did so less because of their founders' magnetic charm or personal commitment than because they appealed to enduring hopes and passions within American Society.²

And Cohen and Roueche write, "The fact that one thousand junior colleges have been built in answer to the direction proposed by early leaders does not mean that the job of translating philosophical aims into practice is finished."³

There is a proper concern regarding the immediately available leadership for the growing numbers of new community colleges. In his introduction to the workshop for new junior college presidents and their wives held at the University of California, Los Angeles, in the summer of 1968, Johnson pointed out:

With the current establishment of seventy and more new junior colleges each year and with the sharp expansion of existing colleges, unprecedented numbers of new junior college administrators are required. As a result of this situation, many two-year colleges find it necessary to appoint presidents who have had little or no background of junior college experience... [These presidents] report as new administrators they face special problems and difficulties.⁴

An underlying premise of the present report is that the laudable goals set forth in the catalogues of most community colleges can be achieved to a much greater extent than, of the present, has been demonstrated. To achieve them, however, these colleges will have to be led by presidents mindful of what the new community college is about, where it came from, what its role is, and how the office of the presidency relates to this.

It is *not* the purpose of this study to describe the new community college nor to relate its historical development. Others have done this.⁵ And although the substantial growth of the community college as a movement has led to a need for ever-increasing numbers of new and replacement presidents, this study is *not* directly concerned with learning the source, or predicting the numbers, of new or replacement presidents needed. Schultz has done this, and it need not be repeated here.⁶

It will be useful, however, to establish some of the basic conditions under which presidents work. This requires a brief look at what a community college is.

THE COMMUNITY COLLEGE

There is some confusion among lay persons about what to call the new two-year colleges collectively. Pray cautions, "There is no such thing as 'the' junior

² C. Jencks and D. Riesman, *The Academic Revolution* (Garden City, N.Y.: Doubleday, 1968), p. 3.

³ A. M. Cohen and J. E. Roueche, *Institutional Administrator or Educational Leader? The Junior College President* (Washington, D.C.: American Association of Junior Colleges, 1969).

⁴ W. A. Harper, *Like It Is* (Los Angeles: Junior College Leadership Program, Graduate School of Education, University of California, October 1968), p. i.

⁵ C. E. Blocker, R. H. Plummer, and R. C. Richardson, Jr., *The Two Year College: A Social Synthesis* (Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, 1965). L. L. Medsker, *The Junior College: Progress and Prospect* (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1960). J. W. Thornton, Jr., *The Community Junior College*, 2nd ed. (New York: John Wiley and Sons, 1966).

⁶ R. E. Schultz, "The Junior College President: Who and Where From," in B. Lamar Johnson, ed., *The Junior College President* (Los Angeles: Junior College Leadership Program, Graduate School of Education, University of California, Occasional Report No. 13, May 1969).

college; rather there are individual institutions.”⁷ Sindlinger notes that the differences in names, in administrative structures, in programs offered, and in many other areas, give to the community-junior colleges the vitality necessary for them to reflect the needs of varying communities.⁸

However, the term *community college* has gained in favor to describe the two-year colleges. Martorana wrote:

Although these institutions are known by various descriptions such as junior colleges, technical institutes, university centers, or community colleges, the term community colleges will be used because it most accurately describes the comprehensive service that these institutions are increasingly providing.⁹

Perhaps the best definition of a community college can be reached only by attempting to describe what this new college does, or is prepared to try to do, in response to the community it serves.

In this study, the term *community college* describes certain post-secondary educational institutions that otherwise might be called junior colleges, vocational-technical institutes or colleges, and two-year extension centers or branches of universities. Excluded are single-purpose proprietary schools such as beauty, barber, business, and electronics colleges.

The community colleges do, or at least aspire to do, certain things. The consensus seems to be that they offer the following:

1. Lower-division senior college or university programs, usually two years in length.
2. Course work imparting marketable skills for people *not* anticipating senior college or university study, but who want to enter the labor force directly after completing courses in this vocational-technical-occupational area.
3. Post-secondary credit programs for adults, usually of a dual nature: (a) refresher or upgrading courses, perhaps in vocational areas where the concern is to keep up to date in the face of technical change; and (b) “interest” courses such as art or music.
4. Community service programs, with experiences not limited to the classroom or campus and dedicated to the enrichment of personal and cultural lives of the individuals within the community, e.g., in the performing arts, recreation, physical fitness, library services, etc.
5. Continuing counseling service responding to the problems individuals face in seeking adjustment to a complex society, and attempting at least to (a) place students in the proper programs of study at the proper time, and (b) give personal assistance to students who need and want it in assessing abilities, directions to go, and decisions about educational and occupational goals.

Although not all community colleges provide all these services, the national trend is toward offering comprehensive programs that are thought of as embracing them all. Johnson reports:¹⁰

There is a definite trend toward the comprehensive junior college, which includes in a single institution preparation for employment and education for transfer.

⁷ F. C. Pray, “A PR Trilogy,” *Junior College Journal*, XXXIV, No. 8 (April 1963), 16.

⁸ W. E. Sindlinger, “Variety in American Junior and Community Colleges,” *High School to College: Readings for Counselors* (New York: College Entrance Examining Board, Educational Testing Services, 1965).

⁹ S. V. Martorana, “Values and Variables in Organizing and Financing Public Community Colleges,” *Technical-Vocational Education and the Community College* (Williamsburg, Va.: Proceedings of the Thirteenth Annual Legislative Work Conference of the Southern Regional Education Board, August 1964), p. 53.

¹⁰ B. Lamar Johnson, *Islands of Innovation Expanding: Changes in the Community College* (Beverly Hills, Calif.: Glencoe Press, 1969), pp. 39, 40.

And further that:

The evidence suggests that the comprehensive junior college, like the comprehensive high school, is both desirable and feasible. Merson goes so far as to suggest that, "One can measure the strength of a community college by the diversity of its program."

In a slightly different vein, Gleazer points out:

For the most part, the community college has become a comprehensive institution with a great variety of programs to match the cross section of the community represented in its students. The concept of comprehensiveness, although still a subject for occasional debate, is generally accepted. This means preparation for employment as well as transfer to four-year colleges and includes a number of other community-related services.¹¹

Harlacher comments in particular on the "community relatedness" of the community colleges:

1. Not all junior colleges are community colleges.
2. The program of a community college may be conceptualized in two dimensions—formal and informal education.
3. Learning has always taken place throughout life, independent of any particular educational structure.
4. Education is a continuous and total process requiring both formal and informal experiences.
5. In implementing its full community dimension, the community college will break, once and for all, the lock-step of tradition; i.e., college is four walls, college is semester-length courses, college is credit, college is culturally and educationally elite.¹²

In performing its stated function, the community college has placed great emphasis on teaching. This is to say that the instructional faculty is *not* expected to engage in research but is expected to concentrate on the classroom and on advising students.

As Brawer has noted, however, little has been done by way of research to determine what is "teaching:"

... (1) there has been no functional approach to previous reviews of research on community college teachers; (2) if the community or junior college is to have a deliberate effect, we need to know about its people as well as its buildings, its administration organization, and its finances; (3) although the junior college is large and growing fast, we do not yet know what effect it has upon its students or the community at large; (4) we should assess the institution from many viewpoints in order to gain a picture of the structure.¹³

Although the concepts of comprehensiveness and community service and the emphasis on student counseling and teaching are fairly well understood and defined, a newly emerging role, that of *social change agent* is only now appearing, and may place additional burdens on new presidents, as Glenn Gooder, President, Los Angeles City College, observed at a recent conference, "We didn't ask for the job—we may not even want it, but we are part of the resurrection of the American city," and Cohen pointed out at the same conference:

Since the junior college is not formed as a community of scholars, it should not

¹¹ Gleazer, *op. cit.*, p. 28.

¹² Ervin Harlacher, "The President, The Community and Community Services," in Johnson, ed., *The Junior College President*, p. 120.

¹³ Florence Brawer, *Personality Characteristics of College and University Faculties* (Washington, D.C.: American Association of Junior Colleges, 1968), p. xvi.

attempt to emulate the forms that were devised for communities of scholars to interact with each other away from the base diversions of the city. The college should cease being a symbol and should deal with the real issues of society.¹⁴

If the community college is to assume or to be assigned a role as a social change agent, it appears such a role would best be filled by methods other than traditional university-type research, and that additional attention should be paid to preparing community college administrators to meet the problems and responsibilities involved.

The posture of community involvement, through a combination of community service orientation plus an awareness of a need to participate as a social change agent, is in reality the antithesis of the medieval university, which walled itself off in order, among other things, to keep the community out.

GROWTH OF THE COMMUNITY COLLEGE

The American Association of Junior Colleges (AAJC) publishes an annual *Directory* listing member colleges. The 1968 *Directory American Association of Junior Colleges*¹⁵ presented an analysis of the growth in membership from 1961 to 1967. During this time, colleges increased from 678 to 912 and student enrollment from approximately 750,000 to 1,700,000. The 1969 *Directory American Association of Junior Colleges*¹⁶ listed nearly 1,000 member colleges and student enrollment approached 2,000,000, indicating the pace of growth has not yet slackened.

This study determined also that in 1967 there were at least 120 more community colleges in the country than were shown in the *Directory*. These were listed in the *College Fact Chart*.¹⁷

As noted earlier, one result of this growth has been to add substantially to the number of new and replacement presidents needed by community colleges.

THE PRESIDENT

Typically the ultimate responsibilities for administration and governance of a community college are vested in a lay board. In practice, however, the board engages the services of a full-time professional—usually designated president—to serve as chief administrator. For this study, the president is defined as that official responsible for the operation of the college. He may be called a dean or director and may report to a policy-making board directly or through another administrative unit, such as a district chancellor (as in the case of a multi-campus junior college district), or a superintendent of schools (as in a unified or common school district).

This definition of president does not differ significantly from that of Tunncliffe and Ingram, writing in 1969, that "The 'president' is the chief executive and

¹⁴ *The Role of the Junior College in the Urban Revolution* (Los Angeles: Report of a conference sponsored by Los Angeles City College, April 27, 1968), pp. 18, 28.

¹⁵ W. A. Harper, ed., *1968 Directory American Association of Junior Colleges* (Washington, D.C.: American Association of Junior Colleges, 1968).

¹⁶ W. A. Harper, ed., *1969 Directory American Association of Junior Colleges* (Washington, D.C.: American Association of Junior Colleges, 1969).

¹⁷ *The College Fact Chart* (Spartanburg, S.C.: The National Beta Club, 1967).

operating officer of the institution, that person appointed by the governing body to represent it in day-to-day operations."¹⁸

The definition of a community college president as adopted here has limitations, chiefly because it does not come to grips with the multi-campus community college district. Since such districts are becoming more numerous and influential,¹⁹ a redefinition of president may be needed for future studies. As will be seen in Chapter 5, some single-campus presidents in multi-campus districts are referred to by the district chancellor as "second-ranking administrators."

Cohen and Roueche note that, however it may be defined, the president's position in the community college is pivotal:

The junior college presidency is a most important position within the institution. It certainly exerts more influence on policy than does the university presidency—this is due, if nothing else, to the fact that university faculties are more autonomous than are their junior college counterparts.²⁰

Roueche further observes:

It appears that the president is the key to change in the junior college. Because he is more influential than any other person, it is almost axiomatic that "if the president wants something to happen, it will." . . . Ultimately, he is responsible for all aspects of his institution.²¹

Lombardi supports these views when he asserts:

On the credit side must be placed the role of the president in the overall development of the institution: indicating the direction of development, setting the tone, modifying organizational patterns, and encouraging faculty in a variety of directions. In this limitless area, he has not only the force of custom and law, but the desire of the faculty for leadership. He represents the institution within and without as no other individual or group can. Aside from any superior personal quality he may have, he has, by virtue of his title, the initiative in leadership, in administration. A recent survey revealed that "in selecting their own jobs, faculty members give evidence that they value good administration."²²

Information developed in this study and reported in Chapter 7, "Perspectives of the President as Reported by Faculty Association Presidents," supports Lombardi's statement completely.

A BASIC POSITION OF THE MONOGRAPH

✓ A basic position of this monograph is that the community college presidency is different from the presidencies of either four-year senior colleges or universities.

The community college is unique as a form of higher education in the United States and has risen, in part, to serve areas of educational needs that other institutions have ignored or on which they have defaulted. Also community college administrative practices differ in historical perspective and origin from

¹⁸ G. W. Tunnicliffe and J. A. Ingram, "The College President: Who Is He?" *Educational Record*, L, No. 2 (Spring 1969), 190.

¹⁹ F. C. Kintzer, A. M. Jensen, and J. S. Hansen, *The Multi-Institution District* (Washington, D.C.: American Association of Junior Colleges, 1969).

²⁰ Cohen and Roueche, *op. cit.*, p. vii.

²¹ J. E. Roueche, "The Junior College President," *Junior College Research Review*, II, No. 10 (June 1968).

²² John Lombardi, "The Junior College President and the Faculty," in Johnson, ed., *The Junior College President*, p. 51.

those of four-year senior college or of universities. The administrative practices of community colleges have deep roots in public schools, specifically in the secondary or high school. This was observed by Angell in 1915,²³ and it continues as an observable phenomenon in that public schools are the source of most community college administrators.^{24, 25}

Community college administrative practices, however, have also been influenced by the demands of universities and accrediting agencies, which often promulgate preconceived standards and practices of senior colleges and universities and impose them on community colleges. Additionally, two year colleges face pressures from the business and industrial world *not* commonly experienced by either the modern high school or the university, but which stem from the realities of offering comprehensive vocational programs requiring the advice and cooperation of industrial and business advisory committees drawn directly from the community.

The result of this history and of these forces is that the community college president is expected to lead a teaching-oriented college—not unlike the thirteenth and fourteenth grades—while defending such university practices and standards as academic freedom and scholarship from community pressures. The community college president does this *without* benefit of university walls or of intellectual distances, while simultaneously inviting the community into the college as a working partner in vocational and community service programs!

Although O'Connell,²⁶ for example, has suggested that the community college president has a position *not unlike* that of his counterpart in the four-year senior college or the university, this monograph places great emphasis on the contrary, namely that the position is as different from the senior college or university presidency as the community college itself is different from those institutions. These considerable differences are nowhere more clearly seen than in the strong emphasis the community college gives to vocational, general and community service education programs and to teaching *without* the presence of upper divisions, graduate colleges or graduate students, or professional schools. Additional differences are also shown in the fact that the community college as an "open-door" college serves an entirely different clientele from that served by the selective senior college or university.

ASSUMPTIONS

Although the community colleges are marked by wide differences in practices, organization, and stated purposes and goals, it is assumed that certain commonalities of practices and functions can be studied or deduced and lead to workable and useful generalizations. Limitations to this general assumption have been and will be noted in the text.

It is also assumed that respondents to questionnaires record answers with sufficient accuracy to assure the validity of this report.

²³ J. Angell, "The Junior College Movement in the High School," *School Review*, XXIII (May 1915), 289.

²⁴ R. E. Schultz and D. Y. Roberts, *Presidents of Public Junior Colleges—An Analysis of Sources* (Tallahassee: Department of Higher Education, The Florida State University, 1964).

²⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 11.

²⁶ T. E. O'Connell, *Community Colleges—A President's View* (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1968).

METHOD

The surveys reported in this monograph were made by questionnaires. The first was sent to the 772 colleges listed in the 1965 *Directory American Association of Junior Colleges*, and was accompanied by a letter:

Dear Fellow Sufferer,

At the risk of incurring your wrath over receiving yet another questionnaire, would you complete the following and return it in the envelope provided.

This is a non-supported study and is not done in pursuit of a degree. It stems from simple curiosity when, as a newly elected president, I found so little practical information available in the literature regarding the position.

I am not at all certain what usable information can be generated from this study, but what does develop will be sent to you as a report. It may well be that we are better off making our own mistakes in isolation rather than borrowing those of others.

An indication of the interest in the first questionnaire came almost immediately from Thomas Carr, then President, Bay Path College, Massachusetts, who refused to answer the questionnaire, but wrote in part:

Your letter dated Spring Quarter 1966 fascinates me.

It is refreshing to find someone who is uncertain. In my 22 years as a college president, I have rarely found anyone in education who admits to being uncertain, especially if the individual holds anything above a bachelor's degree and never if he holds a Ph.D.

If I were to offer, in answer to your question, a piece of advice, it would be in one word—RESIGN—and inasmuch as you admit you are newly elected and have not as yet assumed this position it is not too late to gracefully correct a lifetime of mistakes. You could become a pool shark, a golf pro, or, if you are not athletically inclined, you could work for the government. You will find these positions will give you relative peace of mind and a long life. The course you have embarked upon will not.

More than 55 percent (438) of the 772 questionnaires were returned. This strong response was doubtless due, in part at least, to what an Alaskan colleague confided later: "Damn near threw that first questionnaire of yours away. Then I thought, 'Here's a young buck who's got himself in over his head and needs some help,' and I filled it out."

One early conclusion was that many community college presidents had definite ideas, which they were willing to share.

Responses to the initial questionnaire were summarized and mailed to all presidents on the original mailing list plus those of newly opened institutions or those newly included in the directories consulted. Included was another inquiry form asking them what had happened to the preceding president and what they would do upon leaving the presidency.

The method of collecting data was thus established—to continue seeking perspectives of presidents (or of those close to him) through the use of questionnaires that were sent, after the first one, in company with a report made from previously collected data.

Four inquiries were sent to presidents. The first, in the spring of 1966, was titled, "So You've Arrived! Now What Do You Do?" and was concerned with advice to newly elected presidents. The second, in the fall of 1966, was called, "Quo Vadis—What Next?" and was concerned with the president's predecessor, if he had one, and what the president himself would do upon leaving the presidency. The third, in December 1967, was titled, "Mr. President, How Do You

Get It All Done? or, An Examination of the 400-Day Year" and concerned the conduct of the office by the president—what he did on and off campus and what he felt he ought to do more of. The fourth, in the winter of 1968, "The Successful President or The Right Person in the Right Place," was concerned with the qualities of presidents regarded by their peers as having been successful as compared with qualities that gave other presidents difficulties. In returning what he was advised was the final questionnaire, a long-suffering president from Maryland expressed what may have been the thoughts of many: "Seeing as how you seem to be having so much fun, I'll fill this out as I have all the others, but can we *count* on this being the last?" Another president, from Michigan, who had filled out all of the previous ones also was grateful for the news and penned on his last one, "Thank God! Though I really won't believe it for a while, as you've not yet asked our children for their impressions of the president!"

The "Successful President" form was sent also to state directors of community colleges, to state directors of vocational-technical education, and to a select group of experts—foundation and university personnel.

Accompanying the "How Do You Get It Done" form in December 1967 were questionnaires directed to the "number-two" man at the college and to the president's wife. Later, in the spring of 1968, the study was expanded to include the president's secretary and the president of the most representative teaching faculty association.

Following returns from the "Successful President" (a request on the inquiry form had been to give the name of the most outstanding president ever known), a list of twelve presidents most often nominated as outstanding was compiled. Ten of these presidents were subsequently interviewed.

During these surveys, I appreciated and was encouraged by letters from responding presidents. Robert Turner, President, Macomb County Community College, Michigan, for example, wrote: "You are doing a great thing with your practical and interesting 'continuing' study of a special 'breed of cat' called the Community College President. Congratulations on including the wives. Some interesting things may develop when you start contacting the kids!" From Herbert Zeitlin, President, Triton College, Illinois: "Thanks very much for your survey of 'The View from the Home Front' (The report to the field under this title had been developed from the inquiry form directed to presidents' wives.) It was delightful reading. My wife and I enjoyed it immensely. It seems like an excellent idea to survey the president's secretary as well." And from Daniel G. Walker, President, Cypress Junior College, California: "I suppose your next chapter should be 'The President's View of the Home Front?' Ah, well. We'll leave that up to you." John Musselman, Massasoit Community College, Massachusetts, got to one of the important stimulations for continuing the study by observing, "I am sure it is a satisfying experience to read the variety of responses you have received."

ORGANIZATION OF THE MONOGRAPH.

The following three chapters reflect the three basic situations facing a new president: arrival, survival, and departure. This might be viewed as a progres-

sion from what a president is to what he does to what, eventually, he becomes. Subsequent chapters report perspectives of the community college presidency as held by presidents, the second-ranking administrator, the faculty—represented by the president of the most representative faculty association—the president's secretary, and his wife. The report concludes with chapters on the nature of success in the presidency, the challenges new presidents will likely face, and a final overall perspective.

LIMITATIONS

Included in this report is only a small portion of the views and data assembled during the surveys. It is hoped, however, that the findings will be those of greatest interest and value to the most readers.

The surveys have not, of course, been all-inclusive. Omitted, for example, have been inquiries into the important relationships between presidents and the board of trustees and between presidents and community leaders. The matter of president-student relationships has taken on new urgency with the increased militancy and unrest on community college campuses during the 1968-69 year, but students were *not* included in this study.

Future studies of the presidency should include the perspectives of at least the board, community leaders, and students. Such studies are needed.

A STRATEGY FOR ARRIVAL IN THE PRESIDENCY

The pages that follow will report findings from a questionnaire titled, "So You've Arrived! Now What Do You Do?"

In considering a strategy for arrival, one must obviously (1) get elected by a board of trustees, and (2) arrive physically on the scene. Before that, however, there must have been a vacancy.

Schultz, whose study involved 1,010 of a possible 1,138 newly appointed junior college presidents during the period of 1951-1967, noted that positions became available for several reasons:

A much higher proportion (and number) of those appointed to public junior college presidencies headed newly established institutions. Further, and a point noted in the introduction, with the passage of time, this became an increasingly major factor in public institutions. It accounted for 32.8 percent of such vacancies in the period 1952-62 and increased to 58.8 percent for the year 1965-66.

Vacancies created by turnover resulting from resignations to accept other positions was of about the same magnitude in public or private junior colleges. This accounted for roughly one-third of all vacancies. However, an appreciably higher ratio of the vacancies in private than in public institutions were created by predecessors being released or having resigned before accepting another position. This implies a higher rate of dismissal in private institutions. Overall this accounted for about one vacancy of every ten.¹

It should be noted that Schultz's study involved 188 new presidents in 1963 and 1964; 294 new presidents in 1965 and 1966; and 154 in 1967 for a total of 636 over a five-year period, an average of 127 per year.

One of the initial findings of this survey parallels, in a manner, those of Schultz. In the initial questionnaire, mailed in 1966, was a question on whether or not they were in their first presidency and how long they had held a presidency. Approximately 80 percent (315 of those completing the item) reported they were in their first presidency and had been for an average of 7.18 years. Although, this stability in the presidency had *not* been anticipated, it does explain, in part, Schultz's observations that most vacancies occur because of the opening of new colleges.

In essence, most vacancies in community colleges occur when new colleges are formed, old presidents leave (for a variety of possible reasons to be treated at greater length in Chapter 4), or new administrative designs create a presidency out of a deanship or some other office—such as when a college is removed from the authority of a superintendent of a unified school district.

¹ R. E. Schultz and D. Y. Roberts, *Presidents of Public Junior Colleges—An Analysis of Sources* (Tallahassee: Department of Higher Education, The Florida State University, 1964), pp. 9-10.

SELECTION

Once a vacancy exists, a selection process is set in motion. This can be as simple as a superintendent designating the night-school director as the new president, or it can be an exceedingly complex affair. Brief mention of the process is made here solely as it bears on the functioning president.

The good Lord alone knows why some boards pick the people they do to serve as president. As I have noted elsewhere: "*However many presidents are needed, one can be certain that a nearly equal number of bodies will be found.*" The principal concern, therefore, must be with the quality and not the quantity of the presidents."²

Giles recently observed: "While there is no single method or formula for securing and selecting a president, studies indicate that the lack of a definable process, agreed to and understood by interested parties, has, more than any other item, hampered the selection of a president."³

Giles later notes:

The selection of a president is an awesome task, but, if properly done, it can provide opportunities for reflection on an evaluation and clarification of the goals and objectives of the college as well as meaningful involvement of all segments of the college. Although an orderly professional process will not guarantee an outstanding president, it will provide a greater opportunity for the one selected to become outstanding.⁴

The newly elected president is advised to review the process that produced him. This review can offer a picture of the college in the sense of portraying the interplay of forces, the directions seemingly aspired to, and the amount of confidence and enthusiasm held for the college (as well as for the new president) by those involved in the selection process. In short, the president will already have seen the college at work, however briefly.

Giles proposes six steps in choosing a president:⁵

1. Identifying goals of the college and implications for administration.
2. Developing criteria for the position.
3. Searching for applicants.
4. Screening the applicants.
5. Interviewing applicants.
6. Final selection.

He suggests also that the best approach is one participated in by all who can contribute to the processes, and this would be expected to include:

1. Board of trustees.
2. Retiring president.
3. Administrative personnel.
4. Faculty.
5. Nonacademic staff.
6. Students.
7. Alumni.
8. Citizens.

As important as determining who shall be involved is the specific determination of how they will be involved.

² D. A. Morgan, "The Junior College President: Role and Responsibility," in B. Lamar Johnson, ed., *The Junior College President* (Los Angeles: Junior College Leadership Program, Graduate School of Education, University of California, Occasional Report No. 13, May 1969), p. 21.

³ F. T. Giles, "Selecting and Securing a Junior College President," in Johnson, ed., *op. cit.*, p. 34.

⁴ *Ibid.*

⁵ *Ibid.*, pp. 35-36.

I was elected to the presidency of an established college by a board of trustees who encouraged little or no real involvement by the faculty, line administrators, or students. This resulted in a degree of resentment on the part of some members of these groups, a situation with which I had to contend as a new president. In helping the board to plan procedures for selecting my successor, I urged successfully that the selection process involve the total college, including staff and students. Specifically, the faculty, students, and administrators assisted the board in selecting the ten best qualified applicants. These ten finalists were subject to review by a "board of experts," composed in this case of a university professor of higher education and two senior community college presidents. This board of experts ranked the ten names submitted. The college then invited the three highest-ranking candidates, with their wives, to the campus. Each candidate was interviewed by committees representing the board, the faculty, the student body, and the administrative staff. Following the visit of each candidate, committee chairmen reported judgments of their committee to the total board. With this information, the board, in executive session, made the final selection of a president.

It is clear that the more elaborate, formal, and broad-based the selection process, the more likely will be the president's having a broad base of acceptance as the new chief administrator.

WHO IS SELECTED

Schultz has studied the extent to which presidencies are being filled by qualified individuals:⁶

The following factors, that probably can be considered clearly positive, were revealed:

1. As a group these newly appointed presidents were mature in years.
2. Most of them had previous administrative experience.
3. The ratio of doctorates was increasing substantially among public institutions.
4. The proportion of presidents appointed to public institutions in 1967 who had previous junior college experience showed a marked increase over preceding years.

Balanced against these factors were:

1. Nearly 45 percent of all newly appointed presidents *did not* possess doctoral degrees.
2. Of those with doctorates, few had had specialized preparation in junior college administration until recently.
3. A substantial proportion of junior college presidents have been recruited from elementary and secondary school positions.
4. Nearly half the presidents appointed over the period covered by the investigation had had neither formal study of the junior college nor experience as a teacher or administrator in such an institution.

In the present study, 360 presidents provided information on the degrees they held. Most frequently reported were: (1) doctorate of education, 93 (26 percent); (2) master of arts, 93 (26 percent); and (3) doctor of philosophy, 91 (25 percent). A wide assortment of degrees was reported by the other presidents, led by 31 masters of education (9 percent) and 13 masters of science (4 percent). Doctorates totaled 188, for 52 percent, leading the 148 masters reported, for 42 percent. One president held *no* degree.

⁶ Schultz and Roberts, *op. cit.*, pp. 16-17.

More community college presidents (151, or 47.9 percent of the 336 supplying this information) came from deanships than from any other position.

Most report that their first position in education was in teaching: 116 (35 percent) had begun teaching in the elementary or secondary schools; 84 (25 percent) listed themselves only as having been teachers, without differentiating the level; 66 (20 percent) had begun as college or university teachers. Only 35 (11 percent) had started as public school administrators, and 31 (9 percent) had begun as college administrators.

Presidents were also asked if they had moved to another community when they accepted a presidency. Out of 341 responses, 126 (37 percent) had been promoted by the district or college and 215 (63 percent) had moved to take a presidency. Of the 215 who moved, 140 (66 percent) moved within the state and 75 (34 percent) had moved out of the state. Mobility of presidents was also the subject of a recent study by Carmichael, who concluded:

Geographic mobility and the willingness to relocate in other parts of the country characterize the junior college president. The rapid and decentralized growth in number of junior colleges throughout the country are major factors contributing to this mobility.⁷

Schultz summed up his study on the previous position of presidents with:

Over the period covered by this study over seven of every eight newly appointed presidents came from outside the ranks of junior college presidents... In other words, nearly nine hundred of the 1,010 presidents represented in this study were new in that role. As a result, this investigation reflects primarily the backgrounds of inexperienced presidents...

Not surprisingly, the position from which these presidents most frequently came was some other type of college administrative assignment.⁸

There is no best road to the presidency. Increasingly, however, it would appear that selection processes are finding presidents who: (1) have not been a president before, (2) hold an earned doctorate, (3) have experience in the junior or community college, (4) have previous college administrative experience, and (5) began their careers in education as teachers. It would also appear that successful candidates are often those willing to move, across country if necessary.

WHAT IS A PRESIDENT?—DEFINITIONS AND DESCRIPTIONS

It will be recalled that the operational definition of a community college president is that he is the official charged by the board with responsibility for the day-to-day operation of a college.

The office of president of a community college will vary widely in administrative design at both the local and state level. Comparatively, it will also vary as each college adapts to the unique characteristics of the immediate community. Additional variation is introduced by the nature, background, and experience of those elected to the office. However, it is felt that at least an introduction to the varied nature of the position is important in reaching an "arrival strategy."

Major operational differences are readily found when one state is compared with another. For example, the president of a community college in Oregon obtains roughly one-third of his total operating funds from students in the form

⁷ J. H. Carmichael, "Origin and Mobility of Presidents," *Junior College Journal*, XXXIX, No. 8 (May 1969), 32.

⁸ Schultz and Roberts, *op. cit.*, p. 11.

of tuition, one-third from the state, and one-third from an *annual* levy during which the total operating budget is submitted to the electorate of the district. Compared with the president of a Los Angeles district single college, where the president, in effect, is given a sum from the district office on which to operate, the Oregon president is much more directly involved with and exposed to the voting public. However, the president of a Los Angeles college, where an enrollment approaching 15,000 may include 75 percent black or brown students, is subject to pressures the president of a small rural college in Oregon is unlikely ever to see, a point made earlier by Coultas.⁹ However, from another perspective, as a single-college president in a multi-institution district in California observed in a recent seminar, "The president of a single campus does *not* have an opportunity to talk to a board member very often." In contrast, an Oregon president of a rural district often has difficulty avoiding talking to board members.

Not only does the presidency vary by administrative design, but it also varies in terms of perspectives of the office. I noted earlier:¹⁰

The old adage "if the president wants something to happen, it will" is going to become less and less personalized as the distance from the presidency to the classroom widens. Something *will* happen at any college only if a number of influences that eventually center on the presidency coalesce. *Fewer and fewer presidents will be allowed to emerge from the broom closet after a few hours solo cogitation, clutching a whole new curriculum or next year's budget.*

Also:

It is *not* at all certain that the president has contributed to the importance of the two-year college. It is far more likely that the importance of the two-year college, which has risen to meet society's aspirations, has contributed to the importance of the president.

As for what a president is, some presidents, responding to the inquiries circulated during this study, elaborated on the subject with open-end responses or letters. President-emeritus Milikin, Chaffey College, California, wrote:

A president is not a god or king or a dictator.

When the board is in session, he is a resource advisor and represents all the employees of the school.

When the board is not in session, he is the executive officer representing the board.

From F. B. Branch, President, Holmes Junior College, Mississippi, came the note:

I do not know if you are a theorist or a practical man. [As president] you have to be both. The operation of a junior college is more practical than theoretical.

And Stephen Epler, then President of College of Marin, California, wrote:

The president must be a general manager rather than a specialist and should seek specialists to give him more time and to advise him in areas where he is less strong . . . the most important thing in the new president is the president himself, his abilities as a leader and capabilities to solve the important problems of his college and community.

L. W. Houtz, President, Southeastern Christian College, Kentucky, added:

A president should be broad enough not to be absorbed in professional education *per se*.

⁹ W. T. Coultas, "Problems of Urban Colleges," *Junior College Journal*, XXXV, No. 2 (October 1964), 13-16.

¹⁰ Morgan, *op. cit.*, pp. 20-21.

The rule I have found best for smooth internal relations is to select qualified administrators, put my complete trust in them, allow them to make mistakes if necessary, intervene only when an internal conflict calls for an authoritative arbiter or in cases of gross mistakes. The less the president interferes with his administrators, the better it will be.

TABLE I
WHAT SHOULD THE PRESIDENT-ELECT DO?

The President Should	Average Ranking
1. Visit with faculty and administrators.....	1.88
2. Familiarize himself with personnel and characteristics of the board.....	2.81
3. Review the budget and learn basic fiscal procedures for the college.....	2.87
4. Visit state department divisions dealing with community colleges.	4.31
5. Review correspondence files and current mail.....	4.42

And Lombardi has written elsewhere:

Though the lot of the president may be hard and frustrating, the assignment today has more significance for the survival of the junior college than at any time since the establishment of the first junior college. Upon the president more than upon any other single individual in the hierarchy of the educational organization depends the continued health or the slow decline of the junior college. He, as no other individual in the organization, is responsible for creating the environment in which the conflicting forces among the faculty, students, and community, especially as reflected among board members, are reconciled so that the educational program can flourish, instructors can teach, students can learn, and leaders of the future can emerge to lead us out of the situation in which we find ourselves.¹¹

A president is, for the main, what a president does.

FINDINGS OF THE FIRST SURVEY

In addition to the facts on the presidents' tenure already presented, the first survey sought the advice of practicing presidents about what newly elected presidents ought to do. Two situations were structured in the questionnaire, completed by approximately 60.5 percent (428) of the 724 presidents surveyed: (1) What ought the president-elect do between election and arrival? and (2) What ought the newly arrived president do first? In ranking possible alternatives, number 1 was indicated as the most important duty. The results of the survey are shown in Table I.

The most frequently written-in alternatives to the results given in Table I were: learn college objectives and philosophy (6); contact industry, high schools, and community leaders (4); and pray regularly! (3). Several presidents including Richard Hagemeyer, Central Piedmont Community College, North Carolina, wrote: "Cannot rank [the alternatives]. All are important and make this a 24-hour-a-day job." John Tucker, President, College of Eastern Utah, suggested the alternatives be done "All at once!"

¹¹ John Lombardi, "The Junior College President and the Faculty," in Johnson, ed., *op. cit.*, p. 55.

Respondents were not at all happy with the word "call" in the alternatives presented in Table II. Louis R. Newshan, Dean, Fort Dodge Community College, Iowa, exclaimed: "The word 'Call' leaves much to be desired!" Earle Bigsbee, Executive Dean, Junior College of Connecticut, wrote, "Avoid all [of the alternatives] as long as possible!"

The leading written-in response (12) was by far, "Meet with top administrators and do it often." Several presidents then appended, "And be sure to listen!"

TABLE II
WHAT SHOULD THE NEWLY ARRIVED PRESIDENT DO FIRST?

The President Should	Average Ranking
1. Call a general faculty meeting.....	1.61
2. Call an executive meeting with board.....	2.01
3. Call a general college meeting for both faculty and students.....	3.21
4. Call for a budget review.....	3.27

There were some general, unclassifiable remarks directed by experienced presidents to newly arrived ones. John F. Smoller, President of Oklahoma Military Academy, suggested, "You didn't ask this, but years of experience in assuming command of new organizations have taught me to make no radical changes for at least the first six months. In other words, be sure in a new job that you know what you are doing before you start changing things around." President M. A. (Pat) Allen, Highline College, Seattle, Washington, wrote, "Be of good heart. Live 'em one day at a time. *Your* judgment is the best as to what you ought to do, because its the only one that *finally* determines what you do. Fishing helps, too!" And a cautionary note from Sister Mary Alicia Dalton read: "Now a warning to you: take life a little easy. I'm filling this questionnaire out in the hospital, where I've been since suffering a slight heart attack at our baccalaureate last Friday. My enforced rest now is giving me time to make some good resolutions about my future activity."

Asked what was the best preparation for the presidency, the respondents overwhelmingly indicated the best training was as an administrator with junior college experience. However, as quoted previously in a speech,¹² Nils Sahlin, President, Quinnipiac College, Connecticut, wrote, "There is no such thing [as the best training]! It's like accounting for women!" Rodney Berg, then President of Everett Junior College, Washington, noted wryly that the best preparation for the presidency was to develop "a surly disposition and a lot of gall!"

Presidents were also asked whom they regarded as the key person for acclimating the newly arrived president.

Though included in the category of "second man in administrative organization," those officials with the titles of dean, dean of instruction, or academic dean numbered 153 (exactly 50 percent) of the 306 responses to the question. The president's secretary, with 54 nominations representing 17.4 percent of all responses, was a distant but strong second. Responding presidents did not recom-

¹² Morgan, *op. cit.*, p. 19.

TABLE III
KEY PERSON FOR ACCLIMATING NEW PRESIDENT

Position Held	Frequency	Percentage
1. Second man in administrative organization.....	167	54.8
dean.....	93	
dean of instruction.....	36	
academic dean.....	24	
administrative assistant.....	8	
vice president.....	5	
second-ranking person.....	1	
2. President's secretary.....	54	14.4
3. Business Office.....	32	10.4
business manager.....	29	
finance officer.....	2	
development officer.....	1	
4. Board chairman.....	30	9.8
5. Former president.....	13	4.2
6. Personnel services.....	10	3.3
dean of students.....	7	
dean of admissions.....	1	
dean of personnel services.....	1	
registrar.....	1	

mend strongly that the new president check with the outgoing president; only thirteen (4.2 percent) so recommended. Interesting arguments can be heard on either side of this question from individual presidents, but for those responding to this study, the issue was clear—the outgoing president ranked low as a key person to acclimate the new one.

As many presidents noted, it is well for the newly arrived president to move with caution from a position of knowledge. This, however, is relative. In one situation, a new president took over at mid-year; his predecessor took one administrator with him at that time and reached back to pick up three more before the year was out; the administrative organization was still top-heavy with appointees brought in from another state by the outgoing president; a nearby military base closed and the departure of airmen and civilians wiped out nearly 25 percent of the student body almost overnight; the budget was operating at an anticipated \$60,000 in the red. To sit still for six months, in this situation, would court complete disaster for a newly arrived president.

SUMMARY

Those aspiring to the presidency can anticipate going through increasingly sophisticated selection processes before being elected. It is felt that this kind of selection gives the successful candidate a much sounder platform from which to operate.

Selection processes now in effect are finding presidents who hold an earned doctorate, have previous administrative experience (increasingly at the junior

college level), began in education as teachers, and are mobile, willing to move across country if necessary to secure a presidency.

The thoughtful aspirant to the office of community college president will decide not only to try to become a president, if this is possible, and to accept the multiplicity of pressures and duties the position imposes, but also to accept concomitantly and consciously total personal and professional exposure. Comfort, however cold, can be taken from the simple conclusion: the worst that can happen to him is to be fired or disgraced or both! Accepting this, the new president need not be too concerned about his own future, but can immerse himself in his institution from the moment he arrives as its leader. He can then (as suggested by William Stewart, President of Wenatchee Valley College, Washington, as the best thing for a newly arrived president to do) "Get to work!"

THE NATURE OF THE PRESIDENCY: BASIS OF A STRATEGY FOR SURVIVAL

An old saying observes that the last to see or understand water is a fish, and, although this saying might apply to community college presidents trying to report objectively on the presidency while caught up in the pressures and duties of the office, it is clear that their views are essential to a meaningful attempt to describe the presidency to the succeeding generations of chief administrators. An inquiry form titled, "Mr. President, How Do You Get It All Done? or, An Examination of the 400-Day Year!" was mailed to all known presidents in December 1967. It sought information on what a president did on and off campus and what he thought he ought to do more of. This chapter reports the results of that inquiry.

First, in this discussion of what a president is as measured by what he says he does, it may be helpful to examine other perspectives or descriptions of that office.

The basic responsibilities of the president are often described in the policy handbook of the college, usually created in response to the board's need for information about basic processes and positions. The following is an excerpt from the policy handbook of an Oregon college, for which it is now impossible to determine authorship:

Basic to the administrative pattern are the responsibilities and the capabilities of the head of the community college. A president must have a respect for, and reasonable familiarity with, a wide range of post-high school educational objectives and the curricular program by which these ends might be served. He must associate with and have a degree of status among presidents and faculties of four-year institutions, and must represent with authority important programs and developments in higher education.

The community college president must continually work for the most effective integration of the educational programs with those of area high schools and with senior institutions to which many students will transfer. He must also relate the institution and its services to the occupational world to which a large percentage of his students will go. In this regard he must be at home in the industrial and occupational activities of the community and be sensitive to the educational training needs and special patterns of training that must be developed to serve these needs.

There are different views of what a president does. An enterprising student group in a western two-year college produced and sold, for profit, a "coloring" book, the hit page of which was a picture of the president with instructions to "Color me 'Off-Campus!'" (In an unfortunate burst of loyalty, the dean of students banned the publication from the campus—thereby insuring its success—with the result the students went to city hall, bought a business license, and set up shop across from the college entrance, where they did a land-office business.)

It is true the modern community college president is off-campus as often as not, but this work may be no farther away from the college than a local service club where he is busily drumming up interest in the next bond issue.

Whether he is on campus or off, the calendar of any president is a good indicator of what it is that a president does. The following calendar was given to the board by me, in an effort to describe what the president's office involved. It was *not* a response to a member of the board having asked, "Just what the hell do you do to earn all that money?"—rather it was an attempt to head off that particular question! The effort was prompted in part also by the wish to establish what Newburn called a "complementary and supportive" relationship, where the president is essentially "a pro among amateurs."¹ This calendar was presented at the National Conference on the Junior College President held at the University of California, Los Angeles, in 1968:

To understand the president's calendar, it is necessary first to take a look at the position. The president serves as the chief executive officer of the college. When the board is not in session, he acts for the board and is charged with the management of faculty, curriculum, administration, personnel, student body and facilities in the light of policies established by the board, which, in turn, has acted for the state within the laws and regulations of the state. By practice and policy, the president represents the faculty, administration, personnel and student body to the board when it is in session. The president is charged by law to serve the board as secretary.

Within the role of chief executive officer, the president represents the college officially in a variety of functions. This is practically a twenty-four-hours-a-day process for 365 days a year. This extended calendar is not only an operational requirement but an inescapable responsibility. There are, generally speaking, three distinct functions:

- 1) represent the college as head of a government unit, in this instance a state agency;
- 2) represent the college on legislative matters affecting the college and other institutions of education;
- 3) represent the college on official professional and public matters such as at state, regional and national association meetings, inaugurations of chief executives of other institutions, etc.

Additionally, the president is a professional. As an educationist he is responsible for the promotion of the profession of education. Specifically, as a leader in junior-community college education, he is expected to further this aspect of education. As an educator, the president has professional responsibilities to his own discipline should this be other than education and has a need as well as a responsibility similar to faculty for periodic refurbishment and growth.

The nature of the presidency then dictates the total calendar. In response to the requirements of the position, three more or less distinct calendars are created to operate simultaneously. The priority of one calendar over any other will be in response:

- 1) to the immediate situation of the college in terms of development, available finances, and geography;
- 2) to the policies established by the board;
- 3) to the personality of the president;
- 4) to the requirements set by the state and beyond board review.

The three calendars which make up the total are: (a) in-district; (b) out-of-district; and (c) professional and personal. In-district work refers to the principal duty station but involves a branch campus and five adult training centers. Out-of-district is a response to the pressures from state regulations, legislative and financial efforts and institutional memberships held by the college. Professional and personal calendar

¹ H. Newburn, "The Board Meets the President," *Junior College Journal*, XXXV (November 1964), 12-14.

generates from leave approved by the board for institutes, workshops, or purely recreational leave.²

It would appear the role and responsibilities of the community college president are shifting, as indeed they must. Blocker, Plummer, and Richardson reported:³

What [i.e., the junior college presidency] formerly was a job as the principal of a preparatory program has become a role as educational leader, and as the executive of a complex enterprise with many facets of management relating to personnel, program, plant, finance and public relations. It has become highly important that this educational leadership shall be exercised with the social vision and the professional understanding needed to implement the new concept.

And later added:

The president is the central link between the college and the community, as well as the director and coordinator of the organization's activities. A very brief examination of the activities of two presidents, one a public college president, the other a private college president, with the differences demonstrating, to the authors, the "pervasiveness of situational factors in shaping the activities of the chief executive."

Although it will be seen in Chapter 5 that the president is not seen as being significantly involved with students, this might be one of the bigger changes for future presidents, as Simonson advised:

Just as everything else is changing at an accelerating rate, so are our relationships with students. Think of the ways in which the college president works with various other groups. Consider, for example, the changes that have occurred in the past ten years in our relationships with the faculty, the community, the legislature, the boards, the news media. Is there any reason why our relationships with students, and the actions of students themselves, shouldn't also change?⁴

Fordyce, in noting that the position of president is formidable, quoted Dodds as follows:

I suspect that the job of the president may seem a bit formidable. I must apologize for this and point out that my only excuse for making it sound formidable is that it indeed is. But, as President Dodds has said:

We believe that the president must preserve his educational leadership, that it must indeed be enhanced, but in no area can he do it all himself; he must entrust wide discretion to others. He reveals where his heart lies and sets the character of his administration by the choice he makes between those functions to which he gives his most personal, intimate, and continuing attention and those which he generally leaves to others. We believe that implicit in the office he holds is the duty to participate actively in framing and carrying out the scholarly policies of his institution.⁵

At this point, the description of the *function* of the president blurs into the *role* of the president.

² D. A. Morgan, "The Junior College President: Role and Responsibility," in B. Lamar Johnson, ed., *The Junior College President* (Los Angeles: Junior College Leadership Program, Graduate School of Education, University of California, Occasional Report No. 13, May 1969), p. 24.

³ C. E. Blocker, R. H. Plummer, and R. C. Richardson, Jr., *The Two Year College: A Social Synthesis* (Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, 1965), p. 185.

⁴ E. Simonson, "The Junior College President and the Student," in Johnson, ed., *op. cit.*, p. 75.

⁵ J. Fordyce, "The Junior College President and Student Personnel Services," in Johnson, ed., *op. cit.*, p. 92.

ROLE OF THE PRESIDENT

These introductory statements could make the junior college presidency seem a relatively simple though highly technical position. This might even be so in fact if the president operated in isolation, but he does not. He operates with an institution which is, in essence, a collection of the energies of many people. These energies require direction if they are to properly address the tasks set for the institution. The president, then, operates in that particular crucible of pressure and total exposure typical of any power vortex, however large or small, where the power, through social sanction, is used to direct the affairs of people and, hence, of society.

The presidency is a power position. How powerful it is now or how powerful it will remain is up for question. The presidency is faced with persistent attempts of varying degrees of intensity to divert or reassign part of the powers of the office to other forces within and without the college. The actual amount of effective power wielded by any one president will depend on time and circumstances as well as on his particular leadership ability.

The president's understanding of and ability to interpret the educational philosophy of the junior or two-year college, in terms consistent with the aspirations of the community served, will determine the goals and purposes for the specific college or institution served. The goals, once established, are then accommodated through the design of educational practices and settings that allow the relative accomplishment or achievement of them. These practices and settings are established through administrative processes, the efficiency of which will depend on the organizational and intellectual skills and talents of the leader and the quality of his leadership.

The commonly agreed upon role for the president is that of a leader, and was recently expressed by Gleazer:

The president must lead in the interpretation of the character of the comprehensive community institution, especially if it is new. He must see to it that the board, administration, faculty, students, and community have a working understanding of what the role of the college is.⁶

This was also the tone of Cohen and Roueche's description, though they introduced a cautionary note:

The junior college presidency is recognized in a formal way as being a leadership position. The title, "leader," is accorded to the person ascending to the office. However, in practice, the very nature of this position in the organizational hierarchy may be such that the president is thrust only into a *headman* role. Mere occupancy of a position is no guarantee that its incumbent will actually be a functional educational leader. He may very well be a president and not lead at all.⁷

Gleazer spoke pointedly of what the new two-year college president is *not*: "All that remains of the patriarchal president who spoke benevolently of 'my' faculty is a slightly nostalgic memory."⁸

The junior college president's principal role is as leader. The responsibility, therefore, is to offer leadership. The leadership is exerted on an increasingly

⁶ E. J. Gleazer, Jr., *This Is the Community College* (Boston: Houghton-Mifflin, 1968), p. 109.

⁷ A. M. Cohen and J. E. Roueche, *Institutional Administrator or Educational Leader? The Junior College President* (Washington, D.C.: American Association of Junior Colleges, 1969), p. 10.

⁸ Gleazer, *op. cit.*, p. 109.

important institution within the American educational system. However, if the leader and leadership offered are to be effective, they must be acceptable to the society supporting them. It is also critical that the leadership be acceptable to the specific institution being led.

For effective leadership to be established and accepted, the president must understand, represent, and interpret an educational philosophy. This involves, in reality, little actual philosophizing and lots of hard work, and it must be done in such a way that clear communication is established.

As reported at the National Conference on the Junior College President already alluded to:

The role and responsibility of the junior college presidency, then, involves both understanding the philosophy of the two-year college and possessing the technical and administrative skills for the successful translation of this philosophy into practice. It demands also the most effective leadership to accomplish these goals in an institution composed of emotional people. Furthermore, these goals must be pursued under the full scrutiny of a society with certain very pressing needs of its own, some of which, it has been told, and which it apparently believes, can be met by education as provided in two-year colleges.⁹

These descriptions of the president and his role are meant to set the stage for the presentation of the results of the survey. No one could expect to achieve total agreement on a description from all interested in the presidency. It would be practical and valuable to find out what presidents do. This was attempted.

RESULTS OF THE SURVEY

The questionnaire directed to the presidents was called, "Mr. President, How Do You Get It All Done?" In making up the questions for it, note was made of the dependency of the president on others in getting his job done by asking, "Within the college, whom (by position) do you lean on most for help?" Lombardi has observed in this regard:

The president, of course, does not act alone. Most of the day-to-day activities, the execution of policies, are the responsibility of other administrators, who, by their performance, affect the relations between the president and the faculty. Although the president begins his tenure with administrators already in office, in a short time he gets opportunities to fill vacancies which become to the faculty, "visible, unmistakable signs of his standard of values, irrevocable declarations of the qualities he prizes on his staff."¹⁰

The results, with 318 presidents answering the question, are shown in Table I.

Albeit there is no clear mandate, it is apparent that the "dean," combining positions 1 and 6 in the table, is most heavily leaned upon.

Walberg reported the people who help the president do what he does or who occupy his time as: administrative personnel (26.1 percent); board members and outsiders (37.9 percent); faculty and students (14.0 percent); and the president alone (22.0 percent).¹¹

It is common understanding that the president's job is a pressure-packed one. The presidents were asked, "What are the three sources of greatest pressure on

⁹ Morgan, *op. cit.*, p. 30.

¹⁰ John Lombardi, "The Junior College President and the Faculty," in Johnson, ed., *op. cit.*, p. 52.

¹¹ H. Walberg, "The Academic President: Colleague, Administrator, or Spokesman?" *Educational Record*, Spring 1969, p. 198.

TABLE I
WHOM DOES THE PRESIDENT "LEAN ON"?

Position	Number of Responses	Percentage of Total
1. Instructional dean.....	79	24.8
2. Several or all administrators.....	53	16.7
3. Business officer.....	44	14.1
4. Administrative assistant.....	40	12.5
5. Vice president (unspecified assignment).....	30	9.4
6. Dean (unspecified assignment).....	27	8.6
7. Miscellaneous.....	45	
	318	

TABLE II
THREE GREATEST SOURCES OF PRESSURES ON THE PRESIDENT

Pressures from	A. MOST FREQUENTLY MENTIONED			Total Frequency
	1st Choice	2nd choice	3rd Choice	
1. Faculty.....	80	58	41	179
2. Finances and budget.....	54	28	21	103
3. Community sources.....	13	40	31	84
4. Board of trustees.....	31	25	14	70
5. Administrative details.....	33	17	16	66
6. Campus development.....	16	23	23	62
7. Students.....	6	20	30	56
8. Miscellaneous.....	39			

B. HIGHEST RANKING	On Scale of 1st Choice = 1, etc.
1. Finances and budget.....	1.68
2. Administrative details.....	1.70
3. Board of trustees.....	1.76
4. Faculty.....	1.79
5. Campus development.....	2.11
6. Community sources.....	2.22
7. Students.....	2.43

you?" The responses (with 272 presidents answering—though not all listed three choices) are shown in Table II.

Care must be taken in reading Table II, as with the tables immediately following, in comparing *Frequency* with *Rank*. For example, an item selected only once but selected as *first choice* would have the highest intensity ranking of a perfect 1.00. This would, however, reduce the sample to a single respondent, in

the sense that only one president had so indicated this as the outstanding pressure. Faculty, in terms of frequency, is rated as just such an overwhelming first choice as a pressure. However, when viewed in terms of intensity (or the rank when first choice is rated as "1," second choice as "2," and third choice as "3," and all are summed and an average rank determined), faculty sinks to fourth as a pressure. As for the item of finances, where with faculty many responses were found, it may indeed be true that finances are the most intense of pressures on the president while faculty is the most frequent.

Faculty and finances! A familiar duo for discussion among presidents—a very real pair of pressures as reported by working presidents. As will be developed later, these are (with the growing exception of students—and it must be remembered these data were collected in 1967) the most formidable problems facing the next generation of presidents, although finding time in the face of pressures from administrative details is also likely to be a problem. It may be that colleges of the future will require sets of presidents rather than just one—a president for finance, another for articulation and accreditation visits, and yet another for bargaining with faculty units.

Similar pressures were reported by newly elected presidents with little or no previous experience in community college work. In a nationwide survey, Luskin explored the views of such presidents to test the feasibility of offering a workshop at the University of California, Los Angeles in 1968, and identified human relations—those with faculty and administrators principally, as the problem or issue that was, for them, the more difficult to work with. Of the newly appointed, inexperienced presidents, 48.5 percent report human relations as the outstanding pressure. Next came business operations and finance, named by 15.4 percent as the major problem.¹²

The president was asked to rank the most pressing duties on campus and away from it. The results from 316 responses are in Table III.

The faculty is the *most intense* in consuming time; public relations, the *more persistent* in consuming time, according to these findings.

The presidents were also asked, "What takes you away from campus most frequently in an official capacity?" Results are in Table IV.

Speeches and representation of the college were not only picked most frequently, but were also assigned the highest rank as off-campus demands. State meetings were a close second among off-campus duties.

The presidents were also asked, "Of the above categories (the on-campus alternatives), which are the *three* you feel you *should* spend more time on if you could?" The first five categories were:

1. Faculty matters.
2. Personal professional growth.
3. Students and student affairs.
4. Public relations.
5. Curriculum development.

It will be recalled that the *lowest* ranked category actually given time was "personal professional growth," but it ranked second on the list of what the president

¹² B. Luskin, *A Workshop of Interest to New Presidents with Little Background in the Junior College—An Analysis* (Los Angeles: Graduate School of Education, University of California, unpublished seminar paper, 1967).

TABLE III
ON-CAMPUS WORK—MOST PRESSING

A. Most Frequently Picked as Pressing Duties	Number Choosing Item (No Reference to Rank)
1. Public relations.....	287
2. Budget and financial matters.....	285
3. Board matters.....	285
4. Faculty.....	282
5. Correspondence, trivia.....	277
B. Highest Ranking	On a Scale of "1" as High— for 10 Items
1. Faculty.....	3.11
2. Budget and financial matters.....	3.89
3. Board matters.....	4.02
4. Public relations.....	4.45
5. Physical plan, architecture.....	5.04
C. Lowest Ranked as Consuming Time	
1. Personal, professional interests.....	7.24

Note: As the presidents were asked to rank which of ten possibilities, prestructured, occupied most of their time, A above refers simply to the number of times an item was selected, not to whether it was first or last. B refers to the intensity of the item, whether or not it was picked first or last.

felt he should spend more time on. Overriding almost all his concerns was the matter of faculty relations. This matter will be expanded in Chapter 7.

Before readers interested in becoming presidents reject the job as overwhelming, some advice from Thomas Carr, then President of Bay Path Junior College, Massachusetts, may be appropriate (I well remember his first advice to me was to "RESIGN" before taking over as president), "This institution isn't run like anything else in education. Too many college presidents try to do too many jobs. I even delegate the task of entertaining."

As a spur for the zealous, a note from Richard Gragg, President of Sullivan County Community College, New York, read, "You might be interested in the reply of my six-year-old daughter to a recent inquiry re 'What does your Daddy do?' She said, without hesitation, 'He fights the bad guys.'!!!"

SUMMARY

If the president is as the president does, it can be seen that he has a central (if changing) role, which he executes with the help of others. The quality of leadership is critical. New presidents are well advised to consider their ability to draw strength from others; a strategy for survival in the office of president clearly calls for the positive use by the leaders of the total strength of the college.

The most demanding on-campus duties for a president were reported as faculty and finances. The most demanding off-campus duties were speeches, representation of the college, and state meetings.

TABLE IV
OFF-CAMPUS WORK—MOST PRESSING

A. Most Frequently Picked as Pressing Duties	Number Choosing Item (No Reference to Rank)
1. Speeches and representation	275
2. State and association meetings	263
3. Regional meetings	244
4. National meetings	226
5. Seminars and institutes	222
B. Highest Ranking	On a Scale of "1" as High— for 10 Items
1. Speeches and representation	2.91
2. State and association meetings	3.04
3. Other (miscellaneous, e.g., board)	3.43
4. Legislative matters	3.89
5. State money matters	4.44
C. Lowest Ranked as Consuming Time	
1. Federal money matters	5.86

Note: See Table III, p. 42 for explanation of A and B above.

A STRATEGY FOR DEPARTURE

Do old presidents, as with old soldiers, simply "fade away"? Or do they all wind up with coronaries? It is as certain as death and taxes that each president must some day leave his office. There is, however, the matter of professionalism and of statesmanship as well as fatigue, and it is well for the new president to think through, clear through, his total career as president of the college at which he has arrived. To do so involves contemplating handing the keys over to someone else eventually and considering the condition of the college at that time.

As noted many times throughout this report, the matter of faculty relations and the strain of securing finances appear cause enough for many to leave the presidency, often prematurely in terms of their possible contributions. Harper quoted Lombardi as observing, "A president, reluctant as he may be to give up any of his prerogatives, cannot resist being carried along by the currents . . . the faculty are seeing to that . . . Though today's revolution may force some presidents to resign rather than to submit to the 'usurpation' of their prerogatives, accommodation is taking place."¹

This report suggests that each new president is well advised to think through why he sought to become a president in the first place. Was it a search for status; to "save" a college from a "pack of undeserving applicants" for the presidency; being willingly thrust forward in the name of the faculty; for the not inconsiderable salary attached to the position; as a step upward and onward to bigger presidencies or to four-year college administration; to further the cause of vocational education; or some other of the myriad possibilities peculiar to the ambitions and tastes of any successful administrator? (This last question refers to evidence developed in Chapter 2 that present presidents tend to come from within the ranks of junior college administration.)

The personal reasons for seeking a presidency will, in large measure, give that indefinable but important quality of "style" to what the president does, how he thinks, and his eventual ambitions for the college as well as for himself. As the president and his office are under constant scrutiny both from within and without the institution, this style will soon be evident. As Lombardi noted, and partially quoted from Antony Jay's *Management and Machiavelli*, "Although the president begins his tenure with administrators already in office, in a short time he gets opportunities to fill vacancies, which become to the faculty, 'visible, unmistakable signs of his standard of values, irrevocable declarations of the qualities he prizes on his staff.'"²

¹ W. A. Harper, *Like It Is* (Los Angeles: Junior College Leadership Program, Graduate School of Education, University of California, October 1968), p. 8.

² John Lombardi, "The Junior College President and the Faculty," in B. Lamar Johnson, ed., *The Junior College President* (Los Angeles: Junior College Leadership Program, Graduate School of Education, University of California, Occasional Report No. 13, May 1969), p. 52.

This inward searching and subsequent honest evaluation of "Why did I seek a presidency?" is most important to a strategy for leaving the presidency. A frank estimate of commitment to the college at hand is involved. Does the new president plan to stay until carried out feet first or fired; until all possible contributions along some line are made—stabilizing a disturbed college, introducing new programs, etc.; or for three to five years before moving on to something bigger, better, or more desirable? This is not to suggest that a rigid plan for leaving be adopted at the onset and adhered to at all costs. Revisions are often necessary, and presidents stay and leave for a variety of reasons and pressures.

Such a plan, if only loosely developed, not only allows for statesmanship, but also gives evidence of a sense of reality regarding the nature of the position.

This study sought to determine why presidents stay, why they leave, and where they go when they do leave.

THE SURVEY

A second questionnaire, this one titled "Quo Vadis—What Next," was mailed to all known community college presidents in the fall of 1966. It included questions regarding the sources and backgrounds of presidents, responses to which are presented in Chapter 2. There were 825 inquiry forms sent out (101 colleges had been added to the original mailing list) with a strong 360 response for approximately 43.6 percent. While not as strong a return as enjoyed by the initial inquiry (438 of 724 for 60.5 percent), it gave further evidence of continued field support for the study.

The basic questions posed did *not* concentrate on backgrounds or sources of presidents, but concerned why presidents seek to stay on (at some risk to their health) or to leave (in response to a variety of pressures). Among the specific questions were: (1) Where did your predecessor go? (2) Why did your predecessor leave? (3) If your predecessor was under pressure to leave, from where did the pressure come? (4) What would you prefer to do if you wanted to or had to leave the presidency? (5) What would be your principal motivation to leave the presidency should you choose to do so? and (6) What is your principal motivation for staying on as president?

RESULTS

This questionnaire was less structured than the first and produced a wealth of responses,³ often difficult to classify, but always interesting. Some indication of the breadth and depth of response can be seen from four responses to the question: *Why did your predecessor leave?*

From Georgia: "His enrollment was down, his money was low and his wife unpopular. He was also tired . . ."

From Massachusetts: "I fired him! If some of my answers sound facetious, they aren't, because I actually did fire my predecessor because he was stupid!"

³ Some of these responses were included in an address made at the University of California, Los Angeles, and published in Johnson, ed., *op. cit.*, p. 29.

From Florida: From a former dean of instruction: Why did he leave? "Pressure." From where? "From me, before I knew what the job was!"

From Utah: A report of ambition, a not unheard of characteristic of presidents, caused at least one departure: "He felt the new position was a better steppingstone to a four-year presidency. So he was wrong!"

As for those who went before, 287 of the 360 responding presidents reported they had had predecessors at their present colleges; this also says that 73 reporting presidents were founding or first presidents at their college. What happened to these predecessors?

TABLE I
WHERE DEPARTING PRESIDENTS GO

Activity	No. of Presidents	Percentage of Total
1. Retired.....	61	22
2. Moved to another presidency.....	52	18
3. Moved to four-year college or university.....	41	14
4. Left education for other pursuits.....	29	10
5. Went to a junior college but not as president.....	28	10
6. Died in office.....	21	7
7. Moved to State Department of Education.....	10	4
8. Took full-time graduate study.....	8	3
9. Was transferred by religious orders.....	7	3
10. Miscellaneous.....	30	10
	<hr/> 287	<hr/> 100.1

The results shown in Table I are self-explanatory, although they did not, as anticipated, indicate *why* presidents leave.

Nearly 75 percent of the predecessors left for the first five reasons: retirement, securing another presidency, changing to senior college or university positions, abandoning education as a career, and going to another community college but not as a president. Death in office was a not inconsiderable cause of vacancies and accounted for 10 percent of responses.

The strong response of "moved to another presidency" (18 percent) gives credence to the oft-heard statement that there is a continuing market for those proven to have presidential skills. Also, the fifth category concerns this marketability. Three people I know personally moved to a junior college but not as president; they left small-college presidencies in favor of vice-chancellorships or college deanships in multi-campus community college districts.

Why did the preceding president leave, in the opinion of his successor?

When a president leaves, his reasons for departure—sure to be a topic of concern, rumor, and gossip, both professional and public—are often many. Table II should be interpreted with this in mind. For example, a president

may indeed have left after being offered a "better" position, but the reasons he sought a "better" position might have been subtle pressures never known to any but the board and president and determined, for example, in executive session.

TABLE II
WHY DID PRECEDING PRESIDENT LEAVE?

Reasons for Leaving	No. of Presidents	Percentage of Total
1. Was offered "better" position.....	82	29
2. Was under pressure to leave.....	70	24
3. Reached retirement age.....	64	22
4. Died.....	21	7
5. Left for health reasons.....	19	7
6. Transferred for religious reasons.....	8	3
7. Miscellaneous.....	23	8
	287	100

Schultz tried to get at these reasons tangentially by noting (as quoted in Chapter 2): "An appreciably higher ratio of the vacancies in private than in public institutions were created by the predecessor being released or having resigned before accepting another position. This implies a higher rate of dismissal in private institutions."

This study did *not*, nor did Schultz's, concern itself expressly with trying to determine whether presidents were dismissed or not. Dismissal is a reason for leaving the presidency, the subject here; for Schultz, dismissal was a reason for a vacancy for which a would-be president might apply.

Something of the blurring of reasons for departure was seen as responding presidents reacted to the third question on the inquiry form. To the question "From where did the pressure (to leave) come?" 131 of them answered. Referring to Table II, it can be seen that only 70 presidents indicated the predecessor was under pressure to leave. This seeming inconsistency among respondents is not really so, if it can be accepted that a president may depart for several reasons, not all of them being visible at any one time. For another example, a president may have retired (and been reported in Table II as having done this), but as he may also have been under pressure to retire, he would be included in Table III under a different category.

From where did the pressure to leave come?

Though the board, as expected, led the list, care should be taken in interpreting this. The board may be acting in the interests of the faculty or of organized elements within the community in bringing pressure on the president to leave. It would certainly seem appropriate to state that the president may leave, when pressed to do so, because of pressures rising from the board, faculty, or community.

TABLE III
SOURCES OF PRESSURE ON PRESIDENTS TO LEAVE

Source of Pressure	No. of Presidents	Percentage of Total
1. Board of directors/trustees.....	54	41
2. Faculty.....	25	19
3. Organized elements in community.....	19	15
4. Administration.....	8	6
5. State Department of Education.....	5	4
6. Miscellaneous (including spouses).....	20	15
	131	100

Additional individual responses by presidents, other than those presented in Table I, were received as to why their predecessors had left. Two of these are of interest:

From Texas: "He created most of his own difficulties."

Another, also from Texas: "Other junior colleges had lost respect for him."

The present generation of presidents was also asked, "If you plan eventually to leave the presidency or if conditions lead you to have to or want to leave the presidency, what would you prefer to do next?"

TABLE IV
WHAT PRESIDENTS WOULD PREFER TO DO
IF NOT REMAIN PRESIDENT

First Preference after This Presidency	Frequency (No. of Presidents)	Percentage of Total
1. Teaching in graduate school.....	92	23
2. Seek another presidency.....	91	23
3. Retire.....	75	19
4. Seek other school administrative position.....	42	11
5. Do private study and writing.....	26	7
6. Seek a position outside education.....	18	5
7. Teach at junior college or lower level.....	12	3
8. Undecided.....	11	3
9. Consultant work.....	8	2
10. Other religious work.....	8	2
11. Miscellaneous.....	13	3
	396	101

There are more responses (396) than respondents (360) as several presidents reported two attractive alternatives to the presidency. It seemed undesirable either to assign a priority of one alternative over the other in such cases or to throw these responses out.

TABLE V
MOTIVATION TO LEAVE PRESIDENCY REPORTED BY PRESIDENTS

Principal Motivation to Leave Presidency	Frequency (No. of Presidents)	Percentage of Total
1. Advancement to better or more challenging position....	76	25
2. Too much present responsibility or pressure.....	67	22
3. Another position in education (teaching, other administration, students).....	42	14
4. Health, age, retirement.....	42	14
5. Restrictions and need for personal life.....	42	14
6. Frustrations and feelings of inefficiency.....	21	7
7. Unhappiness or fatigue.....	16	5
8. Moved by religious authority.....	6	2
9. Fired or released.....	6	2
10. Too much politics.....	3	1
	321	99

TABLE VI
**MOTIVATION TO STAY ON AS PRESIDENT REPORTED
BY PRESIDENTS**

Principal Motivation to Stay in Presidency	Frequency (No. of Presidents)	Percentage of Total
1. Challenge.....	119	39
2. Satisfaction.....	56	18
3. Reward.....	39	13
4. Contribution.....	37	12
5. Responsibility.....	30	10
6. Power.....	18	6
7. Personal and social advancement.....	6	2
8. Nowhere else to go.....	3	1
	321	99

The principal motivations to stay on as president were reported as shown in Table VI.

Almost equally attractive to presidents considering other possibilities would be to move to the university or senior college as professors or to seek another presidency, though the attraction of retirement was reported as a strong third choice.

It would appear that presidents do *not* really want to leave their position. This view was also reported by their wives, and is elaborated upon in Chapter 8.

Presidents were asked the principal motivations for either leaving the presidency, should they do so, or for seeking to stay on. The principal motivations to leave were reported as shown in Table V.

A wealth of individual responses, not suitable for tabulation, to the two questions on principal motivations to leave or stay are discussed below.

Why Would Presidents Leave Their Positions?

One ulcer operation is enough!

In addition to this response from Iowa, a rough grouping was set up. First were the remarks with a common vein of statesmanship. With one possible exception, there was no sarcasm:

To open the position for a better trained and younger person. (Alabama)

If I felt I had done as much as I could for the college and that [it] needed new leadership. (Florida)

To teach a course in the 'Politics of Education'! (New York)

I have no desire to leave, and (fingers crossed) I don't think that I'll be forced to leave. (California)

Reason to leave? None, really—though one can say one wants peace and quiet, but not really mean it. (Massachusetts)

Second were those critical of conditions surrounding the presidency, sounding a note of exasperation or frustration rather than despair:

Incompatibility with university administrative setup and direction they are pushing college. (Alaska)

Teacher groups taking over administrative responsibilities. (California)

Demands made by students that have little relation to education. (North Carolina)

The nagging necessity of being a fund raiser. (Oklahoma)

I do not consider myself prepared to be successful in fund raising. (Ohio)

There were also the unhappy:

Sick of artificial pressures.

The inhuman pressures from all sides upon me and the members of my family, particularly my children.

and the very unhappy:

Sick of educational infighting, vested and political interests influencing educational direction and progress, archaic educational philosophy of our very sick society.

as well as those looking ahead:

A desire for 'new worlds'—I've been here six years. (New York)

Freedom to indulge some other interest while I still have the ability to do so. (California)

Why Do Presidents Seek to Stay on Being President?

There were those who couldn't imagine leaving (Incidentally, there is either a lot of happy gas in Massachusetts or very good working conditions):

Leave? Someone would have to fire me. (Massachusetts)

I can't imagine doing anything else half as much fun. (Massachusetts)

I cannot conceive of a reason which would take me from the excitement of this position. (Massachusetts)

I haven't figured out what a president is good for after being president! (Florida)

Far more spontaneous remarks were given by presidents dealing with joys of staying on as compared with the inducements for leaving the presidency. The responses ran a rough gamut—from the jaded, brutally frank, and seemingly entrapped:

I can't think of any reason (to stay) . . . (Ohio)

Monetary, in all honesty. (New York)

Fun. Money. (Pennsylvania)

An exaggerated—but fallacious) social status: I am approaching the dangerous age of considering [myself] indispensable. (Maryland)

to personal commitment and satisfaction:

Satisfactions (mostly vicarious) in seeing faculty, students, and institution grow in ability to render service. (Idaho)

(a) the urgent need of providing new college opportunities to our youth; and (b) the possibility a small college affords of experimenting with new teaching techniques and new approaches to subject matter at the college level. (Puerto Rico)

through the smug and happy:

I like my job. (West Virginia)

Being in the middle where the action is—the challenge of 'making things happen'! (New Mexico)

to the wildly euphoric:

I love it. Hard work—bitter hours—but where else can you find such an opportunity to achieve? (Illinois)

and the ambivalent:

Why leave? "Fatigue!" Why stay? "An unworthy lust for power—seriously it's the variety and challenge of the job!" (California)

SUMMARY

Though slightly akin to the old American adage "You can't fire me—I just quit!" a plan to leave (in reality, a contingency plan) not only is a measure of statesmanship and evidence of a sense of reality, but also allows a freedom (though we hope not to blithely used) of action and a margin for courage—both of which a president needs in abundance.

A large percentage of presidents answering the questionnaire "Quo Vadis?" indicated, if they were forced to leave their present positions, they would seek another presidency. It was equally evident most did not intend to leave their jobs willingly. The responses of two presidents seemed to sum up this feeling:

From Texas much was said by leaving a sentence open-ended. Why stay? "The feeling that there are just a few more things I would like to accomplish before . . ."

From Kentucky, in a letter, "I suspect each of us has a dream of what we think a college should be. None of us will ever attain that dream; and despite all the heartaches, frustration, etc., inherent in the job as president, we will keep striving for that perfection and all of us will probably accept any position that promises us a further opportunity to reach that goal."

How to stay on as president is another matter. There are various inspirations. An anecdote from Oregon bears repeating. Shortly after her father became a two-year college president in Oregon, his daughter was introduced to the joys of an elevated status when her teacher exclaimed, "Oh, your father's the college president!" Sensing the situation presented possibilities, she advised her father that evening, "Dad, I'm glad you're a president. How do you manage to stay one?" Without waiting for an answer from an immediately reflecting parent, the child concluded, "I guess you just have to do everything right. Make sure you do!"

The reasons a president leaves are many and seem interrelated. It may only be that he is tired or has been offered a more enticing position. If he is under pressure to leave, the pressure will be expressed by the board, but it may come from the board, faculty, or community elements. In any case, a basic purpose for developing a strategy for departure is consideration of what is good for the college, in the sense of true professionalism that tries to leave the college in as sound a condition as possible when the day of departure comes.

PERSPECTIVES OF THE PRESIDENCY AS REPORTED BY THE SECOND-RANKING ADMINISTRATOR

As reported in Chapter 2, more community college presidents came to their positions directly from deanships or vice presidencies than from any other position. These posts are typically regarded as the second-ranking positions in community colleges.

Since such positions are the most predictable source of new presidents, and since "number two" must work closely with "number one" (as reported in Chapter 3, the president "leans on" the dean most often and recommends, in Chapter 2, that the new president turn to the dean as the person to help him get acclimated), it was decided to seek the perspectives that second-ranking administrators have of the presidency. Accordingly, a questionnaire seeking their views was constructed and sent to them through their chief administrators, a plan making it necessary for the president to designate whom he regarded as "number two."

Slightly more than 25 per cent (222 of 840) of the questionnaires were returned with usable responses. In addition, fourteen letters and comments were received. This relatively low percentage of returns was not unexpected as there were two sources of attrition: the president might not refer the questionnaire to "number two"; the official designated might not fill out and return the form. A note attached to an uncompleted questionnaire suggested problems of interplay between and among presidents and sub-administrators as well as why returns were not high:

Your questionnaire is returned. To designate a #2 person might ruin the balance of an administrative team, and it might give the nominee ambitions for my job!
(Washington)

The purposes of studying the second-ranking administrator were: to determine what *are* the second-ranking positions in the administrative organization of community colleges; to obtain and analyze what perspectives administrators in such positions have of the presidency; and to determine what aspirations or ambitions the second-ranking person might have to become a president.

WHO IS THE SECOND-RANKING ADMINISTRATOR?

Persons designated by the president and responding gave their position titles and what they regarded as their principal function. As shown in Table I, approximately 67 percent were deans and approximately 13.5 percent were vice pre- s.

TABLE I
POSITIONS HELD BY SECOND-RANKING ADMINISTRATORS

Position	Frequency	Percentage
Dean.....	149	67.1
Vice President.....	30	13.5
Assistant to President.....	12	5.4
Coordinator of Instruction.....	11	5.0
Associate or Assistant Dean.....	7	3.1
Business Manager.....	5	2.1
Director of Public Relations.....	2	0.9
President*.....	6	2.6

* Six superintendents or chancellors of multi-college districts nominated single-campus presidents as the second-ranking administrator.

Within the group of deans, 97 were either deans of instruction, deans of academic affairs, or deans of faculty—approximately 44 percent of the total 222 responding.

Other respondents reported their principal function as responsibility for the instructional program or faculty (vice presidents of instruction, coordinators of programs, or assistant deans of instruction). When these positions were added to the 97 instructional deanships, the total was 155 or approximately 70 percent of the 222 responding. Most "number two" administrators in community colleges are clearly in positions primarily responsible for instructional programs or faculties. A mere scattering of respondents have responsibility for serving as assistant to the president (12), for finance (5), or for public relations (2).

That six presidents were designated as second-ranking administrators reflects the growing phenomenon of the multi-campus district. The chief administrator of such a district in Michigan, for example, wrote:

We are one of those multi-campus . . . institutions, and it is difficult to say what *one* person is number two. Each campus director is semi-autonomic, and I rely heavily on each.

If you care for me to do so, I would be happy to copy your questionnaire and have each [director] complete one.

AMBITIONS FOR THE PRESIDENCY

The second-ranking administrators were asked to indicate what ambitions, if any, they had to become presidents (see Table II). Replies reveal that, on the basis of their ambitions, these officials comprise four groups:

Type 1. Does *not* plan to be a president. Would reject a presidency. Would not apply for or compete for a presidency.

Type 2. Does *not* plan to be a president. Would consider a presidency if offered and might compete.

Type 3. Possibly plans to be a president. Would be willing to apply and might be willing to compete.

Type 4. Plans to be a president. Would apply and would compete.

TABLE II
FREQUENCY OF TYPES OF SECOND-RANKING ADMINISTRATORS

Plans Relative to the Presidency	Frequency	Percentage
Type 1. Has no plans for presidency	48	21.6
Type 2. Would consider a presidency	62	27.0
Type 3. Possibly plans to be president.....	67	30.2
Type 4. Plans to be president.....	45	20.3

If Types 1 and 2 are combined as Group A (those with no plans to be a president), and if Types 3 and 4 are combined with Group B (those with slight to definite plans to be a president), it can be noted that 110 (49.6 percent) have no plans to be president and 112 (50.4 percent) do. Interpretation can be stated in either of two ways: (1) the second-ranking administrator does not necessarily plan to be a president, as just over 50 percent of those responding reported any such plans; or (2) half of the reporting second-ranking administrators have some plans and ambitions to become a president.

PERSPECTIVES HELD OF THE PRESIDENCY

Those surveyed were asked what the president spent most time on and also what he should spend more time on (see Table III).

The president was seen to spend most time as an administrator and *not* as principally involved with either the faculty or the academic or instructional programs. It should be noted that *no* president was seen as involved with the students; e.g., no second-ranking administrator reported the president involved

TABLE III
THE PRESIDENT DOES, OR SHOULD DO, AS REPORTED BY SECOND-RANKING ADMINISTRATORS

DUTIES AND ACTIVITIES OF PRESIDENTS	PRESIDENT DOES		PRESIDENT SHOULD DO MORE OF	
	Frequency	Percentage	Frequency	Percentage
1. Administrative matters, including board, budget and campus development.....	133	59.9	53	23.9
2. Public relations, including community service.....	56	25.2	32	14.4
3. No comment or reported "don't know".....	18	8.1	63	28.4
4. Faculty relationships, organizations, and leadership.....	6	2.7	33	14.9
5. Academic matters, including instructional program development.....	3	1.4	25	11.3
6. Students, student government...	0	0	4	1.8
7. Miscellaneous.....	6	2.7	12	5.4

with students as a principal function. It should also be noted that the data represent the 1967-68 academic year. If this survey had been made during 1968-69, it is probable, because of student activism, that many presidents would have been reported as involved principally with students.

The second-ranking administrator felt the president should spend more time with faculty and with academic and instructional matters. Only four of the 222 respondents, however, suggested that the president spend more time with students.

Not expected was the high percentage of respondents who made no comment or reported they did not know what the president did. In particular, second-ranked officials in Type 1 (those with no plans for the presidency) were not inclined to report perceptions, 27.9 percent either making no comment or reporting they didn't know what the president did; nearly half (48.3 percent) of these made no suggestion for what the president ought to do more of.

THE PRINCIPAL FUNCTION OF A PRESIDENT

The administrators responding had been asked, "What is the principal function of a president?" The intent of this question was to establish an "ideal." Previous questions on what is done and what should be done more extensively were concerned essentially with practices as they are, not as they ultimately should be. Also it was expected that many of those responding to what is done would personalize this to the practices of the presidents with whom they worked. This question was an attempt to let them get away from this. (Enough

TABLE IV
THE PRINCIPAL FUNCTION OF A PRESIDENT AS
REPORTED BY SECOND-RANKING ADMINISTRATORS

Activity or Duty	Frequency	Percentage of Total
1. Leadership.....	58	25.5
a. general (25)		
b. educational goals of college (19)		
c. instructional (7)		
d. faculty (5)		
e. community (2)		
2. Administrative and supervisory.....	58	25.5
3. Board work, policy making, decision making, interpretation.....	26	11.4
4. Chief financial officer and fund raiser.....	16	7.0
5. Coordinator and arbitrator.....	14	6.4
6. Public relations and political activity.....	12	5.6
7. Campus planner and developer.....	10	3.8
8. Educational program developer.....	9	3.4
9. Miscellaneous.....	3	1.3
10. No comment, don't know.....	22	8.9
	<hr/> 228	<hr/> 99.8

responses to the question of what the president ought to do more were in the vein of "Our president is OK!" to indicate that some did indeed personalize the response.)

Comparing results in Table IV with those in Table III, what the president is seen as doing, shows that, though the president is not seen operating as a leader, it is clearly his principal function as seen by the second-ranking administrator. It is of interest to note, also, that "number two" does not see the president functioning as the leader of the faculty (5 responses) or as the developer of educational programs (9 responses), perhaps because these duties are often thought of as devolving on the second-ranking person as delegated responsibilities.

PRESSURES ON THE PRESIDENT

Respondents were asked to list the greatest source of pressure on the president.

TABLE V
GREATEST SOURCE OF PRESSURE ON PRESIDENT AS
REPORTED BY SECOND-RANKING ADMINISTRATORS

Source of Pressure	Frequency	Percentage of Total
1. Financial concerns, budget, funds.....	53	23.8
2. Faculty matters and militancy.....	30	13.0
3. Board of trustees.....	26	11.3
4. Community pressures.....	24	10.4
5. Total personnel, administrators.....	11	4.7
6. Administrative details and trivia.....	10	4.4
7. State board and state agencies.....	9	3.9
8. Public relations, speeches, representation.....	8	3.6
9. Campus development and planning.....	8	3.6
10. Students.....	1	.4
11. Miscellaneous.....	18	7.8
12. No comment, don't know.....	30	13.0
	228	99.9

Comparing Table V with Table II, Chapter 3, pressures on the president as reported by the president, indicates that presidents rate the faculty as a more consistent source of pressure on the presidency than do second-ranked administrators, though both rank faculty as a major pressure on the president.

As respondents were asked for but one response on the source of greatest pressure, each category has an intensity of "one" and no intensity comparisons are possible.

As President-Elect

Second-ranking administrators were also asked what a president-elect ought to do between election and arrival to assume responsibilities of the position.

This question had been asked of presidents earlier (see Chapter 2). Results from this survey are in Table VI.

The recommendations of second-ranking administrators for what the president-elect should do are similar to those made by presidents, though the presidents responded to predefined possibilities (many, however, giving open-ended responses in addition to or in lieu of the categories presented), whereas the second-ranking officials reported entirely open-ended responses.

TABLE VI
WHAT SHOULD THE PRESIDENT-ELECT DO
AS REPORTED BY SECOND-RANKING ADMINISTRATORS

Duties and Activities Recommended	Frequency	Percentage
Meet with college elements to get acquainted.....	57	25.4
Study the situation, community and setting.....	51	23.0
Take some action; e.g., look for administrators.....	37	16.7
Personal—tell wife, resign present position, take vacation..	20	9.4
Miscellaneous.....	7	3.3
No comment, "don't know".....	49	22.1

Officials not planning to be president, Type 1 among respondents, had few recommendations to make on what a president-elect should do, with 25 of the 48 (over 50 percent) either making no comment or reporting they didn't know.

As a Newly Arrived President

Respondents were next asked what a newly arrived president should do first. The results are in Table VII.

TABLE VII
WHAT SHOULD A NEWLY ARRIVED PRESIDENT DO
AS REPORTED BY SECOND-RANKING ADMINISTRATORS

Duties and Activities Recommended	Frequency	Percentage
Meet with college faculty, staff to get acquainted.....	86	38.7
Study the situation; community and college setting and development.....	27	12.2
Take some action; e.g., look for administrators.....	53	23.9
Miscellaneous.....	10	4.5
No comment, "don't know".....	46	20.7

The second-ranked administrators recommended quite strongly that the newly arrived president ought to meet with administrators, faculty, the students; i.e., the entire college personnel. This agrees essentially with what the presidents recommended that newly arrived presidents do (see page 31), though presidents urged that meetings with the board be arranged early, while second-ranking administrators did not.

However, in Table VII, as in previous ones, the category of "no comment or don't know" was a leading one. In looking into this comment further, it was found to be the leading response for those second-ranking administrators not planning to become a president.

CONCLUSIONS

The second-ranking administrator in the community college is a dean, with 67.1 percent (149 out of 222) respondents so titled. Of the 149 deans, approximately 65 percent (97) were either deans of instruction, deans of academic affairs, or deans of faculty. Thirty vice presidents, nominated as "number two," responded.

Approximately half the second-ranking administrators reported no plans to become presidents and many would refuse to be one. On the other hand, half (112 of 222) would like to become presidents and 20.3 percent (45) would actively seek a presidency.

Some perspectives of the presidency held by the second-ranking administrator were found to be:

1. The president was viewed as principally involved with administrative matters and with public relations.
2. The president is *not* viewed as principally involved in faculty affairs, faculty associations, or operating as the leader of the faculty. It was recommended that he spend more time on faculty matters.
3. The president is *not* viewed as being involved principally in the instructional program or with academic matters, and it was recommended that he become more so involved.
4. The president is *not* viewed as principally involved with students, and there were *no* strong recommendations that he become so (data collected in 1967-1968).
5. Those second-ranking administrators *not* planning to be presidents displayed a marked tendency to make *no* comment or recommendation when asked what presidents, presidents-elect, or newly arrived presidents do or ought to do.

Additionally it was determined that second-ranking administrators view the principal function of a president, aside from what the president may do, as offering leadership. This is a role for the president agreed upon earlier, and one to which the "number two" man feels the president should strive.

Though the second-ranking administrators proved, on several occasions, to be reticent beyond expectations when given an opportunity to "tell things like they ought to be" (evoking specters of the old description of the "do-nothing" dean sitting tightly on things as they are), cheer can be taken from a note from Kentucky:

Many outstanding programs are not necessarily due to the college presidents. In fact this past year in visiting some community colleges . . . (elsewhere) . . . , I have come to the conclusion that the deans were of a higher caliber than most of the presidents I met.

PERSPECTIVES OF THE PRESIDENT AS REPORTED BY THE PRESIDENT'S SECRETARY

Although the president's secretary will not ordinarily cause the president either to sink or swim, she is certainly in a key position to make sinking or swimming easier.

In Chapter 2, it was reported, community college presidents (responding to a national survey) urged that newly arriving presidents turn either to the second-ranking administrator or to the outgoing president's secretary as those best situated to help them get acclimated. Earl F. Hargett, President of Brunswick College, Georgia, wrote: "(a) in an established institution [the person to "lean on" is] the former president's secretary or the dean; (b) in a new institution, it's a pooling of talents among administrators."

The perspectives of the presidency as held and reported by the deans were the subject of the preceding chapter; this one concerns the president's secretary's perspectives of "her boss."

The position of the president's secretary, *vis-à-vis* the newly arriving president, is pivotal. If the college is only on the planning boards when the president arrives, he can choose his staff, a central figure of which will be his personal secretary. Another situation is where a new chief administrator inherits an "old" secretary from the departing president. In such circumstances, the problem of transfer of loyalty by the secretary left behind may be of paramount importance. A president needs, always, the loyalty of a large number of people, in particular that of his secretary. Howard Rawlinson, Dean, Mt. Vernon Community College, Illinois, apparently had this in mind when he wrote: "If the secretary has had several years of experience, and if she is not too steeped in loyalty to some one who is no longer there, she should be able to give a lot of help."

A young president, newly elected, once confided he had been taken aside by two close and well-meaning friends, themselves community college presidents of considerable experience, and advised that the outgoing president's secretary (whom neither of them knew personally) was so unlikely to be able to transfer loyalty that he should secure a new secretary. My friend ignored this advice, for several reasons having mostly to do with finances. He confessed that he had been wrong to do so, as he later had to fire her and the non-certificated staff was shaken as a result.

If the outgoing president takes his secretary with him, not unheard of, there is no problem—at least for the incoming president. If the “old” secretary remains behind, however, basic choices, although limited, need consideration—either the new president keeps the secretary he has inherited or he does not. If he decides not to, he can appoint her to another position, perhaps that of receptionist or administrative assistant. This will require either the necessary funds or a convenient vacancy.

If the new president cannot move the “old” secretary elsewhere, he may have to release her—a painful and possibly devastating move, not only to the secretary but also to others on the staff in terms of both security and morale.

It is, of course, possible for a new president to inherit a perfectly satisfactory secretary. Such a situation is most fortunate, as an efficient and loyal secretary can do much to assist a new chief administrator get off to a good start.

Among the important and early responsibilities of a secretary is the matter of the president’s calendar—daily, weekly, and monthly schedules. The secretary, often in company with the president’s wife, becomes the custodian of this calendar, both creating it and trying to get the president where he ought to be when he ought to be there.

Knowing the whereabouts of the president and, often, the state of his mind—why he does what to whom and what he may do next—makes the president’s secretary a key functionary in the college and one to whom many turn for information and assistance. A secretary from North Carolina observes:

I have found that one cannot pinpoint by mere questions and answers the pressures on a president’s secretary. They are much too varied, from keeping peace in the family with children, to informing the President’s wife of dinner engagements, etc., that both she and the president are to attend, getting the president to his appointments *on time*, screening telephone calls that other members of the staff can handle, to say nothing of handling all correspondence when the president is away . . .

And a secretary from Illinois reported the outstanding pressure on her was “evading ‘off-the-record’ inquiries by the staff about issues on the president’s desk!” Another, from Massachusetts, noted the central pressure as “tactful responses to information ferreters.”

The secretary in some instances may also hold “the keys to the kingdom,” in the sense of being the last hurdle between the president and members of the staff, as well as between the president and callers from the community who wish to see him. Does the new president wish to operate with an “open door”? This may—depending on past practices at the college and the views of the new president—be threatening to some secretaries long accustomed to guarding “that” door as an integral part of their jobs—indeed, of their lives. Also, does she screen incoming telephone calls for the president or not? On the basis of my own experience and from asides of others during this survey, I urge new presidents to maintain both an open door and an unscreened phone, though I recognize all will not agree with this. In some instances, it is felt to be to the advantage of a new president to hear first-hand from all elements at the college and of the community sufficiently motivated to seek him out, rather than to hear second-hand from those who, however honestly but often mistakenly, seek to present information the president needs to know.

PRESSURES ON SECRETARIES TO THE PRESIDENT

Because of the importance of the role of the secretary, especially any of her perspectives that may serve as a guide to newly arrived presidents, some 900 inquiry forms were sent to community college presidents with instructions to pass them on to their secretaries for completion—doubtless no surprise to the secretaries who had, in most instances, already screened the mail. Approximately 20 percent (172) responded. This return was not high, there being two sources of attrition—the president who typically throws all questionnaires away and the secretary who is not used to getting any. Replies, however, proved worthwhile in providing information about the presidency as well as about the president's secretary.

The first section of the questionnaire asked about the secretary's position and, in particular, about the pressures on her: "What are the three sources of greatest pressure on your position as secretary to the chief administrator?" Some individual comments were:

Generally keeping people happy when the President is out of town and they have "many many important things" to discuss with him. (Michigan)

Covering for the President when it is a pretty day outside. Keeping coffee cup filled. Doing work for others—other than the President. (North Carolina)

Being discreet without being obvious. Being poised, not easily upset in any situation. Remaining neutral, yet showing interest in any problem related to me. (Origin unknown)

Demands for appointments by all and sundry on many petty matters, without going through proper channels. Gathering data for reports, checking all information, etc. Hat hanging, coffee service, etc., to VIP's. (This takes more time than one would think.) Attempting to answer *his* questionnaires. (Maryland)

Interruptions, board matters, preparation for meetings, and demands of faculty led the list of reported pressures. The matter of faculty was put interestingly by a New York president's secretary:

I once read an article in *Harper's* which described faculty as a "chronically aggrieved group," and this is the thing which wears away at an administrator. Individually they are great people. Collectively they are a bunch of unruly kids, taking pot shots at each other and running to mother with tales. I am on the best of terms with the faculty, and often their tales of woe, told to me while waiting for an appointment with "the boss," sound so trivial, once told, that they often cancel appointments with him, deciding that the grievances are not worth bothering him with.

It became immediately clear that many secretaries were professionals, taking their jobs, themselves as college officials (and their bosses) very seriously, and that they knew a great deal about the presidency as well as the whole community college movement and what it means. The institutional loyalty of such devoted people is well represented by this response from New York:

I have been associated with this college for the past 32 years and can think of no other work that would have been more exciting, more challenging, or more rewarding than this has been. I sometimes feel a personal kinship with each brick and stone in our new buildings as the fight for them has involved long hours, sweat and, yes, in some instances, tears as well.

This feeling was stated again, recently, by a Californian:

But I still wake up in the morning believing that I have the greatest job in the world, anxious to get to work because every day is exciting, and always wondering what the "new generation" of students will come up with next as the issue of the week—or moment.¹

TABLE I
THE THREE GREATEST PRESSURES ON THE PRESIDENT
AS REPORTED BY THE PRESIDENT'S SECRETARY

SOURCE OF PRESSURE A. Most frequently reported	First Choice	Second Choice	Third Choice	Total Frequency	Percentage of Total
1. Administrative details, admin- istrivia, correspondence	31	26	30	87	20
2. Faculty.....	31	26	21	78	18
3. Finance, budget.....	29	25	17	71	16
4. Public relations, speeches, press relations, official rep- resentation.....	9	17	22	48	11
5. Community pressures, visitors.....	7	12	15	34	8
6. Personnel other than faculty	8	6	16	32	7
7. Board of trustees.....	13	10	5	28	6
8. Campus and building devel- opment.....	2	12	9	23	5
9. Students.....	7	9	4	20	5
10. Keeping everybody happy..	8	4	5	17	4
	145	137	144	436	100

B. Highest Ranking	On Scale of 1st Choice = 1, etc.
1. Board of trustees.....	1.71
2. Finance, budget.....	1.83
3. Faculty.....	1.87
4. Administrative details, admin- istrivia, correspondence.....	1.99
5. Community pressures, visitors.....	2.24

Note: A modified form of this table was presented at the National Conference on the Junior College President held at the University of California, Los Angeles, July 1968, and published in B. Lamar Johnson, ed., *The Junior College President* (Los Angeles: Junior College Leadership Program, Graduate School of Education, University of California, Occasional Report No. 13, May 1969), pp. 26-27.

Something of the range of a secretary's responsibility is indicated by this reply from a new secretary (state origin lost):

Answering the enclosed questionnaire was a challenge to me. I have been the President's Secretary for only a year now and feel I have so much to learn about so many different things. I am sure if I were asked the same questions five years from now I would probably give entirely different answers.

Anderson enlarged on this and couched it in terms of purposes of the college:

¹ Lorraine Anderson, "I've Grown Accustomed to His Bellow—Hey Stupid!" *Junior College Journal*, XXXIX, No. 8 (May 1969).

I am a firm believer in practicing good human relations in the office and feel that *all* college employees (not just the faculty and administration) should cooperate in helping to develop the students' total personality. The manner in which the secretaries, clerks, receptionists and PBX operators treat the students, faculty, administration, parents and others has much to do with the total atmosphere of the college. One wonders how much of the current student unrest on campuses throughout the United States could be attributed to rude clerks, authoritarian campus police, hostile and unfriendly secretaries, and a general lack of communication on the part of all.

One point too often forgotten is that colleges are established to provide a place for students to learn—not just a place for us to work.²

PERSPECTIVES OF THE PRESIDENT

The principal concern of the survey was to determine in what perspectives the secretaries held the president.

The secretaries were asked first: What are the three sources of greatest pressure on the president? There were 165 completed questionnaires. As each secretary could give three answers, though not all did, a total of 438 sources of pressure was mentioned. The results are presented in Table I.

Secretaries differ from presidents and from deans in what they rank as the most frequent and intense sources of pressure on presidents (see Table II, Chapter 3, and Table V, Chapter 5). Whereas the president had unequivocally prioritized faculty and finances, and deans differed only in the degree of pressure from each, the secretaries saw administrative details, "administrivia" (clearing desk, writing memos, reading memos, etc.), and correspondence as the most pressing. Presidents ranked this category fifth, deans ranked it sixth. This stress on the presidency being caught up in pressing administrative details is thought to be a bias of the secretary, albeit an honest one, reflecting the aspect with which she is most familiar.

A complete shift is seen when the responses are weighted 1 for first choice, 2 for second choice, 3 for third choice and summed, with an average calculated. The board of trustees, ranked only seventh in frequency, was ranked first often enough to lead in intensity of pressure. It should be remembered here that this rating has limitations, because, if an item were chosen but once and ranked first, it would have the highest possible intensity rating and yet not be a factor at all when a large sample was considered. Nonetheless, it can be seen on the intensity rating that the finance, faculty, and administrative detail categories are reversed from their positions on the frequency table.

The secretaries, as with presidents and deans (the questionnaire to secretaries, sent after those to the president and dean, represents more current experiences), did *not* see students as a significant pressure on the community college presidency. However, as will be seen later in this chapter, the secretaries reported they felt students to be a potential major problem for future presidents. It should be pointed out again that the data were collected during 1967-68, before much of the overt student activism of 1968-69.

A number of individual responses of value are presented here. For instance, one secretary from California reported the pressures on the president as:

² *Ibid.*, p. 34.

1. "Open Door" policy—constant flow of faculty, students, community people.
2. Community demands—active in Rotary, Chamber of Commerce, etc. (public relations).
3. Decisions—often caused by vacillation of other administrators who should handle—final choice of new faculty additions—administrative problems, etc.

From New York, a secretary reported:

1. As you know, the constant pressure for *funds* to keep the whole thing going.
2. We are small, which means that he is terribly involved with the faculty, their problems, personal and professional, and the ever-present clashes between them.
3. Time (TIME) to do all the things required of a college president today. In addition to playing "Big Daddy" here to students and faculty, all those meetings, conferences, etc.

And from a wry soul in North Carolina came:

What are the three sources of greatest pressure on the president?

1. The secretary.
2. The wife.
3. Finding time to carry on the business at the college.

THE PRESIDENT'S OFF-CAMPUS WORK

The secretaries were next asked: What three official duties take the president off campus most?

TABLE II
WHAT TAKES THE PRESIDENT OFF-CAMPUS
AS REPORTED BY THE PRESIDENT'S SECRETARY

Activity	First Choice	Second Choice	Third Choice	Total Frequency	Percentage of Total
1. Off-campus meetings (see next table for breakdown).	90	66	39	195	41.2
2. Speeches, official representation.....	12	27	19	58	12.3
3. Conferences, committees...	12	15	6	48	10.1
4. Service clubs, community work.....	11	13	16	40	8.5
5. Fund raising, financial matters.....	13	8	6	27	5.8
6. General, undifferentiated public relations.....	3	6	14	23	4.8
7. Campus development, building programs.....	5	10	8	23	4.8
8. Accrediting teams (as a member of).....	2	7	3	12	2.5
9. Recruitment of faculty.....	1	5	4	10	2.1
10. Legislative matters.....	3	5	2	10	2.1
11. Other, miscellaneous.....	4	6	17	27	5.8
	171	168	134	473	100.0

The findings in Table II agree substantially with those reported earlier when presidents were asked what took them off campus most frequently. Meetings, here as with the presidents, were an overwhelming choice when added together. For the responses of presidents, meetings were reported under three headings: state, regional, and national. Here they are broken down further, as reported by secretaries, in Table III.

TABLE III
KINDS OF MEETINGS REQUIRING PRESIDENT TO LEAVE CAMPUS
AS REPORTED BY THE PRESIDENT'S SECRETARY

Kind of Meetings	First Choice	Second Choice	Third Choice	Total Frequency	Percentage of Total
1. Unspecified, general.....	21	10	6	37	19.0
2. State board, parent university, state departments....	18	8	6	32	16.4
3. Regional conventions, meetings.....	9	10	4	23	11.4
4. Professional, educational....	8	9	5	22	11.2
5. district administrator meetings.....	14	7	1	22	11.2
6. Presidents—district council..	11	6	0	17	8.9
7. Local board—individual members of.....	4	4	7	15	7.7
8. State association meetings..	3	6	5	14	7.2
9. National associations (American Association of Junior Colleges).....	2	6	5	13	6.8
				<hr style="width: 10%; margin: 0 auto;"/> 195	<hr style="width: 10%; margin: 0 auto;"/> 99.8

Individual responses heighten the finding that meetings dominate the president's off-campus calendar:

What are the three official duties which take the president off campus most?

1. Meetings; of official nature.
2. Meetings; of semi-official nature.
3. Meetings; period.

1. Meetings (scheduled).
2. Hunting.
3. More meetings (he says).

THE PRESIDENT'S ON-CAMPUS WORK

As for presidents earlier, the next question for secretaries was: What three duties occupy most of the president's on-campus time? The results are in Table IV.

TABLE IV
WHAT DOES THE PRESIDENT DO WHEN ON CAMPUS
AS REPORTED BY THE PRESIDENT'S SECRETARY

Activity	First Choice	Second Choice	Third Choice	Total Frequency	Percentage of Total
1. Meetings.....	68	32	27	127	25.6
a. staff, college wide (47)					
b. administrative (38)					
c. individual, "open door" (38)					
d. personnel (7)					
2. Administrative details, ad- ministrivia, and corre- spondence.....	27	35	42	105	20.9
3. Faculty matters and problems.....	17	19	8	47	9.5
4. Administration and super- vision of college business and programs.....	19	12	11	42	8.4
5. Campus and building plans and development.....	14	19	8	41	8.2
6. Budget, finances, fundraising	11	11	7	29	5.8
7. Meetings of preparation for board matters.....	4	7	7	18	3.6
8. Community pressures, visi- tors from community.....	2	6	8	16	3.2
9. Educational program and instructional matters.....	3	5	7	15	3.0
10. Students.....	1	6	4	11	2.2
11. Other, miscellaneous.....	5	17	25	47	10.5
	171	169	157	497	99.9

Again meetings are the bane of the president's life, as reported by his secretary. This is true whether the president is on or off campus. However, the president and his secretary report quite differently on what occupies the president's total time. The president stressed the time taken by faculty and board much more heavily than did the secretaries.

Walberg used slightly different categories, and his study might be compared with both Tables III and IV. He reported the president, from a log recorded by the president's secretary, involved in: administration 30.7 percent of the time; external affairs (fund raising, public relations, correspondence, entertainment, and travel) 46.7 percent of the time; collegial matters (student and faculty affairs, curriculum) 18.1 percent of the time; and reading and reflection 3.9 percent of the time.³ It was interesting that Walberg used the secretary as the source of information.

³ H. Walberg, "The Academic President: Colleague, Administrator, or Spokesman?" *Educational Record*, Spring 1969, p. 198.

Again individual comments by secretaries were of value regarding what a president does on campus:

That routine paper, paper deal. (He never comes up for the third time.) I try to relieve him of reading anything that is unnecessary, but am ashamed to confront him with that deluge of mail when he returns exhausted to campus. (New York)

And from the ever-wry correspondent in North Carolina:

1. Clearing desk.
2. Telling troubles to secretary.
3. Trying to decide which meeting to go to next (running out of excuses).

A secretary from Colorado noted:

The three "C's": Conferences, Correspondence, Coffee.

SUCCESS TRAITS IN PRESIDENTS

Secretaries were asked: In your opinion, what three characteristics of a president are most likely to help him succeed in his work? Responses are tabulated in Table V.

The most frequently mentioned characteristic leading to presidential success, as reported by secretaries, was "ability to work with people" under item 3, *Human relation skills*. This was followed by a tie between *listening and patience* and *administrative ability*.

The leading individual categories were: (1) sense of humor, humility (54); (2) ability to work with people (54); (3) ability to listen, patience (45); (4) administrative ability 45; and (5) intelligence, judgment, and "cool." These findings do not differ significantly from those found when presidents were asked to list the more important ingredients for success of a president. (See Chapter 9.)

The secretaries tended to emphasize the "personal skills" characteristics or attributes, although, as found with the presidents, human relations skills and administrative ability were most frequently mentioned as characteristics conducive to success.

There were, again, some interesting individual responses by secretaries to the question on the three characteristics of a president most likely to help him be successful in his work:

1. Having a good secretary.
2. Having a wife who does not ask questions.
3. Having a dean who can carry on the work while the president is away. (North Carolina)

1. Hide of a hippopotamus.
2. Wisdom of Solomon.
3. A great sense of humor. (New York)

1. Wisdom of Solomon.
2. Patience of Job.
3. Courage of Daniel . . . and a robust sense of humor. (Washington)

Clairvoyance and vision; coping with the NOW generation while planning for tomorrow. (Massachusetts)

Ability to listen *and understand*. Some men may be good listeners but it might "go in one ear and out the other." (Illinois)

TABLE V
CHARACTERISTICS HELPFUL FOR SUCCESS IN THE PRESIDENCY
AS REPORTED BY THE PRESIDENT'S SECRETARY

Characteristic	First Choice	Second Choice	Third Choice	Total Frequency	Percentage of Total
1. Personal qualities.....				189	37.9
a. sense of humor, humility..	20	13	21		
b. intelligence, judgement, "cool".....	16	13	10		
c. objective, fair, consistent.	11	11	11		
d. drive, dedication, dili- gence.....	12	8	11		
e. integrity, personal honesty	8	11	2		
f. energy, stamina.....	4	1	5		
g. decisiveness.....	2	3	2		
h. courage, "guts".....	1	0	3		
2. administrative skills.....				128	25.7
a. administrative ability....	16	16	13		
b. communication skills.....	8	8	9		
c. educational leadership skills.....	6	8	10		
d. public relations abilities..	1	3	10		
e. ability to delegate author- ity.....	5	5	3		
f. skill with board and its members.....	0	3	2		
3. Human relations skills.....				125	25.1
a. ability to work with people	23	15	16		
b. ability to listen, patience	18	21	6		
c. diplomacy and tact with people.....	6	10	7		
d. persuasiveness.....	2	1	0		
4. Professional background.....				50	10.0
a. professional training and experience.....	11	11	9		
b. philosophical commitment to the community college movement.....	5	8	6		
5. Miscellaneous.....				6	1.2

Cracking the whip when necessary with a velvet touch. (Origin unknown)

Ability to implement new policies without hard feelings. (Is that possible?) (Maryland)

1. Genius.

2. Compassion.

3. Prayer. (California)

FUTURE PROBLEMS FACING PRESIDENTS

As the central theme of this report is to develop useful information for new presidents, an inquiry was added to the secretaries' questionnaire on what prob-

lems for presidents they thought were likely to increase in severity in the immediate future. The results are in Table VI.

Though secretaries differed from presidents in reporting that the president spent more time on administrative details and correspondence than on anything else when on campus, they agreed on what constitutes the great future problems facing presidents—finances and faculty.

TABLE VI
PROBLEMS FOR PRESIDENTS INCREASING IN SEVERITY
AS REPORTED BY THE PRESIDENT'S SECRETARY

Problems	First Choice	Second Choice	Total Frequency	Percentage of Total
1. Financial.....			117	35.9
a. fund raising.....	58	39		
b. facility financing.....	7	13		
2. Faculty.....			83	25.2
a. unrest, militancy.....	29	21		
b. recruitment and retention of quali- fied instructors.....	7	15		
c. staffing.....	6	7		
3. Students.....			50	12.1
a. unrest, militancy.....	12	13		
b. increasing numbers.....	12	13		
4. Social unrest and community demands.....			26	7.9
a. community demands.....	7	8		
b. activism in community.....	3	8		
5. Educational and instructional problems.....			22	6.7
a. holding to community college phi- losophy and programs.....	4	4		
b. improving quality of education....	3	5		
c. developing new programs.....	1	5		
6. State and federal intervention in local affairs.....	7	4	11	3.3
7. Demands on president's time by reports and other trivia.....	3	2	5	1.5
8. Board problems and demands.....	1	1	2	.9
9. Miscellaneous.....	6	7	13	3.9
			329	

Of some interest was the category "Students," in Table VI. It will be recalled that the president was reported by neither the secretary nor the second-ranking administrator as being involved significantly with student matters, but Table VI shows that secretaries report they anticipate students to be a future problem for presidents. It may well follow that new presidents can expect to spend more time with students and student matters than have presidents in the past.

Some individual comments of note regarding future problems were:

1. Staying within the budget while trying to keep college from becoming too depersonalized because of increasingly large classes.
 2. Retaining (as opposed to obtaining) good faculty. (Ohio)
1. Hiring a good secretary.
 2. Wondering if he will still have a job the next year. (North Carolina)

On the whole, the secretaries proved enthusiastic and worthwhile respondents. Two comments in particular made the study a pleasant one:

From Florida: "This was fun—thanks for asking our opinions!

And from New York:

"How pleasant it is to spill all this. I am constantly in the position of being quiet, pleasant, and discreet. It's great to spout about it. I love my job! I love my boss! and (don't laugh), I love the faculty! We have great students. I will have to be carried out of here feet first."

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

Secretaries proved a most valuable source of information about the presidency. They were included in this study as community college presidents had recommended that the outgoing president's secretary was the best person, after the dean, to help a newly arrived chief administrator get acclimated. Also, as she occupies a pivotal position at the college at any time, operating at that vortex of power to which people naturally drift for information and assistance and in which she enjoys total exposure, she must develop an ability to analyze all manner of situations and people. As it is not uncommon for an executive secretary to be moved out when a new president moves in, and as it is not uncommon for executive secretaries just to be worn out by sheer pressure and overwork, those who replied to this questionnaire (sent to them through the president) can be assumed to possess critical minds and high survival tendencies.

Secretaries did not agree down the line with either the president or the dean on what constitutes the greater pressure on the president. Secretaries reported administrative details, including correspondence, as the greatest pressure on the president, though they reported faculty and finance nearly as high. Secretaries and presidents did agree, essentially, on what a president does on and off campus, with both noting the high demands on time by meetings—either at the college or elsewhere.

Though students were *not* reported as a major pressure on the president, as occupying much of his time while on campus, students were viewed by secretaries as one of the more likely problems of the future.

The secretary to the president reported three characteristics of presidents as most likely to help them be successful: ability to work with people, administrative ability, and patience with the ability to listen and understand.

PERSPECTIVES OF THE PRESIDENT AS REPORTED BY FACULTY ASSOCIATION PRESIDENTS

Impressions can be misleading, but one gets a strong impression when talking with old-line presidents that they regard the modern faculties of community colleges much in the manner of the old vaudeville "one-liner" on women, "You can't live with 'em, and you can't live without 'em." The tenor of the times is most adequately expressed by Lombardi, who wrote:

In a period of rising faculty influence in the governance of junior colleges, it is natural to become discouraged or to feel that the president is losing his position. Conflict seems to be replacing harmony. The one-happy-family idea has disappeared, assuming that it ever existed. The changes that have taken place and that may continue to take place are not easy to accept, for no matter how democratically inclined a president may be he will resist the efforts of the faculty, especially as they are pushed by faculty organizations, to deprive him of his administrative responsibilities and to some extent of his leadership role.¹

Lombardi also discussed the role of the faculty association and, in this vein, a secretary to a president was quoted in the last chapter as reporting, "Individually they [faculty] are great people. Collectively they are a bunch of unruly kids, taking potshots at each other and running to mother with tales."

A new president needs to listen to the advice of presidents more experienced than he, but this is not to suggest that he automatically heed this advice. While it is true that the rules are shifting over the principal concern of governance, it is equally true that practices of the past, however predictable and workable by a past generation of presidents, have led to the need for change as viewed by the faculty. What is obviously needed is either *new* people or *old* people capable of changing to *new views* in order for a confrontation to become a consensus. The faculty view, oft quoted, that a "dean is a mouse training to be a rat" and the administrative view that the faculty ought to go back to holding classes and keeping their mouths shut are neither one appropriate for the present. Riess put part of the challenge of the faculty forward by noting:

The junior college faculty interacts with the president in many ways—intellectually, professionally, and socially—both formally and informally. Today, however, the most critical area of relationship is that which involves institutional governance. Traditionally the role of the faculty has been one of advisement, as is implied in the often used phrase "faculty participation in the governance of the college." It is my thesis that the

¹ John Lombardi, "The Junior College President and the Faculty," in B. Lamar Johnson, ed., *The Junior College President* (Los Angeles: Junior College Leadership Program, Graduate School of Education, University of California, Occasional Report No. 13, May 1969), p. 52.

evolving relationship of the faculty and the president must be a partnership. This view recognizes the faculty as a part of institutional government and implies a formal organizational structure operating on the basis of shared responsibility.²

And Harper summarized Riess's whole presentation in these major points:

His thesis: that the evolving relationship of the faculty and the president must be a partnership, and that this recognizes the faculty as a part of institutional government and implies a formal organizational structure operating on the basis of shared responsibility. Mr. Riess made some other points:

The president, through his administrative staff, often rules as the benevolent autocrat of a generally conservative institution. Faculties form pseudo-democratic structures which give the external appearance of participation in government.

There is usually very little communication directly between the faculty and board, or between administration, faculty and the board, which hampers involvement of faculty in decision making.

Teachers are voiceless outside the classroom because administrators have centralized control and often govern by mimeograph.

The solution: there should be a faculty oriented administrative structure directly responsible to the faculty with presidential approval—and having decision-making responsibility in a wide range of categories—from development of the budget, to educational and curriculum policy making, and to appointment of all non-instructional administrative personnel, including the office of president.³

The question of faculty-presidential relationships apparently centers on the concept of "governance." This, as does any other issue, has a history, which Garrison tried to put in perspective:

... the lines between faculty and administration—in whatever areas—are bound to blur and become less definite than they have been in the past. Historically, junior colleges have been administrators' institutions, with all major decisions—even, in some colleges... such as what textbooks to order, and the like—made by administrators. Again, in the recent past, some of this has resulted from the intellectual and operational habits of former school principals and superintendents who become junior college presidents and deans. But across the nation, the trend is toward greater and greater faculty participation in the running of junior colleges, in all major aspects, including basic policy-making.

However, greater faculty participation in governance requires a new set of responsibilities and... understandings, both by teachers and by administrators.⁴

And Harper, after quoting Lombardi, posed a pertinent question:

"Though the faculty may wish to participate, it is unlikely that they will want the responsibility of administering and it is not possible for a multitude to assume the role of leadership. Faculty organizations, like labor organizations, will lose their reason for being if they become administrative organs because then they will be the antagonists of their own members, they will be the producers of grievances. Unless we experience a form of sovietization, it is likely that demands on the president will be made just short of usurping his functions as administrator and leader."

Reasonable opportunity for participation in administration may be a hang-up for administrators and faculty alike. Whether administrators and faculty can ever agree on what is "reasonable opportunity for participation" is a moot question.⁵

² L. C. Riess, "The Faculty and the Junior College President," in Johnson, ed., *op. cit.*, p. 67.

³ W. A. Harper, *Like It Is* (Los Angeles: Junior College Leadership Program Graduate School of Education, University of California, October 1968), p. 20.

⁴ R. Garrison, "Junior College Missions: Ideals, Myths, Realities," in *Minnesota Junior College* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota, January 1968).

⁵ Harper, *op. cit.*

The issue can be put differently by centering on the issue of educational leadership as opposed specifically to governance:

Throughout, the authors' belief that educational leadership must take positive dimension is brought out. Junior colleges nationwide simply cannot afford to coast, absorbing ideas from other levels of education, swallowing innovation, yet remaining static. They must now seize the initiative in developing, implementing and, above all, in evaluating their practices. Someone, some group, within the institution must do it. Right now it is, or should be, the president's responsibility. Eventually, it may devolve to the faculty but it cannot be long avoided by both if the college is to persevere.⁶

Governance is defined here as the way society transfers to social institutions the right to control. The social institution involved is education generally and the emerging community college specifically.

Gallagher put this in a comparative and historical perspective:

The legal framework of higher education in the United States differs substantially from . . . the patterns in most other nations.

The typical continental university is an arm of government.

The typical British university is run by its professors, with a rotating residing officer who is more of a ceremonial figurehead . . .

The Latin American universities present a third pattern . . . Student demonstrations in Latin America are deadly serious and aimed directly at seizing power. Since students already run the institutions, their objective is to take over the government.

North American colleges and universities have been accustomed to operate under an unique device, the lay governing board.

Certain consequences flow from this fact. Neither president nor faculty nor students have any rights and privileges except those which are enjoyed under the decisions reached within the board. The only responsibilities carried on campus are those which the board decides to rest there. The typical American college or university therefore starts with an almost military—certainly an authoritarian—chain of command, from the trustees through the president to the campus.

A second consequence is equally important. The lay board, by virtue of its absolute powers, also has an absolute responsibility for maintaining the integrity of the institution under its governance.

The lay governing board is finally accountable for everything that the university is and does.

The faculties, if they are to enjoy the privileges of academic freedom so dearly bought and so precariously defended, must stand ready to assume full responsibility for the whole of the learning process of every student.

Presidents and deans and other administrative persons discharge their obligations in a variety of ways: by refusing to lose the individual in the routines; by adhering to principle even when the easy compromise beckons; by holding faculty members and students accountable for respecting the policies of the institution—and rewarding those who do, as well as failing to reward those who do not; by exhausting their inventive ingenuity in discovering democratic alternatives for autocratic procedures.⁷

Further emphasizing the effect of this on the community college, supporting both Riess's and Lombardi's previous points, Gleazer wrote:

Not only are the community and the college constantly changing; so are concepts of administration. All that remains of the patriarchal president who spoke benevolently of "my faculty" is a slightly nostalgic memory. Now everybody "wants in on the act." Faculty and students want to be involved where their interests are at stake. And those

⁶ A. M. Cohen and J. E. Roueche, *Institutional Administration or Educational Leader? The Junior College President* (Washington, D.C.: American Association of Junior Colleges, 1969), p. ix.

⁷ B. C. Gallagher, "Who Runs the Institution?" *Proceedings of a Conference* (Denver: Western Interstate Commission on Higher Education, December 1966).

interests have wide applicability to the college program and procedure. Both a form of organization and a point of view are called for which result in an accommodation of all who participate in the learning process through division of labor related to their professional preparation and institutional assignments. New forms of organization may very well be needed.⁸

At issue, as noted, is not only governance but leadership, a quality more complicated to define than governance, and one that deans are already on record as wanting a president to exhibit. (See Chapter 5.)

A sociological definition of leadership has been put forward by Gibbs:

Leadership is actually that which in any particular situation enables an individual to: (1) contribute significantly to group movement in the direction of a recognized goal, and (2) be perceived as doing so by fellow members.⁹

Schultz brought this into the context of the community college:

Early research in the area of administrative leadership was based on the unitary trait theory of leadership. Principal postulates of this theory are: (1) that there exists a "leadership trait" which is innate or inherent; (2) that leaders alone possess this trait; (3) that, as with other traits, individuals vary in the degree to which they possess it; and (4) the trait, when possessed, functions with equal force in a variety of situations. The theory implied that the trait could be identified and measured. To date no such trait has been identified though a great deal of time and effort has gone into trying to do so.¹⁰

The relationship of leadership to the quality of both faculty and of their instruction was stressed by Garrison:

... if the college is unsure or confused in its purposes, in its definition of its mission, it is likely that the teacher will be unsure. The teacher who is not convinced of the worthiness of the direction of his college—or who misunderstands it—is likely to be uneasy, often quarrelsome and rebellious, and prone to go about his job with a certain sullen self-pity. If such is the case on a campus, it indicates a real communication breakdown between administration and faculty.¹¹

The central purpose of leadership was reiterated by Cohen and Roueche:

A leader is one who moves the group toward its goals. The quality of leadership does not necessarily relate to the leader's being liked or feared by group members. The essential is that there be effect. Without group movement toward defined ends, there has been, by definition, no leadership exerted.¹²

It is to be remembered, however, that the faculty of a community college is *not* the same as the faculty of a university or four-year college—a basic position of this report whether one considers the president or the faculty. Garrison substantiates this view:

... the impression (indeed, the conviction) deepened that the junior college teacher is—or may be becoming—a new breed of instructor in higher education. Markedly different in significant ways from the usual situation of his four-year colleagues are his conditions of instruction, his aims, and his professional and philosophical attitudes towards his task. Not simply a post-high school instructor of grades thirteen and fourteen,

⁸ E. J. Gleazer, Jr., *This Is the Community College* (Boston: Houghton-Mifflin, 1968), p. 109.

⁹ Cecil A. Gibbs, "Leadership," in *Handbook of Social Psychology* (Cambridge, Mass.: Addison-Wesley, 1954), p. 889.

¹⁰ R. E. Schultz, "A Comparative Analysis of the Junior College Deans's Leadership Behavior," *The Dimensions of the Dean's Task* (Boone, N.C.: The proceedings of a conference held August 6-10, 1962, and jointly published by the Florida State University and the University of Florida), pp. 18-19.

¹¹ Garrison, *op. cit.*

¹² Cohen and Roueche, *op. cit.*, p. 8.

he is in his own desire, and view, a colleague in a new kind of collegiate effort, as yet ill-defined and in furious flux.¹²

It finally comes to the fact the president cannot teach all the students himself. In discussing the central role of the second-ranking administrator, it was noted that the president must work with others. Nowhere is this clearer than with the faculty. Lombardi has addressed this thoughtfully:

In the light of this background, the question is posed, what does a president think he must do or how does he think he must act in order to create a relationship with the faculty which will enable him to accomplish the purposes of his office? There are means available to the president which will make his relationship with the faculty a satisfying one, but the means will not give the president the key to the elimination of conflict or tension, even though he is "more concerned with keeping [his] faculty happy than with placating any other single group." Administrative ability and leadership qualities depend on too many variables to be subject to simple analysis. The most that can be done is to indicate some attributes that are essential; but after these are pointed out it still comes back to the qualities of the individual, his ability, his perceptions.¹⁴

For the president to know how to proceed, it seems reasonable that he be armed with as much information as possible. Central to this will be an understanding of how the faculties presently perceive the president. An attempt to get at this understanding led to this study.

THE SURVEY—METHOD AND RESPONSES

The survey of faculty impressions and perspectives of the presidency was made by questionnaire. The inquiry form was sent through the office of the president of the college—*no direct approach to the faculty was attempted*. Questions were directed to the "President of the most representative teaching faculty association," with the college president asked to forward it to the appropriate individual. Responses were the most varied of any received to the many questionnaires sent out during the course of this entire study:

1. Questionnaires completed and returned with usable responses	139
2. Questionnaires completed and returned with unusable responses	2
3. Other responses	21
a. supplementary letters	9
b. "can't fill it out"	5
c. "won't fill it out"	5
d. mistakes (college president filled it out)	2

—
162
=

A certain amount of emotionalism was identifiable in some of the "other" responses. For example, from North Carolina:

Thank goodness, I am fortunate enough to inform you that we do not have a teaching faculty association. In this small college, our entire faculty and administrative staff function as one group without any separate organization for the teaching faculty.

¹² R. H. Garrison, *Junior College Faculty: Issues and Problems; A Preliminary National Appraisal* (Washington, D.C.: American Association of Junior Colleges, 1967), p. 15.

¹⁴ Lombardi, *op. cit.*, p. 46.

From Virginia:

... College does not have a faculty association of the type to which your questionnaire is directed. We do have a very active faculty which is intimately involved in all aspects of the College. All persons at the College who hold faculty rank including the President are considered members of the faculty. We do *not* feel that any organizational structure which would directly pit the teaching faculty against the administrative faculty is healthy. We feel that it is the duty of each member of the faculty to do everything within his power to build a successful and respected college. Those of us in the administrative area of the college feel that it is our responsibility to keep the teaching faculty informed of administrative matters, to involve the faculty in every decision whenever possible, to provide the faculty with the best physical facilities possible, and to obtain for the faculty the highest possible salaries.

Again from North Carolina:

At [X Community] College we do not have a faculty association. I, as Dean of the College, act as chairman of the faculty which meets monthly. "Faculty" at our institution includes persons such as the President, Dean, Business Manager, Dean of Students, Registrar, and Director of Counseling Service although these persons are not full-time teaching faculty. In fact several of these persons do not teach at all.

From a New York community college:

At the present time, there are two organized groups contending for membership. They are the *United Federation of College Teachers* and the *Legislative Conference*. Their activities have not yet crystallized here and it is not possible to say how many members of the faculty belong to either group or which is, once again, the most representative.

And a very conservative approach from Massachusetts:

This type of organization is [a] maverick in an era of education in which students and faculty are all crying for power. At ... Junior College the administration retains as much power as possible. In my candid opinion, this pleases the president, the administration, the faculty, and students.

RESULTS

Only about 18 percent of the colleges (162 out of 900) were heard from, confirming an anticipated low percentage of response. There were two sources of attrition—the college president, who might or might not forward the questionnaire, and the faculty association president, who might or might not answer it and return it.

WHAT KINDS OF FACULTY ASSOCIATIONS ARE THERE?

Though faculty perspectives of the president were the prime motivation for launching this inquiry, it was important to discover what kinds of associations exist in the community college. The importance of this question was stressed by Cleazer:

Another question deals with the identity of the community college teacher. Where is his professional home? Beyond the campus where do his affiliations lie? Some say he belongs with organizations like the American Association of University Professors. Others suggest that membership in state or national affiliates of the National Education Association would be more suitable. In some cities community college faculty have joined with the American Federation of Teachers. And in a few cases the teachers have set up their own statewide association to speak for them at the state level. This

problem takes on greater urgency and intensity because community college faculties are not only seeking identification with appropriate organizations beyond the campus but are also being sought by them—and in energetic fashion.

The issue of affiliation has not been decided. Nor is it likely that all faculty will identify with the same organizations. The diversified interests of community college teachers may prescribe affiliation with more than one group. But regardless of whether one organization is chosen or many, the critical issue is the possibility that organizations external to the community college will, as a result of value judgments required for membership, fragment this institution or divert it from its designated role.¹⁵

TABLE I
KINDS OF FACULTY ASSOCIATIONS RESPONDING

Kinds of Faculty Associations	Frequency	Percentage of Total Responding
1. Faculty association for a single campus.....	53	39.0
2. Faculty senate for a single college.....	18	13.3
3. AHE or state chapter of NEA.....	11	7.9
4. Faculty council for single college.....	7	5.0
5. None formed (new college).....	19	13.6
6. Miscellaneous.....	31	22.1
	139	99.9

As shown in Table I, the dominant form of faculty organization reporting in this study was the faculty association formed for a single campus, though it was not in a majority. The absence of AAUP (American Association of University Professors) as a major source of respondents was *not* expected, and this finding should be viewed as suspect until verified further (and it should be remembered there will be many AAUP chapters on campuses represented here by another association). The absence of unions was also *not* expected. Two open-end responses in letters indicate, however, that some unions are present:

From Wisconsin:

Until December 20, 1967, the Faculty Association and the Teachers' Union jointly negotiated with the Board. The Faculty Association asked for recognition as a single bargaining unit through the Wisconsin Labor Relations Board. An election was held and the union won.

And from Illinois:

For many years faculty organizations were expected to tune their requests to the financial and organizational limitations imposed by the board and administration. Our faculty organization honestly uses the word "union" in its title and has a written agreement with the Board which is in turn binding on the college administration. It is quite obvious that the union feels this older tactic of asking the faculty welfare organization to "appreciate" the problems of the board has been overworked. The current attitude seems to be that it is up to the board and administration to solve the financial problems—not to ask the union to do it for them. In short, I doubt if the representatives of the union have attempted to define the role or worry about "the sources of greatest pressure on the president..."

¹⁵ Gleazer, *op. cit.*, pp. 122-123.

While this may be somewhat surprising to you, my guess is that it is an attitude which will spread to most colleges unless there is a radical revision of the administrative structure. It has been remarked that if schools are going to operate like General Motors, then you have to expect the faculty to act like the United Auto Workers. I like to think that we are engaged in blazing new trails in faculty-administration relationships at the . . . College and that our experience will someday be valuable to other colleges as well.

It is likely that the issue of faculty representation will become more critical and that a move towards state-wide faculty associations of some kind will come, as is presently the case in Minnesota. The move in California, where law requires the presence of a faculty senate, and in Washington, where the law requires the faculty to elect a bargaining body with which to deal directly with the board and from which the president of the college is excluded (from the faculty organization and from representation but not necessarily from the bargaining sessions with the board) but in which all other administrators are included, signal a trend that will no doubt grow in importance—that of faculties dealing directly with boards and not through presidents on matters concerning their interests and welfare.

FACULTY PERSPECTIVES OF THE PRESIDENT

As with the inquiry forms sent to deans and secretaries, the presidents of the teaching faculty associations were asked what they regard as the principal pressures on the president of the college, the principal function of a president,

TABLE II
THE PRINCIPAL PRESSURES ON THE PRESIDENT
AS REPORTED BY FACULTY REPRESENTATIVES

PRESURES A. Most Frequency Given	First Choice	Second Choice	Third Choice	Total Frequency
1. Faculty.....	24	31	22	77
2. Finances, fund raising.....	31	13	13	57
3. Community pressures, parents.....	14	18	18	50
4. Board of trustees.....	23	7	10	40
5. Students.....	4	15	14	33
6. Total staff and administrators.....	4	7	3	14
7. Campus development, planning.....	4	4	5	13
8. Administrative details, trivia.....	3	4	6	13
9. Miscellaneous.....	7	14	12	33
	114	113	113	340

B. Highest Ranking Pressure	On Scale of 1st Choice = 1, etc.
1. Board of trustees.....	1.68
2. Finances, fund raising.....	1.69
3. Faculty.....	1.99
4. Community pressures, parents.....	2.08
5. Students.....	2.33

the characteristics of a president most likely to lead to success in office, and the future problems likely to face presidents. Added was the question: How can a president best help faculty carry out their legitimate functions?

Pressures on the President

As reported by faculty representatives, the principal pressures on the college president are shown in Table II.

In Table II, two differences can be seen immediately when faculty responses are compared with those of presidents, deans, and secretaries. They are that students are seen as a more formidable pressure by faculties, and the word "parents" was used for the first time. Though *visitors* to the president's office (as reported by both the president and secretary as occupying the president's time) may have been parents, the fact was never specifically noted. It may be that the faculty assumes this as a pressure—parents perhaps complaining about grades, typical of experiences in the high school where administrators are often viewed as the "thin blue line" between the parent and the classroom teacher.

As with secretaries, faculty see the board as a more intense pressure than do either deans or presidents.

TABLE III
THE PRINCIPAL FUNCTION OF A PRESIDENT
AS REPORTED BY FACULTY REPRESENTATIVES

Activity or Duty	Frequency	Percentage of Total
1. Administration and supervision.....	21	15.1
2. Public relations and politics.....	18	12.9
3. Leadership.....	16	11.5
4. Coordinator and arbitrator.....	15	10.8
5. Improving quality of educational program.....	14	10.0
6. Planning new programs and courses.....	14	10.0
7. Finances, fund raising, budget.....	8	5.7
8. Support of faculty and associations.....	8	5.7
9. Miscellaneous.....	13	9.2
10. None given, no comment.....	12	8.6
	139	99.5

The Chief Function of a President

There is a substantial difference between the deans' responses and the faculty's to the question on the chief function of a president when compared with the above table. (See Table IV, Chapter 5.) Deans stressed leadership as the principal function of a president. Faculty representatives see his principal function as administration and coordination. However, in categories 5, 6, and 7 (educational program development, new course planning, and supporting faculty), the faculty views the president as much more properly involved in instructional processes than does the dean.

TABLE IV
CHARACTERISTICS HELPFUL FOR SUCCESS IN THE PRESIDENCY
AS REPORTED BY FACULTY REPRESENTATIVES

Characteristic	First Choice	Second Choice	Third Choice	Total Frequency	Percentage of Total
1. Administrative skills.....				160	43.8
a. administrative ability...	11	23	25		
b. skills with faculty pressures and negotiations.....	12	11	6		
c. public relations skills....	8	6	9		
d. communication skills....	6	7	9		
e. educational leadership...	8	8	2		
f. ability to delegate.....	2	2	3		
g. skill with board.....	0	1	1		
2. Personal qualities.....				101	27.7
a. objectivity, fairness.....	11	7	4		
b. sense of humor, humility	8	7	7		
c. intelligence, wisdom.....	6	5	4		
d. integrity, honesty.....	7	2	6		
e. drive, dedication.....	3	2	3		
f. courage, "guts".....	1	4	3		
g. decisiveness.....	4	2	0		
h. energy, stamina.....	2	2	1		
3. Professional background.....				51	13.9
a. professional training and experience.....	12	8	8		
b. philosophical commitment.....	10	10	3		
4. Human relations skills.....				45	12.3
a. ability to work with people.....	10	7	8		
b. ability to listen, patience	3	2	3		
c. diplomacy, tact.....	4	4	1		
d. persuasiveness.....	1	1	1		
5. Handling student pressures.....				7	1.7
6. Miscellaneous.....				1 $\frac{1}{2}$.3
				365	99.8

As with the other questionnaires, some comments were worthy of being singled out for attention:

As any true leader, he must be a servant of many groups. He must set up a number of goals letting these groups choose one, getting them committed and involved, thus responsible. (Montana)

Regretfully, finding a supply of money to operate. Primarily, provision of quality education to the students. (Illinois)

His functions are so many it is difficult to sum them up in any concrete way except as to run an efficient institution. (Florida)

To exert forceful leadership in the establishment and development of an instructional program and supporting services to meet the needs of the community. (Texas)

To provide leadership while retaining the attitude of service to the faculty. (California)

He's not "the captain of the ship," but more the "chairman of the board." He is a wise and shrewd coordinator who knows best how to stabilize and encourage the talents around him. (California)

Characteristics Helpful to a President's Potential Success

The leading individual categories were: (1) administrative ability (59); (2) skills with faculty matters (29); (3) public relations skills (23); (4) skills in communication (22); and (4) objectivity and fairness (22).

Faculty representatives differed substantially and significantly in rating the characteristics that might lead to a successful presidency. Whereas secretaries emphasize the personal characteristics as critical, the faculty clearly see administrative ability as the key to success. The leading individual categories found in Table V, Chapter 6, make a sharp contrast with those found in Table IV in this chapter. Only one of the secretaries' choices is from administrative skills while four of the five leading categories from faculty are from administrative skills.

This would support Lombardi's contention (see page 74) that "Though the faculty may wish to participate, it is unlikely they will want the responsibility of administering . . ." ¹⁰ Cohen and Roueche's remark quoted partially on page 76 is also repeated: "The quality of leadership does not necessarily relate to the leader's being liked or feared by group members. The essential is that there be effect. Without group movement toward defined ends, there has been, by definition, no leadership exerted." Faculty representative responses seem to indicate they agree with this statement.

Problems for Future Presidents

Faculty representatives were asked, as were secretaries, what they regarded as the problems that seemed to be increasing in severity for presidents.

Though ranking instructional problems much higher as a likely future problem for presidents, faculty representatives agreed, in essence, with secretaries on the general nature of the problems to come. Faculty representatives reversed the order of faculty and finances reported by secretaries, by ranking faculty matters and interests highest, as future problems for presidents. *It appears that not only do presidents regard the principal pressures as coming from faculty, so also does the faculty, which anticipates it will stay that way.*

From Oregon, an interesting combination of problems was seen and reported:

1. Communication with staff.
2. Attracting capable people to serve on board of education.
3. Securing qualified instructors with community college philosophy.

How Can the President Best Help the Faculty?

In responding to the above question, faculty representatives chose the following as things the president might do to help: (1) offer leadership and promote

¹⁰ Harper, *op. cit.*

morale (11); (2) learn to understand faculty members and communicate with them (10); (3) limit class size for faculties within professional guidelines (8); (4) keep current on the development of new programs (5); and (5) provide funds to develop instructional materials (4).

TABLE V
PROBLEMS FOR PRESIDENTS INCREASING IN SEVERITY
AS REPORTED BY FACULTY REPRESENTATIVES

Problems	First Choice	Second Choice	Third Choice	Total Frequency	Percentage of Total
1. Faculty matters.....				105	30.8
a. recruitment and retention of qualified faculty.....	14	11	9		
b. unrest, militancy, activism.....	10	13	9		
c. staffing.....	2	8	4		
d. increasing salaries of faculty.....	6	3	1		
e. communicating with faculty.....	7	7	4		
2. Financial.....				96	28.1
a. fund raising, securing money.....	41	20	6		
b. financing facilities.....	8	10	11		
3. Educational and instructional problems.....				51	14.9
a. developing new programs to meet student needs..	4	7	8		
b. holding to philosophy of community colleges....	6	6	3		
c. improving quality of offerings.....	1	2	5		
d. curriculum problems, schedules.....	3	5	1		
4. Student-related problems.....				43	12.6
a. unrest, militancy, activism.....	4	12	5		
b. increasing enrollments...	8	3	4		
c. communicating with students.....	0	2	5		
5. Pressures from the community.....				17	5.0
a. social unrest, activism...	2	1	4		
b. general relations.....	3	5	5		
6. State and federal intervention in individual collegematters.....				12	3.5
7. Miscellaneous.....				17	5.0
				341	99.9

There was such a range of responses to this last question that no table is attempted. There was, as one might have predicted, a wealth of comments on this topic. Some of them follow:

Let them get directly involved in things that directly affect them and approach them as experts in their fields. Let them help set up classes, etc. (Montana)

Leave academics to the faculty and give department heads real authority for the development of in-service teaching programs, especially for the new teachers. (Massachusetts)

Expect faculty to devote their time to "professional" duties and to employ non-professionals to perform non-professional duties. (Kansas)

Inspire faculty to be devoted educators; give them opportunities to study, attend professional meetings; recognize achievements and contributions. (Iowa)

... by not alienating the faculty. (Washington)

Select the proper people for the staff and weed out those that don't fit—and quickly. (Oregon)

Hide! (Oregon)

By permitting the faculty to participate and function as the policy-making body of the institution. (Connecticut)

Admit it to full and equal partnership in policy-formulation and constantly invite it to grow in achievement and excellence. (California)

Make governance more democratic; include faculty and students in the decision-making processes. (California)

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

Faculty representatives perceive the presidency in a different way from presidents, deans, or secretaries of presidents. The chief differences appear to be that the faculty want the president involved in educational and faculty matters (deans had been lukewarm about this), but principally they want him to be a good administrator with considerable ability in that area.

Judging from comments made on the question of what presidents can do to best help faculties, *faculties want in* on the matter of governance and policy making, but *they do not want the president out*.

A new president apparently need not worry too much about being popular or liked as a person because of his skills with people or his personal characteristics. Other than wanting a president who is consistent and fair, faculty representatives want leaders who can provide for them the administrative skill necessary to run the college well.

PERSPECTIVES OF THE PRESIDENT: MRS. PRESIDENT SPEAKS

The possible impact a president's wife has on a college starts with the amount of influence she has on the president. Additionally, she will have a direct impact, as she is commonly called "the first lady" whether she wishes to be or not.

The president's wife has an *official function* at the college her husband serves, but she does *not* have a *position*. The *function* of the "first lady" is much more than honorary; she can have an effect on a college without ever going to the campus or near her husband's office. It is, however, a most unfortunately advised president's wife who attempts to transcend certain basic functions and dabble directly in college affairs. This would assume that a position exists, which is not the case at all.

Newly elected presidents, or those aspiring to this office, will do well to assess "the home front" beforehand. It has been reported recently that community college presidents, as with business executives, are increasingly mobile.¹ Indeed, following the adage "In order to move up, you must move!" a willingness to relocate may be increasingly necessary for a person seeking a community college presidency. But, if the president-elect—each time he moves—has a wife who clutches a leg of the piano and is reluctant to leave town, he soon will be in marital difficulty and may actually soon be paying alimony. This possible travail can be avoided if the decision to take a presidency represents a consensus of those most affected—the president's family.

While it has been stressed earlier as important that a president have a loyal secretary, it must be stressed even more strongly that the "home front" must be serene and represent a place to which he can retire, comfortably and securely. Wives also seem to recognize this. Harper, in recording the views of presidents' wives at a national invitational workshop for new presidents and their wives, reported:

A college president's wife should have as her first goal that of looking after the health and well-being of her husband, understanding the pressures and problems as well as the hopes and aspirations that may be a part of his daily routine. Providing a good home life is essential.²

ROLE OF THE PRESIDENT'S WIFE

The roles and responsibilities of the "first lady" of a community college are diverse and at times seem to conflict as she seeks to maintain balance and order

¹ J. H. Carmichael, "Origin and Mobility of Presidents," *Junior College Journal*, XXXIX, No. 8 (May 1969), p. 32.

² W. A. Harper, *Like It Is* (Los Angeles: Junior College Leadership Program, Graduate School of Education, University of California, October 1968), p. 9.

for her home and self while supporting both her husband and the college he serves. A principal responsibility for a wife, particularly of a newly arrived president, is to understand something of the educational philosophy, purposes, and goals of the community college in general and of the specific college her husband heads. In this connection, Barbara Morgan has observed:

The wife of a new two-year college president will come quickly to know that the open-door philosophy has very little to do with the U. S. Department of State and the history of relations with China. She will also come quickly to realize that the two-year college is not just a downward extension of the four-year college, regardless of the aspirations of a good many of the academic faculty. Neither, however, is the college an upward extension of the high school.³

Luskin reported the problems most difficult for wives of newly appointed junior college presidents (where the president had *little or no* previous experience in the junior college) as: (1) starting some type of faculty wives association, (2) understanding college protocol, (3) mastering the necessary human relations skills, and (4) having too little time to be a wife.⁴

In responding to the inquiry form used in this survey, a president's wife in Illinois wrote, "The wife of a president has the same obligation that most wives have. Keep the home a refuge." This wife then added a note that suggested this is not easy: "Officially her job is to fit into whatsoever community she is in. Sometimes this means being quite active and in others sitting back. Don't push until you know your community, and be prepared for anything."

In the paper presented by a president's wife at a conference on the junior college presidency, there was stress placed on *stability* as a principal role of the "first lady." This was defined as "the effort to create a stable platform of support for her husband and family at a domestic level. Stability means a stable family, a stable home to which her husband can retire and in which her children can grow healthily, while all occupy the center stage of one of the most exposed positions in education."⁵

THE SURVEY OF PRESIDENTS' WIVES

The initial suggestion that wives be included in this study of perspectives of the community college president was made in San Francisco, at the national conference of the American Association of Junior Colleges in 1967. Here two wives, knowing of my surveys of the junior college presidents, urged that the views of wives were important in coming to an understanding of the presidency. Wives could, they suggested, report on the pressures, pleasures, prerequisites, and pains of presidents. These and other wives with whom I later talked suggested items that I included in the questionnaire "As Seen by the First Lady"—responses to which form the basis for the present chapter. As with the one for deans and presidents, the inquiry form was sent to presidents with a request they give it to their wives for completion and return.

³ Barbara Morgan, "Mrs. President: Role and Responsibilities," in B. Lamar Johnson, ed., *The Junior College President* (Los Angeles: Junior College Leadership Program, Graduate School of Education, University of California, Occasional Report No. 13, May 1969), p. 130.

⁴ B. Luskin, *A Workshop of Interest to New Presidents with Little Background in the Junior College—An Analysis* (Los Angeles: Graduate School of Education, University of California, unpublished seminar paper, 1967).

⁵ Barbara Morgan, *op. cit.*, p. 130.

In approaching the wives for information, I was particularly anxious to obtain their perspectives of the presidency, but I included items asking what the wives' time was spent on "officially and unofficially." Some parts of the findings have been published elsewhere.⁶

There was no overwhelming response to the questionnaire: only 154 replies to a mailing of 900 (17.1 percent). Presidents have countless opportunities to ignore questionnaires. This time, the opportunity was transferred to their wives, many of whom promptly took similar advantage. However, the wives who did take time from their own busy schedules to complete the inquiry held important and insightful views.

Those who responded seemed in agreement with the statement: "There is a need for the 'professional' wife, who, after arriving on the scene, determines through study and observation the degree of assistance she can provide and then proceeds to offer the stability and serenity necessary for the college to prosper to the degree she can be discretely influential."⁷

The "first lady" is also under considerable pressure. Many wives of presidents arrive where they did not aspire to be, center stage, and would gladly leave at any moment. The key role, however, is one of opportunity, and it is not all grim. Some reported great satisfaction from the possibility of growth—for the college, for the president, and for themselves.

THE PRESIDENT AS SEEN BY THE PRESIDENT'S WIFE

The first thing a wife is made aware of is the degree of exposure of her husband. Phone calls, not all pleasant, disturb the tranquillity of meals as well as her entire household. And she is unable to avoid the sight of her husband when he comes home pale and shaken after a long, hard day or after a particularly difficult meeting with either the board or dissident faculty members. The wives responding to this survey seemed aware of this, as indicated in their response to the questions regarding why presidents become presidents, why they succeed in the presidency, what they would want to do if they left the presidency, what are the principal pressures on them, and how they gain satisfaction from their work.

Why Presidents Become President

Based on 136 responses, the opinions of wives on why their husbands became presidents are summarized in Table I.

Results included an individual response worth singling out:

From Florida: "Determination and brass!"

For those readers aspiring to their first presidency, it may be well to relate the information from this table to that reported in Chapter 2.

Success Characteristics of Presidents

As reported in Chapter 4, getting to be a president and staying on as one are not necessarily related. Wives were also asked, "What single characteristic contributed most to your husband's success in staying on as president?"

⁶ Barbara Morgan, *ibid.*; and D. A. Morgan, "View from the Home Front—What Presidents' Wives Say about Their Husbands," *Creative Notebook*, II, Nos. 9, 10 (May and June 1968).

⁷ Barbara Morgan, *op. cit.*, p. 135.

TABLE I
WHY PRESIDENTS BECOME PRESIDENTS
AS REPORTED BY THEIR WIVES

Responses	Frequency	Percentage
1. The five D's (drive, determination, devotion, desire, dedication).....	40	29
2. Personality and ability to work with people.....	23	17
3. Administrative, organizational abilities.....	22	16
4. Training, record, experience.....	15	11
5. Intelligence.....	12	9
6. Honesty, fairness.....	9	7
7. Leadership.....	5	4
8. Ability to listen, patience.....	4	3
9. Self-discipline.....	2	1
10. Luck—being in right place.....	2	1
11. Miscellaneous.....	2	1
	136	99

TABLE II
SUCCESS CHARACTERISTICS OF PRESIDENTS
AS REPORTED BY THEIR WIVES

Responses	Frequency	Percentage
1. Ability to work with people.....	27	21
2. Five D's (drive, desire, devotion, dedication, determination).....	24	18
3. Administrative ability and training.....	24	18
4. Honesty, fairness, integrity.....	13	10
5. Hard work, tenacity.....	10	8
6. Patience, listening.....	8	6
7. Leadership.....	7	6
8. Diplomacy.....	5	4
9. Flexibility.....	4	3
10. Sense of humor.....	3	2
11. Miscellaneous.....	5	4
	130	

One wife observed, from Florida, "He never met a stranger!"; another, from Arizona, "I guess his biggest asset is he is approachable. He will help anyone, at any time, in any way he can, to better himself."

In responding to this query, 130 wives chose: (1) ability to work with people (21 percent), (2) drive, desire, devotion, dedication, and determination (18 percent), and (3) administrative ability and training (18 percent).

Pressures on the President

Wives were next asked to identify sources of pressure on the president (see Table III). It is of interest to note that wives substituted, roughly, community pressures for financial ones when compared with responses of presidents and deans. This may reflect the fact the wife is more distant from actual college operations, although directly involved with the community and its view of the college.

TABLE III
PRESSURES ON THE PRESIDENTS
AS REPORTED BY THEIR WIVES

A. MOST FREQUENTLY OCCURRING SOURCES OF PRESSURE	Frequency	Percentage
1. Faculty.....	81	22.4
2. Community.....	61	16.8
3. Board of trustees.....	50	13.8
4. Administrative details.....	40	11.0
5. Financial matters and concerns.....	32	8.7
6. Student problems and interests.....	14	3.8
7. Strivings of junior administrators.....	13	3.6
8. State, county, district boards and agencies.....	10	2.7
9. Campus development and planning.....	8	2.2
10. The business manager and business office.....	5	1.4
11. Parents.....	5	1.4
12. Miscellaneous.....	44	12.1
	363*	99.9

B. HIGHEST INTENSITY OF PRESSURE	Ranking on Seven-Point Scale with "1" Highest
1. Board of trustees.....	1.72
2. Faculty.....	1.77
3. Administrative details.....	1.82
4. Community pressures.....	2.05
5. Financial matters and concerns.....	2.06
6. Strivings of junior administrators.....	2.15
7. Student problems and interests.....	2.86

* As each wife could make up to three choices, total exceeds number responding.

Although the perspectives held by wives on pressures closely resemble those of the president's secretary, wives introduced a new category—that of "strivings of junior administrators." Apparently this represents a source of pressure that the president confides to his wife but not to his secretary. This might relate to the response of the president from Washington State who refused to nominate a "second-ranking administrator" as it "might ruin the balance of an administrative team . . ." (See page 54.)

It should also be noted that wives rated the category of "campus development and planning" much lower than did other groups of respondents.

As with the perspectives of others reported in this monograph, the wives *did not* see students as a major source of pressure on the president.

Should or Will the President Take Another Position

To the question, "Would you prefer that the president had another position?" the wives overwhelmingly answered "No."

Despite the predominantly "No" responses, some wives had contrary views.

TABLE IV
WOULD YOU PREFER THE PRESIDENT
HAD ANOTHER POSITION?

A. Yes or No	Wives Responding
1. Yes.....	27
2. Maybe.....	7
3. No.....	101
B. If "Yes," Why?	
1. Stress.....	15
2. Lack of family, time or life.....	5
3. Better job.....	2
4. Other.....	3
C. If "Yes," What?	
1. Teaching.....	10
2. What he wants.....	3
3. Anything.....	3
4. Other.....	11

One from Illinois wrote, "Yes. Crises can be overwhelming!" and further, that she'd rather her husband was "Caretaker of Walden Pond." Another from Florida wrote, "Yes. I'm tired, tired, tired!" What? "A farmer!!"

In responding to "Do you think the president will want another position eventually?" wives had varying views.

As shown in Table V, 53 wives answered "Yes" to this question and an equal number "No." "Professor" (mentioned 18 times) was the most frequently suggested *other position*. Some wives—such as one from Washington—were quite uncertain, "Yes." What? "God only knows. I don't—and I don't think my husband does. We may have to invent one just to fit him."

A conclusion to these two previous questions was published previously:

It is clear wives responding in this study do *not* want their husbands to leave the presidency now by an overwhelming 101 to 27, with seven undecided. Even though the wives appear fully aware of, and often object to, the pressures involved with the

president's position and their own consequent exposure, they would seem to regard the presidency as desirable for their men.

Even when asked if the president would eventually want another position, of the 53 who said "Yes" (as compared, interestingly, with exactly 53 who said "No"), 26 qualified this by saying the president would want only another presidency—nine said a four-year presidency, nine said a larger two-year college, and eight said a "change of scene."⁸

Wives agree substantially with presidents on what they would want to do upon leaving the presidency (see Chapter 4). Nearly equally attractive to the president, as reported by wives and presidents, would be graduate school teaching. (Combine "professor," "teacher-instructor" for a total of 28.)

TABLE V
WILL THE PRESIDENT EVENTUALLY WANT ANOTHER POSITION?

A. Will Want Another Position?	Wives Responding
1. Yes.....	53
2. Maybe.....	23
3. No.....	53
B. If "Yes" or "Maybe," What Kind of Position?	
1. Professor.....	18
2. Teacher-instructor.....	10
3. Larger two-year college.....	9
4. Four-year college presidency.....	9
5. Change of scene.....	8
6. Consultant.....	3
7. Dean or other administrative job.....	3
8. Miscellaneous.....	7

The Greatest Satisfaction for the President

Lastly, wives were asked from what the president derived the greatest satisfaction. This question is, of course, related to the one asking presidents why they sought to stay on as president.

Among other remarks on what brings the president satisfaction from his position:

From Washington: "Coming home at night!"

From Mississippi: "Taking a school that is at the bottom and making it one of the best."

From Colorado: "T.H.P.—take-home pay!"

Most often mentioned are "sense of achievement" (38) and "student growth" and "contact with students" (29). This last is interesting in that deans reported the president as not involved with students in performing presidential duties (see Chapter 5).

⁸ D. A. Morgan, *op. cit.*, p. 5.

TABLE VI
THE PRESIDENTS' GREATEST SATISFACTIONS
AS REPORTED BY THEIR WIVES

Responses	Frequency	Percentages
A. The college.....	66	47.1
1. Sense of achievement (38)		
2. Challenges, problem solving (13)		
3. Expansion, growth of college (11)		
4. Starting a college (4)		
B. The students.....	41	28.5
1. Growth and contacts (29)		
2. Providing opportunity to disadvantaged (12)		
C. Programs and curriculum.....	18	12.2
1. Program development (13)		
2. Innovating-creating (5)		
D. Personal-professional.....	14	9.8
1. Sense of service (6)		
2. Pay, prestige (4)		
3. Community contacts (2)		
4. Faculty contacts (2)		
E. General and miscellaneous.....	4	2.7
	<hr/> 143	<hr/> 100.3

One wife ended her response on a happy note by writing from Pennsylvania: "Hooray! It helps just knowing someone is interested and might care about us as individuals. Thanks."

SUMMARY

Wives of presidents do affect a community college, willingly or not, and wives participating in this survey seemed to favor a "professional" wife who takes her job, her husband, and the college seriously. Basically, the wife of the president likes her "job," and she does *not* want her husband to leave the presidency. Should the president want to, however, she feels he would seek either a professorship or another presidency.

Wives attribute their husbands' success in becoming a president to their "drive and determination." They report that the reasons for presidents' success are an ability to work with other people and to retain "drive and determination." They also ranked "administrative ability and training" highly.

The next chapter is concerned with how presidents view the characteristics of success in the presidency. One president, from Georgia, reported that one attribute of the most successful president he had known was that "[his] wife was an asset—stayed home and tended family," and that one source of possible difficulty for a president is "a wife who 'climbs' or otherwise rubs others the wrong way."

THE NATURE OF SUCCESS IN THE PRESIDENCY

Art is commonly defined as the result of bringing order to experience and expressing this. Equally acceptable to some is that art is what artists do. Perhaps the community college presidency is, in the final analysis, a form of art and should be studied as such. However, just as it is possible for "experts" to say that one painting is better than another, though they may be hard pressed to say exactly why this is so, it is also possible for "experts" to say that one president is "better" than another. There are presidents who have an aura of success. It seemed worthwhile to try to analyze the characteristics of success in the hope of establishing information of value to those aspiring to be presidents, those newly elected, and even those with considerable experience who might want to test their own judgments against the opinions of many.

Success as a president may be also a relative matter. One questionnaire returned from California in this survey rated the president regarded as most successful as also "the same person who had the most difficulties." This sentiment was repeated from New York: "The most successful President I know is also the one who has had the most difficulties. [This person] has taken over an already established, although young, 2-year college [with] internal difficulties as problematic as external dilemmas of funding, staffing, etc." A respondent from Indiana volunteered: "You are asking questions of time and circumstance that require subjective judgment; almost impossible to answer." From Alabama came a knowing answer to the request for the name of the outstanding president, "It does not seem that names are important, but images are."

In spite of this relativity of success in a presidency, it was assumed there were commonalities in "administrative art." Lombardi notes in support of this contention:

Today's president has a new role; it is not easy, as I have indicated, but it would be a mistake to think that presidents had an easy time in days gone by. The junior college president of the past experienced conflict with the faculty as does today's president, and many were removed or forced to resign for failure to perform satisfactorily. Today's president is confronted by more militant organizations, which are forcing him to share administrative authority with the faculty or, more frequently, with the leaders of their organizations.

Despite these differences, important and harrowing as they may be, the president succeeded or failed then for the same reasons he succeeds or fails today. The qualities of administrative ability and leadership have not changed significantly, despite

the deep insights and rationalizations developed by theorists on administration. These qualities must still be a part of a president's assets. Moreover, these qualities must change with new perceptions by the faculty of their role.¹

It was also noted at the beginning of this study that tenure by itself is not an indication of success. Tenure may indicate only tenacity, an ability to "ride it out" rather than to do much of anything else. Johnson has stressed the role of innovativeness as a response to change:

Change is required and demanded—not merely change for its own sake, but planned change that will provide the means for better serving every citizen in the land. Some changes have already been made. More are needed. Some of these are currently projected. Others may be devised, and the adoption of successful innovations hastened.²

And Riess put change facing presidents in the context of faculty unrest and activism:

Change is coming. It will come with either unnecessary strife and difficulty or with the normal pains of birth. The amount of time and degree of trauma required jointly rests with junior college boards of trustees, presidents, and faculties, individually and collectively.³

THE SURVEY

Success as Viewed by Presidents

An appeal to expert judgment was made to determine characteristics of success in the presidency, and to discover those who were regarded as the more successful presidents. This was done by an inquiry form sent first to *all* community college presidents. (*All* had now grown to 1,020 in the spring of 1968 as compared with 724 in the spring of 1966.)

The questionnaire asked presidents to nominate the most successful president they had ever known, as well as the most successful president still serving as president if the first nominee had retired or died. They were asked, further, to analyze the qualities of the most *unsuccessful* president they had ever known and then to: (1) suggest what could possibly have helped this person; (2) compare the president regarded as most successful with the one regarded as having the most difficulty; and (3) list the three most important ingredients for success and the three sources of greatest difficulty.

One-hundred and forty-eight of the questionnaires were returned completed (14.5 percent), a modest response indeed, although a large response had not really been anticipated since, for the first time, names of individuals were sought. Joseph Cosand, President, St. Louis Junior College District, confided later, "I almost didn't answer that last one. I thought it was simply an invitation to participate in a popularity poll. Then I thought of this one guy who ought to get some credit in my estimation, and I wrote his name down. Once I did that I decided to fill out the rest of the questionnaire!" Thomas Carr, President, Bay Path Junior College, Massachusetts, wrote: "As for the latest questionnaire—The Successful President—I have given considerable thought to this subject over

¹ John Lombardi, "The Junior College President and the Faculty," in B. Lamar Johnson, ed., *The Junior College President* (Los Angeles: Junior College Leadership Program, Graduate School of Education, University of California, Occasional Report No. 13, May 1969), p. 54.

² B. Lamar Johnson, *Islands of Innovation Expanding: Changes in the Community College* (Beverly Hills, Calif.: Glencoe Press, 1969), p. 29.

³ L. C. Riess, "The Faculty and the Junior College President," in Johnson, ed., *The Junior College President*, p. 74.

the years, and I don't believe that one college president is capable of judging another unless he has had an opportunity to serve under him."

State Directors of Community Colleges

The questionnaire was sent also to state directors of community colleges and of vocational education. There were twenty-seven responses. A number of professors of higher education specializing in the community college and well-known foundation personnel were also invited to fill out the questionnaire. Only three did so. These responses have been collated, but are reported separately from those of the 148 presidents.

The More Successful Presidents

From the nomination of community college presidents, state directors of community college or of vocational education, and experts representing either foundations or universities, a list of the twelve most successful presidents in the nation was established. I subsequently interviewed ten of those nominated, usually in their office. The results of these interviews are presented in Chapter 10.

RESULTS OF THE SURVEY

Presidents responded to the items calling for comparisons of successful and unsuccessful characteristics richly and diversely. Two responses set the tone:

From Massachusetts: What are the three most important ingredients of success for a president? has intrigued me for most of this twenty-four year career. I think the answer applies to any administrator, whether he happens to be connected with a college or is in business. . . (1) the ability to inspire and to lead; (2) imagination combined with reasoned judgment; and (3) a sense of timing. The sources of the greatest difficulty for a college president would be, in my judgment, the lack of all or any of the above. I don't believe that educational qualifications, degrees, or anything else have anything to do with it other than providing a quicker sense of communication.

and from Utah: Most presidents are expedients—know of no one doing much creating thinking!

As had been hoped, however, the larger number of responses fit reasonably well into categories previously established in this survey.

Qualities Conducive to Success

Although secretaries and wives underscored personal qualities of presidents as critical to success, presidents opted, as presented in Table I, nearly as strongly for administrative skills as for personal qualities. The leading single category picked by presidents, with nearly half-again as many responses as any other, was that of "administrative ability" (57 responses). This was followed by intelligence and judgment (39); leadership skills (31); drive, energy, and determination (30); and philosophical commitment to the community college (24). Wives mentioned this last category not at all and secretaries but little. State directors, however (Table II), placed considerable emphasis on it.

TABLE I
CHARACTERISTICS OF SUCCESSFUL PRESIDENTS
AS REPORTED BY THEIR PEERS

Characteristics	Total Frequency	Percentage of Total
1. Personal qualities.....	137	35.0
a. intelligence, judgment (39)		
b. drive, energy, dedication (30)		
c. sense of humor, humility (23)		
d. integrity, honesty (19)		
e. acceptable personality (10)		
f. courage, "guts" (9)		
g. objectivity, fairness (5)		
h. flexibility (2)		
2. Administrative skills.....	132	33.8
a. administrative ability (57)		
b. leadership skills (31)		
c. public relations skills (11)		
d. ability to analyze (9)		
e. communication skills (8)		
f. confidence, security (6)		
g. ability to delegate (5)		
h. skill with board (5)		
3. Human relations skills.....	70	17.9
4. Professional training, experience, and philosophical com- mitment.....	27	6.9
a. professional training and experience (3)		
b. philosophical commitmen+ (24)		
5. Miscellaneous.....	25	6.4
	391	100.0

Although only twenty-seven state directors responded, their views were noteworthy. Compared with responses of presidents, there are substantial differences. Chiefly these are: presidents rank administrative ability much higher and state directors rank philosophical commitment (to the community college philosophy) higher than any other single category. State directors differed from both presidents and secretaries by ranking human relations skills as less critical. There were individual comments worthy of note:

Characteristics of success are:

1. Knowledge.
 2. Wisdom.
 3. Knowledge and wisdom (rare). (Maryland)
-
1. Toughness.
 2. Hard work.
 3. Humanism. (Wyoming)

TABLE II
CHARACTERISTICS OF SUCCESSFUL PRESIDENTS
AS REPORTED BY STATE DIRECTORS

Characteristics	Total Frequency	Percentage of Total
1. Administrative skills.....	23	36.5
a. leadership ability (8)		
b. administrative ability (5)		
c. public relations skills (5)		
d. skills with board (2)		
e. other (3)		
2. Personal qualities.....	15	23.8
a. intelligence, judgment (8)		
b. drive, energy, dedication (3)		
c. integrity, honesty (3)		
d. courage, "guts" (1)		
3. Professional background.....	13	20.6
a. professional training and experience (4)		
b. philosophical commitment (9)		
4. Human relations skills.....	8	12.8
5. Faculty skills.....	5	6.3
	63	100.0

1. Sensitivity to community and faculty concerns.
2. Constant concern and search for a way to do it better.
3. Consistency in administrative and educational decisions. (From a foundation executive)

1. A respect for the teaching faculty
2. A democratic leader.
3. Being provocative without being contentious. (Minnesota)

1. Humility and dedication to instruction and learning.
2. Technical knowledge of finances.
3. Ability to organize so that instruction can take place. (A professor of higher education)

And from California: The ability to analyze problems for elements—often misquoted as "horse sense."

Qualities That Seem to Produce Problems

The responses to the question of why the president of their acquaintance with the most difficulties had so many of them were not easily categorized. There was a strong suggestion throughout the responses that it was simply a matter of that particular president lacking those qualities of success listed in Table I. One response from Massachusetts indicating this was quoted on page 97. Another from California:

What are the three most important ingredients of success for a president?

1. Intelligence.
2. "Guts," personal strength, conviction.
3. Honesty (not merely the dollars and cents variety).

What are the three sources of greatest difficulty for a president?

1. Lack of intelligence and/or knowledge.
2. Lack of personal strength ("guts," etc.) or conviction; timidity.
3. Laziness.

The leading responses on sources of difficulty, without frequencies or percentages, were:

1. Unskilled with current faculty problems, such as militancy.
2. Unable to work with people or to trust them.
3. Hampered by lack of adequate financial base.
4. Limited by a poor board or unable to establish sound board relations.
5. Indecisive.

TABLE III
COULD TROUBLED PRESIDENTS HAVE BEEN SUCCESSFUL ELSEWHERE OR IN ANOTHER TIME PERIOD?

A. Could Have Been Successful at a Different Place?	
1. No.....	67
2. Yes.....	37
3. Perhaps.....	16
4. Doubtful.....	9
5. Is successful.....	2
B. Could Have Been Successful in Another Time Period?	
1. No.....	67
2. Yes.....	49
3. Perhaps.....	19
4. Doubtful.....	9
5. Was successful.....	1

6. Isolated from the college.
7. Egotistical.
8. Lacking in administrative skills or knowledge.
9. Stupid.
10. Unable to delegate authority to others.

The opinions of responding state directors followed, roughly, that of the presidents. The exception, as found also in Table II, was the high value assigned to a philosophical commitment to the community college.

Some individual responses of presidents on the principal sources of difficulty:

1. Faculty.
2. Faculty.
3. Faculty (I was one of them for 22 years). (Maryland)

Calling the dirty gray areas either black or white and being fair about it, while maintaining open lines of communication with faculty, students, etc. (Kansas)

1. Youthful inexperience (He can stand one of these, but not both).
2. Dogmatic characteristics.
3. Lack of experience as a teaching faculty member. (Minnesota)

1. Taking oneself too seriously.
2. Personal insecurity—"do it all yourself, always right"
3. Intellectual limitations. (Pennsylvania)

1. Three to five faculty members who are "itches."
2. Three to five faculty members who are inefficient.
3. Student "pot" smokers. (Connecticut)

And from a foundation representative:

1. Inability to compromise on a position taken publicly and too hastily.
2. Inability to express adequately his educational philosophy to his board of trustees.
3. Lack of sensitivity to community and faculty concerns.

TABLE IV
WHAT COULD HAVE HELPED PRESIDENT WHO HAD
DIFFICULTIES AS REPORTED BY PRESIDENTS

Sources of Help	Frequency	Percentage of Total
1. Better personal characteristics.....	29	21.0
a. integrity, honesty (7)		
b. new personality (6)		
c. humor, humility (4)		
d. common sense (3)		
e. other, general (9)		
2. Better human relations skills.....	23	16.9
3. Nothing could have helped that president.....	20	13.0
4. Better administrative skills.....	12	8.8
a. learn to delegate (5)		
b. decisiveness (3)		
c. general, other (4)		
5. Changes in college administration or board.....	12	8.8
6. Better administrative training and experience.....	11	8.0
7. Better board of trustees or skills with board.....	10	7.2
8. More skill in analyzing community and times.....	9	6.5
9. Medical or psychiatric treatment.....	6	4.3
10. Money or better financial base.....	6	4.3
	138	100.1

Is Success Relative to Time or Place?

Respondents were asked also if the president they knew who had had the most difficulties could have been successful at a different place or in another time period.

The inescapable conclusion is that other presidents regard the most troubled president they have known as likely to have trouble regardless of the college or the time period.

What Would Have Helped the Troubled President?

Respondents were asked to think of the most troubled president and then list what they felt would have helped him most. (See Table IV.)

State directors were also asked this question. Only twenty-three of a possible thirty completed it, and results were too scattered to allow for presentation in a meaningful table. Leading categories for state directors were: (1) better training and experience (5); (2) nothing could have helped that president (3); and (3) better analysis of community and times (3).

The three leading categories, reported by presidents, of what could have helped the president who had the most difficulties, were: (1) better personal characteristics (29); (2) better human relations skills (23); and (3) *nothing* could have helped that president (20). These are probably interrelated. While presidents had lauded administrative skills as critical to success for a president, it appears they regard lack of necessary personal qualities and skills with people as leading most quickly to difficulty.

There are people, it is suggested by these findings, who, because of the kinds of people they are and because of the way they relate to others, should not try to become president of a community college.

As would be expected from previous results, there was a richness of individual response to this question:

What would have helped the troubled president most?

A gun! (Connecticut)

If we had known, we would have helped him! (California)

Psychiatric treatment 10 years ago. (This is a serious statement—not a joke.) (Pennsylvania)

Return to "Go"—and find another occupation. (A state director of community colleges)

An absence of the prejudice which he encountered and the enmity of those ambitious for his position. (Maryland)

If he could have taken a year off and visited many other kinds of institutions and organizations. (Oregon)

Less subterfuge among line administrators who came from the same religious (group) and were, in that sense, peers. (New York)

A comprehension of differences between traditional dictatorial operation by administrative fiat of high school and the necessary ethos of the collegiate instructional system. (A foundation representative)

Keep his mouth closed! (Kansas)

The milk of human kindness and sympathy for the individual. (Georgia)

A real understanding that the president is a key person but not too important to the real purpose of the college—instruction. (Higher education professor)

And lastly, a cheery note from Puerto Rico:

He did overcome them, thanks to his intellectual and moral superiority to his adversaries!

Problems for Presidents as Reported by State Directors

The questionnaire sent to state directors included a question asked of others earlier in the study: "What problems facing presidents seem to be increasing in severity?"

State directors report slightly different perspectives of the problems likely to face new presidents (see Table VI in Chapter 6 and Table V in Chapter 7). Added to previous differences in the state directors' responses, it might be said they view the presidency seemingly from the detachment of distance. Responses here, in Table V, as well as earlier, tended to concentrate on the philosophy of the community college, both in the sense of presidents benefiting from a commitment to the purposes of the college and also in the sense of seeing the development of vocational-technical programs as a principal future problem. State directors

TABLE V
PROBLEMS INCREASING IN SEVERITY FOR PRESIDENTS
AS REPORTED BY STATE DIRECTORS

Problems	Total Frequency	Percentage of Total
1. Educational and instructional problems.....	22	34.9
a. developing vocational technical programs (11)		
b. holding to community college philosophy (8)		
c. improving quality of transfer programs (3)		
2. Faculty.....	18	28.6
a. unrest, militancy, activism (6)		
b. staffing (8)		
c. recruiting qualified people (4)		
3. Financial.....	16	25.4
a. securing adequate finances (13)		
b. financing new facilities (3)		
4. Students.....	3	4.9
5. Gaining community support for college development.....	2	3.1
6. Creating proper image of college.....	2	3.1
	63*	100.0

* Though only twenty-seven state directors completed the questionnaire, there were three possible choices for each on this question. The total frequency of sixty-three achieved is out of a possible total of eighty-one.

ranked educational and instructional problems facing presidents as more severe than did either deans of instruction or representatives of faculty associations.

State directors introduced a new category, "Inability to get along with other professional educators," as a source of difficulty for some presidents.

SUMMARY

Presidents rank administrative skills on a par with personal qualities as those most commonly leading to success in the presidency. Thus, they differed from the second-ranking administrator, who stressed "leadership" as desirable and from secretaries, who ranked personal qualities and human relations skills much higher as characteristics leading to success. Presidents, however, agreed with faculty on this matter; representatives of faculty associations had also stressed that they appreciate and want a president who can administer.

State directors differed markedly from others reporting here on the problems

facing the president, by emphasizing that educational, philosophical, and instructional (program development) problems were potentially the greatest difficulties for the future. It appears that state directors view the presidency from a "grand scale" of purpose and not from the day-to-day pressures of administrative details and the interplay of faculty and other groups—a detachment, as it were, not seen so clearly in the reports of others operating closer to an individual college.

The president of the future who is judged successful by his peers will be someone, judging from results obtained here, with a sense of personal integrity and professional honesty, considerable humility coupled with a sense of humor, a lot of common sense, and warm-soft skills with people. He must also have the administrative ability to run a college well from a posture of commitment to the philosophy and purposes of the community college, and the "guts" to stand by this commitment.

The next chapter presents the views of presidents nominated by their peers as "successful" on this subject of success in the presidency.

FUTURE CHALLENGES FOR NEW PRESIDENTS: SOME PERSPECTIVES OF THE MORE SUCCESSFUL PRESIDENTS

From the nominations of community college presidents, state directors of community college or of vocational education, representatives of foundations supporting junior college education, and professors of higher education at universities conducting junior college leadership programs, a list of twelve most often reported to have been the "most successful" presidents was compiled. Names were added on two criteria: (1) frequency of nomination, and (2) nominations made from both within *and* outside the state where the president served. This produced presidents who were highly regarded locally and who also had regional or national reputations. Not all represented the larger urban districts that could supply a base from which to seek to establish a national reputation. All were men of considerable experience. Their names will *not* be given.

Though names are withheld, the distribution by state may be of interest: four were in California, two in Florida, and one each in Arizona, Missouri, New York, Pennsylvania, Texas, and Washington.

It would be misleading to have readers conclude on their own that a national mandate was given to those included on the final list. The most frequently named president was nominated by eleven respondents out of 178; and the tenth, eleventh, and twelfth were nominated only four times each.

Ten of those nominated were subsequently interviewed. Questions during the interviews centered on (1) what presidents regarded as the problems most likely to press future presidents, and (2) recommendations of practices and approaches to solve these problems.

All interviewed agreed that *faculty and finances represent the most pressing problems* to be faced by community college presidents in the years immediately ahead. It was nearly universally agreed, however, that though faculty and finances are crisis-producing, it is how a president anticipates crises that is critical to his value as a president and to the possibility of successful tenure in that office.

It should be noted, however, that these interviews were conducted for the most part before problems of student activism had begun to loom on some urban campuses.

CRISES

It could have been predicted that the explosive growth of the community colleges (with resulting expansions in administrative staffs, faculty, student

bodies), and the increasing number of citizens coming in contact with all college activities would produce crises for presidents to deal with; this, in fact, seems to be a way of life for many. The presidents interviewed were asked what would likely be the greater causes of crises for new presidents to handle. They specified these and added that an ability to anticipate crises, as well as determining sources and handling them, was most valuable.

Anticipating Crises

Some individual responses are reported below.

The president does not earn his way by handling crises. He earns it by sensing them and preventing them. Most crises come from a lack of communication among several important elements—between administrators and faculty, between college and community, or between president and the board. The greatest crises will materialize over failure to produce for the community what it has been promised.

The prevention of crises becomes critical. The president must develop 360° vision and scan the total area often.

[He] has to develop a sixth sense regarding the impact on the college that something might have. Once an event has occurred or a direction crystallized, the possible impact will have been weighed, but it is best to determine what events *might* happen and then what their possible impact will be.

Sources of Crises

If the ability to anticipate crises is critical, as some reportedly successful presidents stressed, the new president might reasonably ask what are their more likely sources in the experiences of others. (As new presidents have come increasingly from other community college administrative positions and as this trend is likely to continue, they can be expected to have some experience and opinions on the subject themselves.) One answer summed up most responses and supported the views of others reported earlier in this study:

Ultimately finances may be the more difficult technical problem for any president, but they will be easier to deal with than faculty, simply because finances are objective. The most difficult problem for administration will be faculty, simply because people are emotional and objectivity can be lost.

Another major concern:

The massive crises will be urban in character. True causes of this must be determined as the unsuccessful attempts by colleges to deal with existing urban problems (represented by students for the most part) are often reflections of administrative and faculty inadequacies. Also there is bound to be eventually a fundamental struggle with universities regarding the "politics" of higher education—*who* defines *what* will be critical.

The crisis of urban centers, and the rise of militancy among organizations purporting to represent minority groups will have increasing impact on the community college because of its basic tenets and approaches. The community college has yet to come to grips with the significance of this. New presidents will not likely be able to avoid it. One president interviewed noted:

This is the day and age of the organized group, often representing or purporting to represent minorities who have some real grievances. The limits of faculty and student

body involvement in consequent deliberations have to be worked out with them. You can no longer have a "puppet" arrangement with either students or faculty, and you can no longer "manipulate" them. Make sure you start with facts and that the facts you have can stand up under contest. Never promise something you can't deliver!

And another president said:

It's not that we've failed to contribute to solutions of social problems. It's more that we haven't faced the problems correctly. We have a history of forcing a listing of priorities, which may of themselves be completely artificial. Such a move can be meaningful to the pragmatic instinct for simple survival, but it may have little to do with a comprehensive college responding to what society wants and needs; rather it is a response of the college to what the college thinks should be done—essentially an attempt to fit new problems into the same old categories, and it won't work.

Different kinds of customers with different sets of problems will require great flexibility in determining proper approaches and programs for them. This will first require the community college to be roughly aware of what it actually has done as compared with what it thinks it does. Note has been made of the lack of a literature about positions in the community college. There is also a lack of research on what the community college achieves, i.e., does it teach students those things it claims to, and are the things it claims to teach of value to the students who are subjected to them? Evaluation and positive self-criticism were also seen by the successful presidents as an independent crisis—an internal one:

A central question will be how to make education in the community college relevant and how to utilize modern methods of teaching. The problem is to shake off past practices.

We must be willing to evaluate ourselves, our effectiveness, and be willing to admit to mistakes. For example, "remedial" courses have enjoyed but minimal success if not abject failure. It's not sufficient merely to "slow down" the pace of what is given or project it over a longer time. What we had decided, and this is questionable, is that those who don't have skills necessary to compete are wrong—not that we may be wrong in what we ask them to compete in and how.

Evaluations and the quest for relevancy, when initiated, must be translated into curricula or programs of study. This requires financing, but it also requires a commitment to the principle of comprehensiveness. It is not always easy, and presidents reported that it is not going to get easier, to resist the drive of the academic faculty for "legitimacy," which so often to them is total acceptance by the university as being a university-parallel institution for the first two years. Following evaluation and program development, there is the increasingly complex job of "selling" what is needed both to the faculty and to the public. Successful presidents made pointed comments on this:

The crisis in program development flows from the factors of: (1) financing; (2) faculty acceptance of the new courses or programs and subsequent support of them; (3) community acceptance of the worth of the developments; and (4) maintaining an original comprehensiveness in new programs against the forces that seek to "upgrade" them to something they were not intended to be.

There is grave threat that the debacles of land-grant colleges struggling to become "little Harvards" and giving only lip service to the purposes of their founding will recur with the community college.

There is great danger, as often from the community as the academic faculty, of constant demands to reduce the community colleges to offering only a university-parallel curriculum. The pressure is greatest from the faculty, which often loses sight of the fact that the people and not the faculty should have the final say about what the college should do.

One president summed up the concern for program development and for retaining a dedication to comprehensiveness with:

We not only *have* to become comprehensive, we have to *want* to. It is a matter of asking questions before formulating answers. Comprehensiveness stems from a commitment to total service.

There is also a crisis of administrative "identity" or concept of role. It seemingly centers on the matter of governance of the college, but it does not start or stop there. It may well start from the old adage applied to education majors by those in "academic studies," "Those who can't—teach!" and it becomes more sophisticated in the university with the oft-heard phrase, previously quoted, "The dean is a mouse in training to be a rat!" The days of being cowed, however, by their more erudite colleagues in the English department, who spell better simply because they specialize in perpetuating a most outrageous spelling system, are coming to an end. The specialty of administering is regarded as valuable by the faculty, though they do not often choose to get themselves involved in it. This will require recruiting and keeping first-rate line administrators as well as first-rate presidents. It will also be a matter of inculcating in administrators a long-overdue faith in themselves as contributors and not just as practitioners.

Being a president, or any other kind of chief administrator, is not the way it used to be or, perhaps, how it was thought to be. Those interviewed were perfectly aware of this. Some responses of interest were:

Get some old administrators together and have them sound off about the "good old days." There was a time when chief administrators did make independent decisions without consideration of other people and factors. That day is gone. The sad thing is that many old "tight-ship operators" do not recognize the changes that have occurred in administrative practices.

A president cannot just sit in his office and think great ideas. If he stays in his office, nothing is going to happen. He must create a basis for acceptance both in the faculty and in the community. Moreover, if he tries to do it all himself, he'll probably get fired. He probably should be fired.

There must be a willingness to work hard. There cannot be the false kind of leadership of "shooting from the hip" or shouting, "Follow me, boys! Over the top!" It must be a leadership of having done the homework, having gone the extra distance to understand the situation and the people in it, and then moving out with planning and organization and not emotionalism.

Best planning is really a form of research to formulate the possible outcomes from different approaches. You just don't move out with the troops hopefully behind you into "no-man's land" without a map. You'll just get . . . shot down!

Obscured by the problem of getting faculty who understand the community college is a real crisis in obtaining line administrators of needed quality. We presently have mostly administrators who understand neither the principles of management nor the philosophy to be implemented.

A quite different response on a growing problem for administrators was presented by one of those interviewed:

This will sound prudish, which I do not mean it to be, but I feel it should be said. As the pressures mount, chiefly from the interaction or interrelation of public opinion, public support, and finances (which are also the heart of much difficulty with the faculty), I hear more presidents saying, "I drink too much!" I drink also (I hope not too much), but a new president is advised to find some other avenue for release of pressure, for reasons of both health and public respect.

Handling a Crisis

It is one thing to anticipate a crisis and quite another to handle one after it has developed. One of those nominated as a successful president observed:

(1) Don't overreact. (2) Communicate with all elements visible and try to discover if there are invisible elements contributing. (3) Draw the emotionalism out of the issue if possible. (4) Give dissidents a full chance to be heard and then to participate in solutions.

THE MATTER OF FACULTY

As seen throughout this monograph, a central problem facing chief administrators now and in the future is the matter of faculty. Concerns vary on the issues of faculty militancy, activism, attempts to "usurp" administrative fiat, and on how to recruit and hold "qualified" instructors who know something about and will support the purposes and goals of community college education. The responses often used the word "responsible" in describing a desired faculty role. The successful presidents interviewed were asked a question about this: "How can a new president develop responsible faculty leadership?" Some responses were:

It's a matter of combating "isolationism" among the faculty. The initiative for involvement must come from the administration, but it must come gently so as not to be resented as a return to the much-despised old K-12 paternalistic feeling brought along by old superintendents ("We've got to be a big, happy family!" the extension of which was, of course, that the family reported to "Big Daddy," i.e., the president).

What we have found most successful has been to involve the faculty in district-wide committees. These committees are assigned and held to making recommendations on policy and to reviewing existing policies. The key may be that they are given deadlines to establish and then adhere to.

The difficulty in creating responsible faculty leadership is that emotional fights leave scars. Leaders from the faculty must learn to make decisions; this, of course, leads to fights and fights lead to scars. The people more capable of decision making in the faculty often shy away from their responsibilities simply because they don't want to get "cut-up" by their own people. A faculty member can get "roughed up" pretty good in the "in-fighting" among faculties these days. This is a realization new to faculty, but which has been faced continually by administrators.

Faculty competence is also achieved through recruitment. Competence in the discipline to be taught is primary, but each potential instructor must be asked, "Can you and *will* you work with the kinds of students we have within the kinds of programs we offer?" It is not possible to work with instructors effectively in a comprehensive setting if the instructor seems isolated from the reality of the community college or if he sees himself as a bastion to protect only himself and his concept of his discipline.

Developing faculty leadership is a very complex matter, which follows a flow of inculcation, identification, and maturation. It is a principal concern of administration and is not easily accomplished.

The principal problem in developing faculty leadership is how to create responsible leaders and then leave them within the faculty rather than making administrators of them.

Get the best staff money can buy, then turn them loose. Develop respect out of respect. This respect must be extended as a sensitivity and not as a management skill applied to a situation. Presidents must extend it to both faculty and the board.

The faculty can be counted on to advise you who their leaders are. There is a sort of natural selection from within—the same names keep coming up. Sometimes it pays to take the biggest “hell raiser” and give him some real responsibility.

You must develop a “corps of comers!” Should not be those merely aspiring to “loftiness.” Should include those who don’t want to climb to the top of the stairs but might be content to improve that portion of the stairwell they came to rest on. *Not everyone should aspire to be a president.*

Feed the “comers”—give them some straight lines to make them look good. Give them a chance to “star” and, above all, give them a chance to fall on their face. Once down, if they can be helped, help! If they don’t give a damn and don’t try to get up, cut them off! If they care, and this will show, go to bat for them. Give praise, sparingly and justly, and back it up.

BOARD PROBLEMS

The board of trustees was ranked lower consistently (by nearly all respondents in the total study) as a pressure on the presidency than were faculty, finances, administrative details and correspondence, campus planning, and public relations. However, the successful presidents interviewed saw board leadership as a prime future responsibility for new presidents.

“How do you develop leadership within the board?” was asked during the interviews:

It’s chiefly a matter of total information. The board cannot be taken for granted. It is particularly important that they, too, understand the needs of the community and not just of themselves as a board. It is also important to combat the incessant pressures on the board from the community on the question of whether a certain course or program is of college standard or for college credit.

Keep the board totally involved in the long-range goals. Keep them out of management by keeping them focused “on the horizon.” Administrators should keep track of the territory and approaches between where the college is and the horizon.

Give the board pride in themselves and in the district they serve. Convince them, usually not too difficult, that what is going on is important and that they serve an important aspect of higher education. Subordinate business details and give them as much insight as possible into the mechanics of education.

Where there is no great philosophical principle involved, don’t hesitate to compromise with your board. Some quit because they can’t get their own way. They forget their purpose is to lead the board toward making the whole place “tick.”

Most assumptions held by boards are wrong. They bring their biases from a different frame of reference. It is imperative that they be sent background material to read and that their questions be carefully answered. *The board members are politically more astute, usually, than either the faculty or the administration.* Trade on this. Keep them politically active in translating to the community the nature

and needs of the college. First, however, the board must understand clearly, in terms they can handle and understand, what the college is and what its needs are likely to be. If they don't understand, the original erroneous assumptions will be magnified.

This is likely to increase in importance, using the political astuteness and awareness of the board in the positive sense of translating purpose into programs which requires the support of the public, if for no other reason than the increasing mobility of presidents. This results in a newly elected president arriving, often as not, in a community he understands little on a first hand basis. He will need help, and the board can be a source of it.

Other comments on the board were:

The board can't be taken for granted. It too has needs. However the board must understand the needs of the community and not just its own.

The president should not accept the presidency if he can't feel there is a chance to lead the board. If he can't feel this is possible, he may have to overpower them or waste a lot of time getting to know them so that he can be effective. If he is busy overpowering them or studying them, there is little opportunity to lead them.

WHAT IS THE BEST TRAINING OR PREPARATION FOR A PRESIDENCY?

Given the considerable collective experience of those interviewed and the fact that their accomplishments were highly regarded by their peers, it seemed appropriate to ask how a person might prepare for the presidency. Some results were:

The best training for a president will be defined by those who will be led. He must be well educated, and he must stay "up" on things in his field. I have no patience with the administrator who pleads there is no time to read seriously. He can and should assign a high priority to his "professional health." He must know and be able to understand and translate his milieu.

Personal traits are more important than formal training. There must be a drive, a desire, a want to be good, a want to be superior. However, there is nothing more pathetic than the person with lots of drive who arrives in a presidency with *no* ability.

He must have developed "charity." He will ultimately sink or swim on personal relations—how well he works with other people. Equally important is a capacity to trust and have confidence in others. This will help him to surround himself with people smarter than he is, which is most helpful, if not critical, to success.

Preparing an individual for the presidency presumes a base of decisiveness—that is you start with someone willing to decide. This stems in turn from an ability to be perceptive (particularly to see problems before they arise), a willingness to listen respectfully, and an ability to relate to someone else and his position (also the possibility of understanding why he says what he does regardless of how it appears—a need to give credence for intellectual honesty when this possibility is not obvious).

Above all, a president must be able to relate to all elements of the community on a peer basis. This refers to labor unions as well as to intellectual committees of faculty. This can stem only from an understanding of the importance of the position of the president and a respect for the two-year college. There can never be a hint of defensiveness, apology, or defensive aggressiveness regarding the college served.

There must be a willingness to forget "yourself." Involvement in time and space must be a total commitment. Retain, at all costs, a sense of humor.

Graduate schools can help most through establishing intern programs. This will afford exposure to "experienced" individuals. There is a greater need for faculty leadership training centers, from which one can hope for, and expect, presidents to eventually emerge, and proceed through mobility up through the ranks.

As noted earlier, getting to be president and staying on as one are not necessarily related. One president interviewed alluded to this with the remark: "Staying on as a president requires that the drive to get there be subordinated!" Another defined what he regarded as a "successful" president: "It's the guy who meets his challenges—meets the test of his peers—stays out of trouble while fighting only those fights which are necessary. [Success] is definitely related to values that have been preestablished to arrival in the presidency."

SUMMARY

One president observed:

The junior college has the opportunity to be the "humanizing" institution by addressing the human problems of people rather than participating in the dehumanization process typical of so much of what is called higher education today.

The new administrator must be on a level of awareness with our new society. The dehumanization process has begun. It will continue, but it must be combated.

From a series of interviews with ten presidents nominated by their peers as "successful," it is clear that the nature of the presidency of the community college is changing. The "one-man show" will soon be a thing of the past, although a few colleges will still operate, regrettably, in the past. Presidents regarded as successful stressed that new presidents must know what they are attempting to do and be willing to work very hard at it while striving continually to involve others positively and responsibly in matters once thought to be the exclusive reserve of administration.

From responses here and throughout the study, however, it appears that the office of the presidency is still desirable, as measured by the perspectives of those who are presidents. And though changes in the presidency have been and will continue to be substantial, it is still one of the best jobs around. This is true in spite of faculty and finances—the sources of most problems, concerns, crises, and pressures.

One president, at the close of a long interview, mused: "It's such a pity that so much experience by so many [in specific reference to present and past community college presidents] who know and care, often gained at considerable expense and pain, has generated so little literature. Presidents must be encouraged to communicate." It was to this end that this work was directed.

PERSPECTIVES ON PERSPECTIVES

As I view the perspectives of the community college presidency reported in preceding chapters, I find some overall perspectives emerging. This chapter will present some of them—at times in a personal manner and in no sense in a statistical one.

If there is one thing a president of a community college cannot avoid, it is other people. Dependent on public confidence in both his institution and himself for support and dependent on the total college personnel to get the job done, the president is powerless without the combined and directed efforts of many people. His success or value, or lack of it, will be directly related to his leadership ability to coalesce the efforts of others and to direct them towards the accomplishment of the goals and purposes of the college. This requires in turn that the president understand these goals and purposes.

In a situation rife with dissent—from students, from faculty, from taxpayers, it will require presidents who can keep a tight rein on money, a tight rein on emotions, an anxious eye on proving to the customer the worth of what has been done with his money, and above all to have warm-soft and honest skills with people.

The term “community college” is generic. It is not possible to speak of “the” community college as though a single definition could describe the multiplicity of forms such schools have taken. It is better to say that a rapidly increasing number of colleges are describing themselves as either community, junior, vocational or technical colleges, or as two-year extension centers or branches of universities.

Just as one cannot speak of “the” community college, so one cannot speak of “the” community college president. For convenience, however, the president of this college has been defined here as that person in day-to-day control of the operations of the college. This chief administrator may or may not report directly to a board of control and is usually, though not always, referred to as the president.

Although growth by itself does not indicate success, it certainly speaks of vigor and at least temporary acceptance. The number of community colleges is increasing rapidly, and this can only be because the supporting society sees it as offering something of value. There is considerable pride among community college practitioners at “having arrived” as a unique, vital, and strong segment of higher education in the United States. The days of subservience to either the university or to single-minded vocational program specialists are fortunately and happily nearing an end. In talking to those of considerable experience who have watched the emergence of the community college from

the shadows of other institutions and witnessed the dramatic recent growth and public acceptance of them, one often feels the same emotional fervor assigned to the credos "comprehensive community college" or "comprehensive post-secondary education" that one might have found with the early practitioners of "progressive education." This parallel is purposeful, in that the community college is clearly warned it must demonstrate its value beyond emotional credos, as important as these might be in offering a rallying point for those recently emerged from a deep and often frustrating limbo. Sophistication will come with an ability for self-discipline and self-criticism. A capacity for self-evaluation is involved. This will require leadership that is constantly refreshed, either by individuals within who are capable of changing or by individuals brought either "up through the ranks" or into the colleges from "outside" into positions of leadership.

Increasingly important will be the multi-campus district, each of which may have ten or fifteen individual colleges and a collective student body approaching one hundred thousand. The issues of social reform and regeneration of the inner city will complicate the already heavy burdens of massiveness such districts will face. The relationship of the single campus president to the district chancellor and of the chancellor to the state director of community colleges will be formalized. One result may be to reduce the single-campus president to something of a superannuated high school principal, dependent on "Big Daddy," i.e., the central district office and the chancellor or state director, for financial handouts and building approvals as well as a convenient "out" in times of stress—such as with the faculty salary demands. Ex-president Harry Truman is often quoted as having said, "The buck stops here!" In community colleges it will be increasingly difficult to tell just where the "buck" does stop or even, at times, where it is. This will be the price of success as measured by growing enrollments, burgeoning bureaucracies within, and the needs for distinct financial and administrative leadership as opposed to the old "leader of the faculty" skills sought in presidents of the past. As already noted, emphasis will be placed in securing men to be presidents who can supply the hard, cold, business eye and simultaneously attempt to personalize an increasingly complex operation. Need for these skills will be felt most strongly in the multi-campus districts.

The basic situations facing any president can be reduced to three: he arrives, stays, and departs. To meet these situations, a new president is advised to develop a strategy for arrival, a strategy for survival, and a strategy for departure—perhaps the more painful to contemplate. It is also urged that he think through, clear through, a career as president with the view to eventually turning the keys over to someone else and that he regard the condition of things at the college and not of his career as the final determinant of action.

Perspectives of the community college president were sought from a variety of sources in this study. These perspectives varied with the distance from the presidency and with the formal or informal nature of the relationships. There were, seemingly, some commonalities:

1. Functions. The president is seen as caught up in a combination of on-campus and off-campus work dominated by meetings.
2. Pressures. The principal pressures on the president come from faculty,

finances, public relations requirements, administrative details including correspondence, and planning new facilities and campuses.

3. Boards. Though boards hire and fire ultimately, they were *not* reported as the leading pressure on the president by anyone, though they were reported as an intense pressure by secretaries to the presidents and by wives of presidents. Offering leadership to the board was regarded as a critical function for new presidents by a group of successful presidents, as nominated by their peers and subsequently interviewed. This *board leadership* seemed to mean that the president must educate the board to its leadership potentials.

Boards were reported as the major source of pressure on the president to leave in those situations where the president had been under pressure to leave the college. This is possibly an official response to legal responsibility, with the original pressure coming from elsewhere, e.g., the faculty or organized elements within the community, with the board called on to express the discontent formally.

Not obtained were views of the presidency as held by board chairmen. This should be done.

4. Faculty. The faculty is the major source of pressure on the president and a major source of concern for the future. Also the faculty's perceptions of its own role and of the role of the chief administrator, particularly in reference to the governance of the college, are changing rapidly. The issue is who will participate in and determine policies that set the basic course for a college. A definition of what is "responsible faculty leadership" has not been achieved. One is needed.
5. Students. The president of a community college is *not* seen as involved with his student body. Students are *not yet* a source of major difficulty or pressure for him. They are rated as a potential source of pressure for future presidents. Relations will be critical between the president and those purporting to represent various student groups, particularly minority and political activist groups. It should be remembered that the principal data reported were collected in 1966-68, before the increasing militancy of students in some urban areas during 1968-69 could have produced reportable reactions.
6. Finances. Probably the most difficult problem technically for future presidents will be financing the community colleges which exist plus those to come. This will be most directly felt in attempting to establish new programs in response to community needs while simultaneously trying to maintain quality in existing programs. It can be anticipated that finances will lead to the matter of the politics of higher education, and community colleges can expect more concern from other sectors of higher education simply because success (as measured by increasing numbers of colleges and growing enrollments) has led and will continue to lead the community college into direct competition with other institutions (public and private) for a share of taxes, government grants, or foundation support. Presently as the "darling of state legislatures" (as one president, nominated as having been successful, noted in an interview), community colleges have done

very well. To continue to do so, they will increasingly be called on to demonstrate achievement in relation to their stated purposes and objectives of taking people from where they are, educationally, and moving them toward occupational and social relevancy by offering programs of value. The possible difficulties with finances will be the result of multiple factors, but all hinge on the matter of public confidence.

As painful as it may be for some to contemplate, *the president might be well advised to leave leading the faculty to others*—perhaps those within the faculty ranks who develop “responsible leadership” (as defined jointly, perhaps, by boards, administrators, and the faculty) and are left within the faculty rather than promoted, or seduced financially, to administrative responsibilities. There may yet be identified a “faculty-leadership-skills” are form as distinct as that of “administrative leadership skills.” The behaviorist may yet identify, analyze, separate, and quantify characteristics of both, and such research should be cheered on. Meanwhile, faculty leadership, in the sense of who speaks for them, is “up for grabs.”

It is felt strongly that a collection of skills applied to educational problems can be called an administrative art, and some practitioners are more artful than others. Those judged to be the better community college presidents were reported to have possessed recognized administrative skills first. It is high time to acknowledge the dignity of this particular calling in educational administration. The recognition must come first from within, so that it might be realistically earned, then, from without. Its practitioners, community college presidents in this instance, clearly deserve recognition as scholars in their own rights, and the colleges they serve will profit from this.

I closed a speech on the role of the presidency at a national convention with the following remarks:¹

The effectiveness of a president is measured inevitably and properly by the society providing the wealth. Society has been led to expect certain results from its investments in education. That it expects them to be achieved is reasonable and proper. The junior college is peculiar among post-secondary educational institutions in that its goals are calculatedly set closely to a broad spectrum of the needs, both short- and long-term, of the immediate social group as well as of the total social order. The effective president must provide for these social needs as adequately and efficiently as possible. He must do so through the leadership he exerts on the instrument at hand—the community college.

And further that:

These goals must be pursued under the full scrutiny of a society with many pressing needs of its own, some of which, it has been told and apparently believes, can be met by education as provided in community colleges. We can still succeed in meeting this expectation. We will do so only if we *keep the last man in line clearly in focus*. This may be a student who dropped out of high school and for whom the university offers nothing. He may have been in reform school twice, in and out of several federally-supported work-related programs, and he may not really want to be helped at all. If we lose sight of him, however, we may miss the great opportunity to help when help is wanted.

¹ D. A. Morgan, “The Junior College President: Role and Responsibility,” in B. Lamar Johnson, ed., *The Junior College President* (Los Angeles: Junior College Leadership Program, Graduate School of Education, University of California, Occasional Report No. 13, May 1969), p. 30.

To lead [the community college] successfully requires dedication to and respect for people, *all people, including a commitment to the last man in line.*

Keeping *the last man in line* in focus, with the view to helping him, does *not* in any way allow us the privilege of unquestioningly determining how he is to be helped. We have no right merely to impose on him answers that have been helpful to us but that may have absolutely no value to him. Education in the form of grades, distinct time periods, seasonal attendance, and credits may be only our "bag"—having no relevance whatsoever to the real problems of society and of people in it. *It might even be that the last man can teach us something! Why don't we ask him?*

Community colleges serving future society will be led by presidents, or others, who have the capacity to ask questions of *all* and are prepared to listen. Not only must they ask questions, but *they must ask different kinds of questions. A pat answer can be inhibiting, but it is not nearly so inhibiting as a pat question.* The community college must be led by people with such skills if it, and its supporting society, are to benefit from what has been a most auspicious beginning.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- ANGELL, J. "The Junior College Movement in the High School," *School Review*, XXIII (May 1915), 289.
- BLOCKER, C. E., R. H. PLUMMER, and R. C. RICHARDSON, JR. *The Two Year College: A Social Synthesis*. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, 1965.
- BRAWER, FLORENCE. *Personality Characteristics of College and University Faculties*. Washington, D.C.: American Association of Junior Colleges, 1968.
- CARMICHAEL, J. H. "Origin and Mobility of Presidents," *Junior College Journal*, XXXIX, No. 8 (May 1969), 32.
- COHEN, A. M., and J. E. ROUECHE. *Institutional Administrator or Educational Leader? The Junior College President*. Washington, D.C.: American Association of Junior Colleges, 1969.
- COULTAS, W. T. "Problems of Urban Colleges," *Junior College Journal*, XXXV, No. 2 (October 1964).
- FORDYCE, J. "The Junior College President and Student Personnel Services," in *The Junior College President*, ed. B. Lamar Johnson. Los Angeles: Junior College Leadership Program, Graduate School of Education, University of California, 1969.
- GALLAGHER, B. C. "Who Runs the Institution?" in *Proceedings of a Conference*. Denver: Western Interstate Commission on Higher Education, December 1966.
- GARRISON, R. H. *Junior College Faculty: Issues and Problems; a Preliminary National Appraisal*. Washington, D.C.: American Association of Junior Colleges, 1967.
- . "Junior College Missions: Ideals, Myths, Realities," in *Minnesota Junior College*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota, January 1968.
- GIBB, CECIL A. "Leadership," in *Handbook of Social Psychology*. Cambridge, Mass.: Addison-Wesley, 1954.
- GILES, F. T. "Selecting and Securing a Junior College President," in *The Junior College President*, ed. B. Lamar Johnson. Los Angeles: Junior College Leadership Program, Graduate School of Education, University of California, 1969.
- GLEAZER, E. J., JR. *This Is the Community College*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1968.
- HARLACHER, ERVIN. "The President, The Community and Community Services," in *The Junior College President*, ed. B. Lamar Johnson. Los Angeles: Junior College Leadership Program, Graduate School of Education, University of California, 1969.
- HARFER, W. A., ed. *1965 Directory American Association of Junior Colleges*. Washington, D.C.: American Association of Junior Colleges, 1965.
- , ed. *1968 Directory American Association of Junior Colleges*. Washington, D.C.: American Association of Junior Colleges, 1968.
- , ed. *1969 Directory American Association of Junior Colleges*. Washington, D.C.: American Association of Junior Colleges, 1969.
- . *Like It Is*. Los Angeles: Junior College Leadership Program, Graduate School of Education, University of California, October 1968.
- JENCKS, C., and D. RIESMAN. *The Academic Revolution*. Garden City, N.Y.: Doubleday, 1968.
- JOHNSON, B. LAMAR. *Islands of Innovation Expanding: Changes in the Community College*. Beverly Hills, Calif.: Glencoe Press, 1969.
- , ed. *The Junior College President*. Los Angeles: Junior College Leadership Program, Graduate School of Education, University of California, 1969.

- KINTZER, F. C., A. M. JENSEN, and J. S. HANSEN. *The Multi-Institution District*. Washington, D.C.: American Association of Junior Colleges, 1969.
- LOMBARDI, JOHN. "The Junior College President and the Faculty," in *The Junior College President*, ed. B. Lamar Johnson. Los Angeles: Junior College Leadership Program, Graduate School of Education, University of California, 1969.
- LUSKIN, B. *A Workshop of Interest to New Presidents with Little Background in the Junior College—An Analysis*. Los Angeles: Graduate School of Education, University of California (unpublished seminar paper), 1967.
- MARTORANA, S. V. "Values and Variables in Organizing and Financing Public Community Colleges," in *Technical-Vocational Education and the Community College*. Williamsburg, Va.: Proceedings of the Thirteenth Annual Legislative Work Conference of the Southern Regional Education Board, August 1964.
- MEDSKER, L. L. *The Junior College: Progress and Prospect*. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1960.
- MORLEY, CHRISTOPHER. "Introduction," in *The Best of Don Marquis*. Garden City, N.Y.: Doubleday, 1946.
- MORGAN, BARBARA. "Mrs. President: Role and Responsibilities," in *The Junior College President*, ed. B. Lamar Johnson. Los Angeles: Junior College Leadership Program, Graduate School of Education, University of California, 1969.
- MORGAN, D. A. "View from the Home Front—What Presidents' Wives Say about Their Husbands," *Creative Notebook*, II, Nos. 9, 10 (May and June 1968).
- . "The Junior College President: Role and Responsibility," in *The Junior College President*, ed. B. Lamar Johnson. Los Angeles: Junior College Leadership Program, Graduate School of Education, University of California, 1969.
- NEWBURN, H. "The Board Meets the President," *Junior College Journal*, XXXV (November 1964).
- O'CONNELL, T. E. *Community Colleges—A President's View*. Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1968.
- RIESS, L. C. "The Faculty and the Junior College President," in *The Junior College President*, ed. B. Lamar Johnson. Los Angeles: Junior College Leadership Program, Graduate School of Education, University of California, 1969.
- ROUECHE, J. E. "The Junior College President," *Junior College Research Review*, II, No. (10 June 1968).
- SCHULTZ, R. E. "A Comparative Analysis of the Junior College Deans' Leadership Behavior," in *The Dimensions of the Dean's Task*. Boone, N.C.: The proceedings of a conference, published by Florida State University and the University of Florida, August 1962.
- . "The Junior College President: Who and Where From," in *The Junior College President*, ed. B. Lamar Johnson. Los Angeles: Junior College Leadership Program, Graduate School of Education, University of California, 1969.
- , and D. Y. ROBERTS. *Presidents of Public Junior Colleges—An Analysis of Sources*. Tallahassee: Department of Higher Education, The Florida State University, 1964.
- SIMONSON, E. "The Junior College President and the Student," in *The Junior College President*, ed. B. Lamar Johnson. Los Angeles: Junior College Leadership Program, Graduate School of Education, University of California, 1969.
- The College Fact Chart*. Spartanburg, S.C.: The National Beta Club, 1967.
- The Role of the Junior College in the Urban Revolution*. Los Angeles: Report of a conference sponsored by Los Angeles City College, April 1968.
- THORNTON, J. W. JR. *The Community College*, 2nd ed. New York: John Wiley and Sons, 1966.
- TUNNICLIFFE, G. W. and J. A. INGRAM. "The College President: Who Is He?" *Educational Record*, L, No. 2 (Spring 1969).
- WALBERG, H. "The Academic President: Colleague, Administrator, or Spokesman?" *Educational Record*, L, No. 2 (Spring 1969).

Occasional Reports from UCLA Junior College Leadership Program:

1. Frederick C. Kintzer. *Faculty Handbooks in California Public Junior Colleges* (Junior College Leadership Program, Occasional Report No. 1). Los Angeles: University of California, Los Angeles, 1961. Price, \$1.00.
2. Frederick C. Kintzer. *Board Policy Manuals in California Public Junior Colleges* (Junior College Leadership Program, Occasional Report No. 2). Los Angeles: University of California, Los Angeles, 1962. Price, \$1.00.
3. *Institutional Research in the Junior College—A Report of a Conference* (Junior College Leadership Program, Occasional Report No. 3). Los Angeles: University of California, Los Angeles, 1962. Price, \$1.50.
4. Frederick C. Kintzer, *President's Report in American Junior Colleges* (Junior College Leadership Program, Occasional Report No. 4). Los Angeles: University of California, Los Angeles, 1963. Price, \$1.50.
5. *Establishing Junior Colleges* (Junior College Leadership Program, Occasional Report No. 5). Los Angeles: University of California, Los Angeles, 1964. Price, \$1.50.
6. B. Lamar Johnson, *Islands of Innovation* (Junior College Leadership Program, Occasional Report No. 6). Los Angeles: University of California, Los Angeles, 1964. Price, \$1.00.
7. B. Lamar Johnson, ed. *New Directions for Instruction in the Junior College* (Junior College Leadership Program, Occasional Report No. 7). Los Angeles: University of California, Los Angeles, 1965. Price, \$2.00.
8. B. Lamar Johnson, ed. *The Junior College Library* (Junior College Leadership Program, Occasional Report No. 8). Los Angeles: University of California, Los Angeles, 1966. Price, \$2.00.
9. B. Lamar Johnson, ed. *Systems Approaches to Curriculum and Instruction in the Open-Door College* (Junior College Leadership Program, Occasional Report No. 9). Los Angeles: University of California, Los Angeles, 1967. Price, \$2.00.
10. Ervin L. Harlacher. *Effective Junior College Programs of Community Services: Rationale, Guidelines, Practices* (Junior College Leadership Program, Occasional Report No. 10). Los Angeles: University of California, Los Angeles, 1967. Price, \$2.00.
11. Arthur M. Cohen, in collaboration with Florence B. Brawer. *Focus on Learning: Preparing Teachers for the Two-Year College* (Junior College Leadership Program, Occasional Report No. 11). Los Angeles: University of California, Los Angeles, 1968. Price, \$2.00.
12. B. Lamar Johnson, ed. *The Experimental Junior College* (Junior College Leadership Program, Occasional Report No. 12). Los Angeles: University of California, Los Angeles, 1968. Price, \$2.00.
13. B. Lamar Johnson, ed. *The Junior College President* (Junior College Leadership Program, Occasional Report No. 13). Los Angeles: University of California, Los Angeles, 1969. Price, \$2.00.
14. Don A. Morgan. *Perspectives of the Community College Presidency* (Junior College Leadership Program, Occasional Report No. 14). Los Angeles: University of California, Los Angeles, 1969. Price, \$2.00.

For Sale by UCLA Students' Store