UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

Los Angeles

The Barriers and Successes Experienced by

Chief Business Officers in Higher Education

Who Have Served in the Role of College President

A dissertation submitted in partial satisfaction of the

requirements for the degree Doctor of Education

by

Michael Hill Carter

2016

ABSTRACT OF THE DISSERTATION

The Barriers and Successes Experienced by

Chief Business Officers in Higher Education

Who Have Served in the Role of College President

by

Michael Hill Carter

Doctor of Education

University of California, Los Angeles, 2016

Professor Mark Kevin Eagan, Chair

In an effort to provide new avenues for sourcing college presidents, this study examined the barriers and successes chief business officers (CBOs) experience when pursuing and serving in the role of college or university president. Specifically, this study examined the perceptions and experiences of 12 current presidents from CBO backgrounds as well as five executive recruiters who have recently guided a presidential search process.

Semi-structured individual interviews provided the data for this study, which, when analyzed, identified specific themes to aid the research questions. As these themes emerged, they helped inform subsequent interviews, refining and reformulating the questions asked.

The findings of this study suggest that CBO presidents are likely to work in less selective, financially struggling institutions. Despite their lack of academic credentials, these presidents reported experiencing an insignificant amount of resistance from faculty during the search process. As CBOs, the participants in this study obtained a breadth of experience directly related to the skills needed to be an effective president. These skills extended beyond traditional CBO roles of managing the internal resources of an institution. Most importantly, the CBOs gained experience working through issues related to the academic mission of the institution. Most CBOs also participated in raising funds for the organization. Over half of the study's presidential participants credited their work with a mentor for providing these broad opportunities.

With regard to the interviewed recruiters, most felt that the number of CBO presidents will increase slowly due to the large number of presidential vacancies, the lack of traditional candidates in the pipeline, and the current financial crisis facing higher education. In order for more CBOs to rise to this elevated position, CBOs must broaden their focus by addressing the gaps in their skills and experience that currently hinder their paths to the presidency.

The dissertation of Michael Hill Carter is approved.

Christopher Erickson

Robert Rhoads

Linda Sax

Mark Kevin Eagan, Committee Chair

University of California, Los Angeles

2016

DEDICATION PAGE

To Ericka and Lauren.

Your love and support have kept me going throughout this journey.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

this doctorate degree and for sharing your insight with me. From the beginning, all three of these individuals recognized something in me that I had not yet seen myself.

None of this would be possible without the support of my family. To my amazing daughter, Lauren; thank you for inspiring me on a daily basis. You are the bright star in your parents' lives. Finally, I would like to thank my wonderful wife for her love, encouragement, support, and patience each and every day. Ericka, I could not have done this (or just about anything else) without you. I love you both.

VITA

EDUCATION

2003
          M.B.A.
          Loyola Marymount University, Los Angeles, CA

1997
          B.B.A., Computer Information Systems, *Magna Cum Laude*
          Loyola Marymount University, Los Angeles, CA

PROFESSIONAL EXPERIENCE

2016 – Present
          Vice President, Chief Operating Officer
          Southwestern Law School

2010 – Present
          Chief Advisor, Digital Media Development & Strategy
          Golden Globe Awards (Hollywood Foreign Press Association)

2012 – 2016
          Vice President, Chief Operating Officer
          California Institute of the Arts

2011 – 2012
          Vice President Operations and Chief Information Officer
          California Institute of the Arts

2008 – 2011
          Associate Vice President and Chief Information Officer
          California Institute of the Arts

2000 – 2008
          Chief Technology Officer
          American Film Institute

EXTERNAL GOVERNANCE

2015 – Present
          Board of Trustees Investment Committee Member
          Henry Mayo Newhall Memorial Hospital

2014 – Present
          Board of Trustees Finance Committee Member
          Henry Mayo Newhall Memorial Hospital

PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT

2012
          Institute for Educational Management
          Harvard University Graduate School of Education

CHAPTER ONE

Statement of the Problem

A leadership crisis in higher education is looming (Kim, Cook, American Council on Education, & College and University Professional Association for Human Resources., 2013; King, Gomez, American Council on Education, & College and University Professional Association for Human Resources., 2008), as colleges and universities will likely experience a major change in presidential leadership during the next decade due to a significant number of anticipated retirements (Kim et al., 2013; King et al., 2008; Song & Hartley, 2012). In 1986, 41.6% of college presidents were between the ages of 31 and 50 and 13.9% were over 60 years of age. By 2011, the age demographics of this group changed dramatically. In 2011, only 10.1% of presidents were in the 31 to 50 age group, and 58% were over 60 years of age (American Council on Education [ACE], 2012). The average retirement age in the Unites States is 62 years (Riffkin, 2014). More than half (52.6%) of incumbent presidents surveyed in 2011 indicated that they would not seek another presidency after they step down from their current position, and only 20.6% indicated a desire to continue as a president of a college or university (ACE, 2012).

As the age of current presidents increases, their time in office is decreasing. In 1986, the average tenure of college presidents was 8.5 years. By 2011, this figure had decreased to 7 years (ACE, 2012). Given the need for experience and stability in executive leadership amidst the current economic challenges facing higher education, this decline in presidential tenure is concerning (Song & Hartley, 2012). The combination of aging demographics, a large number of upcoming retirements, and increased turnover may lead to all sectors of higher education facing a shortage of candidates who are prepared for the position of the president (ACE, 2012; King et

1

al., 2008). A projected shortage of candidates who have traditionally filled this role only compounds these issues.

Traditionally, the largest source of candidates for the position of president has come from chief academic officers (CAOs), or provosts (ACE, 2012; Berliner, Palm, Yakoboski, Lorden, & Smyer, 2009; Cohen, March, & Carnegie Commission on Higher Education, 1974; Eckel, Cook, & King, 2009). A 2012 survey of university and college presidents revealed that 44.6% of respondents listed CAO or senior academic officer as their immediate prior position (ACE, 2012). A companion survey in 2013 found that the average age of deans and CAOs was 57 years (Kim et al., 2013). If this group follows the normative path to the presidency, they will quickly add to the ranks of presidents over the age of 60.

Despite the demand for candidates who have followed a more traditional academic career path toward a college presidency, a supermajority of CAOs have indicated that they are not interested in a move to the presidency (Berliner et al., 2009; Eckel et al., 2009; Hartley & Godin, 2010). Over half of CAOs decide against remaining in campus administration after leaving their current position. The most common next steps for a CAO are retirement (21%), college/university president (20%), or returning to the faculty (18%; Berliner et al., 2009). Two-thirds of CAOs reported that they do not find the work of the president appealing, and many consider it too time consuming and visible (Eckel et al., 2009).

Exacerbating this issue is the fact that the main job responsibilities of a CAO have little to do with the main responsibilities of the position of the president (Berliner et al., 2009). Specifically, the president's job now requires expertise in finance due to pressure from internal and external budgetary forces, which includes cuts in funding, losses in enrollment, and increases in the cost of delivering education (Jones & Wellman, 2010; Tierney & Minor, 2003). In 2013,

states spent 28% less on colleges and universities as compared to 2008. During this same period (2008-2013), over 20% of states reduced spending by more than one-third. On the extreme end of this spectrum, Arizona and New Hampshire cut their per-student spending in half during this time (Oliff, Palacios, Johnson, & Leachman, 2013). These financial issues have created an environment where fundraising and budgetary management are the top two most important and time-consuming tasks of a university president (Song & Hartley, 2012).

Due to the relatively scarce supply of traditional candidates for the college presidency, increases in complexity of the presidential position, and the financial issues facing higher education institutions, governing boards, executive recruiters, and presidential search committees increasingly look to potential presidential candidates who come from outside of higher education (ACE, 2012; Tierney & Minor, 2003). Birnbaum and Umbach (2001) label these candidates *strangers*. In 2006, 13% of presidential recruits came from outside higher education. In 2011, that number had risen to 20% (ACE, 2012). These nontraditional candidates must overcome significant legitimacy challenges as they attempt to lead their institutions. In order to receive community acceptance, nontraditional presidents must demonstrate budgetary and management expertise, display a sensitivity to the academic culture, and possess strong academic values. Many nontraditional presidents possess the fiscal and managerial experience required for the job, but struggle to adapt to the politics in higher education and slower pace of decision-making. (Bornstein, 2003).

One candidate who possesses financial insight and operates within both academic culture and shared governance environment is the non-academic executive in higher education. In their study of the career path of college and university presidents, Birnbaum and Umbach (2001) used the label *steward* for presidents who have never taught in academe but who have worked in

higher education in their previous two positions. Chief business and financial officers (CBOs) represent one type of candidate to serve as a steward president. CBOs oversee the financial operations of the institution but often remain disconnected from teaching and research activities.

This qualitative study examined the barriers and successes experienced by CBOs who have served or are serving in the role of college president. The study investigated the perceptions and experiences of these steward presidents along with executive recruiters who have served on presidential search committees. In an effort to provide new avenues for sourcing college presidents, this study illuminated the challenges and benefits experienced by executives that have followed this nontraditional path. The findings of this study will guide CBOs interested in developing the skills needed for the presidential role in higher education.

Leadership in a Culture of Shared Governance

In 1858, Henry Philip Tappan, president of the University of Michigan, proposed that faculty oversee teaching methods and curriculum in academe (Birnbaum, 2004), thereby establishing the need for college presidents to be sensitive to academic culture. Although it did not fully embrace it, over the next 50 years, academia widely recognized the principle of faculty oversight. In the early decades of the 20th century, faculty members increased their professionalism and control over the curriculum of their institution. The academic revolution that followed World War II led many institutions to accept faculty involvement in other education-related matters (Birnbaum, 2004). Nearly all of the colleges and universities in the United States now have some semblance a system of shared governance (Gilmour, 1991). Tierney and Minor (2003) surveyed 3,761 CAOs, academic senate leaders, and department chairs from 763 4-year colleges and universities in the United States. In the results of the survey, 83% of respondents indicated that shared governance was an important part their institution's values and identity

(Minor, 2003). Over 95% of the CAOs indicated that shared governance was an important core value of their institution.

Nontraditional presidents who come from non-academic organizations without shared governance may struggle to embrace a culture where most decisions lack a top-down approach. In higher education, there is a strong resistance to the hierarchical leadership found in traditional organizations. It is more accurate to describe the faculty in a college or university as constituents rather than followers of a president (Birnbaum, 1989). Without acceptance and perceived legitimacy from campus stakeholders, a president cannot advance an ambitious agenda. These stakeholders legitimize those presidents who they perceive to understand and reflect the institutional culture of their university (Bornstein, 2003; McLaughlin & Riesman, 1990). Such acceptability is essential for every presidential task, including administration, governance, planning, constituent lobbying, resource acquisition, and institutional positioning (Bornstein, 2003).

Given the importance of cultural understanding and acceptance to both presidential legitimacy and success, one possible source of potential presidential candidates is the non-academic executive in higher education. These individuals, called stewards by Birnbaum and Umbach (2001), perform many of the duties of the modern president within the structure of a shared governance environment. In a 2011 survey, the American Council of Education (ACE, 2012) found that 13% of current presidents of independent colleges and universities were non-academic officers in higher education (stewards) prior to assuming the role of president. A survey in 2006 by the same group found that 25% of these presidents were previously stewards (Song & Hartley, 2012). While reviewing the 2012 ACE survey for data related to presidents of independent colleges and universities, Song and Hartley (2012) found this perceived decrease to

5

be misleading. Ten percent of the presidents of independent institutions selected *other* when asked to identify their professional title prior to becoming a president. After examining the data, Song and Hartley found that most of the titles in the other category were non-academic positions in colleges or universities. Thus, they determined that the number of presidents promoted from non-academic officer positions in independent colleges and universities was comparable for 2006 and 2011.

Given the large number of upcoming vacancies, the aging demographics, and the lack of interest among traditional candidates, higher education must continue to cast a wider net during the presidential search process (ACE, 2012; Bornstein, 2011). As stated previously, a supermajority of CAOs have indicated that a move to the presidency does not interest them, and many do not possess the financial acumen needed for the position (Berliner et al., 2009). By continuing to source presidential candidates from the academic ranks, American institutions of higher education may face a shortage of interested and qualified candidates for their presidential positions (Kim et al., 2013). Therefore, higher education must take "aggressive initiatives" (Bornstein, 2011, p. 21) to rapidly expand the pool of qualified presidential candidates (Song & Hartley, 2012). Due to their job duties within the shared governance environment, stewards in higher education are a source of uniquely qualified and culturally legitimate presidential candidates.

Data on presidential duties indicate that stewards are uniquely qualified in ways different from the traditional university presidential candidate. Data from a 2011 survey show that many of the primary duties of CBOs of colleges and universities correspond to the top duties of college presidents. For instance, the top job duty for both presidents and CBOs is managing the institution's financial resources. Both presidents and CBOs list strategic planning and managing

capital projects as common job duties (ACE, 2012; National Association of College and University Business Officers [NACUBO], 2013). By comparison, many of the skills and much of the experience currently lacking among college presidents (such as technology planning, risk management/ legal issues, and managing capital improvement projects) are regular job duties of CBOs (ACE, 2012; Kepple, 2012; NACUBO, 2013).

The Presidential Search Process

In higher education, governing boards are responsible for presidential transitions and the appointment of presidential search committees. These search committees are ideally made up of seven to 12 members, with more than half of the representation coming from the membership of the governing board, whereas a combination of faculty, staff, students, and alumni can make up the remaining members, depending on the institution. In addition to these members of the institutional community, approximately 60-80% of presidential searches use the services of an executive search consultant, who plays the important role of identifying potential candidates and guiding the search committee through the process of evaluating candidates. At the conclusion of this evaluation, the board charges the search committee with delivering a list of final candidates to them. The members of the board then make the final selection of a president (Johnston & Ferrare, 2013). Since the executive search consultant identifies potential candidates and the governing board makes the final selection, both groups are critical in the decision-making process.

<div align="center">

Research Questions

</div>

In order to identify the barriers and successes experienced by CBO presidents and the universities they lead, this study sought to answer the following research questions:

1. What do former CBOs say were key factors of their success (or failure) as presidents?

a. What are the experiences of these leaders as they work towards gaining legitimacy on campus?

2. What are the challenges CBOs face during the presidential search process according to CBO presidents and executive recruiters?

3. What do executive recruiters say about the effectiveness of the presidential search process to yield candidates that have the traits and skills needed in a modern president?

Design of the Study

A qualitative perspective was deemed appropriate for this study due to the importance of gaining a deep understanding of the point of view of each participant (CBO presidents and executive recruiters). By conducting one-on-one interviews, this study uncovered the views, recent memories, and possible resistances related to the viability of CBOs as presidents. These interviews allowed the researcher to posit questions that may not have ready-made answers. During the initial interviews, new themes emerged. The researcher shaped future interviews with presidents and search consultants to gain a deeper understanding of these new themes and probe for further information (Milliken, 2010; Tracy, 2013).

Twelve current CBO presidents were interviewed to gain a broad understanding of how they progressed to the presidency as non-academics and gather the specifics on what they did to succeed and maintain legitimacy in their specific environments. The selected presidential participants were currently serving as the leader of a 4-year college or university in the United States. Additionally, five executive recruiters were interviewed to gather their insights on the benefits and risks of selecting stewards as presidents and the viability of increasing representation in this group among future presidents. The selected executive recruiter

participants had each placed one president in a 4-year college or university within the previous 5 years.

Theoretical Framework

To gain a better understanding of how CBO presidents have established and maintained legitimacy on campus, this study viewed the role of these presidents through the four frames developed by Bolman and Deal (2008). The application of this organizational theory provided a structure that grouped information into understandable patterns and served to filter nonessential information. The structural frame focuses on the specific work of an individual or organization and how this work is distributed through the institution. The human resource frame seeks to understand people through their strengths, weaknesses, emotions, desires, and fears. The political frame reveals how individuals within an organization operate in an environment with scarce resources and competing interests. Finally, the symbolic frame analyzes the importance of ritual, ceremony, and culture in an institution. This frame also establishes the importance of the process that an individual takes to become a member of a group.

Data Collection and Analysis

In order to capture deeper insights and eliminate the potential for groupthink, the researcher conducted one-on-one interviews with each participant. This choice also maintained the participants' confidentiality. The researcher interviewed participants in person or via telephone. The interviews were transcribed verbatim and the transcripts were analyzed and coded for predefined as well as emergent themes. Predefined themes included preparation for the presidency, gaining and maintaining legitimacy, and the presidential selection process.

This chapter provided an overview of the leadership challenges facing higher education and a potential (and partial) solution. The next chapter will gather and report on the pertinent

literature on the current state of leadership and the role of CBOs in academia. The third chapter

provides the methodology behind the study and the fourth chapter will provide a background of

the participants and the results of the study. The final chapter of this study concludes with a

discussion of the findings and related recommendations.

CHAPTER TWO

Literature Review

Higher education will soon face a leadership crisis at the highest level. In the next decade, a large number of college presidents will retire, and there is a shortage of traditional candidates: namely CAOs. Research shows that many of these CAOs possess neither the interest nor the specific skills needed to be a successful modern president (Berliner et al., 2009; Hartley & Godin, 2010). Due to vacancies in the presidential position and the lack of interest and preparation of CAOs, colleges have turned to executives from outside higher education to fill these positions at an increasing rate. Examples of these *outsiders* include corporate CEOs, politicians, and former military officers. These external candidates have struggled to achieve legitimacy on campuses due to their lack of understanding and acceptance of the shared governance system.

A viable candidate for the presidency who operates within the shared governance environment is the CBO in higher education. Although research has revealed much about the day-to-day operations of these executives, there is a lack of data on their path to and success as college presidents. In an effort to expand the pool of candidates for the presidential position, this study illuminates the challenges and successes experienced by the individuals who have followed this nontraditional path.

This chapter begins with a report on the large number of college presidents set to retire and the reasons behind this imminent exodus. Next, the study examines the shortage of CAOs interested in filling these positions and demonstrates how the role of CAO does not always provide the preparation needed for the job duties of a modern college president. The chapter continues with a review of the programs developed to help prepare candidates for the office of

the presidency. The study then turns to the challenges facing presidential search committees as they attempt to yield qualified candidates for the position and then examines the increasing trend of these committees to select candidates outside of academe. The chapter discusses the challenges faced by these stranger presidents as they work to gain legitimacy within a shared governance system. The study continues with a detailed discussion on how the duties of CBOs are in line with duties of both the modern college president and the decision-making process within academe, followed by a review of how these individuals may be limited as presidential candidates. The chapter progresses with a review of the organizing framework used for this study. Finally, the study illuminates the lack of research on these non-academic executives as presidents and declares its intent to fill this void in academic literature.

Significant Presidential Retirements on the Horizon

  An aging demographic. Since 1986, ACE has conducted regular surveys of college and university presidents from across the nation. The results of this survey are published in ACE's *American College President* (ACP) report. In 2011, ACE conducted its sixth survey by querying 3,318 presidents and CEOs. The 2012 ACP report compiled data from 1,662 respondents. In the 25 years since the first ACP report, the age demographics of this group have increased dramatically. In 1986, 41.6% of college presidents were 31 to 50 years of age. In 2011, only 10.1% of presidents were in this age group. In 2011, 58% of presidents were over 60 years of age, up from 13.9% in 1986. Over the past 25 years, the average age of presidents has increased from 55 years to over 60 years of age. The average age of presidents at doctorate-granting universities was 62 in 2011 (ACE, 2012; Song & Hartley, 2012).

  When we look at the data from private, liberal arts colleges and universities, the picture is very similar. Beginning in 2008, the Council of Independent Colleges (CIC)—an association

representing 616 small and mid-sized private liberal arts colleges and universities—pulled the data for its member institutions from the ACP reports. Their goal was to analyze trends within its member institutions and compare the results against other colleges and universities. The data from CIC presidents closely resembles the data from the population of presidents in the ACP reports. The average age of CIC presidents has increased steadily over the past 25 years: 52 years (1986), 54 years (1990), 56 years (1995 and 1998), 57 years (2001), 59 years (2006), and 60.3 years (2011). Although they are slightly younger than the larger population in the ACP report, a majority of CIC presidents (53%) are over 60 years old (Hartley & Godin, 2009; Song & Hartley, 2012).

Presidents are stepping down. A large number of presidents will retire in the near term (ACE, 2012; Hartley & Godin, 2009; Kim et al., 2013). Additionally, a majority of college and university presidents are now at or within a year of the average retirement age in the Unites States (62 years old; ACE, 2012; Hartley & Godin, 2009; Riffkin, 2014; Song & Hartley, 2012). More than half of the then-current presidents surveyed in 2011 indicated that they will not seek another presidency after they step down from their current position, and only 20.6% of presidents who responded to the survey expressed a desire to continue as a president of a college or university (ACE, 2012). Among the CIC presidents surveyed in 2011, 73% expect to step down from their position in 9 or fewer years, 48% plan to step down in the next 5 years, and 12% expect to leave their current position in 1-2 years. More than one-third of CIC presidents plan on retiring after they leave their current position, and only 23% of all CIC presidents plan on seeking another presidency (Song & Hartley, 2012).

If half of all presidents 61 or older choose to retire in the next year, nearly one-third of U.S. college presidencies would become vacant (ACE, 2012; Kim et al., 2013). As of 2013, there

were 4,726 degree-granting postsecondary (Title IV) institutions in the United States (U.S. Department of Education, 2013). The massive exodus of so many leaders at such a high level is a significant concern (ACE, 2012; Kim et al., 2013; King et al., 2008; Song & Hartley, 2012).

Declining presidential tenures. In 1986, the average tenure of college presidents was 8.5 years. By 2011, this number had decreased to 7 years (ACE, 2012). The decrease in tenure numbers at CIC institutions is very similar: down to 7.1 years in 2011 as compared to 8.5 years in 2006 (Song & Hartley, 2012). For the first three-quarters of the 20th century, the median tenure of college presidents had been approximately 10 years (Cohen et al., 1974). With aging demographics, a high number of upcoming retirements, and increased turnover, higher education's demand for college presidents may significantly outpace the supply of traditional candidates (ACE, 2012; King et al., 2008; Song & Hartley, 2012).

The Pool of Traditional Candidates Is Not Deep

The most common candidate for the role of the college president is the Provost or CAO (ACE, 2012; Berliner et al., 2009; Cohen et al., 1974; Hartley & Godin, 2009; Kim et al., 2013; Song & Hartley, 2012; Travis & Price, 2013). It is most common for a president to come through the academic ranks of a college or university (ACE, 2012; Travis & Price, 2013). In 2012, 82% of all presidents had previously served as members of the faculty (Kim et al., 2013). Cohen et al. (1974) described the normative path to the college presidency as a system of academic promotions progressing from professor to department chair to dean, and then to the penultimate position of Provost or CAO before assuming the role of president. According to the ACP report, 34% of all first-time presidents were previously CAOs in 2011, up from 22.5% in 1986 (ACE, 2012). When looking at CIC institutions, the role of CAO is also the most common previous

position among presidents, with 29% coming from this path in 2012, up from 27% in 2006 (Hartley & Godin, 2009).

Similar to their presidential counterparts, most CAOs are also approaching retirement age. In 2013, ACE and the College and University Professional Association for Human Resources commissioned the study *On the Pathway to the President,* which focused on senior administrative positions on college campuses. More than 300 institutions participated and provided information on 3,906 executives in senior positions at colleges and universities. According to this study, the average age of CAOs was 57 in 2013 (Kim et al., 2013), which has held relatively constant from 2008 to 2013 (Eckel et al., 2009; Hartley & Godin, 2010; Kim et al., 2013). In 2008, the average age of CAOs in CIC institutions was 56.5 years and the average age of CAOs in private and public doctoral institutions was 60 years. These numbers indicate that, like presidents, the majority of CAOs are most likely within a decade of retirement (Hartley & Godin, 2010).

The aging demographic of the CAO population corresponds with a lack of interest in the presidency. Among CIC CAOs age 61 or over, 75% say they have no plans to seek a presidency. More than a third (36%) of CAOs age 51-60 do not desire the position. (Hartley & Godin, 2010). In a 2008 national survey of 1,715 CAOs from 2- and 4-year public and private colleges and universities, 66% of the respondents perceived the job of the president as unappealing. Only 30% of the CAOs indicated that they were interested in becoming a president (Eckel et al., 2009). CIC CAOs are even less interested in promoting to this level, with fewer than one in four (24%) indicating that they intended to become a president. Nearly half said that they were definitely not interested in the position; 30% said that they were undecided (Hartley & Godin, 2010).

When asked for reasons why they were not interested in the presidency, a large majority of CIC CAOs (74%) said that the nature of the work of the president is unappealing. Other reasons given included the following: 26% said that they "do not want to live in a fishbowl," (Hartley & Godin, 2010, p. 36), 25% said that they were ready to retire, 25% did not like the time demands of the position, and 24% expressed a desire to return to the faculty. Among the CIC CAOs that were undecided on whether they wanted to pursue the presidency, 74% said they did not know whether they would enjoy the nature of the work (Hartley & Godin, 2010). The CAO has a very close view of the difficulty and stress related to the role of the president, and Palm (2009) asserted that the reason behind the CAOs' reluctance to ascend is due to their proximity to the president. This proximity would explain other reasons listed by CAOs for not pursuing the presidency including concerns over balancing family life and a desire to return to the faculty (Berliner et al., 2009; Hartley & Godin, 2010). Richard Ekman, president of the CIC, believes that this lack of interest of CAOs has created an *urgent issue* (Ekman, 2010; Travis & Price, 2013). Given all of these factors, it is not surprising that CAOs average only 4.7 years in presidential roles (versus an average of 7 years) and then frequently either return to the faculty or retire (Bornstein, 2011).

The Traditional CAO is Not Prepared for the Modern Presidency

Those CAOs who are interested in the presidency may not be prepared for the leadership challenges facing the modern university. During the Colonial period in the United States, college presidents were often clergymen who the institution expected to serve concurrently in the roles of faculty and administrator. After World War II, as the number of colleges and universities increased, the role of the president on campus diminished (Bornstein, 2003). The role of the contemporary president is now more complex and goes beyond the historical role of working

with the faculty and managing the academic process and policies (Cowen, 2008). A modern

president must be adept at fundraising, financial management, external relations, strategic

planning, capital improvement, and technology assessment (ACE, 2012; Cowen, 2008). In 2011,

ACE asked current presidents to select the top three areas (out of 20) that served as their primary

uses of time while on the job. More than half (57.9%) ranked budgeting and financial

management as one of the top three issues demanding their time and attention. Slightly less than

half (47.0%) of those surveyed ranked fundraising as a priority requiring substantial amount of

time and attention. Less than a fourth (19.6%) of the presidents listed academic issues as a

primary focus and slightly less than one in eight (12.2%) of those surveyed indicated that work

related to academic issues was a top use of time. Table 2.1 lists the top areas that consume the

time of a president in the 21st century. Much of the work of the modern president extends beyond

the walls of his or her institution. Nine of 10 presidents now participate in external duties such as

serving on boards of non-profit institutions and other colleges as well as interacting with

governmental organizations on behalf of their institutions (ACE, 2012; Song & Hartley, 2012).

Table 2.1

Primary Uses of Time for All College and University Presidents

Primary Use of Time	% of Presidents Ranking Area in Top Three Ways They Spend Their Time
Budget/financial management	57.9
Fundraising	47.0
Community relations	22.7
Strategic planning	22.2
Personnel issues	21.6
Governing board relations	20.7
Enrollment management	19.6
Faculty issues	15.0
Government relations	13.1
Capital improvement projects	12.6
Academic issues	12.2

Note. Adapted from *The American College President: 2012,* by the American Council on Education, 2012,
Washington, DC: American Council on Education, Center for Policy Analysis. Copyright 2012 by the author.

As external matters became a larger part of the president's role, many of the internal duties of the college or university have been delegated to the position of the CAO (Kerr & Gade, 1987). Therefore, the duties of the CAO are primarily inward-facing (Berliner et al., 2009; Hartley & Godin, 2010). When analyzing the role of the CAO, it is no surprise that the five most time-consuming tasks for CIC CAOs are all academic- and faculty-related. The CIC survey cited the oversight of curriculum and academic programs as the most time-consuming task for 63% of CAOs. This was followed by dealing with personnel matters (50%); hiring, promoting, and retiring faculty (46%); accreditation and assessment (35%); and campus shared governance (30%; Hartley & Godin, 2010). All of the top duties of the CAOs listed in Table 2.2 are inward facing and most are focused on academics and the faculty.

Table 2.2

Primary Uses of Time of CIC CAOs

Primary Use of Time	% of CAOs Ranking Area in Top Three Ways They Spend Their Time
Curriculum and academic programs	63
Supervising and managing personnel	50
Hiring, promoting, and retiring faculty	46
Accounting, accreditation, assessment	35
Campus/faculty governance	30
Strategic planning	28
Budgeting/financial management	27
Entrepreneurial activities	6
Enrollment management	6
Student issues/student development	5
Facilities, space allocation, and capital projects	2

Note. Adapted from *A Study of Chief Academic Officers of Independent Colleges and Universities*, by H. V. Hartley and E. E. Godin, 2010, retrieved from http://eric.ed.gov/?id=ED510962. Copyright 2010 by the authors.

The career path of the CAO also fails to provide many of the skills needed to perform the role of the president. As stated previously, the most common path to the CAO is from the academic roles of professor to department chair to dean before assuming the role of the CAO (Cohen et al., 1974). Across all institutional types in higher education, approximately 90% of

CAOs arrive from an academic position and have spent most of their career primarily in the classroom/laboratory (Hartley & Godin, 2010).

When comparing the roles of the modern president and CAO, it is clear that the duties of the CAO are unrelated to the most time-consuming responsibilities of the president (Berliner et al., 2009). Table 2.3 compares the primary uses of time of CIC presidents versus CIC CAOs. The areas where a primary job function of the president does not correspond to a primary job function of a CAO are marked with an asterisk. All of these non-corresponding areas involve working with outside constituencies on behalf of the college or university. Therefore, the career path and job duties of the CAO may not adequately prepare a person for the modern presidency (Berliner et al., 2009; Cowen, 2008; Hartley & Godin, 2010).

Table 2.3

Primary Uses of Time of CIC Presidents vs. CIC CAOs

Primary Use of Time	CIC Presidents	CIC CAOs
Fundraising*	72%	—
Budget/financial management	57%	27%
Enrollment management	31%	6%
Strategic planning	29%	28%
Governing board relations*	25%	—
Community relations*	15%	—
Personnel issues (excluding faculty)	14%	50%
Academic issues	12%	63%
Faculty Issues	12%	30%
Capital Improvement Projects	11%	2%
Entrepreneurial Ventures	6%	6%
Government Relations*	3%	—
Athletics*	3%	—
Campus Internationalization	2%	30%
Media/Public Relations*	2%	—
Accountability/Assessment of Student Learning	2%	35%
Crisis Management*	2%	—
Risk Management/Legal Issues*	2%	—
Student Life/Conduct Issues	2%	5%

* Presidential duty does not correspond to CIC CAO duty.
Note. Adapted from *The American College President: 2012,* by the American Council on Education, 2012, Washington, DC: American Council on Education, Center for Policy Analysis. Copyright 2012 by the author. Adapted from *A Study of Chief Academic Officers of Independent Colleges and Universities*, by H. V. Hartley and E. E. Godin, 2010, retrieved from http://eric.ed.gov/?id=ED510962. Copyright 2010 by the authors.

When analyzing the areas where current presidents felt least prepared, one sees that four out of the top five and half of the total areas of insufficiency do not correspond to a frequent job duty of the CAO. Table 2.4 shows the areas where CIC presidents felt least prepared after assuming their first position as president. The areas in the table that do not correspond to the duties of the CAO are marked with an asterisk.

Table 2.4

Areas Insufficiently Prepared for First Presidency in CIC Institutions

Area	CIC Presidents
Technology Planning*	45%
Risk Management/Legal Issues*	25%
Fundraising*	30%
Entrepreneurial Ventures	29%
Athletics*	29%
Capital Improvement Projects	27%
Campus Internationalization*	24%
Budget/Financial Management	23%
Accountability/Assessment of Student Learning	22%
Government Relations*	22%
Governing board relations*	21%
Enrollment Management	20%
Academic Issues	20%
Crisis Management*	18%
Faculty Issues	17%
Student Life/Conduct Issues	17%
Media/Public Relations*	15%
Strategic planning	13%
Community relations*	13%
Personnel Issues (Excluding Faculty)	11%

* Presidential duty does not correspond to CIC CAO duty.
Note. Adapted from *A study of Presidents of Independent Colleges and Universities*, by W. Song and H. V. Hartley, 2012, retrieved from http://eric.ed.gov/?id=ED533603. Copyright 2012 by the authors.

Due to the fact that the CAO is the most common position that leads to the presidency, the misalignment between these two positions suggests that this is a significant career change rather than a natural progression for CAOs (Berliner et al., 2009). The lack of succession planning and the limited sources of leadership training in higher education have led to many

CAOs becoming "accidental administrators" (Berliner et al., 2009, p. 6). The career progression through the ranks of academe for most CAOs was not intentional and occurred due to circumstantial events. Many CAOs were successful academics who accepted more academic responsibility in service to their institution. These CAOs therefore learned their administrative skills on the job rather than through purposeful leadership development programs (Berliner et al., 2009; Robinson, 1988). It is clear that more training may likely be needed for CAOs who are considering a pursuit of the presidency (Berliner et al., 2009).

Efforts to Develop More Presidential Candidates

Despite the need for more qualified candidates for the office of the president, higher education has not done enough to prepare potential candidates for this important leadership role (Lenington, 1996; Travis & Price, 2013). Although previous experience in academe can prove useful to a new president, it is often not sufficient due to the specific skill set needed to be an effective president (Fisher & Koch, 1996; Travis & Price, 2013). Candidates for the presidency are more prepared for the position when they participate in focused development programs such as doctoral programs in academic leadership (Mcfarlin, Crittenden, & Ebbers, 1999; Song & Hartley, 2012). These programs should focus on issues such as risk management, enrollment management, technology planning, fundraising, external relations, board relations, and fiscal management (ACE, 2012; Song & Hartley, 2012; Travis & Price, 2013). In addition to the doctoral programs in educational leadership, shorter-term programs such as CIC's Executive Leadership Academy and the Academic Leadership Program hosted by the Committee on Institutional Cooperation also exist.

The Executive Leadership Academy is a 1-year program designed to prepare CAOs and vice presidents to become presidents in liberal arts colleges (The Council of Independent

Colleges, 2015). In the program's first class in 2009-2010, 63% of the cohort members moved up the ranks in higher education after attending the program, with 16 of the 41 participants later becoming a president or chancellor. In the 2011-2012 class, 71% of the cohort members were promoted after attending the program with 10 of the 40 participants assuming the role of the president or chancellor. In the latest class that completed in summer of 2014, two participants have become presidents and three have been promoted. CIC does not provide any data on the titles or backgrounds of the participants, so there is no data on the numbers of participants from the academic or non-academic ranks (The Council of Independent Colleges, n.d.).

A consortium of the Big Ten Universities and the University of Chicago (called the Committee of Institutional Leadership) runs the Academic Leadership Program. The committee created the program to prepare academic administrators for the role of presidency, provost, or dean at major research universities. The program includes courses that focus on current challenges facing the academic organization: leadership, operations, finance, facilities, external relations, and globalization (Big Ten Academic Alliance, n.d.). A review of the directory of the 2014-2015 Academic Leadership Program Fellows reveals that only two of the 74 fellows are from the non-academic ranks. The remaining 72 fellows are all serving in academic roles in their institutions (Committee on Institutional Cooperation, 2014)

In addition to focused training, mentoring is also an effective way to unlock the complex role of the president. Current and past presidents who make themselves available to share their experiences and answer questions can serve as a critical network for new presidents (Cowen, 2008; Travis & Price, 2013). One example of a mentoring program in higher education is the ACE Fellows Program. Participants in this program observe the work of an experienced mentor, such as a college president, and participate in key meetings, events, and special projects over a

period of 1 year. In addition, the ACE fellows form instant support networks within their cohort and among the fellows that have come before them. Of the 1,800 people who have participated in this program, over 300 have become college presidents (ACE, n.d.). According to the titles of the people in the most recent class of the ACE Fellows Program, 22 fellows came through the academic ranks and seven fellows are non-academic executives (ACE, 2015).

The Presidential Search Process Is Not Yielding Enough Qualified Candidates

In academe, the process and outcome of a presidential search are equally important. On the process side, the search serves as one of the most important rituals and ceremonies in the life cycle of an institution (Birnbaum, 1988; McLaughlin & Riesman, 1990). Governing boards are responsible for these presidential leadership transitions and make the ultimate decision on the choice of a president. The members of these boards appoint the search committee and, in most cases, select a search firm (Johnston & Ferrare, 2013).

The selection process and eventual makeup of a search committee can ultimately determine whether or not a president is bestowed legitimacy by campus stakeholders. The goal of the board is to give the chosen president the maximum amount of legitimacy with key constituents on campus. It is therefore common for search committees to include representatives from members of the governing board (or trustees), faculty, and administration (Birnbaum, 1992; Johnston & Ferrare, 2013), and it is important for a president to obtain and maintain the support of all three of these groups if he/she is to be successful (Baliles, 2006; Birnbaum, 1992). Although search committees can exceed 20 people, the optimal size is seven to 12, with half of the members coming from the governing board (Johnston & Ferrare, 2013). The search process should elicit buy-in from these groups by providing an opportunity for these members of the community to be heard (Birnbaum, 1988; McLaughlin & Riesman, 1990). Legitimacy on

23

campus will occur when these groups see the person as *our president* (Bornstein, 2003; McLaughlin & Riesman, 1990). Without legitimacy, a president will not be able to enact his/her agenda (Bornstein, 2003).

According to Birnbaum (1992), trustees are responsible for representing the interests of the institution and the public. Viewing him/her as the chief executive officer (Basinger, 2002; Birnbaum, 1992), the trustees judge the president based on his/her ability to represent the institution to outside groups, respond to the needs of the community, and use the institution's resources wisely. By contrast, the administration reviews the president's ability to keep the internal institution focused, make timely decisions, and balance the needs of disparate constituencies. Administrators look to the president to provide structure and support similar to the chief operating officer (Birnbaum, 1992).

The primary constituency in the search process is the faculty (Johnston & Ferrare, 2013), who judge a president based on his or her dedication to academia and its programs and values. Since they see the president as the CAO (Basinger, 2002; Birnbaum, 1992), it is therefore essential for the president to focus on curriculum and student progress. In this role, it is essential for faculty to feel that the president is listening to faculty and respectful of their concerns. The president must also lead within the shared governance structure by working with faculty and its leadership on initiatives important to the faculty (Birnbaum, 1992).

An integral component of the search committee's activities centers on the frequent use of search consultants. Over 80% of CIC presidential searches between 2007 and 2011 used an executive recruiter to guide the process. This statistic stands in stark contrast to 1985, when only 16% of presidential searches used these firms to recruit presidents (ACE, 2012; Bornstein, 2003; Corrigan & American Council on Education, 2002; Song & Hartley, 2012). Due to the declining

24

numbers of traditional, qualified candidates and increasing numbers of retiring presidents, it is likely the number of searches that use a search consultant will continue to increase. These firms have the ability to expand the pool of candidates due to their access to people who may not be looking for a new position. They also bring their knowledge on how to lead a successful search (Johnston & Ferrare, 2013).

Search consultants have reported a decline in the number of interested and qualified applicants for open presidential positions (Basinger, 2002; Hartley & Godin, 2009). In addition to the lack of interested and prepared CAOs, Bornstein (2011) attributed the dearth of qualified candidates to the decreasing number of permanent, tenured faculty in colleges. Currently in the United States, tenure-track faculty aged 34 or younger only represent 3% of the total faculty (Nealy, 2009; Travis & Price, 2013). The traditional pipeline of academics will continue to shrink in the future if colleges increase the number of adjuncts in their institutions. Fewer tenured faculty members translate into fewer people in the academic leadership pipeline. It seems likely that the quality of our CAOs will decrease as the number of tenured faculty decreases.

Institutions Increasingly Look Outside of Higher Education for Candidates

Due to the lack of traditional candidates and the rise of external challenges facing academe, institutions are sourcing presidents outside of higher education at an increasing rate. In 2001, 9% of all CIC presidents were hired from outside higher education (Hartley & Godin, 2009). In 2009, that number rose to 15% (Song & Hartley, 2012). Looking at all of higher education, the increase is more dramatic. In 1995, 3.9% of all presidents arrived from outside academe (ACE, 2012; Birnbaum & Umbach, 2001). In 2012, 23% of all first-time presidents came from the outside (ACE, 2012; Kim et al., 2013). Birnbaum and Umbach (2001) refer to these presidents as strangers. These presidents have never taught in a college or university and

have worked outside of higher education in their last two positions. These presidents come to higher education from positions in the military, politics, and business without any experience in higher education. Recent examples of stranger presidents include Simon P. Newman (private equity chief executive) at Mount St. Mary's University of Maryland (Stripling, 2016), Lee T. Todd Jr. (technology executive) at the University of Kentucky, Richard F. Celeste (former U.S. ambassador) at Colorado College, Lawrence Summers (former U.S. Treasury secretary) at Harvard, Bob Kerry (former U.S. Senator) at the New School University (Basinger, 2002), John Fry (former management consultant) at Drexel University (Basinger, 2002; Finder, 2008) and Janet Napolitano (former United States Secretary of Homeland Security) at the University of California (Zweifler, 2013).

This rise in stranger presidents stems from the increased belief among governing board members that the presidential role is evolving to focus on financial issues, politics, marketing, and fundraising. During the Great Recession of 2009, extreme cuts of 15% to 20% in funding for public institutions in states such as Pennsylvania, Virginia, New York, Florida, and California were common (Jones & Wellman, 2010). Institutions are currently facing large enrollment losses across the country, and the cost of delivering education is rising while competition from for-profit and online organizations is increasing (Jones & Wellman, 2010; Tierney & Minor, 2003). In addition, colleges are now responding to modern challenges such as an increase in globalization and an ever-changing technical landscape. All of these issues fit within the purview of a number of outside candidates (Basinger, 2002; Bornstein, 2011). Additionally, as mentioned previously, trustees view the president as CEO and measure his/her performance accordingly (Birnbaum, 1992).

Along with support from the trustees, presidents must also gain approval from the faculty. The distributed power within colleges and universities is very different than the centralized power within a corporation (Bornstein, 2011). Outside presidents must learn to adapt to this nearly ubiquitous system in higher education where the president shares power and decision-making with the faculty. The current system of shared governance dates back to 1967 when the American Association of University Professors, the ACE, and the Association of Governing Boards of Universities Colleges (AGB) formally articulated and legitimized the role of faculty in academic governance.

The *Statement on Colleges and Universities* laid out the basis of the relationship between trustees, presidents, and faculty based on two principles. The first principle is that important areas of action should involve the initiating capacity and decision-making participation of all institutional constituents. Secondly, differences in the weight of each voice should be determined by reference to the responsibility of each constituent for the particular matter at hand (Joint Statement on Government of Colleges and Universities, 1990). This statement confirmed the faculty's *primary responsibility* for issues related to curriculum and instruction, but it also pronounced the importance of the faculty in broader educational policy areas such as long-range planning, decisions related to existing or prospective physical resources such as buildings and facilities, budgeting, and selecting administrators. Gilmour (1991) surveyed presidents and governance chairs at 800 institutions of higher education in the United States. Ninety-one percent of the 402 institutions responding to the survey utilized a participative governance body for decision-making.

Outsiders face a "steep learning curve" adapting to the academic culture and governance in higher education (Basinger, 2002, para. 26). This "lack of cultural fit" (Bornstein, 2003, p. 44)

can lead to a lack of support from the key constituency—the faculty—and is one of the threats to presidential legitimacy (Bornstein, 2003; Johnston & Ferrare, 2013; Stripling, 2016). In a study of 16 recent presidential derailments, Trachtenberg (2013) cited two cases of unsuccessful presidents who failed due to a lack of experience operating in an academic setting. "Charlie," a president at a public master's university, arrived at the presidential position from law and government where he utilized an authoritarian approach to leadership. When applied in the university setting, this approach was not successful.

According to a member of the university community, Charlie did not understand the shared governance system. An example of this lack of understanding was on display when Charlie decided to introduce a new major at the university against the faculty's wishes. Charlie also created a faculty policy manual without input from the faculty. By avoiding the established shared governance system of the university, Charlie did not get the buy-in from the faculty. Rather than working as a collaborative colleague with the faculty, members of the university's community described Charlie's management style as "very aggressive" and "manipulative." Charlie's replacing many of the vice presidents with those who did not have a strong background in higher education further added to his difficulty adjusting. The governing board of the university attempted to salvage Charlie's presidency by taking away his campus duties and instead having him focus on external relations and fundraising. Rather than follow this directive from the board, Charlie remained active in campus decision-making. Six months later, the board dismissed Charlie (Trachtenberg, 2013).

Similar to Charlie, a midsized land grant university selected "Edward" despite his having no previous experience in higher education. Edward was previously in a leadership position where he was accustomed to giving orders and expecting his subordinates to follow them.

Edward's presidency failed due to his lack of adjustment to the shared-decision-making culture of the school and for refusing to engage with the campus stakeholders (Trachtenberg, 2013). In order for external candidates to be successful, they will require more orientation to the governance and culture of higher education (Hartley & Godin, 2009; Song & Hartley, 2012). The governance of an academic institution is a partnership among the president, faculty, and governing board. In order to lead effectively, a president must connect with an institution's "academic and cultural values" and gain "broad support and commitment" from all constituents (Baliles, 2006, p. 3).

In 2015, Simon P. Newman became president of Mount St. Mary's University in Maryland after leaving the position of chief executive of a private equity firm (Mangan & Desantis, 2016; Stripling, 2016). Throughout his tenure as president, Mr. Newman struggled with the amount of time and consultation needed to make a decision in a shared governance environment (Stripling, 2016). Mr. Newman cut medical and retirement benefits for faculty and staff without consulting the faculty. He also fired two professors (one of whom had tenure) and demoted the provost. The termination of the professors triggered thousands of academics across the United States to sign a statement protesting the decision (Mangan & Desantis, 2016). On campus, this decision led to nearly all faculty members (97%) voting to demand Newman's resignation (Thomason, 2016). Mr. Newman resigned on February 29, 2016 – approximately 1 year after he began his tenure as president. The case of Mr. Newman highlights the struggle of stranger presidents as they attempt to adapt to the consultative decision making environment of higher education. The top-down leadership style of the corporate, military, or government position does not match directly with a leader operating in a shared governance setting.

Duties of Stewards Align Better with the Regular Duties of the President

The common pathway for a steward president is from a position within the senior non-academic officer ranks. Senior non-academic officers include chief business officer (or chief financial officer), chief human resource officer, and general counsel (Kim et al., 2013). For the purposes of this study, executives who lead areas related to student affairs (vice president of student affairs, chief student affairs officer, and chief enrollment officer) were not included among the non-academic officer ranks.

In December 2012, the National Association of College and University Business Officers (NACUBO, 2013) sent a survey to CBOs at 3,200 public, private nonprofit, and private for-profit, 2- and 4-year universities, and published the data from the 772 CBOs who responded in the 2013 National Profile of Higher Education Business Officers. The data in the report show that the most important job duty listed by 77.1% of the CBOs is managing the institution's financial resources. Similarly, the number one use of time of college presidents is focusing on the budget and the financial management of the institution (Table 2.1). The second most important CBO job duty is strategic thinking and decision making, which corresponds to the fourth most common use of presidential time: strategic planning (ACE, 2012; NACUBO, 2013). The fourth most important CBO job duty is directly supporting the initiatives of the university president. Nearly all (93%) CBOs report directly to the president of their institution. The final common job duty of presidents (number 10) and CBOs (number 8) is managing capital projects (NACUBO, 2013). Table 2.5 compares the CBOs' ranking of their most important job duties with the presidents' primary use of time.

It is important to note that the function listed second by presidents is fundraising, which is the primary function of another college steward, the chief advancement officer. Despite the

fact that the normative path to the presidency is through academic positions, the lowest ranked

item in the job duties of the president is tending to academic issues (ACE, 2012).

Table 2.5

CBOs' Most Important Duties vs. Presidents' Primary Uses of Time

Job Duties	CBOs' Rank for Most Important Duty	Presidents' Rank for Primary Use of Time
Managing the Institution's Resources	1	1
Strategic Thinking and Decision Making	2	4
Leading Change and Fostering Innovation	3	-
Supporting the President and Managing Up	4	-
Appropriately Engaging the Community in Financial Decisions/Communicating	5	-
Making Important Decisions Even When Unpopular	6	-
Getting a Clean Audit	7	-
Managing the Institution's Capital Projects	8	10
Enterprise Risk Management	9	-
Mentoring	10	-
Other	11	-
Managing the Institution's Endowment	12	-
Personal Leadership Development	13	-

Note. Adapted from *The American College President: 2012,* by the American Council on Education, 2012, Washington, DC: American Council on Education, Center for Policy Analysis. Copyright 2012 by the author. Adapted from *2013 National Profile of Higher Education Chief Business Officers*, by the National Association of College and University Business Officers, 2013, Washington, DC: Author. Copyright 2013 by the author.

The survey also asked presidents to identify the areas in which they felt they felt

unprepared after becoming a president (Table 2.2). Three of the top five areas listed by

presidents are primary job functions of CBOs (technology planning, risk management/legal

issues, capital improvement projects; ACE, 2012; NACUBO, 2013). Presidents also listed

budget/financial management, governing board relations, government relations, crisis

management, strategic planning, non-faculty personnel issues, and community relations as areas

they felt unprepared for (ACE, 2012). All of these areas are part of the regular job duties of a

CBO in higher education (Kepple, 2012; NACUBO, 2013). It is therefore safe to say that CBOs

perform all of their internal duties within the shared governance environment.

31

When presidents were asked to identify which constituency presented the greatest challenge to them, the presidents listed legislators/policymakers (50.8%) and the governing board (29.3%; ACE, 2012). For CBOs, a large part of the job is dealing with policymakers and working directly with their governing board (Kepple, 2012; NACUBO, 2013). This external experience corresponds to the need for modern presidents to be more outward facing (ACE, 2012; Basinger, 2002; Birnbaum, 1992; Song & Hartley, 2012).

Limitations of Stewards as Presidential Candidates

Although stewards have based a career on working within the shared governance system of higher education and regularly perform the duties of the president, they often must accept presidential positions in less prestigious institutions (Birnbaum & Umbach, 2001). This may be due to the fact that only a small percentage of CBOs (8.6% of females and 10.5% of males) possess a doctorate degree (Ph.D. or Ed.D.; NACUBO, 2013). A large majority of current presidents (76.8%) possess a doctorate degree (ACE, 2012). This lack of terminal degree may be a limiting factor for increasing the number of stewards as presidents.

The career path of John Fry, president of Drexel University, provides an example of how a steward without a terminal degree ascended to the presidency. Mr. Fry's highest degree is a master's degree in business administration from New York University. Mr. Fry began his career in higher education as a financial and management consultant. During a consulting engagement at the University of Pennsylvania, the president, Judith Rodin, asked Fry to become the university's executive vice president. After serving for 7 years in the role of executive vice president, Fry became the president of Franklin and Marshall College, a liberal arts college in Pennsylvania (Finder, 2008; Franklin and Marshall College, 2015). At Franklin and Marshall College, many members of the faculty were initially uncertain if a non-academic without a

terminal degree could lead their institution. Mr. Fry gained legitimacy on campus by setting an impressive agenda for the institution and not interfering with the academic programs (Finder, 2008). John Fry served as the president of Franklin and Marshall College for 8 years before assuming the role of president of Drexel University in 2010 (Drexel University, 2015).

In addition to potentially being limited due to the lack of a doctorate, many potential steward presidents are nearing the age of retirement. For example, most CBOs are within a decade of the average age of retirement. In 2013, the average age of CBOs was 56 years, up from 54 years in 2010 (NACUBO, 2013). Given the ongoing problem of presidential retirements, higher education must continue its efforts to develop qualified presidential candidates from both traditional and nontraditional paths.

Theoretical Framework

As stated previously, Bolman and Deal's (2008) four frames served as an organizing framework for this study. The structural (or bureaucratic) frame emphasizes roles, responsibilities, rules, policies, and procedures. This frame often enforces and highly structures organizational reporting lines with heavily prescribed and well-defined roles and responsibilities. In a study of 32 college and university presidents, Bensimon (1989) found that presidents who utilized this frame in their leadership style focused on the importance of their personal role and preferences in decision-making and obtaining positive results. Under this frame, presidents also emphasized the importance of superiors directing the work of subordinates through established systems of management and bureaucracy. Through the structural lens, this study aimed to uncover how the roles and responsibilities of CBO presidents in their previous position as a non-academic executive prepared them for their current role as president. The structural frame also provided a lens through which to examine whether and how perceived and defined

33

responsibilities/requirements of CBO presidents contrasted with those of more traditional academic presidents.

The human resource (or collegial) frame focuses on the intersection of people and organizations (Bolman & Deal, 2008). Drawing from psychology, this frame focuses on the role of interpersonal relationships within an institution. College and university presidents who use this frame embrace shared decision making and focus on the success of others. Through this lens, this study examined the effectiveness of non-academic presidents leading in a shared governance environment. Presidents who have deployed this frame successfully focus on the value of interpersonal skills and motivating others by putting the interests of the institution first (Bensimon, 1989). Through this lens, this study also examines the perceptions of recruiters and campus stakeholders towards non-academic presidents. This study used this frame to understand how CBO presidents build relationships with and establish legitimacy among those who have initially questioned their legitimacy as president.

The political frame views organizations as arenas or contests with limited resources. The actors within these institutions are competing for limited resources through bargaining, coercion, and compromise (Bolman & Deal, 2008). Using this frame, this study sought to understand the strengths and challenges of CBO presidents who are leading institutions during the current financial pressure facing higher education. Successful presidents who utilize this frame lead through persuasion and are rigid regarding achieving specific results but flexible regarding the methods used to achieve those results. Using this frame, successful presidents focus on creating change through coalition building between competing constituencies, much like a prime minister's role in the parliamentary system of government. The political frame also compels a

president to focus on external groups and policymakers that may influence the institution's success (Bensimon, 1989).

Finally, the symbolic frame focuses on the cultural aspects of an organization, such as its rites, rituals, myths, and ceremonies. This frame goes beyond the literal to focus on the abstract and the symbolic (Bolman & Deal, 2008). This study utilized this frame to trace the steps taken by presidents as they attempted to assimilate into the tribe of higher education where membership was previously restricted to those with an academic background. Presidents who utilize this frame guide an institution using subtlety rather than leading through overt leadership (Bensimon, 1989). These leaders adopt Cohen et al.'s (1974) view of higher education institutions as "organized anarchies" (p. 2) due to their inherent ambiguity in their goals and uneven participation from community members.

Summary

The review of literature provided the following basis for the current study, namely: (a) a large number of presidents will be retiring soon and there is a shortage of traditional candidates willing and/or able to fill these upcoming vacancies, (b) presidential search committees are not yielding enough candidates for their current positions, (c) this shortage of candidates is leading to an increase in presidents from outside academe, (d) these external candidates may struggle to gain legitimacy within the shared governance system, and (e) CBO candidates are a source of uniquely qualified candidates based on their daily duties performed within a shared governance environment. The literature provides no information on the career path of CBOs or guidance on how they prepared for the role of the president. There is also no research on the challenges and successes of CBOs who transition into college presidents. This study aimed to address these gaps in the higher education literature.

CHAPTER THREE

Methodology

In an effort to address the problem of sourcing qualified candidates to fill the upcoming vacancies in the role of college president, this study documented the barriers and successes experienced by chief business and financial officers (CBOs) in higher education who have served in this role. Due to the increasing age of the incumbents in the position, a large number of vacancies in the role of college and university presidents will occur in the next decade. At the same time, the average tenure of college presidencies is decreasing (ACE, 2012; Kim et al., 2013, 2013; Song & Hartley, 2012). A lack of traditional candidates willing to step into the role of the president exacerbates this issue. In addition, many of these candidates do not possess the skills required for the modern presidency.

Research has shown that the job duties and skills possessed by CBOs align with the skills needed in modern college presidents (ACE, 2012; NACUBO, 2013). This qualitative study sought to gain a deep understanding of the experiences of these steward presidents and the executive recruiters who serve on presidential search committees. This study focused on these non-academic administrators and did not include student affairs executives due to their proximity to academic operations in most colleges and universities.

Previous research has not documented the experiences, actions, and everyday struggles of CBOs as presidents. From the interviews conducted for this study, new insights into the experiences of these individuals emerged related to their success transitioning to and succeeding in the role of the college president. These insights shaped future interviews to probe for further information about the successes and failures of these presidents (Milliken, 2010; Tracy, 2013).

This study required probes for a deep understanding of human choices: choices made by executive recruiters as they consider potential candidates for the presidency, and choices made by CBOs as they progressed and later succeeded (or failed) as college presidents. This qualitative study provides a description of the perceived challenges and benefits faced by CBOs as presidents and provides insight into the factors that contributed to their success or failure. Interviews will provide a deep understanding of the perceptions, decisions, and behaviors of these actors operating within the unique context of higher education (Geertz, 1973; Merriam, 2009; Tracy, 2013). The findings of the study are assembled into a guide that CBOs can follow to develop the skills needed for the presidential role in higher education.

Research Questions

Through a set of interviews with various constituencies, this study addressed the following research questions:

1. What do former CBOs say were key factors of their success (or failure) as presidents?

   a. What are the experiences of these leaders as they work towards gaining legitimacy on campus?

2. What are the challenges CBOs face during the presidential search process according to CBO presidents and executive recruiters?

3. What do executive recruiters say about the effectiveness of the presidential search process to yield candidates that have the traits and skills needed in a modern president?

Participants

This study interviewed 12 current presidents from 4-year universities who formerly held the position of CBO. It also interviewed five executive recruiters. Purposeful sampling was

37

employed to select the participants in this study. This sampling method targeted a small number of participants based on specific criteria and ensured representativeness within the unique setting of higher education (Merriam, 2009; Patton, 2002). This method yielded a thorough examination of the information-rich cases within the population (Bickman & Rog, 1998; Merriam, 2009).

Criteria for participants. This study selected presidential participants if they previously served as a CBO in a non-profit, 4-year college or university in the United States and were currently serving or had previously served as a permanent president of the same type of institution. This study did not consider individuals who had only served as an interim president. It additionally did not consider presidents who previously served as a tenured faculty member or as member of the academic administration of a college or university (chair, dean, provost).

This study selected members of executive recruiting firms based on their experience guiding 4-year colleges and universities through a presidential search. Within executive recruiting firms, the study chose participants from the senior executive team of the firm based on the individual's title (president, managing director, vice president, or partner). To ensure that the experience of the executive recruiters was relevant, the study only selected recruiters who had successfully placed a president in a four-year college or university within the prior 5 years. This study selected participants without regard to the individual's gender, ethnic, or racial background. The limited pool of potential participants necessitated accepting any volunteers who fit the selection criteria for this study.

Selection process. NACUBO provided a list of presidents who were previously CBOs. The researcher obtained and reviewed all the biographies of each college president on this list from the respective institutions' websites to select the individuals that fit the participant criteria

of this study. With the assistance of NACUBO, each president was then contacted via e-mail to request an interview.

Classified advertisements placed in the *Chronicle of Higher Education* and the membership list of ACE's Roundtable of Executive Search Firms were used to gather a list of executive recruiters. The researcher then contacted each potential participant via e-mail and/or phone to request an interview.

Data Collection Methods

This study utilized semi-structured individual interviews to collect data. This interview format allowed the researcher to be flexible in the wording of the questions and gather data in an adaptive and organic manner (Merriam, 2009; Tracy, 2013). The researcher based follow-up questions on the respondents' answers to the questions and allowed the researcher to probe for meaning interactively. The researcher interviewed 12 participants via telephone and one participant in person. The duration of each interview was approximately 60 minutes. The researcher recorded the audio from each interview and took notes to document the elements of the interview that were not captured in the audio recording (surroundings, non-verbal cues, etc.).

To address research question one, the researcher asked current CBO presidents probing questions intended to uncover the key factors that facilitated or hindered their success as president. The interview protocol questions aligned with this research question sought to elicit the espoused leadership theories held by the presidents as they reflected on their everyday experiences and struggles towards gaining and maintaining legitimacy on their campuses. This study intended questions one through six and numbers 12 and 15 in the interview protocol for presidents (Appendix A) to address research question one by inquiring about the specific experiences of the presidents as they lead their institutions and strive to gain legitimacy on

campus. The researcher intended the interview questions aligned with research question two to uncover the specific challenges experienced by CBO presidents as they navigated through the presidential search process. The researcher asked presidents to reflect on whether their non-academic background was a factor during this process and the strategies they employed to successfully address any questions or objections related to their background. The study aligned questions seven through 11 in the presidential interview protocol with this research question. Finally, the researcher asked presidents questions aligned with the ultimate goal of this project: to guide the development of current CBOs interested pursuing the role of college president. The study intended questions 13 and 14 to elicit information related to this goal.

The researcher asked executive recruiters a series of open-ended questions related to the presidential search process and the experience, skills, and traits needed in a modern president. Appendix B contains the full semi-structured protocol for executive recruiters. The study designed the first eight questions in this protocol to gather general information about the presidential search process. To address research question three, the researcher asked executive recruiters questions (nine through 15) related to the benefits and risks of hiring CBOs as college presidents and how these individuals perform in the presidential search process. Finally, the researcher asked executive recruiters to reflect on the upcoming vacancies in the presidential position and ways to target and develop current CBOs to fill some of these vacancies.

Data Analysis Methods

The researcher performed data collection and analysis simultaneously throughout the project. The researcher transcribed recorded interviews verbatim, and the researcher analyzed and coded transcripts of the interviews to identify specific themes aimed at addressing the research questions. The researcher used these themes to refine and reformulate subsequent

40

interview sessions (Merriam, 2009). The researcher organized and named the emergent themes from the interview sessions, using quotations from the interview sessions to support the espoused theories presented in the study (Bernard, 2013).

One area this study intended to illuminate is the extent to which steward presidents felt prepared for their role as president. Within this theme, this study examined how connected steward presidents felt the roles and responsibilities in their previous non-academic executive position were to their presidential appointment. Another theme explored the search process the perspective of both of the steward presidents and executive recruiters. A final theme delved into steward presidents' transition into their new roles. This theme examined the key factors that led to the presidents gaining and maintaining legitimacy on their campus and within their respective communities. The information that presidents shared regarding their views on the components of good presidential leadership and how they gained legitimacy as president, were coded to identify references to the use of one or more of Bolman and Deal's (2008) four frames.

Ethical Issues

The confidentiality and anonymity of the participants and their respective sites was the most important ethical consideration for this study. To ensure the privacy of the participants and protect them from harm, the study anonymized each participant. The gender of the participants in this study were assigned randomly while maintaining the correct male-to-female ratio. This study has employed pseudonyms for each name and institution and has removed (or, in the case of gender, randomized) any identifiable information for every individual and site. This study only discusses background information or demographic data that could identify an individual or site in the aggregate so that it cannot be attributed directly. In addition, the study does not provide information on specific programs or initiatives that might to identify any individual or site.

41

Due to the researcher's professional interest in the outcome of this study, he disclosed to each participant that he is a non-academic executive that intends to pursue the position of college president. He also disclosed that, in addition to publishing the dissertation, he would personally use the findings of this study as he progresses in his career.

Reliability and Validity

To enhance credibility, this study used quotes to provide direct evidence and minimize any bias in the interpretation of the data. These detailed quotes will enhance the applicability of the results to other individuals and sites (Creswell & Miller, 2000). In order to minimize any reactivity, the researcher attempted to avoid asking questions that could lead the participant to a particular answer (Maxwell, 2012). In addition to receiving anonymity, participants were reassured that they were not obligated to discuss anything that they did not want to discuss. The researcher systematically analyzed the transcripts of the interviews using standard coding procedures. This study also triangulated presidents' claims against the views of executive search consultants.

Summary

The purpose of this study was to capture the key factors that encouraged or inhibited the success of college presidents who were previously CBOs in higher education. Using qualitative interviews, this study will document the experiences of these presidents and the executive recruiters who have led presidential searches. This study documented the experiences of 12 presidents and five executive recruiters. The researcher analyzed the transcripts from these interviews and coded them for themes. The next chapter will discuss the results of this analysis.

CHAPTER FOUR

In an effort to provide new avenues for sourcing college presidents, this study investigated the barriers and successes experienced by non-academic executives in higher education who have served in the role of college president. As established previously, higher education will soon face a leadership crisis at the presidential level. In the next decade, a large number of college presidents will retire due to a significant increase in the age demographics of these executives. One viable candidate for the presidency, one who operates within the shared governance environment, is the non-academic executive in higher education. Although much is known about the day-to-day operations of these executives, there is a lack of research on their path to and success as college presidents.

In an effort to expand the pool of candidates for the presidential position, this study sought to illuminate the challenges and successes experienced by these executives who have followed this nontraditional path. To answer the research questions, the researcher analyzed the transcripts from interviews conducted with 12 CBO presidents and five executive recruiters. The chapter begins by providing background information about the participants and their institutions. The next section explores themes related to experiences and traits that helped to prepare CBOs for their ascendance to the college presidency. The chapter then reviews how CBOs transitioned into their presidential appointments and examines particular challenges these presidents faced. Throughout the chapter, this study weaves in executive recruiters' perspectives on CBOs as presidents. The study concludes with an analysis of what executive recruiters think about the effectiveness of the current presidential search process and the likelihood that it will lead to the selection of additional CBOs as presidents.

Background

CBO Presidents and Their Institutions

Twelve presidents who have risen from the CBO ranks agreed to participate in this study. The presidential tenure for these participants ranged from 0 to 19 years with a median tenure of 6.0 years. Prior to serving in the presidential role, the participants spent from 5 to 25 years in the role of CBO for a college or university with a median tenure of 11.0 years in this antecedent position. When considering the highest degree obtained, five presidents (42%) had Ph.D.s, four (33%) had Ed.D.s, two (17%) had master's degrees, and one (8%) had a bachelor's degree. All nine presidents (75%) with terminal degrees (Ph.D. and Ed.D.) obtained their degree in the field of education. The gender of the participants was split between four females (33%) and eight males (67%). Eight presidents (67%) had taught classes in a higher education setting whereas four presidents (33%) had no teaching experience.

All of the presidents lead non-profit, 4-year colleges or universities in the United States. The median student population of the presidents' institutions is 3,939 students. According to the Carnegie Classifications of Institutions of Higher Education (Indiana University School of Education, 2016), four institutions (33%) can be considered small (1,000-2,999 students), six institutions (50%) are medium in size (3,000-9,999 students), and two institutions (17%) are large (more than 10,000 students). Eight institutions (67%) are private colleges/universities and four institutions (33%) are public. Table 4.1 contains the complete list of the CBO presidents with the pseudonyms used for each name and institution.

Table 4.1

List of CBO Presidents

Pseudonym	Gender	Institution	Institution Size	Private/ Public
Adams	Female	McGee University	Medium	Private
Blair	Male	Sims College	Small	Private
Chase	Male	Rowland University	Large	Public
Cole	Male	Owens University	Small	Private
Edwards	Male	Tucker University	Medium	Public
Finch	Male	Hudson University	Large	Private
Gates	Female	Gilmore College	Medium	Private
Gordon	Female	Townsend University	Medium	Public
Kirkland	Male	Norris University	Medium	Private
Langley	Male	Conner University	Medium	Public
Rogers	Male	McKay College	Small	Private
Roth	Female	Harding College	Small	Private

Presidential Search Methods

Participants in this study were selected as president via one of four different search methods. Four presidents (33%) were internally appointed—without a search process—by the governing board as a promotion from their current position as the institution's CBO. One president (8.3%) was selected from a closed search conducted solely by the governing board with no faculty representation. Four presidents (33%) were selected from a confidential search with faculty representation on the search committee. The members serving on confidential search committees are instructed to keep all matters related to the search confidential. The candidates in the confidential searches did not meet with any other campus constituents other than the representatives on the search committee. Finally, three presidents (25%) participated in a completely open search with open forums on campus where all members of the campus community were invited to talk with the candidates. In total, nine out of the 12 CBOs (75%) were selected as president without broad faculty involvement beyond the faculty serving on the

search committee. Table 4.2 shows the most recent type of search method used to hire each president.

Table 4.2

List of CBO Presidents and the Presidential Search Method

Pseudonym	Search Method
Adams	Internally Appointed
Blair	Open & Non-confidential
Chase	Internally Appointed
Cole	Confidential with Faculty Representation
Edwards	Confidential with Faculty Representation
Finch	Confidential with Faculty Representation
Gates	Internally Appointed
Gordon	Internally Appointed
Kirkland	Confidential with Faculty Representation
Langley	Closed
Rogers	Open & Non-confidential
Roth	Open & Non-confidential

Executive Recruiters

Five executive recruiters participated in this study. All recruiters were senior-level executives (vice president and above) in the educational practice of their firms. Each recruiter had over 20 years of experience in the executive recruiting field for education with a median 24 years of experience. Three of the recruiters (60%) are females and two recruiters (40%) are male. All recruiters are currently leading searches for presidents of non-profit universities and colleges in the United States. Table 4.3 contains the complete list of the executive recruiters with the pseudonyms used for each name and institution.

Table 4.3

List of Executive Recruiters

Pseudonym	Gender	Company
Evans	Female	Columbia Executive Search
Cook	Male	Jefferson & Associates
Dillon	Female	Kemp Executive Search
McKnight	Female	Lewis & Logan
Higgins	Male	Holcomb Executive Search

The Selection of a President: CBOs' Experience during the Search Process

Most Presidential Participants Work at Less-Selective, Financially Struggling Institutions

Eight of the 12 presidents indicated that their college or university was financially struggling prior to their selection as president. One of the remaining four presidents was chosen to create a new institution that did not exist prior to his tenure as president. According to data from the U.S. Department of Education (2016), all but one of the presidents currently serve at institutions that accept over 60% of the students who apply. The average acceptance rate for the 12 institutions led by the CBO presidents in this study was 73% with a median acceptance rate of 75%.

Roth stressed that her selection as a president at Harding College was based partially on her prior research of this institution conducted during her job search. During that research, she uncovered that the institution was facing financial difficulties. She then applied for the presidential position knowing that her background in finance would be a match with the institution's current needs. Kirkland summed up the sentiments of the presidents leading schools with financial issues thusly:

> I have felt that I got the job at [Norris University], which by the way was in terrible financial shape, and I really believed [they] hired me because they thought, "We've tried everything else, we'd better try somebody who knows the money."

By applying to schools that were struggling financially or less-selective public colleges, the

participants indicated that their non-academic background differentiated them during the

presidential search. For example, when Gates was chosen as president of her institution, the

chairman of the board came to her and said, "We really think for the life of the institution right

now your financial background is what we need." Many CBOs commented that they highlighted

their nontraditional backgrounds in their interviews at the institutions that needed financial

guidance to differentiate themselves from the traditional candidates in the pool with academic

backgrounds. Finch expressed an understanding that he was competing against CAOs in two

presidential searches and used this knowledge to his advantage:

> I don't go in and say, "I'm the same president as the provost," what I say is, "I'm
> different, and that's good," and I actually found in both interviews, it got me to the finals,
> because I was the only two-headed calf of the interview process, that unusual person, and
> so I stood out because I was different and they kept me in the process longer because
> when you had 18 provosts and one CFO, and they were going to make cut down to 10,
> they would keep me. I think often because I was different.

Finch fully embraced his nontraditional background rather than attempting to convince the

members of the search committee that his background was similar to the traditional candidates

against whom he was competing. Similarly, when discussing her background as a CBO and the

search process at Harding College, Roth said, "I think for this particular institution at this

particular time, most saw it as a strength." Langley echoed the statements of Finch and Roth by

stressing the importance of a candidate highlighting his/her unique background as a strength:

> I think you always have to keep that in mind in terms of preparing and how you package
> and position yourself and what your strengths are that really are unique and different and
> why those are so important to the institution at that time.

Half of the presidents believed that they would not be selected as president of prestigious

and/or selective institutions or large research universities. The presidents cited three reasons for

this reluctance to accept a nontraditional candidate. First, as stated by Blair, many selective

institutions are more focused on how they "direct resources" more than how they "secure [additional] resources." Second, these institutions likely have the necessary managerial and financial expertise within their current administrative ranks. Due to this existing internal capability, Cole emphasized that the presidents at prestigious institutions "never touch the business model." Cole's view on the established roles and responsibilities within the institution and the clear separation of duties between the president and subordinates is in line with Bolman and Deal's structural frame (Bensimon, 1989; Bolman & Deal, 2008). Blair summed up the final reason for these institutions not selecting CBO candidates:

> Institutions with high prestige and/or wealth will predominantly select a president from the academic side. [Presidents at these institutions] have strong scholarship publication, research backgrounds. They rose as leaders in that way to the deanship, to the chief academic officer, and ultimately to the presidency. They are a beacon of academic scholarship, achievement, and excellence as presidents for their institutions. I think there's a different expectancy for the presidency in those places to be able to send those signals in ways that other institutions, such like mine for example, just one [sic] simply aren't trying to do, even if it would be the appropriate thing to do. Many of these institutions expect the president to bring a level of prestige to the institution.

As Blair stated, prestigious institutions are looking for a president with an academic background that reflects the institution's prestige in academia. Like Blair, Cole viewed the exclusion of non-academic presidents through the symbolic frame. Cole declared that the focus on the pedigree of presidential candidates by high-prestige institutions and the exclusion of nontraditional candidates like CBOs was "all about status" for the institution and "all about looks."

The executive recruiters tended to share the perspective of the CBO presidents that institutional fit is very important for CBOs to consider when they are thinking about applying for a presidential position. All five recruiters felt that CBOs will be more successful focusing on institutions that recognize they have financial problems. Evans summed up the recruiters' sentiments regarding financial fit:

Institutions that have the biggest financial problems, and recognize that they have the financial problems are, most often, attracted to people with what I'll call finance backgrounds, which is the list that you just described. If they think they're financially robust and that that's not their issue then those finance candidates are... I don't want to say less attractive, but they don't have the edge they would have in an institution that's struggling financially.

Evans stated that CBOs are more attractive to financially struggling institutions due to their background. In addition to the structural value that CBOs bring to an institution, all five recruiters felt that CBOs bring symbolic credibility to an institution looking to improve its financial outlook. Dillon felt that CBOs would be a good fit for smaller, liberal arts colleges. All recruiters indicated that CBOs would not be chosen to lead large research universities. What remains unclear is whether CBOs' propensity to be more successful at financially struggling institutions also increases their likelihood for failure given the often precarious situation they enter upon assuming their presidential responsibilities.

Three presidents indicated that prestigious institutions and those institutions not experiencing leadership issues or financial struggles often indicate that they are looking for a diverse set of candidates including people from nontraditional backgrounds, like CBOs. According to Kirkland, this stated desire does not match the qualities in the final selected president:

When you're a CFO, people just aren't really sure what to make of you, and they want you there because you broaden the pool at the front end, but as you work your way through the interview process, they start wanting somebody…this obviously is not 100% true, but it probably is 95% true… but they start wanting to have somebody that looks like the person that just left, or looks like what they think a president ought to be, and that's not often a CFO person. You're in there for the beauty pageant, but you don't necessarily make it all the way. I was in, as I said, maybe six to eight searches where I made it to the airport interview, and then I was in maybe three where I made it to the final before I got my first presidency.

Kirkland states that an institution will often select a president with a background similar to the previous president which reduces the chances for the selection of a CBO for the position. Roth

echoed Kirkland's perspective, stating, "Most consultants will say, 'Oh sure, they're open to nontraditional [presidents].' The alternative search that I was in, it was pretty clear to me that there's a variety of ways where it wasn't a good fit." According to Roth, executive recruiters encourage nontraditional candidates to apply to presidential searches to broaden the initial pool of applicants despite the narrow chances for success. These presidents expressed that more selective institutions will often select a president from a traditional background despite their stated intentions to consider nontraditional candidates.

Cook, an executive recruiter, echoed the sentiments of the CBO presidents who said that many institutions claim that they are interested nontraditional candidates for the role of the president. According to Cook, this stance often ends up with the search committee wasting people's time when they ultimately select a traditional candidate:

> Organizations and people that say that want a nontraditional candidate. It's a fun thing to say. Everybody says that we need fresh thinking and when push comes to shove, we've done all the evaluation and, in the end, more often than not they really don't. It was a fun thing to say at the beginning, and so that's why we can end up playing with people getting their hopes up, but then dashing their dreams because this group was more risk adverse so there is no way they were going to do this.

All five search consultants reported that one of their primary jobs is to focus search committees on what they need in a president in order to align the committee's goals with reality.

CBO Presidents Reported Experiencing Little to No Faculty Resistance during the Search Process

All 12 presidents reported that they experienced little to no resistance from or prejudice among the faculty during the presidential search associated with their non-academic background. Edwards, a participant in a confidential search with faculty representation, recalled his experience with faculty during the interview process:

The questions that they would ask me, it was sort of acknowledgment that I was a nontraditional candidate, because they would say, "Now, you may not have been involved in faculty governance, but what would you think about this, this and this?" I thought they were being pleasant, and they weren't trying to put me on the spot and they weren't trying to use that as a lever to oust me from the candidate pool.

Six presidents echoed similar experiences with faculty members during the search process. Each of these presidents felt that the faculty members asked questions during their interviews to ensure that the CBO candidate understood the importance of faculty governance, but the presidents felt that the faculty did not attempt to eliminate them based on their non-academic background. Roth (open and non-confidential search) stated that, during the interview, faculty intended to uncover whether she understood what faculty do but added, "throughout the interview process I didn't feel a ton of scrutiny coming towards me." Kirkland (confidential search with faculty representation) also did not "remember having deep discussions about academic issues" during his search.

When asked by the faculty about his lack of an academic pedigree, Finch (confidential search with faculty representation) employed a strategy to acknowledge his nontraditional background while highlighting his dedication to understand and embrace the importance of maintaining and supporting the academic traditions of academia:

"Yes, I have a Ph.D., yes I've taught in the classroom and I've published papers and done that stuff, but I am not an academic, I don't pretend to be." I just told them, "I have invested time and energy so I can understand what you do, so I can support it." That kind of candor cut me a lot of slack with them. I wasn't posturing that I was better than them, I was simply saying, "I understand your world enough that I can empathize with your challenges."

Finch's attempt to "empathize" with and "understand" the needs of the faculty emphasizes a human resource perspective, which focuses on prioritizing and addressing concerns of organizational members (Bolman & Deal, 2008). Although Finch's approach of directly

confronting his lack of academic pedigree was unique among the participants in this study, many presidents expressed the importance of possessing a broad understanding of academic affairs.

Despite the type of presidential search, the presidential participants in this study expressed that they did not encounter significant resistance from faculty due to their non-academic background. Most tellingly, the three presidents who participated in open, non-confidential searches did not experience resistance in a search process where faculty were represented broadly and had direct access to the candidates. This reported lack of resistance may be due to the type and/or financial outlook of the institutions selected by the CBOs or to the preparation that each candidate undertook prior to applying for the presidential position. It is important to note that this study did not interview members of the faculty; such interviews would be required in order to conclude that faculty resistance did or did not occur.

The CBO Role As Preparation for a College Presidency

Opportunities to Develop a Broader Institutional Focus Beyond Finance

All 12 of the presidents remarked that their daily duties as CBO went beyond the immediate financial management of the institution. By taking a more expansive role and moving beyond their perceived boundaries established by the structural frame (Bolman & Deal, 2008), participants claimed that they were given a broad understanding of everything that occurred on campus. Finch stressed the importance of this broader institutional focus:

> The best way to express it is a finance person is the head of a pin, our career is designed to specialize us, but a president is not specialized. A president has to be a generalist, bring a broad range of skills together. A CFO who wants to make this transition has to invest a lot of energy and see to it that they don't continue to specialize, that they also get chances to play in other parts of the organization.

The presidents felt it was critical for presidential candidates to possess this holistic view before applying to the presidency. The presidents credited their ability to be effective in multiple

initiatives on campus to the CBO's centrality to most of the decisions made on campus and the personal initiative they took to look for opportunities to do more than manage the college's funds.

Gordon asserted that her time as a CBO exposed her to "the financial challenges, enrollment challenges, [and] fundraising challenges" of the organization. Kirkland echoed this sentiment:

> When you're the CFO, you have your fingers in virtually everything that gets done. Obviously you're not intimately involved with the academic program, but if the academic program is going to have some new facet, or a center to study something in particular, you're involved in that. You're involved in enrollment estimates, and the budgets that flow through that. You're involved in what you're doing from a financial aid strategy point of view, you're involved in the risk issues related to student life, and I could go on and on. The point of it is to say that you're involved in virtually everything, so when you come into the presidency from that kind of a role, you have encountered a whole lot of the things that you will encounter as president. The difference of course is that you are going to look at them in a slightly different way.

Kirkland's broad purview in non-financial areas such as enrollment management, financial aid, and student life prepared him for the expansive role of the president. In regard to enrollment management, Blair added, "While enrollment didn't report to me, because of my position on the team, I had a lot of influence and involvement in enrollment management there." Cole correlated his broad involvement "in nearly every facet of the school" to the size of his institution, stating that at a larger school he would not be as "hands-on." Langley added that his involvement in managing "enterprise-wide projects" gave him "experience working with the faculty and the senate and multiple committees."

In several cases, presidents' perspectives aligned with Bolman and Deal's (2008) symbolic frame when they stressed the need for CBOs to remove the stereotypical "green eyeshade" visor worn by accountants and auditors and to involve themselves in multiple initiatives on campus, such as enrollment management, student affairs, fundraising, and

54

academic affairs. Cole added that the work of the president is often "vague and nebulous" rather than the "black and white" often associated with the work of a CBO. He also stressed the importance of CBOs embracing the uncertainty that often goes along with the work of the college president:

> Once you're in this seat you quickly learn that nothing is that finite, nothing is that concrete. The goals become much, much more vague and nebulous and the target lines just keep moving all the time. You have to be able to embrace uncertainty in this job.

This use of the symbolic frame calls for CBOs to go beyond the literal to focus on the abstract (Bolman & Deal, 2008). Langley provided the following commentary on the importance of coming to the presidency with an appreciation and understanding of the work of faculty:

> I think it's really important for chief business officers to above all else really understand the role of faculty governance and shared governance and working with the deans and the academic administration as it relates to all things about the university. It's pretty easy when you're a chief business officer to be focused on being perfunctory. I've got to get this done; I've got to get that done; I've got to get ... all these things have to get done, but you might want to cut corners, and I understand that. It's something that does not pay off in the end, particularly if you really want to be a president, then that is something that you have to protect your reputation and build your reputation as being a real thought leader with the faculty and having that trust and connection with the faculty. It's really important.

Cole echoed the need for CBOs to have "respect and credibility with the faculty" by taking the time to "understand faculty work." Cole developed a relationship with the faculty by first getting to know the provost and then "leveraging their relationship with the faculty." Roth developed a "familiarity with [faculty] governance" by attending faculty committees and "steering committees that have faculty and staff on them." Blair felt that teaching a class as an adjunct professor gave him an understanding of curriculum development as well as the role of faculty in shared governance and leading the academic enterprise.

The presidents in this study reported that they took advantage of the central role of the CBO in higher education to go beyond the financial realm. These individuals indicated that they

developed a broad view of the academy by engaging in work related to enrollment management, fundraising, and academic affairs such as curriculum development. The participants also employed the human resource frame by attaining their goals through the development of relationships with the provost and members of the faculty.

Gaining Experience through Interactions with the Governing Board

Participants' human resource focus extended to their connections with their institutions' governing boards, as all 12 presidents felt that their previous role as CBO prepared them for managing their relationship with this body. Blair and Finch remarked that most members of the board are business people and are looking for people, like CBOs, who can speak their language and present information that makes sense to them. Kirkland discussed the benefit that the CFO confers over other executives in higher education in managing and interacting with the board:

> The CFO is different from every other VP, because every other VP normally has one committee, where there's a committee liaison to the board. The CFO usually has four: Investments, facilities, finance, audit, and sometimes strategic planning, and sometimes it's even involved with the executive committee. Consequently, you've met virtually every board member through that, and it gives you a really strong sense of how to manage and evaluate boards and board members. I came even into my first presidency with a substantial level of comfort in the kind of issues that a board can present, and how to get them to be their very best.

Several presidents mentioned that this experience of leading committees of the board as the source of their confidence dealing with the current board members. Roth remarked that 10 years of staffing the trustee committees gave her the opportunity to "see the breadth of what the trustees do." Through this experience, she was able to learn about "the kind of information trustees want" and how to condense information and educate the board.

Developing Confidence in Liaising with Governmental Officials

Nine presidents mentioned that their previous experience interacting and developing

relationships with government officials and departments helped them be more effective in their

current position. Edwards reflected on his legislative experience as CBO:

> [As a CBO], I took every opportunity to volunteer, to go with the president, the vice president, whoever it was, our legislative person, whoever it was, to the capitol building and help prepare them to present information. Then as they went on through things, to be the one that was presenting the information. That's an extremely valuable lesson to learn.

The nine presidents viewed their interactions with the governmental officials through the

political frame as they sought to secure scarce funding. Specifically, Edwards credited his

previous experience with government officials with his effectiveness as president to maintain

state funding and lobby on behalf of his institution to "limit the damage" of legislation in the

works. Similarly, Gates stated that she was "really involved in legislative relations and working

with state legislators and the Governor" as CBO. Blair echoed the call for CBOs to be involved

in governmental relations:

> [As CBO] I took on government relations with our local and state municipalities. I wanted to help my own function, but it also advanced my personal interests in experience in this way. Also, other sorts of external relations related to I guess we would call college relations, or university relations. I sought out state boards, I ended up chairing a state board in higher education, the state of Arizona. Those were all both to advance not just the institution, but build out my skill set, and again I had an institution that was very supportive of that sort of involvement. I think in this way I think it's important for not just CBO's, but anybody, but certainly in this case CBO's that if they aspire to the presidency, or if they're interested in it, that they seek out ways to add some of those extra dimensions at least in part to their work.

These participants indicated that currently they must interact with local, state, and federal

governmental officials on behalf of the institution as part of their regular job duties as president.

The Importance of Being Mentored for the Next Step

Seven of the 12 presidents (58%) stressed the importance of previously working for a

president who was willing to mentor them after they expressed an interest in becoming a

president. The presidents reported that their mentor relationships led to "stretch assignments"

that gave them a broader portfolio of experiences. Presidents such as Langley credited these

mentor-provided experiences with "a keen understanding" how all of the disparate pieces of the

organization fit together to strategically align with the academic focus of the institution. Adams

credited her mentor with expanding his purview as CBO:

> [The president] and I worked closely together for a long time, and so I was able to get a
> lot of experience that wasn't typical of a financial officer, and he gave it to me because he
> saw I could do things beyond financial decisions. I looked at the world ... I'd like to think
> of myself as a pretty strong financial officer. I look at how to get things done. Really, it's
> a matter of how do you make things happen, get things done. I was pretty good at that. If
> you're good at that, that goes across a lot of areas. That's why my responsibilities
> expanded, and we did really well during that period when I was doing that stuff. That's a
> lot of the preparation I got.

Langley echoed this sentiment of the mentor providing an opportunity to stretch beyond the

financial realm:

> My preparation in part was being a CFO and a chief business officer, but the other was
> having a strong sort of mentor-sponsor who also provided me with stretch assignments so
> that I had a more well-rounded portfolio. For example, the traditional budget and finance
> matters are certainly important, but they're a small percentage of the job. The bigger
> percentage of the job is really having a keen understanding of how all of those pieces fit
> together strategically within the academic focus and component as well as the
> development focus and component.

Six of the presidents also gave their mentor credit for their involvement in fundraising activities

as CBO and for the introduction to potential donors. Cole expressed that he was given the

opportunity to "watch the best" as he attended fundraising trips with his president. He likened the

value of these fundraising trips to the learning that would occur if he had gone "camping with

Daniel Boone." The strong interpersonal relationship between president and CBO expressed by

Cole and the six other participants is another example of the application of the human resource frame.

Fundraising Experience as a CBO Critical to Many Steward Presidents' Success

Seven of 12 presidents indicated that they were involved in the fundraising efforts as CBOs. The fundraising activities of CBOs ranged from leading capital campaigns for new buildings to overseeing the entire development department for the institution. One president remarked that he was personally responsible for bringing in a $10 million gift from a donor. Cole made the case that CBOs presidents are more equipped than more traditional presidents to raise funds:

> Actually, I think CFOs are probably in a better position than people who come up from the other tracks because we can talk about the business model I think perhaps more fluently, in a more sophisticated way than people that came up through the other ranks. Donors really want to know what they're investing in. They want to know that we're here for the long haul especially in this market where every time you turn around there's a school closing somewhere. Investors want to know that your strategies and your tactics are carefully thought out and that they're going to work and they've been adequately vetted. We just have a vernacular that can speak to those kinds of concerns better than people who come up from academic affairs or student services or advancement even.

According to Cole, presidents who have previous experience as a CBO know how to frame pitches to donors in a way that conveys knowledge about how the institution operates, specificity about the particular investment opportunity, and confidence in the fiscal health of the college. Kirkland also commented on the value of working with donors as a CBO:

> [As CFO] when we got a donor that wanted to give something that had a particularly odd twist, I would work with them to see how we could keep the essence of what they wanted, but make it fit with what we had to do from a fiduciary point of view. After a while, you get to understand what makes them tick, and why giving is important to them, so you can roll that over into your presidency.

Kirkland felt that his efforts to match a donor's interest with an important initiative at his institution gave him insight into the donor's mindset. He later mentioned that "fundraising was

not hard at all" once he became president. Similarly, Langley used his position as CBO to shape

the building of a new library to match a donor's interest:

> I took on the fundraising role for several elements of the business development of the
> facility, . . . and over time developed the relationship with a particular donor where I
> solely went to that donor and redesigned the building around something very specific to
> the Native American community. This particular donor provided $10 million as the lead
> gift for that, which I asked for.

Langley worked within his duties as CBO to turn an interaction with a donor into a successful

gift for Conner University. Langley continued his fundraising success as president by bringing in

"alternative [revenue] sources for projects that were important to the institution."

Out of the five presidents who did not have previous fundraising experience prior to the

presidency, three remarked that it was not difficult to raise money once they began their term as

president. Gates explained that being successful at fundraising is more about attitude rather than

aptitude and that the necessary skills for effective fundraising are brought in with the person

rather than learned on the job:

> You know the fundraising piece is part of personality and character to be quite honest.
> There are certainly well timed asks and well prepared asks, but you've got to have the
> personality and, I hate to say charisma, but that is a big piece of it to sit across the table
> with someone, engage them in a conversation after knowing them for 10 minutes, and
> getting them hooked on the [Gilmore College], and why really this is the right time for
> you to help us. That's part of a personality and a skillset.

Gates's reflection connects with the human resource frame, as she identifies the most important

skill for effective fundraising as the ability to find commonality with the potential donor and to

then connect the donor with the work of the institution. She demonstrated this early in her

presidency by bringing in a large donation: "My very first ask of a donor was a million dollar

ask, and she said 'yes,' and so having fairly well prepared experiences like that help build your

confidence."

Edwards recognized his lack of experience as a fundraiser, so he hired an outside consultant to assist him.

> When I first came, I knew presidents were supposed to act presidential, but they were also supposed to be fundraisers. So, I hired a consultant to come in and do a little quick assessment of what did we have, what might we be capable of, and he brought back a report to me. We raised a good bit of money, just project after project. Several of them were buildings, and I knew how to do those, of course, but several of them were professorships and chairs, academic program support. Then we put together a whole team of fundraisers.

The fundraising consultant helped Edwards assess the current in-house fundraising capabilities and guide him in the hiring of a new development staff. Finch also recognized the importance of a strong fundraising team and found success after he "made some senior leadership changes in [the] advancement [department]." None of the three presidents (Gates, Edwards, and Finch) had previous fundraising experience as CBOs. They credited their presidential fundraising success to having a strong development team who supplied them with good information on potential donors and good advice on how to proceed with the solicitation of funds.

Executive recruiters stressed the importance of fundraising experience for CBOs who are considering a move to the college presidency. Evans pointed out that if an institution is struggling and in need of resources, fundraising experience is more important than experience managing the finances of an institution:

> I mean here's an interesting way of thinking about this: if it's all about resources, is the attraction going to be greater to an advancement professional or a finance professional? And I would say that typically it's going to be the advancement professional who's going to be more attractive to a search committee...Because everybody imagines that if they could only raise more money they would be in great shape. And I don't think they think as much directly about the management of that money as they think about the gaining, the getting of that money…we're looking for a resource development cluster that is more often focused on fundraising than it is on financial management per say.

Evans stressed that institutions that are in financial straits would be more likely to select a president who has shown he/she can raise more money over a candidate who has shown he/she can manage existing resources effectively.

All five of the recruiters responded that a CBO would be more attractive as a candidate if he/she had previous fundraising experience. The recruiters stressed the importance for candidates to have experience convincing others to invest in the institution. Higgins remarked that the president's focus on external resource development over internal resource management is a recent development:

> As the times have changed and presidents and chancellors have had to be more external then [sic] it's been more important for the presidents to be able to hire smart, delegate, and hold people to accountable in the management area, so they can be out more doing the revenue generation part of the puzzle.

Similarly, McKnight felt that institutions rarely want a president "to be the intellectual leader and champion of the liberal arts." All recruiters stressed the importance of a president being able to convince others to believe and invest in a financial plan. Dillon defined successful fundraising as "being able to sell, telling stories, gathering resources. Getting people to believe in it." Similarly, Dillon stated that successful fundraisers "have to show that they can be convincing in telling a story and that involves often being able to persuade people." This desire for a fundraiser to build relationships and deliver a story or idea that connect with the needs and desires of others is aligned with the human resource frame (relationships) and symbolic frame (storytelling; Bensimon, 1989; Bolman & Deal, 2008).

Two of the five recruiters shared that they rarely see CBO presidential candidates with substantial fundraising experience due to the propensity for most CBOs to think in black and white terms. Evans reported that it was "pretty unusual" for a CBO to have fundraising experience. Cook echoed Evans view and shared his opinion on CBOs as fundraisers:

I don't know how many CBOs actually have actual fundraising experience and the ability to go out and raise a significant amount of money. What people like to do is they like to get through saying, "Well, through public/private partnerships I raise this much money through bonds or through whatever, this and that." Again, you are faking it. The way I view fundraising is even the way you talk about putting a vision forward to a campus and the ability to sell intangibles. Do you have that ability or don't? I would say a lot of CBOs deal in the concrete and don't actually have that skill honed.

Cook stressed that it is not sufficient for CBOs to show that they have raised funds through traditional means. Similar to the other recruiters, Cook referenced the symbolic frame by stressing the importance of selling an abstract vision through effective storytelling.

The Importance of a Doctoral Degree

Eleven out of 12 presidents indicated that it was essential for CBOs to obtain a doctoral college degree such as an Ed.D. or Ph.D. in order to transition successfully to the role of president. The presidents listed two reasons for this requirement. Four presidents mentioned that a doctoral degree provides a person with important preparation for the role of the president. Another four presidents commented that a doctoral degree is symbolically important to the faculty and the outside world. While the remaining three presidents felt that the degree was important in terms of both preparation and symbolism, the single CBO with only a bachelor's degree expressed that a doctoral degree was not important for the role of the president.

The doctoral degree as preparation. All seven presidents who valued the doctoral degree as preparation cited that the degree oriented them to the way academic institutions operate. As stated previously, all of the presidents who earned doctoral degrees did so in the field of education. Through the lens of the structural frame, the participants offered examples of the practical training and academic orientation provided by their doctoral degree. For Chase, the doctoral degree allowed him to sit on doctoral committees while he was a CBO. Cole stated that this service provided an opportunity to "build relationships with the academic side." Cole and

Edwards stated that their terminal degrees in education gave them a better understanding of the

faculty and the history and traditions of higher education. Cole provided a detailed explanation

of his preference for a doctoral degree in education over a Ph.D. in a non-education field:

> This sector needs to have presidents that have degrees in higher education and policy and they need to be terminal degrees. I would never recommend anyone without an advanced degree in higher education to take this job. [I had] the privilege of going to [university name removed] and learning from some of the best researchers in the country. The best people in higher education history and policy what I was lacking as a CFO to be president I didn't even know that I was lacking until I did the doctoral program at [university name removed]. I thought I understood the plight of students from underrepresented groups and students from low socioeconomic background. I thought I understood those plights by being one of them but no I really didn't. I thought I understood faculty but I really didn't know the history of the academy. I really didn't know how we got to be here and with 200 years of these kinds of models just how hard change is to happen.
>
> If you're asking me do I think they're any better off with an advanced degree in biology, I'd say no. In those fields they're learning more and more about less and less. Really the only thing that would be helpful to them is they would have perhaps a better handle on reading research and understanding the difference between good research and bad research. A practitioner based program that's nested in scholarship that's the very best way. Sadly I can't really say that I think an Ed.D. is generally better than a Ph.D. because there are so many crappy Ed.D. programs.
>
> Just like the banker [a person with a theoretical Ph.D. doesn't] know about the latest research in higher ed. She didn't know best practices in retention. I don't get the love affair with this role for the Ph.D. Now at the highly endowed National Liberal Arts Colleges there it's all about status. It's just all about looks and the [president name removed] of the world would do very, very well. Also they never touch the business model. There these people are just the face of the institution and they're not planning the campaigns, they hire consultants for that. They're not doing the day to day enrollment stuff, they outsource all that. For that position it's okay but a position like this the president is actually the CEO, the president is in charge of the business model. Here is not a place for a Ph.D.

Cole felt strongly that small, private institutions like Owens University required a president who

was equipped to have direct oversight over the institution's business decisions. According to

Cole, a president must have an understanding of the context of higher education, the needs of

students, and academic culture in order to be effective. Similarly, Edwards stated that his

doctoral degree in education taught him "all the traditional kinds of things involving [faculty] governance."

Five presidents indicated that the most important experience gained from the doctoral degree was through the rigor of the dissertation process. Langley noted that the process forces a person to understand the difference between weak and strong scholarship:

> You see the world differently. You understand the value of quantitative analysis and what is really evidenced based. You understand weak scholarship; you understand strong scholarship. You don't actually learn those things until you go through the doctorate program, in my view. You understand the high-quality peer-viewed journal and some of those articles are painful to read but you understand those meta-analyses. You understand the lingo, that you really, really ... even if you weren't the faculty member, at least you know what the stuff means. If you don't have it all together, then you really ... I think ... personally I just don't see how you could operate in that space.
>
> … I do think it makes you more tolerant of another faculty member's opinion even if you don't agree with it, aside from people that are just boisterous, but you understand they have an academic opinion based on research, based on evidence that they believe. Even if it's different from your own, you begin to understand why these various positions matter… I don't think you fully appreciate that until you're sitting in a classroom or sitting home at night reading these 25-page peer-reviewed articles.

In addition to learning to discern between weak and solid scholarship, Langley cited the dissertation process as a source of empathy and acceptance of faculty opinions and views on the academic issues important to them. He also referenced the value of clear analysis in his role as the final arbiter of faculty tenure: "you read what the faculty wrote, what the deans wrote, what the provost wrote. Ultimately, you're making that decision based on the credibility of the individuals who have come before you with their analyses."

The symbolic value of a doctoral degree. Seven presidents spoke to elements of the symbolic frame by valuing the terminal degree for the signal that it sent to others. Adams stated her views on doctoral degrees very clearly:

> Do you need to have a terminal degree to *do* this job? No. A terminal degree is important as a *signal* to others more than what you actually learn in the process. I think it's

perceptions. It's typically faculty perceptions because they're on search committees, and that's a way of dwindling it down to get out people you don't want.

Adams felt that the value of the terminal degree was primarily due to its effect on faculty members of search committees in contrast to the educational learning that would occur during the process of obtaining the degree. Gordon echoed Adams's view that the symbolic value of the terminal degree was realized during the search committees' filtering of resumes in the search process:

> If you've been involved in searches, the easiest thing to do is the first step when you're deciding the yes, no, maybe piles, who's in the no pile, those who don't have the degree. Maybe something will catch your eye, they don't have the degree and you put them in the maybe pile, but you're always trying to narrow that pool down, and the narrowing is taking into account all the qualifications of the individual and the more, the better.

Five presidents stated that the symbolic value of the doctorate degree was the ability to indicate to the faculty of an institution that a person performed (as Blair stated) the "heavy lifting" of going through the academic process of researching, writing, and defending the dissertation and (as Finch stated) were a "member of the club." The presidents also stated that the degree was also a sign that they understood and valued what the faculty do on a daily basis.

The type of terminal degree matters. Eight of the 12 presidents indicated that the faculty at top research universities will only accept an academic president with a Ph.D. and will not accept an Ed.D. Finch expanded the pool of schools that will not accept an Ed.D. by saying that the faculty members at most 4-year institutions would not consider an Ed.D. as a "real degree" from a "working faculty member." Finch discussed his reasoning behind this assertion:

> In the vast majority of higher education, a Ph.D. is seen as someone who did their dissertation and did the heavy lifting, and an Ed.D. is seen as somebody who didn't do a dissertation and didn't do their heavy lifting. If you have an Ed.D. and you have a dissertation, you're going to have to make a point in your resume of noting you have a dissertation, because that's the litmus test ... Personally, my experience, that's what faculty look for, that you actually put yourself through the same academic rigor they did.

In this statement, Finch shared that a large number of faculty do not believe that Ed.D. students go through the rigorous process of creating and defending a dissertation.

The presidents differed somewhat when describing which 4-year institutions would accept a president with an Ed.D. Adams reported that the decision was based on the individual institution and there was no pattern behind which school would or would not accept an Ed.D. Roth felt that the top 25 liberal arts colleges would not accept a president with an Ed.D. due to the person's lack of academic experience and that small liberal arts colleges were a better fit for presidents with an Ed.D.

Once again referencing the structural frame, three presidents indicated that an Ed.D. geared toward higher education provides more practical preparation for the actual work of the president than a Ph.D. in a non-educational field. All three of these presidents had an Ed.D. in Education. The presidents indicated that these practitioner-based degrees in education broaden one's perspective and create a network of fellow practitioners. Cole stated that higher education "needs to have presidents that have degrees in higher education and policy, and they need to be terminal degrees." Cole continued to discuss Ph.D. degrees in non-educational areas by explaining:

> In those fields they're learning more and more about less and less. Really the only thing that would be helpful to them is they would have perhaps a better handle on reading research and understanding the difference between good research and bad research. A practitioner-based program that's nested in scholarship, that's the very best way.

Cole clearly emphasized the value in of practitioner-focused doctorate, but this perspective ignores the hands-on training that those with Ph.D.s in a particular discipline receive through leadership roles as department chairs, deans, and provosts; these positions provide important insight into the inner workings of higher education institutions. All three presidents stated that their Ed.D. degree provided them with practical information they needed to solve "real world

67

problems" during their daily duties as president. It is important to note that none of the presidents in this study possessed a doctoral degree in a non-educational field. Therefore, the opinions of those individuals and the value that they bring (or do not bring) to the presidential position were not represented in this study.

Each of the five recruiters clearly stated that a terminal degree was important for the success of candidates for a college presidency, and such a degree adds credibility with the faculty. Higgins stated that the reason faculty want to see a candidate with a doctoral degree is that "they want someone who understands the depth of the faculty issues, the curriculum development, being able to innovate through the curriculum." This particular perspective may be a bit too stringent, as a Ph.D. conveys that the degree earner has particular expertise within a certain area of a discipline or field.

Like campus-based search committees, recruiters also use the terminal degree as a filter to quickly eliminate a large number of applicants. Cook stated that recruiters are usually faced with a high number of resumes and a compressed amount of time in a search timeline. He stated that recruiters look for shortcuts to quickly winnow out the less-qualified candidates:

> There is just all sort of the pragmatic part of running a search. That is an infinite pool of candidates. How are you going to sort that through? If you think about running a search process over 6 to 9 months or maybe in 12 months this is basically sampling theory, right? You've got to basically sample the market in an efficient manner in that moment in time. Narrow it down. That's why you go back to all the traditional pedigree makers and criteria because it helps the human brain process and just make sure we are actually getting the best candidate in that. You can go too far afield and have too big a dataset when you are sampling. You're never going to get that so people do look for these shortcuts. I think that's part of what works against nontraditional candidates.

This initial screening by recruiters can reduce the chance that CBOs without terminal degree will progress to the next round of the search process.

All recruiters indicated that faculty members perceive a difference between the Ph.D. and Ed.D. degrees due to the belief that the Ed.D. was not a research-based degree. The recruiters all stated that the value of an Ed.D. degree varied by institution and search committee. Cook felt that the Ed.D. was "greatly discounted" by the faculty as a "Ph.D. Lite." He continued by saying that some faculty would prefer a person who does not have a terminal degree over someone who has attempted to "fake their way in" with an Ed.D.; it remains unclear whether Cook was referring to individuals with a bachelor's degree or whether he meant to reference other types of terminal degrees, such as MBAs, JDs, and MDs, which are quite common credentials held by many college and university presidents. Higgins stated that most research universities and prestigious colleges require a presidential candidate to have a Ph.D.

Dillon stated that faculty incorrectly correlate academic excellence with leadership ability and felt that many academics who rise through the ranks do not have real-world leadership experience.

> The other issue is that, I think, people are not thinking about the style of leadership enough. They are more focused, as it has been traditionally, on the pedigree, the number of scholarly articles published, and I appreciate that kind of credibility, but those things don't necessarily speak to leadership. Those things don't necessarily speak to how somebody would need to raise money, et cetera. I feel like there's a real need to make people aware of the fact that these behaviors are really what you need to focus on, not to the exclusion of other things like academic chops.

Dillon continued by saying that some governing boards are recognizing this and expanding their views on the backgrounds and experiences of presidential candidates:

> I'm seeing more and more boards say, "Well why shouldn't we think more broadly about the type of candidate that we could bring forward and have those leadership skills who would appreciate the higher education culture." . . . It's pretty clear that challenges today are demanding more than when my grandfathers were administrators of universities. Back then it was much more about certainly academic credibility and the wisdom. Sort of the wise sage kind of leader. I think universities are going to have to look more broadly for their leadership and consider folks that are different candidates that have other experiences. I think, to bring back this who Jesuit piece, in a microcosm of what you just

asked, Jesuit schools are asking themselves questions about can we go with a lay president? Just because somebody doesn't have a Ph.D., or just because somebody is from a non-educational background, they are part of our community and our lives and have contributed, hopefully, to the world in a productive way and have a set of leadership skills that could transfer easily into this environment and can operate successfully. I think it behooves the universities to be more broad-thinking around skill sets, leadership, decision-making, persuasiveness, communication styles, given what your needs are, and the whole litany of other assessables, if you will, qualities that go in to how a person leads.

Dillon's statement may indicate a willingness for governing boards to consider CBOs for the position of the president. It also may explain the recent increase in presidents who have come from outside higher education.

Overcoming Challenges While on the Job

Deficiency in Academic Affairs Knowledge Identified as Most Important Area to Develop

Eight of the 12 presidents indicated that they lacked experience managing academic affairs due to the fact that they did not progress through the traditional academic path. They also indicated that academic affairs is a complex area and that it is "difficult to get right." According to Gates, "it doesn't take [a president] long to figure out the student services piece, the college advancement piece, and some of the other pieces. What is very unique to higher education really does reside in academic affairs."

Five presidents indicated that it was not difficult to acquire the knowledge needed to interact with students. Finch found success with students through frequent interactions:

I think the most important thing that I've found to be really critical is interacting with students. I spent my first six months, I ate breakfast, lunch, and dinner every chance I could in the cafeteria with students. I attended ever sporting event that I could get on my calendar, I had open office hours every week for two hours, I still do in the summer and people line up to tell me their problems. I had 27 events at the university residence with faculty, staff, and separate events with about 20 people per event. I interacted with them with every ounce of my being and it sent them a message that I cared about the institution and that I cared about them and it's hard not to like somebody that you've had a chance to meet.

70

Like Finch, Edwards attributed his success with students to purposeful engagement:

> When I came here, I just made the all-out effort to engage with students. I started having students over to the president's residence once a month for discussions and talk and lasagna. We had lasagna. I think I had really good rapport with the students from the very first time I set foot on campus. I never had any qualms about that either.

All five presidents credited their success with students to regular interactions at events such as athletic games, special meet-and-greets with the president, or casual encounters on campus.

In order to gain understanding and legitimacy in the area of academic affairs, the actions of CBO presidents connected with all of Bolman and Deal's (2008) four frames. All of the presidents employed the human resource frame by seeking to understand the needs and academic interests of individual faculty members by frequently meeting with them. Adams stressed the importance of gaining the trust of the faculty by being direct and honest with them and following through on her commitments with them. She said that it took 3-4 years of frequent interactions to make inroads with the faculty. Gates also highlighted the symbolic value of regular interactions with the faculty due to her view that faculty perceived these visits as a gesture of "profound respect" by the president. Edwards also stressed the importance of regular interactions with the faculty: "I would meet with them regularly, but I never tried to impose anything on them. If they asked, I would tell them, but I relied on them to do what they needed to do."

All presidents in this study attempted to gain legitimacy and understanding of academic affairs by recognizing the defined division of labor and decision-making authority of the faculty; this acknowledgment aligns with Bolman and Deal's (2008) structural frame. Through this frame, presidents recognized the faculty governance system as an essential piece of "architecture" of their organization and supported the faculty's "rules and roles" in the academic decision making in the institution. Finch mentioned meeting with the faculty senate on a monthly basis to seek advice on matters related to the academic areas of the institution and to gather input

from the faculty on the problems that needed to be addressed. Similarly, Edwards allowed the

faculty to guide the institution's academic direction:

> I learned early on that they were going to do what they wanted to do in the way they wanted to do it, and unless it was something that was not going to be good, a good decision or a good outcome … I relied on them to do what they needed to do. If they were headed down a path that I thought was not going to be good, I would intervene, but very delicately, very gently, and let the academic faculty senate [govern].

Half of the presidents mentioned the importance of recognizing the authority of the

provost to lead in areas related to academic decision making. When asked how a president with a

non-academic background can lead the institution's academic affairs effectively, Blair stated:

> I look to the provost for that role, and have a very strong belief in an arm and arm, number one, number two relationship with the provost, and I try to set up my relationship with my current provost in that way. We really work together in terms of leading the academic enterprise with her at the forefront on that side with me leading the overall institution from a strategic and leadership perspective.

Blair partnered with his provost and followed her lead in matters related to the academic mission.

Kirkland echoed his view of the provost as partner and guide in the area of academic affairs:

> One would think that that would be second nature, but academic governance and policy and stuff, is just something that is not second nature. I have relied heavily on provost to teach me, as well as do their job. That's probably the thing I knew the least about. The provost relationship is critical since he/she will be the president's guide in navigating through academic issues.

Kirkland recognized his lack of experience guiding the academic mission and looked to the

provost to take the lead in this realm. Kirkland also relied on the provost to teach him about how

to work with and support the faculty on his campus effectively. Similarly, Cole recognized the

need to support a strong leader in the academic realm:

> I would be very, very careful to always lift up my provost. I would be very careful in the beginning to defer every time I could to my provost. When I got here my provost she just had the title of Dean so one of the first things I did was elevate her status to the provost model.

Cole felt so strongly about the need for a strong provost that he created the position at his institution and elevated the current Dean into this role. All of the six presidents credited their success in understanding and navigating through academic affairs to a close relationship with an effective provost.

Five of the presidents taught classes as CBOs to gain a better understanding of the academic process. Blair felt that his teaching experience taught him the importance of curriculum development and the role of faculty in academic governance:

> How are you going to relate, answering the question of how are you going to relate to the faculty? I think is a question for CBO's who if they haven't been in the classroom, that that can be I think that can be a challenge. While they might be well-suited to be a CEO, are they really positioned to be the titular and literal leader of a higher education entity? I think it was very helpful at a minimum that I had been a regular faculty member, that I understood curriculum, and through my conversations was able to articulate a real understanding about the role of faculty in leading the academic enterprise and could talk about shared governance in a true and genuine way for me from experience, and I think that that was very important, yeah very important in the process.

Similarly, Chase gained understanding of the academic process through teaching:

> I taught in Higher Ed Ph.D. programs and I was voted on by the faculty to be an adjunct assistant professor. I got to learn about the academic side. In fact, one of my jobs was the interim registrar for 6 or 7 months because I knew the deans and how that academic piece worked. I think that 7 very important on how to build relationships at [the university].

Through his work as an adjunct professor, Chase was able to develop key relationships with faculty while serving as a CBO. His leveraged his knowledge of the academic process and the faculty to serve as the registrar at his institution on an interim basis.

Four of the five recruiters felt that CBOs would broaden their portfolio and signal that they are more aligned with the academic goals of the institution by teaching a class, but all of the recruiters felt that teaching would marginally help gain credibility with the faculty. Dillon represented this view when asked if a CBO should teach a class part-time:

73

It marginally helps. I think it marginally helps. But it's really hard to overcome the fact of getting tenure, going through the tenure process. It's really hard to not consider somebody who has been in the classroom or who has gotten research grants at NIH. It's really hard if you don't have those things and you're at a research university. It's tough. Even if you have those things and you want to become a provost or president of a liberal arts college, it still gives you academic credibility with the faculty. If you don't have those things, it's really something hard to overcome. Some boards are able to really push those people through because they have other experiences that are incredibly valuable that a school will need. But that academic credibility, boy I tell you, that matters a lot to people.

Dillon's view makes it clear that the value of the teaching position is not based solely on the preparation of lessons for the class and interacting with students. Academic credibility also comes from the successful navigation of the tenure process and the process of applying for and receiving research funding.

Without prompting, one president specifically identified Bolman and Deal's (2008) political frame as informing his approach to working with faculty. Cole stated:

I'm a political frames leader, so, for me, I knew I had some work to do with the faculty. My wheelhouse is my ability to be transactional, my wheelhouse is my ability to say, "Okay they want this but what could I get from them?" That's just who I am and that works amazingly well on this campus. It is the absolute truth, and you just have to get people working with you and you just have to figure out a way to line up the goal so that we all get something out of it.

In his description of his approach, Cole stressed the importance of understanding the needs of the faculty and honoring their contributions to the organization. This particular acknowledgment suggests his ability to map the political terrain while recognizing the needs and objectives of one of his constituents. In considering what he might elicit from faculty in a possible negotiation, he is considering how to best set the agenda, which Bolman and Deal highlight as another key element of the political frame.

Only one participant reported experiencing continuing resistance from faculty after becoming president. Kirkland stated the following about a small number of faculty on his campus:

> I can probably name 12 of them who probably feel really hostile that I didn't come out of their background, and there's no way on Earth I could understand what it is they're trying to do, or the beauty with which they do it. I'm sure that they're the same 12 who have no understanding of what I do. In some ways, that's just in the noise, and I can't spend a lot of time ... I spend a lot of time trying to help them understand what I do, and understanding what they do, but they have their own views, and they're going to keep those views, and that's the way it is.

Through the lens of the human resource frame, Kirkland attempted to seek mutual understanding with this small number (less than 5%) of the faculty. He also recognized that he may not be able to convince these individuals to accept his non-academic background.

Although it was reported as the most difficult part of the president's job, all of the presidents in this study recognized the importance of embracing and understanding the academic mission and culture of their institutions. Presidents accomplished this through working with students, teaching courses, building relationships with faculty by respecting their role in academic governance, and supporting the role of the CAO.

Avoiding Criticism for Non-Academic Background

Kirkland was the only participant who reported experiencing faculty resistance as president. He was selected as president at Norris University through a confidential search with faculty representation. As stated previously, Norris University is a medium-sized, private institution. Adams and Gates are both presidents of similar sized private institutions and were appointed to their positions with no faculty involvement. These two participants reported experiencing no pushback from faculty based on their non-academic background. Moreover, other than Kirkland, no other participant reported experiencing any pushback or prejudice from

faculty or any other internal constituency based on their non-academic background. Importantly, Kirkland stated that the resistance from faculty was not significant and did not impact his ability to perform his duties as president.

Along with supporting and respecting faculty governance, the presidents referenced the structural frame by citing their accomplishments and effectiveness as a leader as reasons for the lack of interest in their background. Edwards commented that, if a president does his/her job effectively, the members of their community will not reference (or even remember) their lack of academic credentials:

> It turns out, from my perspective, that if you do your job, if you know what your job is and you do your job, that's what people are looking for. They're looking for the performance. If you can perform, why would they be upset with you? That's what I focused on, was being a real people person. If you were to ask … a person who didn't know me for [my tenure] here what my background was, they would not jump to finance in the third hop. They just wouldn't do it. It's just not ... it's not what they would assume, based upon my actions.

Langley similarly stated that he expected push-back from the faculty based on his CBO background, but he has experienced no such issues. Like Edwards, he attributed this lack of prejudice on his ability to perform:

> As far as the faculty, I mean, I'm doing a lot of other things that are keeping them happy; bringing in money that it is growing their programs and increasing the things that they want to see happen, and I think they see some value in the fact that I'm business savvy.

Like Edwards, the presidents in this study have gained credibility and acceptance with the faculty by bringing in resources, growing programs, and succeeding with initiatives that support the institution's academic mission.

Similarly, all four presidents who were appointed to their position internally experienced little to no resistance from faculty, students, or staff, since they had already adopted a human resource frame and gained the trust of the internal community through years of successful

interactions and recognized leadership. While serving as CBOs for their institutions, all four

participants were asked by the leadership of the governing board to step into the role of

president. After the participants accepted the position, their appointment was announced to the

community. Gates summed up the views of the internally appointed presidents:

> I think, if I start with the varied constituency groups, by and large I had the support of the faculty. They knew me, so I think I had integrity and credibility from my nine years on campus. I think I had a good relationship with them, and as CFO engaged them through the senate, through RTS (rank, tenure, salary), so I would say by and large I had the support of the faculty. No objections from the student body. Certainly no objections from the professional staff or the support staff.

Regardless of how they were selected or what type of institution they serve, no president

reported experiencing significant pushback from faculty as president. The participants credited

their effectiveness to lead and to deliver the resources needed to support the academic mission of

the institution for this lack of resistance.

Assembling and Developing the Right Leadership Team

Nine of the 12 presidents stressed that the most important role of the president is to select

the right leadership team and align that team with the institution's strategic priorities. Kirkland

described his team-building role as the basis of his work as president:

> What I do is I build really, really great teams. They're all better at what they do than I would be at what they do. As a team and individually, we agree on what our goals are to move the university forward, and then I get out of their way and ask them how to help them be the best they can be. That's really what I do.

Eight other presidents echoed this sentiment about the essential function of selecting and

aligning a high-performing team. Alternatively, the most frequent mistake listed by presidents

was the failure to remove under-performing team members who were not aligned with the

priorities of the institution. Cole recalled this mistake from early in his career:

> The mistake that I made is I did not have my predecessor fire any of her senior staff before I came. I came with the thought that, "Hey I can make it work with all of these

folk." Then 2 months in I decided that I couldn't do it with my VP for advancement and I had to replace that position. As it turned out the whole world agreed and wondered why it took me two much to get to that point and I didn't have any backlash but that was pretty silly. I should have my predecessor do that before I came in.

Rather than removing a key member of his staff due to underperformance, Cole allowed the person to remain on the team. Finch also admitted making this same mistake, which could be interpreted as an over-reliance on the human resource frame:

> One of the mistakes that I have made is I inherited a staff, and one of the things I said was everybody deserves a chance, no matter what the board says or what their results are because I'm a new leader, and as a result of that, maybe I can help them be more efficient. That was a mistake in a philosophy, I should have said, "If everyone says this person is not doing their job effectively, I need to get rid of them now." Waiting and being nice, being non-CFO-ish and giving people a chance fundamentally was not the right strategy. I should have just dealt with them, because the longer they stayed around, the more painful the transition was.

By not moving quickly to remove an employee, Finch stated that he likely increased the amount unpleasantness associated with a termination. Langley similarly recalled a mistake of not removing his provost:

> [U]ltimately I had to make a provost change. In hindsight, I probably should have made the change sooner, but I was hesitant to make the change because I wasn't an academic and I wasn't really entirely clear how much support the provost had.

Langley's situation differed from Finch's in that Finch was aware of the lack of community support for the team member he wanted to terminate. Langley was unaware of the depth of his provost's political connections. Rogers stressed that he was only as good as the team that he had assembled. Finch and Roth credited their success to the ability to delegate authority and responsibility for important tasks to the members of their teams. Roth specifically mentioned the amount of trust a president must have with his/her team:

> You get the chance to advance by being a really good doer, and then as you get higher and higher on the organizational chart your responsible for more but you do less. The day to day doing looks different. I have to trust others to do a lot of the lifting that I previously would have done myself.

Roth referenced the structural frame stating that a leader is responsible for doing more through the work of others as they ascend through an organization. The broad responsibilities of a president require delegating decisions and managerial oversight to an effective leadership team.

Building Relationships

Nine presidents indicated that, in addition to building a solid team, one of their primary jobs was to develop consensus by building relationships on campus. Chase believed that "relationship-building is the most thing you can do as president." Blair's work to develop individual relationships with faculty paid off during difficult times on campus. He offered the following advice to new presidents:

> Build as many not just collective, but individual relationships across your campus community as possible, particularly with your faculty. . . . When things get a little bit tough, that's not the time when you're building relationships, you need to rely on them.

Through the lens of the human resource frame, the presidents described the process of relationship building as taking the time to meet with and listen to the needs of faculty, students, trustees, and donors. Presidents, like Langley, attend student events, faculty lectures, committee meetings, and faculty senate meetings. Like Blair, Langley relies on positive relationships with faculty when forced to make unpopular decisions:

> No matter where you're at in higher education, you're earning a reputation with the faculty. When you go for another position, whatever it is, there's always a faculty member or two or three on the search committee. There's always a dean or two or three, and they're going to call no matter how confidential everybody says things are, they know somebody who knows somebody who isn't going to tell. They start talking to each other, and if you don't have a good faculty, that network of faculty, that are going to say, "That person's a good egg" or whatever the compliment is or they're going to say that person's a straight shooter or they're going to say stay away from that person because X, Y, and Z. That faculty relationship is really important, even if it takes longer. When you've been around like I have in higher ed for 20 plus years, you do things that are not popular, and so you've got to make sure that if people are going to say she did this really horrible thing, that at least they balance it out with the scenario.

Langley's views apply to CBOs as well as presidents. CBOs pursuing a presidential role will need a solid base of faculty support at their institution due to referenced checks during the search process.

Many of the presidents stressed the importance of one-on-one meetings with their constituents. Edwards highlighted the value of listening:

> Just listen. People tell you what's possible. You've got to sort through the chaff sometime, you know, because they'll tell you a lot of stuff and you've got to sort through it, but they'll generally tell you what can be done and what is going to be difficult to do and what can't be done. You just have to work your way through that, but if you listen, you can.

Cole echoed Edwards's view on listening by stating, "Seek first to understand and then be understood." Presidents who have used their interpersonal skills to advance the cause of their institutions through the development of relationships have successfully deployed the human resource frame (Bensimon, 1989; Bolman & Deal, 2008). Rogers provided a clear example of the implementation of this frame by looking for ways to "say yes" more by giving people at least some part of what they need:

> It is important for CBOs to say "yes" more. In the roll of a business officer, your role is in some ways to say no. I still say no a lot but I look for ways to try to give people at least some of what they want or need even if it's not everything. That includes students and some of the crankiest faculty. [There are] plenty of opportunities to take things personally because people come at your personally and then being able to avoid reacting personally. You can go home and spout off about people, but you never want people to feel like they have somehow gotten to you which is not easy.

Rogers described the need for CBOs to develop a high degree of social and emotional intelligence so that they are able to put the interests of their institution and others over their own. The nine presidents who have worked to develop relationships and establish legitimacy among their campus constituencies are using the human resource frame effectively to accomplish the goals of the institution (Bensimon, 1989).

In addition to the importance of building relationships with on-campus constituencies, two presidents indicated the need to develop connections with executive recruiters. Kirkland offered the following advice to current CBOs:

> They really need to meet some of the search people, because they are the gatekeepers in some ways to these presidencies. One way to do that is if you're going to be in DC, or wherever some of the search firms are headquartered, is just call up and make an appointment, and go and introduce yourself. I did that with one firm in fact, well actually two firms. I think that's important, because they need to assess you and your strengths as a person and a communicator. Remember, some of us... [are] painted with the brush that because we're business people, we either say no all the time, or we're green eyeshades, or pick your unpleasant phrase. You really need for people to see that you have interpersonal strengths and skills, so that they will bring your name forward for positions, and that means talking to search firms.

As Kirkland stated, the executive recruiters serve as the primary filter through which all candidates must pass. Kirkland feels that these connections would offer an opportunity for CBOs to show that they have the skills and interpersonal traits needed for the presidency. Rogers echoed Kirkland's suggestion to network with search consultants by stating that CBOs should "try and build some relationships with [the] handful of search consultants … that do this work."

All recruiters indicated that CBOs must broaden their experiences beyond finance and develop a holistic and strategic view of the institution. According to the recruiters, CBOs are often seen as operational and transactional and need to be viewed as strategic and forward thinking and show that they are actively involved with initiatives that matter to students and faculty.

All five recruiters stressed the importance of CBOs getting involved in the academic side of the institution. As an example, Evans referenced one CBO who has gone beyond the financial role by acting as an academic advisor for 10 students every year. In contrast to the experience of the presidential participants in this study, the recruiters all stated that the faculty are the source of most of the resistance to candidates who come from the CBO ranks. They stated that CBOs must

show that they understand the mindset of the faculty and reference examples showing that they

have rallied academics toward a common cause. McKnight said that CBOs who have made this

leap have an "enormous amount of flexibility, curiosity of what makes other people tick, [and

try] to figure out ways to speak [the faculty's] language" rather than "throwing spreadsheets

down in front of people."

Evans stressed the importance of CBOs gaining the trust of the faculty. She felt that many

CBOs, as members of the administration, do not have the trust of the faculty. Successful CBOs

have worked together with faculty on academic issues such as accreditation committees,

curriculum committees, student affairs, and enrollment management. Cook added that a CBO

must show that he/she understands the mission of the academy, the politics, the way decisions

are made, and how faculty work. Perhaps the presidential participants avoided this pushback due

to their effectiveness in developing relationships with faculty and delivering resources to their

institutions, and/or their ability to demonstrate support of the academic mission of their

institutions.

<center>**Executive Recruiters' Views on the Search Process**</center>

The Current Search Process Yields Average Leaders

The executive recruiters were consistent in their description of the presidential search

process. A search process begins with the creation of a search committee, which can consist of

various members of the campus community: faculty, staff, students, and trustees. The recruiters

work with the search committee to develop a "leadership profile" that lists the qualities and

experience needed in a new president. The committee will often conduct meetings with the

campus community to gather feedback on the contents of the leadership profile. The recruiters

will often meet with the governing board, members of the executive leadership team, and various

<center>82</center>

campus stakeholders as well to gather input. The recruiters will then use the leadership profile to search for a pool of candidates. Evans stated that this profile is also used to filter out candidates that do not fit the description of what the search committee is looking for:

> [W]e put a lot of work into [the position description] at the beginning of the search. And then we use that throughout the search to define, for example, certainly what kind of candidates we recruit. There's no point in recruiting somebody who doesn't fit the image that the search committee has of what they're looking for.

After the recruiters select a pool of candidates based on the attributes in the leadership profile, the pool is then presented to the search committee, which will then review the pool and select the candidates they will interview. The leadership profile is then, once again, used to develop the questions that will be asked during the interview. In most cases, the search committee is charged with recommending one to three final candidates from the pool to the governing board. The recruiters then conduct background checks on the finalists. The governing board (or subcommittee of the board) will then select the next president from the finalists.

Three of the five recruiters stated that the current presidential search process often leads to less-than-spectacular results. When asked about the effectiveness of the search process, McKnight stated, "It's a process that yields spectacular results rarely. It yields disastrous results rarely. So mostly it delivers predictable average results." Dillon stated that the selected president is "usually the lowest common denominator person" who has "offended the least" during the search process. Dillon and Cook both stated that the reason for these lackluster results lies in the institutions' unwillingness to conduct a thorough and honest examination of what is really needed in a president at the beginning of the search process. Cook said that in the beginning, "nobody wants to disagree" and that "everyone wants to get along," which leads to average expectations for the next president.

According to Cook, the individual search committee members often choose to have open disagreements after a pool of candidates has been selected based on the agreed-upon position description. Cook shared his views on the search process:

> The problem with the search process is that nobody wants to disagree. Everybody wants to get along. You know the last thing they want to do is play out their disagreements at the beginning of the process. What happens in a search process is often those disagreements are actually expressed and dealt with when they look at an actual pool of candidates, and then everybody kind of has veto power on one candidate. There was something about the candidate they didn't like or they were looking for that's not in a particular model, and you end up having [a failed search] and so there are searches where they get very upset, they get very grumpy because they didn't sort out their differences. They didn't come up with a clear understanding of where the institution is going to go. They didn't have a heroic sense of what this person could do with this platform with this institution.

Both Cook and McKnight referenced that the current search process allows one person to veto a candidate who doesn't fit the individual's model of what a president should be. McKnight stated that she has witnessed individual search committee members intimidate other members to remove candidates from the pool who did not possess the credentials that the individual desired in the president. McKnight described one particular event:

> [Some members] will really bully the committee into doing their bidding. I've seen that behavior happen and it's very intimidating. Committee members just shrink and run from the room. . . . I'm talking about a recent experience where a very, very influential committee member literally stood up, pounded on the table, stated his opinion that these three things were absolutely necessary in the next leader, and that there was no way he was going to vote otherwise. If the committee put anybody forward who didn't have those things, he'd make sure that the search failed.

In McKnight's example, a search committee member threatened to make the entire search process fail if his/her fellow committee members put any candidates forward who did not fit the individual's stated list of required background credentials.

Dillon stressed that the problem is compounded by the fact that the people who are deciding which candidate makes it through the process (the search committee) are often the

people who would serve in a subordinate role to the president rather than those who have held a

senior leadership position. Four of the five search consultants felt that the members of the search

committee are often not well informed on what qualities and skills they need in a new president.

Cook stated that it was part of the executive consultant's role to educate the committee on the

duties of the president:

> I think a good chunk of the committee has no clue what the president does. I mean,
> seriously. They all think they do, but it's a strange perspective. I think we can have a
> highly uninformed committee, but that's our problem is to bring them up to speed.

Evans, Cook, and McKnight all stated that committee members often refer to their own

experiences and focus solely on selecting a candidate who looks like them or comes from a

similar background. As stated before, Dillon added that most of people are therefore focused on

academic degree and the number of scholarly articles published rather than demonstrated

leadership skills. On the involvement of faculty in the search process, McKnight commented, "I

would say that usually academics are the most isolated and the least knowledgeable as a group of

people about the whole enterprise."

Evans stated that many presidential searches are actually redoing the previous search

rather than thinking about what is needed for the present and future. All of the search consultants

indicated that it is part of their role to talk to governing boards and search committees to help

them think more broadly about what is needed in the presidential role. Cook and McKnight

stated that they have seen the search committee's learning grow over time and develop into a

group focused on what presidential qualities and skills are needed for the institution as a whole.

The final selection, according to the recruiters, was the fiduciary responsibility of the

governing board. Cook and McKnight felt that most boards are risk averse and end up choosing a

traditional, safe candidate. Cook attributed this choice to the board's desire to keep the campus

community happy and quiet.

The Future for CBOs as Presidents

Despite the lack of nontraditional candidates selected during the existing presidential

search process, four of the five recruiters indicated that the number of CBO presidents is likely to

increase given the large number of presidential vacancies that will occur in the near future, the

lack of traditional candidates in the pipeline, and the continuing financial challenges in higher

education. Evans stated that she is currently seeing an increasing number of vacancies in the

presidential position and has talked to a significant number of provosts that "don't want to be

president." Evans added that a significant number of provosts are retiring or approaching

retirement, so people from that path are less available. McKnight said that governing boards have

asked her about nontraditional candidates in every search pitch in which she has been involved

over the last year. Dillon explained that the rise in CBO presidents would only represent a

moderate increase due to the pre-conceived assumptions about CBOs in higher education. Cook

was the only recruiter who did not expect to see a measurable increase in CBO candidates in the

future. Cook explained that the financial crisis was likely to lead to the closure of many small

liberal arts colleges, so any increase in opportunities for CBOs would be offset by the closing of

potential institutions for these nontraditional candidates. Higgins provided a counter perspective

by anticipating an uptick in CBO presidents due to the current financial challenges. When asked

about his opinion in terms of whether we would see more CBOs as presidents in the near future,

he said, "It's certainly moving in that direction, it's much more open I think now than it was 20

years ago." He continued:

> [The issue] that's going on right now that's in the favor of the business officers is, and
> it's the same thing that was going on in the early eighties, the concern that more

institutions would be closing or merging. You're going to see more universities with a lot of serious financial and enrollment problems which is going to open up the door that much more for VPs for business and finance and also VPs for enrollment. It absolutely is typical not always for same reasons, but it's very typical, and in the early eights the people who were getting presidency were not the standard higher in academic dean, provost, etc. That's when a lot of VPs for student affairs, VPs for advancement, especially in the private institutions the VPs for advancements were able to get their first presidencies.

According to Higgins, the institutions facing financial and enrollment issues will be more receptive to presidents who have served as vice presidents in business, finance, and enrollment. This openness to nontraditional candidates, coupled with the lack of traditional candidates in the pipeline and the large number of upcoming presidential retirements will likely lead to an increase in presidents from CBO backgrounds.

Conclusion

A total of 12 presidents and five executive recruiters shared their views on the challenges and successes of CBOs who have followed a career path leading to the college presidency. The CBOs who have made a successful transition into the presidential position are likely to work in less selective institutions that are struggling financially. Even though these individuals did not follow a traditional academic path to ascend to the presidency, the faculty at their institutions presented an insignificant amount of resistance to their candidacy as president. The presidents in this study obtained a wide breadth of experience during their tenure as CBOs that related directly to the skills needed to be effective in the role of president. These individuals undertook a broad range of responsibilities beyond their traditional roles of managing the internal resources of the institution. Most importantly, the CBOs gained experience working through issues related to the academic mission of the institution. Over half of the presidential participants credited their mentor with providing rich opportunities to develop skills that went beyond the financial realm. CBOs also reported working with their governing board and liaising with governmental officials.

Most CBOs also participated in raising funds for the organization. A majority of participants stressed the importance of earning a doctoral degree for anyone considering the role of president.

The participants in this study illuminated several potential obstacles that CBOs face in their attempts to gain legitimacy as non-academic presidents. Most importantly—and most difficult—is the acquisition of knowledge and experience in the area of academic affairs. Despite their lack of academic credentials, the presidents did not experience significant resistance from faculty on campus. On the contrary, the presidents reported on their successful attempts to develop relationships, which gave them the ability to build consensus around important issues and navigate through difficult times.

Finally, executive recruiters shared their views on the presidential search process. Most tellingly, the recruiters revealed that the current process increases the likelihood of the selection of an average leader. Most of these recruiters felt that the number of CBO presidents will slowly increase due to the large number of presidential vacancies, the lack of traditional candidates in the pipeline, and the current financial crisis facing higher education. In the final chapter, this study will discuss the key findings of this study and will provide recommendations for CBOs who aspire to become a college president.

CHAPTER FIVE

This study investigated the experiences of CBOs as they progressed toward the role of college president and worked to gain and maintain legitimacy once selected for this leadership position. The study also examined the perceptions of executive recruiters in regard to the performance of CBOs in the presidential search process. This study aimed to elucidate the key characteristics and preparatory experiences of CBOs who transitioned successfully into the role of a college president given the forthcoming dearth of traditional, academically trained candidates ready to fill presidential vacancies. This chapter begins with a discussion of the study's key findings, followed by a number of recommendations for CBOs who are considering a move into the role of president, limitations of this study, and finally the need for future research.

Discussion of Key Findings

The Importance of CBOs Broadening Their Experiences beyond College Finances

Throughout the study, presidents and recruiters stressed the broad nature of the presidential role on college campuses. Participants expressed broad agreement that search committees are interested in presidential candidates (traditional and nontraditional) who have a holistic understanding of their institution. The CBOs in this study who successfully achieved presidential appointments had moved beyond the financial realm of their institutions by demonstrating leadership in areas related to the academic mission of the institution, enrollment management, and fundraising, among other areas. According to presidents and recruiters, experience working on academic matters is not only the most difficult skill for CBOs to master but also among the most important skills for CBOs to have when being considered for the role of the president. Most of the presidents also brought some fundraising experience with them from

their tenure as CBOs. Presidents cited their successful fundraising efforts as one of the key factors in gaining legitimacy with the faculty on their campuses. Managing relations with both the governing board and outside constituents (such as governmental officials and community leaders) was also indicated as an important skill for CBOs to attain before considering the presidential position.

The elements of broad leadership responsibilities enumerated by the presidents and recruiters in this study are all represented in the list of primary uses of time by college president in the 2012 ACE survey (Table 2.1). College and university presidents named academic issues, faculty issues, fundraising, community relations, and governing board relations as receiving the primary focus of their time on the job (ACE, 2012). Participants in this study said they obtained these skills by working closely with the provost and faculty or through a close mentorship relationship with the existing president during their tenure as CBO. Through the lens of the human resource frame, the participant and his/her mentor developed an interpersonal relationship that enabled the CBOs to push past their traditional job duties boundaries supported by the structural frame of leadership.

CBOs Need to Be Concerned about Institutional Fit

The steward presidents in this study succeeded in moving from CBO to college president by focusing their presidential searches on institutions that were struggling financially and/or had lower admissions standards. Two-thirds of the presidents in this study were selected to lead an institution that was struggling financially; other participants worked at campuses with acceptance rates as high as 75%. Recruiters and presidents stressed that institutional fit is very important for CBOs considering which college or university to target. Recruiters concurred with the presidents by indicating that CBOs seem to find a niche in applying successfully to campuses encountering

financial difficulties, as the search committees on those campuses apparently assumed unique expertise in sound fiscal management associated with participants' experience as a CBO. The incoming president's former position signals financial stability and fiscal soundness to an institution in need of a president to improve their financial health quickly.

Presidents Reported Rarely Encountering Faculty Resistance Due to Non-Academic Background

An unanticipated finding in this study came from presidents reporting that they had not experienced resistance based on their non-academic background during the search process. Presidents reported not experiencing any significant resistance during the search process beyond fielding a small number of faculty questions to ensure that the CBO understood the importance of faculty-related issues such as governance.

This lack of resistance may be related to the CBO presidents meeting the criteria in the three previous findings: (a) the CBOs possessed a broad, institutional view; (b) the CBOs possessed a doctoral degree; and (c) the CBO candidates were well matched with the hiring institution's needs. Perhaps a CBO's broad understanding of the important faculty-related issues at the hiring institution coupled with his or her possession of a terminal degree with a dissertation satisfied the faculty's concern that the CBO understood the general nature of faculty work. By preselecting institutions in need of proven financial leadership, the entire campus community may have welcomed a person from a CBO background, preempting or precluding critical faculty from loudly voicing concerns about the steward president's non-academic background. Additionally, due to the fact that CBOs in this study were more likely to be selected by internal appointment or via a closed or confidential search, it is possible CBOs avoided interactions with a large segment of the institution's faculty. However, the three presidents who applied through

open and non-confidential searches also reported experiencing a lack of pushback from faculty. The symbolism of the financial crisis potentially may have overridden some faculty members' political concerns about the non-academic background of the steward president.

Legitimacy Created and Sustained through Appreciation of Academic Culture

Another unanticipated finding in this study was that, regardless of the type of presidential search or whether the CBO was appointed as president, all CBOs in this study reported a lack of faculty resistance once they began serving as president. It would seem logical that faculty may resist a president chosen without their broad involvement, as in the case of an internal or closed search, especially if the successful candidate was not an academic; however, data from this study provide a counter-perspective.

Bornstein (2003) stated that, in order to gain legitimacy on campus, a president must display an understanding and appreciation of the academic culture and possess strong academic values. The presidents in this study all mentioned the importance of working with the faculty and establishing that they understood and supported the faculty's role in leading and implementing the academic mission of the institution. Such an acknowledgment and understanding among participants cuts across all four of Bolman and Deal's (2008) frames. Structurally, conveying their understanding of and respect for faculty governance signals that steward presidents recognize the division of labor and lines of authority within their campuses. From a humanistic perspective, this recognition underscores participants' willingness to not only work with but also cultivate relationships with their faculty. Politically, steward presidents' acquiescence to (if not embrace) shared governance indicates their understanding that important decisions will require negotiations with influential players. Finally, from a symbolic lens, participants'

acknowledgment of the importance of shared governance conveys a sense of respect to the faculty about their expertise and professionalism.

Presidents Reported a Doctoral Degree Is Required for the Role of the President

With one exception, every participant in this study stressed the importance of presidential candidates obtaining a doctoral degree. The presidents referenced the structural frame by stressing the practical learning gained from the degree; both presidents and executive recruiters used the lens of the symbolic frame by stressing the value of the signal that such a degree sent to others. As stated previously, over three quarters of current presidents in higher education report having a doctorate degree (ACE, 2012); however, only 8.6% of female CBOs and 10.5% of male CBOs have obtained a Ph.D. or Ed.D. (NACUBO, 2013). Therefore, very few CBOs currently have the academic credentials that most participants in this study perceived as essential for college presidents.

As evidenced by recruiters' comments, presidential search committees prefer a candidate with a Ph.D. over an Ed.D., despite the practical preparations delivered through the latter degree. Both presidents and recruiters list the dissertation process as the underlying element important to members of the search committee and faculty. On the structural side, presidents list the dissertation's practical values of teaching the ability to discern between weak and solid scholarship and increasing their ability to understand the important role of the faculty. Symbolically, the participants mentioned that the dissertation sent a signal that the person performed the "heavy lifting" associated with academic scholarship.

Recruiters Reported the Current Presidential Search Process Delivers Mediocre Results

Most of the recruiters in this study felt that the current presidential search process often leads to the selection of a less-than-spectacular president. According to recruiters, governing

93

boards and search committees are reluctant to thoroughly uncover what is truly needed for the institution at that time. Rather than engage in an open dialogue where people discuss openly and feel free to disagree about what is needed in a modern president, search committee members will often censor themselves in the beginning of the search. They will then wait until a final pool of candidates are interviewing on campus before they will enter into a debate about the important leadership traits and experiences required for the position. To make matters worse, many of the people selecting the presidential candidates lack any senior leadership experience. All but one of the recruiters stated that the members of the search committee are often uninformed about what qualities and skills the institution needs in a new president. One of the recruiters painted a darker picture by adding that the members who lack sufficient information about institutional needs and priorities often believe that they are well informed about traits needed in a president.

The recruiters in this study shared that the end result of the search process is often a repeat of the previous presidential search. The final candidate in this process will often mirror the people on the search committee and come from a similar background as they do. According to one recruiter, the faculty members on the committee will tend to select candidates based on their academic pedigree rather than on demonstrated leadership skills.

Regarding the structural frame, recruiters stated that part of their job duties is to work with members of the search committee to educate them on the role of the president. The recruiters also employed the human resource frame in an attempt to facilitate an open dialogue among committee members in order to build consensus at the beginning of the search.

Most Recruiters Expect a Slow Increase in Presidential Opportunities for CBOs

Four of the five executive recruiters agreed that the number of presidential vacancies will continue to grow in the near future due to retirements. The recruiters also acknowledged

challenges in the current pipeline of traditional candidates, as CAOs increasingly tell recruiters that they are not interested in advancing into a college presidency. One recruiter also pointed out that CAOs as a group are also advancing in age. This lack of interest among CAOs coupled with the upcoming retirements in the position coincides with research findings from Kim et al. (2013), King et al. (2008), Song and Hartley (2012), and Hartley and Godin (2010).

In response to the increased number of presidential openings at U.S. colleges and universities coupled with a smaller number of candidates from the traditional academic path, governing boards are asking recruiters to review and present more nontraditional candidates. Recruiters and presidents in this study indicated that they have experienced institutions claiming an interest in non-academic candidates only to quickly dismiss the candidates during the first screening of resumes. Regardless, four out of the five recruiters and all of the presidents perceived that the number of CBO presidents will likely increase at a slow pace due to the rising financial challenges in higher education. It should be noted, however, that one recruiter added that this increase in financial stress would actually limit the numbers of CBOs who advance to the presidency due to the closing of the very schools that would be interested in hiring a CBO as a president.

<div align="center">

Recommendations

</div>

CBOs Aspiring to College Presidencies Need to Expand Expertise beyond Finance

Given the importance of presidential candidates possessing a broad institutional view, CBOs who wish to ascend into a college presidency should adopt the structural frame by analyzing their current job duties and experiences and comparing them with the most common duties performed by college and university presidents. In order for presidents to fill the gaps in their experience, they must adopt a symbolic mindset by moving away from a narrowly defined

<div align="center">

95

</div>

financial view of the academy. Previous research (ACE, 2012; Bornstein, 2003) and the findings from this study suggest that academic leadership is a critical skill that any presidential candidate must possess. To obtain this experience, CBOs might consider adopting a human resource mindset by partnering with academic leadership such as CAOs, deans, and chairs of important academic initiatives such as enrollment management, strategic planning, student affairs, and other areas of academic affairs such as curriculum development. CBOs can also get involved in student-related activities such as presenting to student government meetings or partnering with leaders in student affairs to fund initiatives that improve the student experience. CBOs should also display an active interest in the work of the faculty at their institution by engaging the faculty in one-on-one meetings to discuss their needs, attending lectures, and participating in faculty-related events. It is critical for CBOs to embrace a human resource mindset to develop meaningful relationships with faculty and to understand and embrace the faculty's role in institutional governance. CBOs who embrace the academic mission and culture of their institution not only increase their likelihood of gaining valuable experience but also gain political advantage by establishing important relations with faculty members who may end up providing a reference during a future presidential search.

CBOs may also consider gaining fundraising experience by partnering with their institution's lead fundraising executive and attending donor outreach visits. CBOs should be mindful of their governing board's interest in existing capital projects on campus. Finally, CBOs should discuss their interest in expanding their purview on campus with their president. A number of presidents credited their expansion of duties and experience as CBOs to a mentor relationship with a previous president. Finally, connecting with local, state, or federal

government officials can provide current CBOs with the kind of external relations experience necessary for success as a college president.

CBOs Aspiring to College Presidencies Should Earn a Doctoral Degree

Throughout this study, the participating presidents and recruiters were nearly unanimous in their recommendation for CBOs to obtain a doctoral degree prior to applying for a presidential position. A Ph.D. is recognized as more scholarly and preferred by members of the search committee. An Ed.D. may provide more practical knowledge for the CBO but may not be held in the same esteem as a Ph.D. at some campuses. Participants in this study nearly uniformly agreed that any doctoral degree should include a successfully defended dissertation, as such a credential conveys legitimacy, credibility, and specific expertise to not only faculty but also many other internal and external constituents of the institution.

CBOs Should Develop Relationships with Executive Recruiters

This study has shown that executive recruiters are leading a supermajority of presidential search processes. Institutions hire these individuals to locate and screen potential presidential candidates and guide the internal search process. When a recruiter is selected to locate candidates, he/she will look first to people he/she knows or has met in the past. Being top-of-mind to the top executive recruiters in higher education is an advantage to CBOs. CBOs should develop relationships with executive recruiters who lead presidential searches in colleges and universities. The personal interactions with these individuals would provide CBOs with an opportunity to for their interpersonal skills to be seen and appreciated through the human resource frame. Most importantly, the CBOs would be able to convey their understanding, appreciation, and involvement in the academic success of their institution. The one-on-one interactions would also allow the CBOs to show—through the structural frame—that they have

broadened their skills beyond the financial realm. The contact information of 26 executive recruiters and their respective firms can be found on the ACE website under the Roundtable of Executive Search Firms (ACE, 2016).

CBOs Seeking to Become a College President Need to Target Appropriate Institutions

The presidents and executive recruiters in this study clearly stated that CBOs have the greatest chance of being appointed president at small-to-medium-sized institutions with financial struggles or broad-access missions. Findings from this study also underscore the importance of CBO presidential candidates' consideration of less prestigious institutions, as recruiters and presidents in this study highlighted that the more selective colleges and universities seem to have less of an appetite for presidential candidates who lack a traditional academic background. Lastly, CBO presidential candidates may consider engaging in a direct conversation with the executive recruiter, leading a search to learn whether the institution will seriously consider a president from a non-academic background, as recruiters and presidents in this study consistently indicated that many institutions lack sincerity in advertising an openness to non-academic applicants.

The Presidential Search Process Should Adapt to Prioritize Candidates with Modern Leadership Skills

Given the financial situation of many institutions in higher education, presidential search committees must favor candidates with proven leadership skills over those with an academic pedigree. In order for institutions to identify what is needed in a modern president, the search committee must be willing to participate in an open debate of ideas prior to the selection of the pool of candidates. As reported by recruiters, this debate is not happening during the discussion of the qualities of the desired president. Instead, the current process allows a single person to

completely halt a process after a final group of candidates have been selected, thereby overriding the consensus of his/her colleagues.

Finally, an institution should put great thought into who may serve on presidential search committees to ensure that the participants understand the true role of the president and comprehend the leadership traits required of the candidates. Ideally, some of the members of the committee would have high-level leadership experience. A current or former college president from a similar university would be a good addition to a search committee. The committee members that do not have leadership experience should participate in training exercises that identify the general leadership skills needed in a president as well as the specific leadership needs of the institution.

Limitations of the Study

The main limitation of this study is related to sample size and the lack of knowledge of the size of the population. As mentioned previously, NACUBO generously supplied the list of all known CBOs who are college or university presidents. Only 12 of the presidents in this list fit the criteria of this study and all 12 agreed to participate. It is unknown if NACUBO's list of CBO presidents is exhaustive. A total of eight executive recruiters were contacted to participate for this study and five agreed to participate. An unknown number of executive recruiters are working in the area of higher education. It is unknown if the sample method used in this study yielded volunteers that were skewed toward a particular institutional type or if another sample method would have yielded convergent or divergent information.

Another limitation in this study is due to the lack of participation of campus constituents beyond the president. To fully understand how a campus felt about a presidential search or the

effectiveness of a college president, one would need to interact with many diverse groups such as faculty, students, staff, and members of the governing board.

The limited time allotted to interviewing the participants in this study (60 minutes) created another limitation. With the vast experience and expertise of the participants, it was impossible to elicit the full picture of their experience, preparation, transition, and current successes/struggles in an hour-long interview.

It is unknown if the recruiters in this study have successfully placed a CBO in his/her career, which may account for some differences in perceptions between recruiters and presidents. Due to confidentiality restrictions, it was not possible to determine if the presidents in this study participated in any of the presidential searches performed by the executive recruiter participants. Connecting the stories of the recruiters with the stories of the specific CBOs that participated in their searches may have yielded a more complete understanding of the experiences of the CBOs. The need to maintain the confidentiality of presidential and recruiter participants and their current institutions may have meant that more specific stories or details could not be disclosed in the study without jeopardizing participants' anonymity.

Opportunities for Future Research

The goal of this study was to reveal the barriers and successes CBOs experience when pursuing and serving in the role of college or university president. In order to gain additional understanding of the distinct experiences of these individuals, future research can be directed toward CBOs who have attempted to become president but did not succeed. The experience of these individuals may be helpful to future CBOs that are considering a transition into the presidency. To identify and separate the distinct challenges of CBOs who have become

100

president, future research should also include the stories of non-CBOs who have ascended to this position. This additional research would serve as a control to isolate the experiences of CBOs.

Additional efforts should be made to identify and interview additional college and university presidents who have come from CBO backgrounds. A survey could be sent to presidents asking them to provide the details of their background. A reexamination of the topic of CBOs as presidents should occur at regular intervals in the future to track the changes in opportunities and sentiments toward CBOs as president. It would be useful to conduct a longitudinal study of the CBO presidents at the same time to determine the level of continued success in their roles. A regular check-in with these presidents would be helpful to determine if the views of these individuals change over time. It would also be useful to compare the tenure of CBO presidents against those of presidents who come from traditional backgrounds.

In this study, presidents and executive recruiters indirectly conveyed the opinions of faculty as they perceived them, but both of these groups stressed the importance of faculty opinion in the presidential search process. In order to fully understand the perceptions of faculty, future research can explore faculty opinions on CBOs serving as president. Additional research can also provide a complete, 360-degree view of the campus by investigating the opinions of other members of the community such as students, staff, and members of the governing board.

Finally, additional research should be conducted on the presidential search process to quantify its effectiveness in identifying and selecting candidates with the appropriate leadership profile. This study should include the opinions of more executive recruiters along with campus constituents such as faculty, staff, students, and the governing board.

Conclusion

A leadership crisis in the presidential position in higher education will occur soon due to the large number of incumbents retiring and a lack of interested and qualified candidates in the traditional pool. Compounding this problem is the increase in complexity of the presidential position and the current financial issues facing higher education. Presidential search committees have attempted to address these challenges by looking outside of academia for leaders with budgetary and management experience. The results of this effort have been mixed due to many nontraditional candidates' struggles in adapting to the culture of higher education. This study has demonstrated that a president must have a deep understanding of and appreciation for the culture, politics, and decision-making process of academia.

This study has shown that the college CBO is a viable candidate for the position of the president. The presidents in this study demonstrated that their ability to acquire leadership skills within a broad institutional vision as CBOs enabled them to understand and effectively support the academic mission of their institutions once they became college presidents. This display of appreciation of the academic culture allowed the presidents to gain and maintain legitimacy on campus. The CBO presidents in this study have thrived in a niche of less selective, small-to medium-sized institutions that were struggling financially.

The participants in this study predicted that the number of CBO presidents will continue to rise slowly due to the current financial situation facing most colleges and universities. In order for more CBOs to rise to this elevated position, CBOs must broaden their focus by addressing the gaps in their skills and experience. Institutions must also be willing to take a deep look at what skills and qualities are really needed in a president that will lead them through their current state and beyond. The future of higher education depends on a community of thoughtful and

informed individuals who are able to set aside what was done in the past by selecting future

leaders based on a demonstrated history of excellence in leadership rather than selecting a leader

that resembles the last president and expecting different results.

<h1 align="center">APPENDIX A</h1>

<h2 align="center">Interview Protocol for Presidents</h2>

Interviewee: (Title and Name): _____

Institution: _____

Interviewer: _____

Introduction

The purpose of my study is to illuminate the challenges and benefits experienced by presidents

of colleges and universities who have previously served as chief business and financial officers

(or CBOs) in higher education. The end goal is to explore additional avenues for sourcing

college presidents by creating an actionable plan to target and develop CBOs for the role of the

president.

As a participant in this study, your identity and the identity of your institution and any colleague

you mention will be confidential. Aliases will be created to describe each person and institution.

[DISCUSS IRB INFO AND DISCUSS CONSENT FORM]

To facilitate my note-taking, I would like to record the audio of our conversations today. The

only people who will have access to this recording are the transcribers and myself. The recording

will be destroyed after the notes have been transcribed.

I have planned for this interview to last no longer than one hour.

Thank you for your agreeing to participate.

[PROMPT: An important part of my study is to examine the career paths that executives—like yourself—took to get to the position of president.]

1. Please discuss the previous two positions you served in before becoming the president?

2. In what ways did the job duties and required skills of those positions prepare you for the role of the president?

3. What (if anything) would you have done differently along your career path to better prepare for your first role as president?

4. What were you best (and least) prepared for in your first role as president?

5. How did you develop the skills needed for this position that you did not develop in your previous positions?

[PROBES: For example, how did you develop your fundraising skills? (if you did not have previous fundraising experience). How prepared were you in areas related to academic affairs? How prepared were you to deal with student interactions (protests, crisis, etc.)? How prepared were you interacting with the Board and outside constituencies?]

6. What kind of strengths did you bring to the job as a CBO?

[PROBE: How did you use those strengths once you became president?]

7. In what specific ways (if any) do you feel your non-academic background was a factor in the presidential search process?

[PROBES: *If participant mentions resistance or prejudice:* What group (or group) were most focused on or resistant to your non-academic background? What kind of questions did they ask or what objections did they raise that you that you think were related to your non-academic background? How did you handle these questions or any objections to your background? Why do you think these objections were raised? What kind of reactions did you experience from campus stakeholders based on your non-academic background after accepting your first role as president? How did this resistance change as you progressed along your presidential tenure?]

8. Did you have any teaching experience in higher education? If so, did it help in the search process?

9. What are your thoughts on the importance (or lack of importance) of a terminal degree like a Ph.D. or Ed.D. in a presidential search? [PROBES: If a terminal degree is important, why do you think it is important? Do you think search committees place a different weight on a Ph.D. versus an Ed.D. degree?]

10. How many presidential searches did you participate in before being selected as a president?

[PROBE: What (if any) indications suggested that you were not selected due to your lack of academic background?]

11. What type of search process did you participate in before being selected as president?

12. What (if any) missteps did you make in your first role as president?

[PROBES: What you did to correct them? How did your non-academic background relate to those missteps?]

13. What recommendations do you have on how to target and develop additional CBOs for the role of the president?

14. What advice do you have for other CBOs as they consider the role of the president?

15. How do you define good presidential leadership?

16. What other comments would you like to add?

Thank you for your time.

Interview Protocol for Executive Recruiters

Interviewee: (Title and Name): _____

Institution: _____

Interviewer: _____

Introduction

The purpose of my study is to illuminate the challenges and benefits experienced by presidents

of colleges and universities who have previously served as chief business and financial officers

(or CBOs) in higher education. The end goal is to explore additional avenues for sourcing

college presidents by creating an actionable plan to target and develop CBOs for the role of the

president.

As a participant in this study, your identity and the identity of your institution and any colleague

you mention will be confidential. Aliases will be created to describe each person and institution.

[DISCUSS IRB INFO AND DISCUSS CONSENT FORM]

To facilitate my note-taking, I would like to record the audio of our conversations today. The

only people who will have access to this recording are the transcribers and myself. The recording

will be destroyed after the notes have been transcribed.

I have planned for this interview to last no longer than one hour.

Thank you for your agreeing to participate.

1. What are your thoughts on the effectiveness of the presidential search process?

[PROBE: How has the process changed or adapted to yield candidates with skills needed for today's presidency?]

2. During the presidential search process, what types of experiences, skills, and traits are you looking for in a candidate?

3. Prior to the presidential search process, what do you do to attempt to understand the expectations of the campus community (faculty, staff, and students) as they apply to the experience, skills, and traits of the president?

4. How does the presidential search committee become informed about the experience, skills, and traits needed for the new president?

[Probes. How informed are they on what is needed in a modern president?]

5. How do various constituencies (the governing board, campus community, search committee) become informed about the experience, skills, and traits needed for the new president?

[Probes. How informed are they on what is needed in a modern president?]

6. What role does the campus community (faculty, staff, and students) have in the selection process of the president?

7. How interested do you think the search committee is in the accuracy of their decision as it applies to the desires of the campus stakeholders?

8. How interested do you think the governing board is in the accuracy of their decision as it applies to the desires of the campus stakeholders?

9. What are your thoughts on presidents that come from non-academic executive positions in higher education such as chief business officers or chief financial officers?

10. Have you overlooked a candidate for a position due to a lack his/her lack of academic experience? Why or why not?

11. What (if any) traits do you think a CBO brings to the presidency?

12. What (if any) traits or experiences do non-academic executives like CBOs lack that are needed for the presidency?

13. What are your thoughts on the importance (or lack of importance) of a terminal degree like a Ph.D. or Ed.D. in a presidential search? [PROBES: If a terminal degree is important, why do you think it is important? Do you think search committees place a different weight on a Ph.D. versus an Ed.D. degree?]

14. What (if any) resistance or pre-conceived prejudices did you think non-academic executive candidates experience during the search process? What would need to happen to create the possibility for more CBOs to fill the role of college president?

[PROBES: What group (or group) is the source of most of the resistance or prejudices? What kind of questions did they ask or what objections did they raise that you that you think were related to the candidate's non-academic background? What is the best way for a candidate to handle objections related to their background? Why do you think these objections were raised?]

15. If a non-academic candidate has teaching experience will this affect the outcome of the search process?

16. What would need to happen to create the possibility for more CBOs to fill the role of college president?

17. What are your thoughts on the presidential retirements that will occur over the next 10 years and the ability of the current search process to yield enough candidates to fill these positions?

[PROBE: What is the likelihood of the number of presidents from non-academic executive ranks increasing to meet the upcoming demand for presidents?]

18. What recommendations do you have on how to target and develop additional CBOs for the role of the president? What advice do you have for other CBOs as they consider the role of the president?

15. What other comments would you like to add?

Thank you for your time.

University of California, Los Angeles **CONSENT TO PARTICIPATE IN RESEARCH**

IDENTIFICATION OF INVESTIGATORS

Michael Carter, a doctorate candidate in the Educational Leadership Program at the University of California, Los Angeles (UCLA) Graduate School of Education and Information Studies, is conducting a qualitative research study. Your participation in this study is voluntary.

WHY IS THIS STUDY BEING DONE?

In an effort to provide new avenues for sourcing college presidents, this qualitative study will illuminate the barriers and successes experienced by non-academic executives who have served in the role of college president.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF I TAKE PART IN THIS RESEARCH STUDY?

The researcher will ask you to participate in the following activities:

One (1) interview with the researcher (in person) and review of the
interview transcripts (optional via email)

HOW LONG WILL I BE IN THE RESEARCH STUDY?

Participation will total 1 hour.

ARE THERE ANY POTENTIAL RISKS OR DISCOMFORTS THAT I CAN EXPECT
FROM THIS STUDY?

The focus of this qualitative study is hearing your story, not necessarily that of your institution(s). There are no anticipated risks or discomforts.

ARE THERE ANY POTENTIAL BENEFITS IF I PARTICIPATE?

Your experience and leadership principles may benefit educational research and the training of 21st century leaders.

WHAT ARE MY RIGHTS IF I TAKE PART IN THIS STUDY?

You can choose whether or not you want to be in this study, and you may withdraw your consent and discontinue participation at any time. You may refuse to answer any questions you do not want to answer and still remain in the study.

You have the right to review the audio file and transcript made as part of the study to determine whether they should be edited or erased in whole or in part. The researcher and the contracted transcription party will have access to the audio files. The audio files will be erased one year after the conclusion of the study.

WILL INFORMATION ABOUT ME AND MY PARTICIPATION BE KEPT CONFIDENTIAL?

Any information that is obtained in connection with this study and that can identify you will remain confidential. It will be disclosed only with your permission or as required by law. Confidentiality will be maintained by using pseudonyms for yourself and your institution. All identifiable data will be kept as secure electronic files, accessible only to the researcher, with the password only known to the researcher. Electronic analysis of data will utilize codes in place of identifiable data.

WHO CAN I CONTACT IF I HAVE QUESTIONS ABOUT THIS STUDY?

If you have questions or concerns about the research, you can contact:

The Researcher or the Researcher's Faculty Sponsor:

Michael Carter at ▮▮▮▮▮▮▮▮, or ▮▮▮▮▮▮▮▮▮▮

Dr. Kevin Eagan at ▮▮▮▮▮▮▮▮, or ▮▮▮▮▮▮▮▮

UCLA Office of the Human Research Protection Program (OHRPP):
If you have questions about your rights while taking part in this study, or you have concerns or suggestions and you want to talk to someone other than the researchers about the study, please call the OHRPP at (310) 825-7122 or write to:

UCLA Office of the Human Research Protection Program
11000 Kinross Avenue, Suite 211, Box 951694
Los Angeles, CA 90095-1694

You will be given a copy of this information to keep for your records.

APPENDIX D

Consent Form for Executive Recruiters

<div style="border:1px solid black; padding:10px;">

University of California, Los Angeles

CONSENT TO PARTICIPATE IN RESEARCH

</div>

IDENTIFICATION OF INVESTIGATORS

Michael Carter, a doctorate candidate in the Educational Leadership Program at the University of California, Los Angeles (UCLA) Graduate School of Education and Information Studies, is conducting a qualitative research study. Your participation in this study is voluntary.

WHY IS THIS STUDY BEING DONE?

In an effort to provide new avenues for sourcing college presidents, this qualitative study will illuminate the barriers and successes experienced by non-academic executives who have served in the role of college president.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF I TAKE PART IN THIS RESEARCH STUDY?

The researcher will ask you to participate in the following activities:

One (1) interview with the researcher (in person) and review of the
interview transcripts (optional via email)

HOW LONG WILL I BE IN THE RESEARCH STUDY?

Participation will total 1 hour.

ARE THERE ANY POTENTIAL RISKS OR DISCOMFORTS THAT I CAN EXPECT
FROM THIS STUDY?

The focus of this qualitative study is hearing your story, not necessarily that of your institution(s). There are no anticipated risks or discomforts.

ARE THERE ANY POTENTIAL BENEFITS IF I PARTICIPATE?

Your experience and leadership principles may benefit educational research and the training of 21st century leaders.

WHAT ARE MY RIGHTS IF I TAKE PART IN THIS STUDY?

You can choose whether or not you want to be in this study, and you may withdraw your consent and discontinue participation at any time. You may refuse to answer any questions you do not want to answer and still remain in the study.

You have the right to review the audio file and transcript made as part of the study to determine whether they should be edited or erased in whole or in part. The researcher and the contracted transcription party will have access to the audio files. The audio files will be erased one year after the conclusion of the study.

WILL INFORMATION ABOUT ME AND MY PARTICIPATION BE KEPT CONFIDENTIAL?

If you choose, any information that is obtained in connection with this study and that can identify you will remain confidential and will be disclosed only with your permission or as required by law. Under this system, confidentiality will be maintained by using pseudonyms for yourself and your institution. All identifiable data will be kept as secure electronic files, accessible only to the researcher, with the password only known to the researcher. Electronic analysis of data will utilize codes in place of identifiable data.

WHO CAN I CONTACT IF I HAVE QUESTIONS ABOUT THIS STUDY?

If you have questions or concerns about the research, you can contact:

The Researcher or the Researcher's Faculty Sponsor:

Michael Carter at ▮▮▮▮▮▮▮▮▮, or ▮▮▮▮▮▮▮▮▮▮▮▮

Dr. Kevin Eagan at ▮▮▮▮▮▮▮▮, or ▮▮▮▮▮▮▮▮▮▮

UCLA Office of the Human Research Protection Program (OHRPP):
If you have questions about your rights while taking part in this study, or you have concerns or suggestions and you want to talk to someone other than the researchers about the study, please call the OHRPP at (310) 825-7122 or write to:

UCLA Office of the Human Research Protection Program
11000 Kinross Avenue, Suite 211, Box 951694
Los Angeles, CA 90095-1694

You will be given a copy of this information to keep for your records.

REFERENCES

American Council on Education. (n.d.). *ACE fellows program*. Retrieved from

    http://www.acenet.edu/leadership/programs/Pages/ACE-Fellows-Program.aspx

American Council on Education. (2012). *The American college president: 2012*. Washington,

    DC: American Council on Education, Center for Policy Analysis.

American Council on Education. (2015) *ACE fellows program class of 2014-15*. Retrieved from

    http://www.acenet.edu/news-room/Pages/ACE-Fellows-Class-of-2014-15.aspx

American Council on Education. (2016). *Roundtable of executive search firms*. Retrieved from

    http://www2.acenet.edu/resources/esr_members/

Baliles, G. L. (2006). *The leadership imperative* (Vol. 14). Washington, DC: Association of

    Governing Boards of Universities and Colleges.

Basinger, J. (2002, December 13). Casting a wider net. *The Chronicle of Higher Education*, A32.

Bensimon, E. M. (1989). The meaning of "good presidential leadership:" A frame analysis. *The*

    Review of Higher Education, *12*(2), 107–123.

Berliner, H. A., Palm, R., Yakoboski, P., Lorden, J., & Smyer, M. A. (2009). *Chief academic*

    officers and the future of leadership of American higher education. Retrieved from

    https://www.tiaainstitute.org/public/institute/research/advancing_higher_education/ahe_0

    32409.html

Bernard, H. R. (2013). *Social research methods: Qualitative and quantitative approaches*. Los

    Angeles, CA: SAGE.

Bickman, L., & Rog, D. J. (1998). *Handbook of applied social research methods*. Thousand

    Oaks, CA: SAGE.

Big Ten Academic Alliance. (n.d.). *ALP introduction*. Retrieved from

    http://www.btaa.org/projects/leadership/alp/introduction

Birnbaum, R. (1988). Presidential searches and the discovery of organizational goals. *The*

    Journal of Higher Education, *59*(5), 489–509. https://doi.org/10.2307/1981700

Birnbaum, R. (1989). The implicit leadership theories of college and university presidents. *The*

    Review of Higher Education, *12*(2).

Birnbaum, R. (1992). *How academic leadership works: understanding success and failure in the*

    college presidency. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Birnbaum, R. (2004). The end of shared governance: Looking ahead or looking back. *New*

    Directions for Higher Education, *2004*(127), 5–22. https://doi.org/10.1002/he.152

Birnbaum, R., & Umbach, P. D. (2001). Scholar, steward, spanner, stranger: The four career

    paths of college presidents. *Review of Higher Education*, *24*(3), 203–217.

    https://doi.org/10.1353/rhe.2001.0001

Bolman, L. G., & Deal, T. E. (2008). *Reframing organizations: Artistry, choice, and leadership*

    (4th ed.). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Bornstein, R. (2003). *Legitimacy in the academic presidency: From entrance to exit*. Westport,

    CT: Greenwood Publishing Group.

Bornstein, R. (2011). *Succession planning for the higher education presidency*. Washington, DC:

    AGB Press.

Cohen, M. D., March, J. G., & Carnegie Commission on Higher Education. (1974). *Leadership*

    and ambiguity: the American college president. New York, NY: McGraw-Hill.

Committee on Institutional Cooperation. (2014). *ALP fellows directory 2014-2015.* Retrieved

    from http://www.cic.net/docs/default-source/leadershipdev/complete-2013-14-alp-

    fellows-directory6d2139394e16.pdf?sfvrsn=2

Corrigan, M. E., & American Council on Education. (2002). *The American college president.*

    Washington, DC: American Council on Education, Center for Policy Analysis.

The Council of Independent Colleges. (n.d.). *ELA results to date*. Retrieved from

    http://www.cic.edu/meetings-and-events/Leadership-Development/Pages/Results.aspx

The Council of Independent Colleges. (2015). *Executive leadership academy*. Retrieved from

    http://www.cic.edu/meetings-and-events/Leadership-Development/Pages/Executive-

    Leadership-Academy.aspx

Cowen, S. S. (2008). The changing of the guard. *Presidency*, *11*, 15–19.

Creswell, J. W., & Miller, D. L. (2000). Determining validity in qualitative inquiry. *Theory into*

    Practice, *39*(3), 124–130. https://doi.org/10.1207/s15430421tip3903_2

Drexel University. (2015). *Biography - Office of the president*. Retrieved from

    http://www.drexel.edu/president/JohnFry/biography/

Eckel, P. D., Cook, B. J., & King, J. E. (2009). *The CAO census: A national profile of chief*

    academic officers. Washington, DC: American Council on Education.

Ekman, R. (2010, September). The joys of the college presidency. *University Business*

    Magazine. Retrieved from http://www.universitybusiness.com/article/joys-college-

    presidency

Finder, A. (2008, March 5). A college president whose credentials stress taking care of business.

    The New York Times. Retrieved from

    http://www.nytimes.com/2008/03/05/nyregion/05face.html

Fisher, J. L., & Koch, J. V. (1996). *Presidential leadership: Making a difference*. Phoenix, AZ: Rowman & Littlefield.

Franklin and Marshall College. (2015). *About the college*. Retrieved from http://www.fandm.edu/about

Geertz, C. (1973). *The interpretation of cultures: Selected essays*. New York, NY: Basic Books.

Gilmour, J. E., Jr. (1991). Participative governance bodies in higher education: Report of a national study. *New Directions for Higher Education*, (75), 27–39. https://doi.org/10.1002/he.36919917504

Hartley, H. V., & Godin, E. E. (2009). *A study of career patterns of the presidents of independent colleges and universities*. Retrieved from http://www.cic.edu/Research-and-Data/Research-Studies/Documents/CICPresSurvey.pdf

Hartley, H. V., & Godin, E. E. (2010). *A study of chief academic officers of independent colleges and universities*. Retrieved from http://eric.ed.gov/?id=ED510962

Indiana University School of Education. (2016). *Carnegie classifications: Institution lookup.* Retrieved from http://carnegieclassifications.iu.edu/lookup/lookup.php

Johnston, J. S., & Ferrare, J. P. (2013). *A complete guide to presidential search for universities and colleges*. Washington, DC: AGB Press.

Joint Statement on Government of Colleges and Universities. (1990). *Academe*, *76*(3), 45–48.

Jones, D., & Wellman, J. (2010). Breaking bad habits: Navigating the financial crisis. *Change*, *42*(3), 6–13. https://doi.org/10.1080/00091381003730169

Kepple, T. R. (2012). *CFO perspectives: The small private college*. Washington, DC: National Association of College and University Business Officers.

Kerr, C., & Gade, M. L. (1987). The contemporary college president. *American Scholar*, *56*(1), 29.

Kim, Y. M., Cook, B. J., American Council on Education, & College and University Professional Association for Human Resources. (2013). *On the pathway to the presidency 2013: characteristics of higher education's senior leadership*. Washington, DC: American Council on Education.

King, J. E., Gomez, G. G., American Council on Education, & College and University Professional Association for Human Resources. (2008). *On the pathway to the presidency: characteristics of higher education's senior leadership*. Washington, DC: American Council on Education/College and University Professional Association for Human Resources.

Lenington, R. L. (1996). *Managing higher education as a business*. Phoenix, AZ: Oryx Press.

Mangan, K., & Desantis, N. (2016, March 1). Simon Newman resigns as president of Mount St. Mary's. *The Chronicle of Higher Education*. Retrieved from http://chronicle.com/article/Simon-Newman-Resigns-as/235541?cid=cp30

Maxwell, J. A. (2012). *Qualitative research design: An interactive approach* (3rd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE.

Mcfarlin, C. H., Crittenden, B. J., & Ebbers, L. H. (1999). Background factors common among outstanding community college presidents. *Community College Review*, *27*(3), 19–32. https://doi.org/10.1177/009155219902700302

McLaughlin, J. B., & Riesman, D. (1990). *Choosing a college president: Opportunities and constraints*. Princeton, NJ: Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching.

Merriam, S. B. (2009). *Qualitative research: A guide to design and implementation*. San

Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Milliken, P. J. (2010). Grounded theory. In N. Salkind (Ed.), *Encyclopedia of research design*

(pp. 549–554). Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE.

National Association of College and University Business Officers. (2013). *2013 national profile*

of higher education chief business officers. Washington, DC: Author.

Nealy, M. J. (2009, February 11). Higher ed leaders debate best path to college presidency:

Higher education. *Diverse: Issues in Higher Education*. Retrieved from

http://diverseeducation.com/article/12275/

Oliff, P., Palacios, V., Johnson, I., & Leachman, M. (2013, March 19). *Recent deep state higher*

education cuts may harm students and the economy for years to come. Retrieved from

http://www.cbpp.org/research/recent-deep-state-higher-education-cuts-may-harm-

students-and-the-economy-for-years-to-come

Patton, M. Q. (2002). *Qualitative research & evaluation methods* (3rd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA:

SAGE.

Riffkin, R. (2014, April 28). *Gallup poll: Average U.S. retirement age rises to 62*. Retrieved

from http://www.gallup.com/poll/168707/average-retirement-age-rises.aspx

Robinson, P. R. (1988). Changing roles and new expectations. *New Directions for Higher*

Education, *1988*(61), 71–74. https://doi.org/10.1002/he.36919886115

Song, W., & Hartley, H. V. (2012). *A study of presidents of independent colleges and*

universities. Retrieved from http://eric.ed.gov/?id=ED533603

Stripling, J. (2016, March 2). The Mount St. Mary's presidency was a corporate test case. It

 failed miserably. *The Chronicle of Higher Education*. Retrieved from

 http://chronicle.com/article/The-Mount-St-Mary-s/235558

Thomason, A. (2016, February 12). As Mount St. Mary's offers to reinstate 2 professors, faculty

 demands president quit. *Chronicle of Higher Education.* Retrieved from

 http://chronicle.com/blogs/ticker/mount-st-marys-reinstates-2-professors-but-one-says-

 hes-not-going-back/108589

Tierney, W. G., & Minor, J. T. (2003). *Challenges for governance: A national report*. Retrieved

 from http://www.usc.edu/dept/chepa/documents/publications/gov_monograph03.pdf

Trachtenberg, S. J. (2013). *Presidencies derailed: Why university leaders fail and how to prevent

 it*. Baltimore, MD: The John Hopkins University Press.

Tracy, S. J. (2013). *Qualitative research methods: Collecting evidence, crafting analysis,

 communicating impact* (1st ed.). Chichester, West Sussex, UK: Wiley-Blackwell.

Travis, J. E., & Price, K. F. (2013). Preparation and job satisfaction of college and university

 presidents. *FOCUS on Colleges, Universities & Schools*, *7*(1), 1–11.

U.S. Department of Education. (2013). *Digest of education statistics, 2013*. Retrieved from

 http://nces.ed.gov/programs/digest/d13/tables/dt13_317.10.asp

U.S. Department of Education. (2016). *College scorecard data.* Retrieved from

 https://collegescorecard.ed.gov/data/

Zweifler, S. (2013, July 18). U. of California gets an unexpected leader in Janet Napolitano. *The

 Chronicle of Higher Education*. Retrieved from http://chronicle.com/article/U-of-

 California-Gets-an/140465