

THE UNIVERSITY OF OKLAHOMA
GRADUATE COLLEGE

UNIVERSITY PRESIDENTIAL TERM APPOINTMENTS

A DISSERTATION
SUBMITTED TO THE GRADUATE FACULTY
in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the
degree of
DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

BY
JOHN H. CROOCH, JR.

Norman, Oklahoma

1974

UNIVERSITY PRESIDENTIAL TERM APPOINTMENTS

APPROVED BY

Stephen R. Plenge

Paul C. Sharp

Dorothy J. Gray

Leah Williams

DISSERTATION COMMITTEE

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The idea for this dissertation and the many steps that brought it into being had several contributors. For many years university presidents, whom I have known directly through personal friendship and indirectly through the literature of American higher education, have evoked my respect and admiration. I have a deepening interest in their work and contributions, and this has evolved into the present undertaking.

Four higher education scholars have given me direct assistance. My chairman, Dr. Herbert R. Hengst, has been a thorough and exacting guide; and he has my special thanks and esteem for the major time and generous effort he contributed to energizing this project. Dr. Paul F. Sharp helped focus my interest in university presidents on the topic of their term appointments. Dr. Dorothy A. Truex, characteristically, provided personal encouragement and professional perspective. Dr. Lloyd P. Williams, setting the style of a disciplined scholar, first sharpened my interest in the history of higher education.

Particular thanks goes to my friend and secretary,

Freida Murphy, who, on occasion, endured much that I might accomplish little.

My special appreciation is given to the loves of my life, Jamie and Jennifer, my wife and daughter, for their affirmation and sacrifices throughout this endeavor. I gladly dedicate this volume to them.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
LIST OF TABLES	vii
Chapter	
I. THE PROBLEM: PRESIDENTIAL TERM APPOINTMENTS	1
Introduction to the Study.	1
Problem Statement.	2
Early Appointive Conditions.	4
Presidential Tenures	8
Delimitations.	16
Significance	17
Organization	17
II. REVIEW OF THE TERM APPOINTMENT LITERATURE. .	20
Introduction	20
The Concept: Support and Opposition . .	20
Practices in Other Countries	25
Precedents on Other Organization	
Levels within Universities	29
Non-University Executive Term	
Appointments	33
Summary.	37
III. DESIGN OF THE STUDY	39
Introduction	39
Definitions	40
Questions Treated	41
Population	41
Term Institutions	41
Comparison Group	42
Historical Survey	44
Instruments	44
Summary	49

	Page
IV. HISTORICAL PRESIDENTIAL TERM APPOINTMENT PRACTICES	50
Introduction	50
New York University	53
University of Missouri	55
University of Illinois	60
University of Michigan	62
Summary	63
V. FINDINGS CONCERNING CURRENT PRESIDENTIAL TERM APPOINTMENTS	65
Introduction	65
Extent of the Current Practice	66
Description of the Current Practice	75
Comparisons of Term and Non-term Appointments	85
Summary	96
VI. DISCUSSION OF THE FINDINGS AND IMPLICATIONS FOR FURTHER STUDIES	99
Introduction	99
Discussion of the Findings	99
Implications for Further Research	107
BIBLIOGRAPHY	113
APPENDICES	122

LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
1. Responses to First Survey	67
2. Survey I: Doctoral Program Institutions with Presidential Term Appointments According to Source of Control	68
3. Survey I: Number of Institutions with Reported Consideration and Subsequent Action Regarding Presidential Term Appointments	71
4. Year in which Institutions Initiated Presidential Term Appointment Policies Currently in Effect	75
5. Length in Years of Presidential Term Appointments in Effect	76
6. Representation of University Elements Initiating and Formally Studying Presidential Term Appointments	79
7. Presidents Expressing Satisfaction with Term Appointments	81
8. Number of Institutions Evaluating Presi- dential Term Appointment Incumbents and Using Formal Criteria	83
9. Representation of University Elements in Review of Presidential Term Appointment Incumbents	84
10. Renewal of Presidential Term Appointment. .	84
11. Length of Tenure in Process for Current Presidents	87
12. Length of Tenure for Past Two Presidents	87

Table		Page
13.	Means of Vacating Office by Past Two Presidents	88
14.	Representation of University Elements in Selection and Appointment of President	90
15.	Percentage of Term and Non-term Presidents Holding Faculty Rank and Tenure	91
16.	Aggregate Professional Background of Current Presidents	92
17.	Occurrences of Evaluation Policy and Criteria for Term and Non-Term Presidents	94

UNIVERSITY PRESIDENTIAL TERM APPOINTMENTS

CHAPTER I

THE PROBLEM: PRESIDENTIAL TERM APPOINTMENTS

Introduction to the Study

A standard organizational model in American higher education has the enabling corporate charter, legislation, or constitutional provision giving the governing body full power to manage the institution as well as to act as trustee of its assets.¹ The task of selecting, evaluating, and, at times, discharging a president is a function of the board's management responsibilities for the institution. The governing board is to make provision for administrative leadership for the university. Authority, therefore, is delegated by the board of control to the chief executive officer of the institution. The president is finally accountable to the board.

The two primary means by which the president has been related to the board of control in American higher education history have been one in which the president serves a

¹Morton A. Rauh, The Trusteeship of Colleges and Universities (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1969), p. 2.

continuous appointment which was limited only by the commitment of either the president or the board to maintaining the relationship and another in which the presidential appointment has been for a one-year election with annual renewal.

Serving a continuous appointment at the pleasure of and "instant accountability" to the governing board, or serving an annual appointment with yearly assessment procedures may not best serve the individual's need for some position security and the institution's need for accountability for leadership and management of the university.

Problem Statement

This dissertation probed a third alternative for the president's formal relationship to the governing board. Beyond the notion of the president serving at the pleasure of the board until the relationship is severed or the pattern which provides for the president's contract to be reviewed and renewed annually is the possibility of the president serving the corporation for a specified term. The research reported below, therefore, was an investigation of the concept and practice of past and current presidential term appointments. The population examined was the doctoral degree granting universities in the United States.

No clear picture of the extent or description of the practice of term appointments for university presidents has

been available, and this research has intended to allow historical and empirical data to clarify the scope of their use as well as to describe the practice.

Once institutions were identified which do employ a term appointment for the president, they were compared and contrasted with universities which were similar in demographic characteristics except for the presidential term appointment. The contrasting picture was used to detect if any readily observable differences could be established which would indicate why some universities have adopted presidential term appointments and others have not.

Therefore, the basic problem this research was designed to treat was the past and present concept and practice of the specified term appointment of presidents of American universities which confer the doctoral degree. The purpose was to gain perspective on presidential term appointments formerly and currently in effect. Specific questions were raised in the study: (1) What has been the historical practice concerning American university presidential term appointments?, (2) to what extent is the presidential term appointment used currently in American universities?, (3) what description can be made of the current presidential term appointment practice?, and (4) are there readily observable differences between "term" and "non-term" institutions?

Early Appointive Conditions

Historically, accountability of the president has been given more emphasis than has security for the president. Accountability has been presidential, and security has been institutional.

The Harvard historian Morison related that in the beginning at Harvard the president and tutors had no security. They were employees of an official board.² However, early in American institutions the office of the president began to develop recognized power. "Lay boards of trustees were absentee proprietors, and in the bustling America of colonial days they usually had very little leisure to devote to their colleges."³ The tutors were temporary instructors; the president was the one who was the learned leader of the enterprise and who remained until death, resignation, or ouster.

The position of the president has not, in general, been protected by formal "job security" provisions. The first three chartered institutions in the colonies set the style for the two customary modes of relationship between university boards and presidents. The first mode was known as serving at the pleasure of the board. This relationship

²Samuel Eliot Morison, Harvard College in the Seventeenth Century, I (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1936), pp. 3-4.

³Richard Hofstadler and Walter P. Metzger, The Development of Academic Freedom in the United States (New York: Columbia University Press, 1955), p. 124.

can be understood as serving an indefinite appointment, but indefinite does not equal permanent or iron-clad. Any assurance of position under this arrangement has been based on the confidence of the board in the incumbent. The second mode was one in which the board annually elected or reappointed a president. Harvard and Yale employed the first mode, and The College of William and Mary used the second.⁴

Provisions surrounding the appointments of early presidents in American higher education dealt less with the length, tenure, or term for which the president might lead the institution and focused more on the stipend and benefits to be furnished the president and the expectations of the president by the governing board. Harvard and Yale again were influential in setting the early style. Morison reported on provisions for "executive housing" at infant Harvard. He stated that a house owned by William Peyntree was acquired from Peyntree or a third party before May 3, 1638, when Nathaniel Eaton, the first head⁵ of Harvard, moved into it.⁶ Morison also provided the detail that the Peyntree house was dismantled, and a new home for the president was built on the same site in 1645.

The first president of Yale, called the Rector in the

⁴A more detailed discussion appears in Chapter 4.

⁵Henry Dunster was the first to be called "president."

⁶Samuel Eliot Morison, The Founding of Harvard College (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1935), p. 205.

Oxford tradition, was also given housing considerations. "The Rector was promised 'entertainment' (i. e., board and lodging) in Saybrook at the charge of the Trustees, if he should removed thither before the next meeting in September."⁷ The rector referred to here was the first to be selected at Yale, the Rev. Mr. Abraham Pierson, who was elected on November 11, 1701, and the village of Saybrook was the first site of Yale College, known originally as the Collegiate School of Connecticut.⁸

Charles Chauncy, 1654-1672, was offered the presidency of Harvard on November 2, 1654, at a salary of 100 pounds currency annually.⁹ No other conditions were recorded. In 1663 Chauncy petitioned the General Court for an increase in salary or perquisites.

He had expended his English estate, and run into debt; it was impossible to give his family 'comfortable subsistence' on a 100 pounds a year; he still had no 'land to keep so much as one cowe or horse upon,' nor was his habitation dry and warm.¹⁰

Chauncy argued that heads of English universities had their stipend, their "diet" and other necessary provisions "according to their wants" and asked that Harvard live up to those same conditions for presidential service.

⁷Franklin B. Dexter, ed., Documentary History of Yale University (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1916), p. 6.

⁸Ibid., p. 5.

⁹Morison, Harvard College in the Seventeenth Century p. 320.

¹⁰Ibid., p. 336.

A test of orthodoxy has at times been applied to persons being considered to lead American institutions of higher education. An extract from the original charter of Kings College, October 31, 1754, stated that the president "shall for ever hereafter be a member of, in communion with, the Church of England, as by law established..."¹¹

Being declared sound in political doctrine has also been held to be necessary. In 1774 the Rev. Samuel Langdon, of Portsmouth, was elected to the presidency of Harvard, because he . . .

had rendered himself highly acceptable to Hancock and the other patriots of Massachusetts, by his open and bold opposition to the measures of the British government, and unquestionably owed his elevation as much to this circumstance, as to his learning, or general character.¹²

Following the Civil War the executive committee of the University of North Carolina was given general powers to elect the president and professors as part of a plan to continue the university. The committee required that the positions be filled only with persons who were both loyal to the Union and the Republican Party.¹³

¹¹Herbert Schneider and Carol Schneider, eds., Samuel Johnson: President of Kings College, His Career and Writings, IV (New York: Columbia University Press, 1929), p. 220.

¹²Josiah Quincy, History of Harvard University, II (Cambridge: Folsom, Wells, and Thurston, 1840), pp. 161-62.

¹³Kemp P. Battle, History of the University of North Carolina, II (Raleigh: Edwards and Broughton Printing Company, 1912), p. 9.

Conditions which defined and/or limited presidents' appointments to institutions in the early periods of American higher education dealt more with salary, residence, lifestyle, and religious and political stances than with constraints on presidential tenure of office. The notion of a specified term of appointment, as a formal limitation upon the president, cannot be documented. The chief condition which determined the length of service was the relationship between the president and the governing board.

Presidential Tenures

Investigation of presidential tenures have been conducted by researchers to demonstrate the length of time that individuals have been able or willing to serve as university presidents. For the most part these examinations have not dealt with factors that contributed to longer or shorter tenures, and the studies have been used to indicate trends for the length of presidential careers. Some researchers have drawn broader conclusions.

The length of time that one has held the office of the presidency of a university has been used as a prominent factor in indicating the effectiveness or importance of that presidency. Brief tenures have been viewed as transitional administrations or pauses in a dynamic continuum. "Permanent and constructive policies for the development of the institutions cannot be effectively pursued if frequent changes

are made in their executive officers."¹⁴ Also, presidential survival has been accepted as one test for mutual satisfaction between the president and those with whom the president has worked.¹⁵

Tenure, as used here, means "length of time" and does not have the ramifications of the phrase "faculty tenure." The granting of faculty tenure to a president or elevating a faculty member with tenure to the presidency is one means of giving assurance to the president that a teaching and/or research position can be available if the presidency must be vacated. This, however, is not administrative job security.

It should be remembered that holding a tenure position in the faculty does not mean tenure in the administrative position to which a man may be currently assigned. Moreover, it is not unusual to give an administrator faculty rank without granting him tenure in this rank.¹⁶

Average completed tenures of office for presidents of two selected colonial institutions which span into the twentieth century demonstrate high average length of terms. The first sixteen presidents of Yale University, beginning in 1701 with Abraham Pierson and concluding with the close

¹⁴Arthur J. Klein, Survey of Land-Grant Colleges and Universities, I (Washington: Government Printing Office, 1930), p. 64.

¹⁵Clark Kerr, "Presidential Discontent," in Perspectives on Campus Tensions, ed. by David C. Nichols (Washington: American Council on Education, 1970), p. 139.

¹⁶Mark H. Ingraham, The Mirror of Brass (Madison: The University of Wisconsin Press, 1968), p. 141.

of the administration of Alfred Whitney Griswold in 1963, have had an average tenure of 15.4 years. The longest service belonged to Jeremiah Day (1817-1846) and the shortest to Timothy Cutler (1719-1722).¹⁷ Brown University's first ten presidents, bridging the years between 1765 and 1937, produced an average tenure of 16.1 years. Francis Wayland held the office for the longest period of time, 1827-1855, and shortest presidency at Brown belonged to Alexis Caswell, 1868-1872.¹⁸

In the twentieth century, as presidential tenures became a subject for study by governmental and higher education organizations and individuals, the average length of time that incumbents filled university presidential responsibilities had decreased.

In 1913 William L. Bryan, president of Indiana University, studied a group of institutions belonging to the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching. He found that for 350 past presidents of these institutions the average term of office was 11 years.¹⁹ Six percent had served 30 years or more and five percent had held the office

¹⁷Historical Register of Yale University (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1969), p. 13.

¹⁸Historical Catalogue of Brown University (Providence: Brown University Press, 1951), p. 1.

¹⁹William L. Bryan, "The Share of Faculty in Administrative Government," Transactions and Proceedings of the National Association of State Universities, XII (1914), p. 93.

for less than one year. Acting presidents were not included. The average term for the then 65 current presidents of the study was also 11 years. Most of the institutions in Bryan's study were private universities and colleges and were presumably free of political interferences. In light of the average of 11 years for both past and present presidents, he concluded that the university presidency was an especially hazardous occupation.

Statistics on land-grant institutions in 1930 indicated that 308 presidents had served land-grant colleges since their establishment.²⁰ Without determining mean or median calculations the report concluded that the actual length of service was brief and that a considerable turnover of presidents occurred. The conclusions were drawn by determining that 167 of the 308 presidents had served less than five years.

In 1933 Alfred H. Upham reported a study he had conducted on member institutions of the National Association of State Universities since 1895.²¹ From this membership 150 presidents had retired from presidential service since 1895 with an average tenure of service of 9.4 years. Eight presidents had served longer than 25 years. The longest period of service, 45 years, belonged to President Patterson

²⁰ Arthur J. Klein, Survey of Land-Grant Colleges, p. 64.

²¹ Alfred H. Upham, "State University Presidents," School and Society, XXXVII (May 27, 1933), p. 686.

of the University of Kentucky. The fifty state university presidents who were in active service at the beginning of the 1932-33 academic year had an average tenure of 7.7 years with the longest tenure in progress belonging to William Lowe Bryan of Indiana University with 30 years.

R. W. Edmiston, in a 1938 study, asked if presidents of privately controlled or publicly controlled institutions were more secure. He studied presidencies from 1898-1937 in 120 privately and 120 publicly controlled colleges and universities. Both groups had an average of 9.52 years for length of service. Within the groupings, for privately controlled institutions the non-sectarian private institutions were highest with 13.00 years, and the Baptist-controlled institutions were lowest with 6.29 years. Among the public institutions teachers' colleges were highest with 11.52 years, and municipal-controlled institutions were lowest with 5.42 years.²²

The 1959 William K. Selden study on presidential tenure gathered its data by including a questionnaire in the membership bills to the 1300 member institutions of the National Commission on Accrediting. Selden received a 78 percent return which showed that the average length of service for current

²²R. W. Edmiston, "The Tenures of Publicly Controlled and Privately Controlled Colleges and Universities," School and Society, XLIX (February 25, 1939), pp. 254-56.

presidents was 8.1 years.²³ Former presidents of membership colleges and universities which were founded before 1900 had, from the founding dates of their institutions, a mean average for presidential service of 10.1 years. This figure includes both presidents and acting presidents. In comparison, the average presidential tenure for all membership institutions founded in the twentieth century was 10.3 years. When acting presidents were deleted from the latter group the average rose to 11.4 years. The conclusion reached by Selden was that in 1959 the long-term president was not a creature of the past.

Selden's interpretation of the results of his study can be contrasted with Bryan's above. Selden viewed the 10-11 year presidential tenure as one having respectable length and durability. Leadership had the time and security to be influential in this interval. For Bryan, however, an average term of eleven years indicated that a most hazardous profession awaited those who were achievement-oriented enough to seek a university presidency.

For his report to the Commission on College Administration of the Association of American Colleges, Mark Ingraham solicited information by means of a questionnaire from the presidents of the universities and colleges listed in

²³William K. Selden, "How Long Is a College President?" Liberal Education, XLVI (March, 1960), pp. 5-15.

the 1965-66 Education Directory of the U. S. Office of Education.²⁴ He included from among these institutions only those that provided as a minimum educational offering a four-year liberal arts and general program. Presidents who were currently in office reported to Ingraham that their immediate predecessors had a length of service that averaged 11 years with a median of 9 years.²⁵ The average for immediate past presidents of private universities was 13 years, and the average for their public counterparts was 10 years.²⁶

Clark Kerr examined tenures of the presidents of member universities of the Association of American Universities. His data included tenures that were in process as well as those which were completed. He reported that over a seventy year period, 1899-1969, the average years in office of this group of presidents dropped from 10.9 years to 5.9 years. The big drops came in the 1930's, from 9.5 in 1929 to 7.7 in 1939; and in the 1960's, from 7.4 to 5.9.²⁷

The most recent and comprehensive study of presidential tenure has been done by Cohen and March.²⁸ They reached two

²⁴Ingraham, The Mirror of Brass, p. 3.

²⁵Ibid., p. 142.

²⁶Ibid., p. 299.

²⁷Kerr, "Presidential Discontent," p. 139.

²⁸Michael D. Cohen and James G. March, Leadership and Ambiguity: The American College President (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1974), pp. 153-93.

conclusions important as background for this research. They concluded that the current tenure expectations of American college presidents, as a whole, are probably about what they have been through most of the twentieth century. Specifically, they

do not believe there is evidence of any major recent shifts in the expected tenure of new presidents, or the expected additional or full tenure of current presidents, or that departing presidents are leaving office much earlier than would have been expected.²⁹

Thus, they contradicted the studies which show briefer tenures for current than for past presidents. However, they suggested that a relatively rapid turnover of presidents may be called for in order to have a vitality of administrative organization. What has produced discontent among presidents, they wrote, will not of necessity produce discontent among others or harm the institution. "It is quite possible that the best president for a college or university is a young man and that the best tenure is relatively brief."³⁰ They concluded, therefore, that times change more rapidly than presidents normally are able to.

Therefore, for the most part, these studies did indicate a decline in the length of presidential tenures of office; and the Cohen and March study, which did not find evidence for current or near-future declines, concluded that brief

²⁹Ibid., p. 157.

³⁰Ibid., p. 191.

presidential careers were preferable. These studies have provided a background function for the research of presidential terms which have been intentionally defined with time constraints.

Delimitations

This research has been confined to institutions which offer the doctorate as the terminal degree because in many cases they are considered to be, i. e. treated as, the "prestige" institutions which serve as leaders and role models in higher education. They are looked to for innovations that represent the less faddish trends. The chief administrators of these institutions are expected to offer contributions of significance to higher education organization and thought. They are the focal points of attention for those looking for an interpretive word about higher learning and governance. Therefore, the acceptance or rejection of the presidential term appointment concept by the institutions represented by these presidents is of interest to persons with concern for higher education.

Doctoral-granting institutions include both private and public universities in their number, and they provide a wide geographical mix. Moreover, for the most part, they offer a broader range of educational opportunities than institutions which do not confer the doctoral degree.

If doctoral institutions do not accept the practice

of a term appointment as a feasible and respectable means by which their presidents can be related to the institution, then the term appointment for chief administrators is unlikely to become widely accepted in American higher education. Acceptance by these institutions will greatly increase the normative potential of presidential term appointments. Therefore, the appointive relationship of presidents to institutions which provide students the opportunity to earn the doctorate can be indicative of the future acceptance of presidential term appointment practices.

Significance

This investigation, by means of historical and new data, is a clarification of university presidential term appointments in American higher education.

The results of this research could prove to be significant for boards of control, administrators of state systems, candidates for university presidencies, current presidents, and selection committees. The picture developed could also be the foundation for future studies, following the completion of terms now in process, concerning presidential decision-making, relationship of the president to the governing board, presidential contentment and security, presidential accountability, and the university presidency as a career.

Organization

The organization of this study was developed to report

significant features of the background materials and the findings in response to researching the problem of historical and current university presidential term appointments. Background elements which provide the setting for the problem as well as the rationale for the problem of researching specified term appointments for university presidents are reported in the introductory chapter. An examination of the concept of the specified presidential term as presented in current higher education literature and precedents for the practice of the term appointment in higher education administration at levels other than the presidency, at levels other than the university, for university presidents in other countries, and in other public institutions follow in the second chapter. In chapter three the means by which data on presidential term appointments have been gathered is described. The fourth and fifth chapters, respectively, consist of the report of the historical findings for presidential term appointments in American universities and the presentation of the findings developed concerning current specified presidential terms resulting from two survey instruments and from telephone interviews with presidents whose appointment is for a limited term. The final chapter contains conclusions and discussion of the findings in light of both the research questions and statements found in the current literature concerning presidential term appointments as

they are viewed from the results of the research. The concluding section of the final chapter is comprised of suggestions for further research.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF THE TERM APPOINTMENT LITERATURE

Introduction

An investigation of the contemporary context of term appointments functions to help clarify the problem examined through this research. Arguments both in favor of and opposed to term appointments for university presidents were found in the literature of higher education. Rather than being responses to research, the arguments, for the most part, are expressions of conviction and sentiment. Precedents for term appointments at levels other than those of university presidents and term appointments for presidents of universities outside the United States are compiled from the literature below.

The Concept: Support and Opposition

Two studies, the results of which were both published in April, 1970, dealt with the question of term appointments for university chief executives in the United States. Harvard's University Committee on Governance, in preparation for the search for a new president, publicly raised the question of a term appointment for the new Harvard president.

The committee's inquiry was concerned with what would be a reasonable length of term and how the president's performance could be reviewed.¹

At the same time the Special Committee on the Structure of the University for Princeton University was reaffirming the 1967 By-laws of the Trustees of Princeton which stated that the president would not be appointed for a specified term. A clear concern of the committee was presidential accountability.

We endorse the principle that presidents should be accountable for their conduct in office but are not persuaded that a set term of office is a good way to achieve that result. The best time to change presidents is when the incumbent no longer wants to lead or has lost his ability to do so. We see no reason to believe that either of these things is likely to occur at any fixed time, and if that is true, a fixed term of office could easily delay action when it is required.²

The Princeton committee, on the other hand, called for the Trustees to accept the continuing responsibility for assessment of what the President is attempting to do and his ability to persuade others to support those attempts. A major factor in this effort, the committee stated, would be frequent consultations between the Trustees and other parts of the university.

¹The University Committee on Governance, Harvard University, John T. Dunlop, chairman (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University, 1970).

²The Governing of Princeton University: Final Report of the Special Committee on the Structure of the University (Princeton, New Jersey, 1970), p. 69.

Mr. Louis H. Heilbron, former chairman of the Board of California State College Trustees, took a similar position to the Princeton stance. The president of a university, he stated, should serve without any fixed term. He discounted any positive contribution of term appointments and insisted that they were not an appropriate means of relating presidents to universities.

If the chief executive loses control of the institution, or if he finds that he is unable to work with the board, an unexpired contract period will only be an obstacle to the inevitable and necessary dissolution.³

If mutual commitment has broken down, then, for Heilbron, it would be better for the board and president to have the freedom to terminate the relationship immediately. A term has usually not been stipulated and it should not be.

Other voices in American higher education have made positive arguments for presidential term appointments. President Kingman Brewster of Yale suggested the presidential term appointment as an alternative to strict participatory democracy on campus. Accountability, he submitted, rather than representation, was the clue to university improvement. Brewster asserted that faculty and administrators are competent to operate campuses, but accountability, in the form of systematic reassessment, was necessary. He envisioned periodic and explicit review along with definite consideration

³Louis H. Heilbron, The College and University Trustee: A View from the Board Room (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers, 1973), p. 67.

of the president's reappointment. The initial appointment, for Brewster, might be for seven years, followed by shorter intervals. An impermanent administration that is given the power to lead, with formalized periodic accountability that is carried out with campus-wide participation, was his concern. If the result of the assessment was one of no confidence in the president's performance, then new leadership would be sought.⁴

Another case for presidential term appointments was made by Clark Kerr, Chairman of the Carnegie Commission on Higher Education and former President of the University of California. The most important change in university presidencies, wrote Kerr, would be to place the president on a term appointment of reasonable length. Giving the president a fixed period for planning and exercising leadership would reduce presidential discontent and increase presidential productivity. He stated that,

At the end of the term, he will have an easy opportunity to review his own desires and for others to review his conduct. If he is reappointed, he will have received a reaffirmation of his authority as he meets new crises. In any event, opponents will not feel that they must wait forever for a change unless they mount massive opposition. A term of office could relax their opposition. This is not to suggest, however, that under exceptional circumstances a president may not be terminated at any time.⁵

⁴Kingman Brewster, Jr., "Politics of Academia," in Power and Authority, ed. by H. L. Hodgkinson and R. Meeth (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers, 1971), pp. 54-64.

⁵Clark Kerr, "Presidential Discontent," in Perspectives on Campus Tensions, ed. by David C. Nichols (Washington: American Council on Education, 1970), pp. 159-60.

Kerr conceived a term to be not less than five nor more than ten years, and his preference was one of six years which, he claimed, was the actual average term of office for presidents at leading universities.⁶

The American Association of University Professors' Committee T on College and University Government stated that, rather than assuming the president has acquired de facto tenure, a formalized system should be sought through which confidence in the president could be reinforced or withdrawn.

Such a system might take the form of a term appointment, near the end of which the president's term could be reviewed by formal or informal agreement, and he would be reappointed for another term or not be reappointed.⁷

A major concern expressed in the committee report was the assurance that significant faculty involvement in the selection, retention, and dismissal of the chief administrative officer be accepted.

Another advocate of presidential term appointments has been Warren Bennis, president of the University of Cincinnati. He advised presidents to insist upon a term contract and understood term appointments to be a clear and welcome trend in higher education. Bennis argued that skills and styles change, and no one should be locked into a position,

⁶Ibid., p. 160.

⁷"Faculty Participation in the Selection and Retention of Administrators: A Report by Committee T," AAUP Bulletin, June, 1972, LVIII, 174.

no matter how satisfying to the incumbent, for life. Leaders should be enabled to lead rather than be smothered by "campus participatory democracy schemes." He wrote,

Give presidents and all leaders a chance to succeed or fail. And give them some elbow room and freedom to lead, although not despotically. Hold the leaders accountable and throw the rascals out if they don't succeed in a reasonable period of time. Term appointments should facilitate strong, vigorous leadership, not diminish it.⁸

The length of service, in Bennis' view, should not exceed ten years because of the enormous personal demands on the president. Accordingly, review should take place mid-term, and a president should retire from the office at the end of the ten-year period.

This procedure would allow any individual president time to implement long-range plans and at the same time guarantee the institution a new administrative perspective at least every ten years.⁹

Bennis, as president of the University of Cincinnati, is appointed for an indefinite period. "The Board of Directors does not believe it necessary or desirable to have a term appointment for the President."¹⁰

Practices in Other Countries

Various forms of the practice of a term appointment

⁸ Warren G. Bennis, The Leaning Ivory Tower (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, Inc., 1973), p. 83.

⁹ Ibid.

¹⁰ Letter from Daniel Hershey, Assistant to the President, University of Cincinnati, May 13, 1974.

are currently in effect for chief executives in public higher education systems in other countries. A study¹¹ which reviews higher education systems in eight industrial nations, with the later addition of India, shows that the term appointment of university chief administrators occurs in universities abroad. In the nineteen universities of France,¹² the president, formerly known as rector, is elected by the university board for a five-year term and cannot immediately succeed himself.¹³ Within the Federal Republic of Germany the custom has been for the rector, as the chief executive for non-academic administration of the university, to be elected from and by the full professors for a one year term. Frequently the term is extended to two years by means of re-election.¹⁴ The Swedish university rector is elected by the University Council for a four-year term and may be reappointed once. Presidents of national universities in Japan are appointed for a four-year term and may be reappointed once.¹⁵

¹¹Barbara B. Burn, et al., Higher Education in Nine Countries: A Comparative Study of Colleges and Universities Abroad (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1971).

¹²Eric Bockstael and Otto Feinstein, Higher Education in the European Community (Lexington, Mass.: D. C. Heath and Company, 1970), p. 27.

¹³Burn, op. cit., p. 25.

¹⁴Ibid., p. 178.

¹⁵Ibid., pp. 209-46.

The 1966 Duff and Berdahl report on Canadian higher education mentioned the possibility of a five-year term with a five year renewal, but it counseled that a term contract would prove to be an obstacle in attracting superior persons to presidential posts. The report concluded that the best arrangement was a permanent appointment subject to the pleasure of the Board with a stated retirement age.¹⁶

Since this report, however, the Association of Universities and Colleges of Canada has indicated that at least six presidents of Canadian universities have accepted five-year term contracts. "Indeed, it is becoming the standard form of presidential appointment in Canada."¹⁷ This number, six, is compared with the twenty-five Canadian institutions which were accredited to confer the doctoral degree.¹⁸

Two major illustrations of presidential term appointment in Canada were available. The president of Simon Fraser University was provided with a three-year term appointment in 1969, and the contract was renewed for a two year period.

¹⁶ Sir James Duff and Robert O. Berdahl, University Government in Canada: Report of a Commission Sponsored by the Canadian Association of University Teachers and the Association of Universities and Colleges in Canada (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1966), p. 44.

¹⁷ Letter from K. M. Larose, Information Associate, Association of Universities and Colleges of Canada, Ottawa, April 9, 1974.

¹⁸ The Association of Commonwealth Universities. Commonwealth Universities Yearbook: 1973 (London: The Association of Commonwealth Universities, 1973).

A twelve months' leave will follow the completion of the term. The succeeding president will have a five-year term followed by a one year leave of absence.¹⁹ The University of Toronto chief administrator was awarded a five-year term in 1972. An informal arrangement was made which would allow the term to be extended for two years, but, apart from that extension, the term was non-renewable.²⁰

In 1971 the Association of Universities and Colleges of Canada issued "Guidelines on University Organization." The section pertaining to presidents provided term appointment guidelines which suggested (1) a term of five to seven years renewable, (2) a full year's leave of absence at the end of each term, (3) provisions for continuance in the service of the institution after serving as president, (4) early termination as president, with salary continued, when continuance as a professor is in doubt, to avoid forcing the incumbent president to search for a job, and (5) when a contract is terminated prematurely the president should be entitled "to something like" half salary for life.²¹

The Canadian references above understood a presidential

¹⁹Letter from K. Strand, President, Simon Fraser University, Burnaby, British Columbia, May 21, 1974.

²⁰Letter from John Evans, President, University of Toronto, Ontario, May 13, 1974.

²¹Association of Universities and Colleges of Canada, "Guidelines on University Organization," Ottawa, 1971. (Mimeographed.)

term appointment to have contract status.

Precedents on Other Organizational
Levels Within Universities

The idea of a "term appointment" in American academia was first written into the 1696 and 1697 proposed charter revisions for Harvard.²² The 1696 version stated that "the President and all Fellows receiving salary shall dwell and reside at the College; and no one shall enjoy a Fellowship with salary for more than ten years, except continued by a new election."²³ Morison's quotation of the 1697 charter for Harvard used the seventeenth century colonial English, and the following citation faithfully reproduces that style:

And it is further declared by the Authority aforesaid That after this Act shall be confirmed the President, as well as all the Fellows receiving Salary shall reside at the Colledge, and that not one shall enjoy a Fellowship with Salary for more than Seven Years except continued by a new Election.²⁴

The article of the charter copied in this form lacks some precision, but apparently, the intent of the passage

²²The 1650 Harvard charter established a seven-member Corporation, consisting of the President, Treasurer, and five Fellows. The charter was ratified by the General Court of the colony of Massachusetts, because King Charles was dead and the colonial leaders would not recognize any sovereignty of the Long Parliament over the colony. See Morison, I, p. 4.

²³Josiah Quincy, History of Harvard University (2 vols.; Cambridge, Mass.: Folsom, Wells, and Thurston, 1840), p. 597.

²⁴Samuel Eliot Morison, Harvard College in the Seventeenth Century, II (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1936), 658.

was to require a periodic election for the teaching staff but not for the teaching president. The phrase "not one" could not refer to the President unless the President enjoyed a Fellowship. Peirce's 1833 history of Harvard stated that from the commencement of the college, and for more than half a century, the tutors, who with the President conducted the instruction and immediate administration of the college, were called "Fellows of the College."²⁵ It can be deduced that the President, as distinct from the tutors, did not "enjoy a Fellowship."

The 1697 charter was disallowed by the King in council, and in 1707 the 1697 charter was superseded by a return to the 1650 charter. In a compromise move to secure the election of John Leverett to the presidency of Harvard by the Massachusetts House of Deputies, Governor Dudley recommended to the Deputies that the more recent charters be discarded, and the 1650 charter would again be in force. The House of Deputies happily complied because such action acknowledged the incorporating powers of the colony.²⁶ Therefore, the "short" provisions were nullified, and the Corporation was reduced to the earlier number of seven.

The short-lived Harvard policy, as argued above, did

²⁵ Benjamin Peirce, A History of Harvard University (Cambridge, Mass.: Brown, Shattuck, and Company, 1833, p. 79, appendix.

²⁶ Morison, Harvard College in the Seventeenth Century, I, p. 6.

not include the president and, of course preceded the development of other administrative positions; however it introduced the notion of specified term appointments into American higher education at an organizational level immediately below that of president.

A term appointment for university administrators does have precedent at the department chairman level of administrative responsibility in American higher education. On July 26, 1941, President Joseph Brandt of the University of Oklahoma asked his Board of Regents to ratify a plan whereby University of Oklahoma department chairmen would be appointed for a term of three years without the option of renewal of the term.²⁷ Later, President George L. Cross asked the Regents to revise their earlier policy in order to allow department chairmen to succeed themselves in office.²⁸ At some point between January, 1944, and June, 1945, the length of term was increased to four years, but no formal record of the change was found in available University documents.²⁹ Currently chairmen are appointed for a four year term unless an unexpired term is being completed by a new appointee, in which case the new appointment is limited to

²⁷ Minutes, Board of Regents, University of Oklahoma, July 26, 1941.

²⁸ Minutes, Board of Regents, University of Oklahoma, January 12, 1944.

²⁹ Private Interview, Mrs. Barbara James, Secretary to the Board of Regents, University of Oklahoma, October 24, 1973.

the remaining portion of the term.

More recently, the governing board of the University of Cincinnati amended its policies to provide for terms of not less than four years nor more than six years for vice presidents, including a Provost, and Vice Provosts. Each academic dean and academic department head, under this policy, was appointed "for a term designated by the by-laws of his college but to be not less than three nor more than seven years."³⁰ These appointments were made by the board upon the recommendation of the president in concert with appropriate committees. Incumbents in each of the foregoing positions, if they wish, could be reappointed following a normal review process.

At Yale University all college masters, department chairmen, and deans received their administrative position for a term of years. Department chairmen had a three-year term; college masters and deans held a five-year term. Evaluation of performance was required at the close of the service period, and each administrator was expected to revert to purely academic status at the close of a second term.³¹

Heilbron reported that in most private institutions governing board members serve in a self-perpetuating capacity,

³⁰ By-Laws, Board of Trustees, University of Cincinnati, Article II, Section 2, April 4, 1972.

³¹ Brewster, "Politics of Academia," p. 60.

and, in effect, fill their own vacancies.³² There are, however, private boards which use a specified term for their members. The members of the University of Pennsylvania Board of Trustees have been elected to their positions on a term basis. A University of Pennsylvania charter revision of 1927 called for twenty term trustees elected for a period not to exceed ten years with eligibility for re-election. It also directed the election of ten alumni trustees to serve for a period not to exceed ten years but ineligible for re-election in the years of the expiration of the term.³³

Non-University Executive Term Appointments

Although this research dealt with presidential term appointments to doctoral-granting universities, executive term appointments exist at other levels in higher education and in other systems within the society.

In May, 1973, the Minnesota State College System approved a term appointment policy for the presidents of the seven state colleges and the chancellor of the system.³⁴ The University of Minnesota, which is governed by a separate board, was not included under this policy. The length of

³²Heilbron, The College and University Trustee, p. 6.

³³Donald R. Belcher, The Board of Trustees of the University of Pennsylvania (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1960), p. 51.

³⁴Minnesota State College System, "Policy on Appointment, Evaluation, Retirement, and Distinguished Service Professorships for College Presidents," St. Paul, 1973. (Mimeographed.)

the term was set at five years, and the appointment was not given the status of a contract. Both the president and the board have been left free to sever the relationship, but the expectation was that the incumbent would remain in office for the full term except for unusual reasons. The term was also renewable for a second five years. A maximum of ten years is the expected length of time an incumbent may hold office; however the board may grant annual appointments following the completion of ten years if the college being served is in the midst of an activity that, in the consideration of the board, can best be concluded by the incumbent president.

A president under the Minnesota College policy will be considered for a second five-year term prior to two internal procedures. During the third year of the five-year term a team of consultants, external to the system, will evaluate the performance of the president chiefly by means of interviews with representatives of internal constituencies of the college. This evaluation will be timed so that constructive criticisms can be incorporated by the president before the term expires. A second evaluation, called an administrative review, will be conducted by the chancellor's office in the fifth year of the term. Criteria for this review had not been developed, but the president's performance will be judged by previous objectives agreed

upon by the president and governing board.³⁵

The individual president has some financial and job protection under the Minnesota policy. If the incumbent is terminated following the first term, five months additional salary is paid the president. When termination follows the second term the president will be given salary for an additional nine months. Upon completion of the first term the president is eligible for consideration as a Minnesota State College System Distinguished Service Professor. This designation will not be automatic, but when it is utilized the salary cannot be less than 80 percent of the presidential salary for the year prior to the close of the completed term.³⁶

When organization forms, in a concern for the relationship of the executive to the system or sub-system, employed, and given consideration to, the specified term appointment.

Military officers assigned to special category activities were assigned on a term basis. Commanders of Air Force Reserve Officer Training Corps units, for example, were appointed for a three-year term with the option of a one year extension.³⁷

³⁵Private Interview, Garry D. Hays, Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs, Minnesota State College System, July 27, 1974.

³⁶Minnesota State College System, op. cit.

³⁷U. S., Department of the Air Force, Air Force Assignment Manual, AFM 36-11, July 19, 1972, Table 9-1.

The use of term appointments has been proposed for the civil service executives of the American federal government. During February, 1971, the executive branch of the federal government sent to the Congress a recommendation for the establishment of a new Federal Executive Service.³⁸ One feature of this system would be to differentiate more sharply between noncareer executives, who would be appointed to government service for a limited duration from industry, universities, etc., and career executives who would be chosen under merit principles. Since the tendency in federal administration has been to classify positions of the chief administrators as noncareer, the career executive who has elected to move into such a position must necessarily forfeit the career rights that he had built up during his years of service. Under the proposed Federal Executive Service he could accept any assignment without jeopardizing his career.

This proposal basically would establish a term appointment for federal executives and would make provision for the review of the executive and his contribution to the position he occupies. As priorities shift or the executive's ability to contribute change, he would not be reappointed to the position, but, at the same time, he would have assurance of a position at the GS-16 level.

³⁸Seymour S. Berlin, "The Federal Executive Service," Civil Service Journal, XI (April-June, 1971), p. 7.

Far from creating an untouchable elite corps, the FES proposal recognizes that the country's needs demand that the executive group be composed only of individuals currently making an exceptional contribution, and that persons serving in career executive positions are periodically reviewed for retention in the group.³⁹

Both the executive and the agency, the proposal claims, are protected. The executive has substantial protection against removal during the period of the appointment agreement, and the needs of the governmental agency are recognized in providing for specific intervals of evaluation.

Summary

The concept of a term appointment for university presidents is not clearly formulated in the literature concerning higher education. The idea has both strong defenders and stiff opposition. Some characterize the presidential term as "necessary" and "the future model." Others represent a term as being "non-executive" and a hindrance upon governing boards. There are unmistakable disagreements about the presidential term appointment as a structure for enhancing leadership and accountability in higher education. It is also evident that the extent to which term appointments are currently in practice is not clear.

Term appointments are not foreign to higher education administration. Examples of term appointments for senior administrators, presidents, private trustees, and chief

³⁹Ibid.

administrators in other countries can be documented.

No comprehensive picture of term appointments for university presidents is extant in the current literature, although interest in the topic is evident. In American universities the president traditionally has been the focal point of the community. His role, office, tenure, background and personality have been studied. The possibility of his relating to the university by means of an appointment for a specified number of years has been investigated by individual institutions for their own purposes of planning, but a more comprehensive view of the concept and practice of term appointments for presidents remains undeveloped. That task was the intent of this research.

CHAPTER III

DESIGN OF THE STUDY

Introduction

The problem dealt with in this research was to determine and describe the concept and practice of former and current presidential term appointments in American doctoral degree granting universities. The plan for approaching the problem included (1) examining the histories of American higher education with the purpose of detecting presidential appointments that were defined by means of a specified term, (2) identifying each university which currently uses a term appointment arrangement for its president, (3) securing from each president of that group a standard body of data concerning the nature and practice of their terms, (4) selecting a representative group of peer institutions for comparative purposes, and (5) comparing the presidential appointive relationship of those universities which do have a term appointment with those similar institutions which do not.

The study relied on four approaches for gaining information, (1) survey of historical writings on universities, (2) an initial postal card questionnaire (Survey I), (3) a

questionnaire to both term and non-term institutions (Survey II), (4) and a telephone interview with presidents appointed for a specified term.

Definitions

A term appointment, for the purposes of this research, was defined as an appointment formalized for a specified period which spans a time-block longer than one year. Therefore, a presidential term appointment is a formalized appointment for a limited period of time. It is not an annual appointment nor an appointment to a fixed retirement age, subject to the pleasure of the board. It has a mutually understood expiration point, which may or may not be preceded by an evaluation of presidential performance. Reappointment may or may not be executed. The presidential term appointment is a means of structuring and protecting a length of time a person may hold presidential leadership in a university. A term appointment is contrasted with an annual appointment which is renewed yearly and a continuous appointment in which the incumbent serves an indefinite period at the pleasure of the governing board.

The phrase "doctoral degree" used in this research refers to terminal academic degrees. Doctorates considered as "honorary" and first professional degrees were not included in the meaning.

Questions Treated

This research was designed to treat four questions:

(1) what has been the practice concerning presidential term appointments in the past?, (2) what is the extent of the current practice?, (3) what is the form of the current practice?, and (4) are there readily observable differences between term and non-term institutions?

Population

The population involved in this research consisted of the universities in the United States which confer an accredited doctoral degree as recognized by the Federation of Regional Accrediting Commissions of Higher Education and listed in Accredited Institutions of Higher Education, 1972-73.¹ Two hundred and seventy-two accredited, graduate institutions which confer doctoral degrees were identified. In states where these institutions have been organized into a state-wide system and/or governed by a single board only the campuses of that system which do, in fact, confer the doctoral degree were counted individually and included in the population of 272.

Term Institutions

Responses on the postal card response forms, described

¹Federation of Regional Accrediting Commissions of Higher Education, Accredited Institutions of Higher Education: 1972-73 (Washington: American Council on Education, 1972).

below, were used to determine the number of institutions of the population which make use of a term appointment for their chief administrator. The institutions which make up the group which employs the practice of a term appointment for their presidents, therefore, involve all those accredited higher education institutions in the United States which offer the doctoral degree and have adopted the practice of a presidential term appointment.

Comparison Group

Another group of accredited, doctoral-granting universities were randomly selected which would be considered peer institutions of the term universities, except that they do not appoint their presidents on a term basis. Criteria were established for the selection of this randomly stratified peer group. The selected universities in this group were similar in control, size, and region to the institutions which have term appointments for their presidents.

Each university with a presidential term appointment was teamed with another university which is controlled similarly, i.e., public to public, private to private. In order to align institutions according to size, six full-time equivalent enrollment divisions were determined. The divisions were 1-500, 501-1000, 1001-5000, 5001-10,000, 10,001-25,000, and above. Therefore, these enrollment ranges were used to pair the universities. The third criterion, regional similarity, was met by requiring the paired institutions

to belong to the same regional accrediting agency as do their corresponding term institutions. The boundary lines of the accrediting agencies were used as an objective means of classifying the institutions regionally. The boundary divisions as listed for the six regional accrediting agencies in Accredited Institutions of Higher Education: 1972-73² were used to team the institutions regionally.

Each institution that met the criteria of accredited, doctoral-granting, control, size and region were randomly numbered and randomly selected. This procedure was used to match approximately a non-term institution with each of the term institutions. All institutions which met the criteria for each term institution were constituted into a pool from which the single comparison university related to the term institution was drawn.

Two qualifications had to be made to the above criteria. In one instance no similar comparison institution in the accreditation region of the term institution could be found, and, subsequently, an institution similar except for the regional criterion was selected. In another situation one comparison institution which was controlled privately was paired with a public institution because of an absence of similar public institutions, but both institutions met the other criteria for similarity.

²Ibid.

Historical Survey

In order to describe the practice of presidential term appointments in the past, examination was made of the history of American higher education for examples among the population institutions of presidential appointments limited by defined time constraints. Available state histories and histories of universities, along with letters received from presidents and university historians, have been the chief sources of the historical data.

Instruments

Data were gathered to deal with the questions of the current practice by means of two surveys, using mailed questionnaires, and follow-up telephone interviews.

Survey I

Information concerning the current extent of the practice of presidential term appointments was provided by an initial survey mailed to the university presidents as defined in the population. A cover letter describing the study and defining the phrase "presidential term appointment" as used in this study accompanied a stamped postal card response form supplied to the presidents.

The response form provided, in addition to the name, address, and position of the respondent, the following information: (1) the title of the institution, which was furnished by the researcher; (2) the source of the institution's

control, private or public; (3) a response concerning the use of the presidential term appointment for the chief administrator of the institution; (4) a response concerning formal plans of the institution to initiate a term appointment in the future; and (5) a response concerning study and rejection of the presidential term appointment practice at the institution.

Survey II

A thirty-two item questionnaire was developed in order to secure a standard body of information from each president identified in the initial survey as holding office by means of a specified term appointment as well as from those presidents of institutions of the comparison group. Additional information was asked of the presidents appointed on a term basis.

A preliminary questionnaire was field-tested with the co-operation of selected university administrators. The instrument evaluators included a university president, an executive assistant to a university president, and a vice-president for administrative affairs. The review of the evaluators provided a clarification of the instrument and led to some modifications.

The final form of the instrument contained three major sections. The first section included generally available information and was completed prior to being mailed to the

universities. This information was supplied by the researcher to the respondents in order to certify if the information was accurate. Items in the first section included the title of the institution, the means of control, public or private; the type student body, coed, all-male, or all-female; size of the enrollment; and the number of doctorates awarded the year ending June 30, 1971. The source for the enrollment information was the Yearbook of Higher Education: 1973-74,³ and the information concerning the number of doctoral degrees conferred by the institution was listed in American Universities and Colleges.⁴

Part II of the questionnaire contained items designed to produce information descriptive of the formal relationship between the president and the institution. Questions were posed treating the following elements in the relationship: (1) length and termination of service of former presidents, (2) nature of the appointment and service of the current president, (3) evaluation of the president, and (4) nature of the contract.

All questions of this section were formed to provide information which would lead to a description of the current term practice. Items concerning the length of tenure and

³Jon S. Greene, ed., Yearbook of Higher Education: 1973-74 (Orange, N. J.: Academic Media, 1973).

⁴W. Todd Furniss, ed., American Universities and Colleges (11th ed.; Washington: American Council on Education, 1973).

means of terminating the office were designed to determine if any trends for long or short presidencies preceded the current presidencies or if any expiration patterns could be developed. Items concerning the appointment of the current president were constructed to produce data concerning which constituencies participated in selection of the president and academic security provisions provided the president. Items concerning evaluation of the president's performance were developed to describe existing review practices of the institutions.

The final information produced by Part II was the president's description of the presidential contractual relationship with the institution. If the response indicated that a "specified term," as contrasted with an annual contract renewal or an indefinite appointment, depicted the relationship then additional information was requested.

Part III of the instrument, directed toward those presidents with term appointments, produced the following information: (1) the nature of the term, (2) conditions of evaluation of the term, and (3) and the circumstances surrounding reappointment or renewal of the term. The items were designed to produce descriptive information concerning current term appointments.

A letter accompanied each instrument explaining the purpose of the investigation, giving the references for the information supplied in Part I and soliciting the president's

assistance in the project. A pre-stamped, return envelop was included to encourage response.

Interview Schedule

Each president whose appointment was defined with a specified term was telephoned for an interview. In each case the special secretary to the president was first contacted, told the topic of concern, and asked for a convenient time when the president could be called for a brief interview.

In introductory comments the presidents were told that their personal perceptions were valued in this interview.

Two major questions were asked of each person in order to deepen the researcher's understanding of the individual president's term appointment. The questions were as follows:

(1) What were the dynamics surrounding the origin of the term appointment at the institution you lead?, and (2) Are you personally satisfied with serving under a term appointment arrangement?

Therefore, the major purposes of the interview were to extend the data into the areas of perceptions of the presidents concerning their satisfaction level with their term arrangement and to inquire more deeply into the factors which led to the adoption of a term appointment for their university.

Summary

In order to describe the past and current practice of presidential term appointments, histories of institutions which currently are accredited to grant the doctoral degree were examined and these institutions were surveyed to determine the extent of the use of presidential term appointments. Following the identification of the institutions whose presidents hold office on a term basis, an equal number of similar institutions were selected for comparison purposes. Both sets of institutions were surveyed concerning their presidential appointment practices. Telephone interviews were used for purposes of further investigating the appointments of the term presidents.

CHAPTER IV

HISTORICAL PRESIDENTIAL TERM APPOINTMENT PRACTICES

Introduction

For the most part appointments of university presidents by governing boards in American higher education have been without stated term conditions, however some presidents have been given annual appointments. Again, the Harvard charter was precursory in that the appointment of the president was not defined with time constraints. By implication the possible time of service was unlimited. The College of William and Mary provided the model for an annual renewal of the president's appointment.

Harvard's contribution to the concept of the length of tenure being tied to "the pleasure of the Board" was derived from the Harvard charter of 1650 which gave no temporal definition to the relationship between president and board.¹ The implication was that the duration of the relationship, or "corporate fellowship", was limited only by the agreement of the parties involved. Later the 1701 charter of Yale also omitted any direct reference to the appointive

¹Morison, Harvard College in the Seventeenth Century, 1, pp. 5-8.

relationship between board and president. The chief concern of the Yale charter, in this regard, was for the Trustees to appoint a rector who would work for the stated purposes of the college.² However, minutes preserved from the November 11, 1701, Trustees meeting record that the Rector, Master, Usher, or Ushers, shall continue in office Quamdiu Bene Se Gesserint, "as long as they conduct themselves well."³ The burden of the appointive relationship was intended to be placed on the incumbents.

The Charter for The College of William and Mary called for eighteen trustees who must be residents of the colony. "Every year they were to elect from their number a rector for the college. Every seven years they were to choose some eminent and discreet person to be the Chancellor."⁴ The rector, or president, of the college was the "practical executive" of the institution.⁵ The first annual rector was the Rev. James Blair. As one of the original trustees he

²Franklin B. Dexter, Biographical Sketches of the Graduates of Yale College with Annals of the College History (New York: Henry Holt and Company, 1885), pp. 3-4.

³Franklin B. Dexter, ed., Documentary History of Yale University (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1916), p. 28.

⁴Herbert B. Adams, The College of William and Mary (Washington, D. C.: Government Printing Office, 1887), p. 18.

⁵For an interesting account of the decline of the chancellor at Oxford and the ascent of the rector see John B. Davis, Corporations: A Study of the Origins (2 vols.; New York: Burt Franklin, 1905), pp. 266-70.

was annually elected to the office until his death in 1743.⁶

The Chancellor of the college, on the other hand, was considered an honorary position. Old statutes define his position, saying "when the college wants a new president or professor, or master, let the college senate rely chiefly on his assistance, advice, and recommendation."⁷ During colonial rule the Bishop of London served as Chancellor. In 1788, George Washington was the first American elected chancellor by the Board.⁸

There are, however, incidences in American higher education history of legislative statutes, charter requirements, and board policies which called for a limited presidential term. Available, basic historical writings have been searched for occurrences of specified terms for presidents in the universities of the population.

In the findings of presidential term appointments which follow one was a charter requirement, one was based on board policy, and one was written into the state statutes, and the last was a method used by a board in the selection of a particular president and was not the ongoing policy of the board.

⁶The annual election seems to have been perfunctory, Blair held the office for fifty years. The first sixteen presidents of William and Mary served from 1693-1854 with an average tenure of 10 years. Two served single year terms.

⁷Ibid., p. 35.

⁸Ibid., p. 34.

Terms seem to have been imposed or ignored in response to pressures of the day. In three of the cases the university mentioned began a term appointment with its first president, and the fourth was a temporary policy on the part of a university board when filling the vacancy of a popular president who had held office for nearly four decades.

New York University

The organizing charter for the University of the City of New York, later named New York University, called for the Council, as the governing board of the institution, to elect a Chancellor of the university for a term of four years with the eligibility of re-election.⁹ The number of times re-election could take place was not specified. The Rev. Mr. James Mathews was the first to be elected chancellor of the university. He served two terms from 1831-1839,¹⁰ and resigned during a period of financial stress and faculty tension.¹¹ Following the first chancellor the concept of a term was apparently ignored by the board. The second chancellor, Theodore Frelinghusen, served from 1830-1850 and resigned to become President of Rutgers University. No

⁹Theodore F. Jones, ed., New York University: 1832-1932 (New York: The New York University Press, 1933), p. 27.

¹⁰Sidney Sherwood, The University of the State of New York: History of Higher Education in the State of New York (Washington: Government Printing Office, 1900), p. 265.

¹¹Jones, New York University, p. 51.

term contract was mentioned in the literature surrounding his presidency. Following Frelinghusen the university could not afford the services of a chancellor, but in November, 1852, Dr. Isaac Ferris accepted the position without salary until subscriptions to eliminate the university's debt could be completed.¹² Ferris held the office for seventeen years without term requirements. In 1870 it was suggested informally to him by Council members that he retire in order to allow one more energetic to head the university.¹³ Term appointment procedures were not employed at this time to mollify the embarrassments of this situation.

Dr. Howard Crosby was elected chancellor in 1870.

He reminded the Council that by the statutes of the University a Chancellor was elected for a term of four years; and he regarded his election, in spite of precedents to the contrary, as for that term only.¹⁴

Because of continued difficulties in securing endowments Crosby resigned in June 1873, before the four-year term could have expired, but he continued to serve in the office until June, 1881. He stated that he understood his services from 1873-1881 to be purely temporary.¹⁵

During the presidency of the Rev. John Hall, 1881-1891, the fact that the charter of the university had been

¹²Ibid., p. 70

¹³Ibid., p. 90.

¹⁴Ibid., p. 95.

¹⁵Ibid., p. 118.

ignored was faced by the Council. Existing practices did not reflect charter statements. The charter had required for one-fourth of the Council to be elected annually, for the mayor of the city and four members of the city council to be elected annually, and for no one religious sect to ever have a majority in the Council.¹⁶ Although modifications were made on these items,¹⁷ the term appointment aspects of the university's organization were not reformed. It appears that the struggle for survival of the institution demanded the chief energies of the Council, and less effort was made to deal with governance matters that seemed secondary to the question of existence.

University of Missouri

The University of Missouri also initiated a term appointment beginning with its first president. At a meeting of the Board of Curators on October 6, 1840, the policy was agreed upon that would set the president's term of office at six years with an annual salary of three thousand dollars.¹⁸ John Hiram Lathrop accepted these conditions and became the first president. On January 29, 1849, the Board repealed its former resolution, passed on January 29, 1846, providing for the election of a president at the "annual meeting next

¹⁶Ibid., p. 126

¹⁷Ibid., p. 128.

¹⁸Frank F. Stephens, A History of the University of Missouri (Columbia: University of Missouri Press, 1962), p. 30.

preceding" the termination of his term and extended Lathrop's term of office four years beyond the expiration date of his current term.¹⁹ He had been re-elected in 1846 for a four year term.²⁰ The new action was taken to protect the president from the new Board taking office in April, 1849, which contained anti-Lathrop factions. Under pressure, President Lathrop resigned in the summer of 1849 without completing his second term.²¹

The term appointment policy of the Missouri Board was not provided by statute or charter, and, therefore, the application of the policy and the length of the term varied in accordance with the purposes and/or consensus of the members of the Board at any particular time. The second president of the University of Missouri protested appointment on a term basis.

Dr. James Shannon was elected president in September, 1849, and took office in July, 1850.²² He was first elected to a term of six years. Shannon objected that the effect of this limitation was to place him on probation as if to test him for his fitness for the office. He wrote that he knew of no other college in Europe or America electing a

¹⁹ Ibid., p. 64.

²⁰ Ibid., p. 122n.

²¹ Ibid., p. 65.

²² Jonas Viles, The University of Missouri: A Centennial History (Columbia: University of Missouri Press, 1939), p. 53.

president for a term of years and requested that the Board omit the term requirements if they wished for him to accept.²³ The Board rescinded its previous action and elected Shannon "during good behavior." He also insisted on being able to continue his preaching, and the Board tacitly accepted this condition.²⁴ Shannon's preaching was the source of many disputes. Anti-Shannon factions wanted the president and professors of the university to give full attendance to their duties of office and avoid the simultaneous practicing of other "learned professions."²⁵ In July, 1856, the Board "voted unanimously to re-elect James Shannon for a term of six years 'who shall hold his office in the manner prescribed' by the Act of December 4, 1855."²⁶ In the light of this action Shannon was faced with the decision of remaining as president on a term basis or abandoning his preaching. He declined the appointment.²⁷

Following the resignation of Shannon, the Board returned to its term appointment policy with the selection of Professor William W. Hudson to be president for a term of six years.²⁸ Hudson died of a bronchial disease in June,

²³Stephens, University of Missouri, p. 80.

²⁴Viles, University of Missouri, p. 53.

²⁵Stephens, University of Missouri, p. 118.

²⁶Ibid.

²⁷Ibid., p. 119.

²⁸Ibid.

1859, near the end of his third year in office.

The Board next elected Albert Taylor Bledsoe to a six year term of office without having any assurance that he would be receptive to the offer. Bledsoe declined the position.²⁹

The Board then reformulated its term policy. The university was reorganized into five departments. The professor of Moral and Intellectual Philosophy and Political Science was elected to be ex officio President.³⁰ The Board limited the term of teachers to exceed not more than four years without re-election, therefore the term of the president was set because of his faculty rank.³¹ Benjamin B. Miner was elected president.³² In March, 1862, the University was closed due to the civil war and the duties of the President and professors were interrupted.³³ The term policy did not prove to be a means of protection for those serving under its provisions. It was more ornamental than shielding.

In 1865, John H. Lathrop, the first president of the University of Missouri, (in the mean time having served

²⁹Ibid., p. 129.

³⁰Ibid., p. 139.

³¹Ibid., p. 141.

³²Ibid., p. 145.

³³Ibid., p. 161.

presidencies at Indiana and Wisconsin), was again elected president.³⁴ No term was stated for him, but the faculty at that time was serving a one year term.³⁵

At the end of one year Daniel Read was elected president in 1866 for a four-year term, and without consulting him, the Board re-elected him for another four-year term in 1869, "to commence at the expiration of his first term."³⁶ When his second term expired, because of minority opposition to him, Read was re-elected for a one-year term, from July 1, 1874 to July 1, 1875. Later, he was elected for another one-year term, but he gave explicit notice that he would not accept the office beyond July, 1876.³⁷

The next Board selection for the presidency was Dr. Samuel Spahr Laws, who was elected for a four year term on December 15, 1875.³⁸ In his letter of acceptance Laws insisted on the qualification that

. . . he reserved the right to resign at his own discretion, noting that such elections were usually indefinite in length and implying that his presidency should not be limited by a term of years.³⁹

At the close of this four-year term Laws was unanimously

³⁴Ibid., p. 186.

³⁵Ibid., p. 184.

³⁶Ibid., p. 253.

³⁷Ibid., p. 254.

³⁸Ibid., p. 264.

³⁹Ibid., p. 265.

re-elected, and at that time "no term of office was specified."⁴⁰ Laws resigned in 1889 in a dispute with the state legislature.⁴¹

The initial four-year term of Dr. Laws was the final effort of the University of Missouri Board to operationalize a specified term policy for the President. The next succeeding six presidents of the University of Missouri were elected without reference to a term appointment for their position, although one, Dr. Walter Williams, was elected only four years before his mandatory retirement at the age of seventy years.⁴²

Missouri statutes since 1855 regarding the state university have allowed the Board of Curators to appoint and remove the university president "at discretion."⁴³ In this case the early governing boards at Missouri chose the term as their pleasure and policy.

University of Illinois

The first chief administrator of the University of Illinois, originally named Illinois Industrial University,

⁴⁰ Ibid., p. 318n.

⁴¹ Ibid., p. 316.

⁴² Ibid., p. 568.

⁴³ Letter from Robert H. Hall, Assistant Programs Director, Missouri Commission on Higher Education, Jefferson City, May 9, 1974.

was given the title "Regent"⁴⁴ and was elected for a two year term. Earlier a committee of the State Agricultural Society, known as the Decatur Committee, had framed an organization for a university in Illinois and drafted a bill to establish the Illinois Industrial University.

The Decatur Committee set the term of the Regent at six years, the same as the trustees, but the General Assembly reduced it to two years without recorded debate.⁴⁵

The short term, according to historian Solberg, represented the academic equivalent of frequent elections in politics and was in harmony with the Jacksonian politics that called the university into being.⁴⁶

The first Regent at Illinois, John M. Gregory, considered the two year term hazardous.⁴⁷ However, Gregory did serve as Regent from 1867 to 1880. Gregory's appointment was a series of two year terms, and this same practice defined the length of the chief administrators' service at the University of Illinois until 1930. "On May 9, 1930, the Board of Trustees amended their By-Laws to read that the President shall 'hold his office on indefinite tenure,

⁴⁴The term "Regent" was used to avoid what the establishers of the university understood to be the negative connotations associated with the office of the president in the ante-bellum college. See Solberg, p. 330.

⁴⁵Winton U. Solberg, The University of Illinois, 1867-1894 (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1968), p. 80.

⁴⁶Ibid.

⁴⁷Ibid., p. 86.

at the pleasure of the Board.'"⁴⁸

Earlier, on June 30, 1927, the statutes of the state of Illinois had been revised to change the title of the chief administrator of the university from regent to President. At the same time the term of office provisions for the President were eliminated, and the incumbent was required to serve at the pleasure of the board of trustees.⁴⁹

University of Michigan

At the retirement of James Burrill Angell in 1909 after thirty-eight years as president of the University of Michigan, the board of the university approached New York Governor Charles Evans Hughes with an offer to become the new president, however Hughes subsequently declined. No likely candidate appeared to be immediately available, and, therefore, the dean of the School of Law, Harry Burns Hutchins, was appointed acting president for a term of one year. During this period the board continued to search. The presidency was offered both to Woodrow Wilson of Princeton and David Jayne Hill, former president of the University of Rochester and at the time of the offer the U. S.

⁴⁸Letter from Maynard Britchford, University Archivist, University of Illinois, June 19, 1974.

⁴⁹Edward C. Elliott and M. M. Chambers, eds., Charters and Basic Laws of Selected American Universities and Colleges (New York: The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, 1934), p. 231.

Ambassador to Germany. Both declined.⁵⁰

In June, 1910, the Board concluded to make Hutchins president for a term of five years. At the end of the five-year term the Regents urged him to continue as president, and Hutchins remained in the office another five years until 1920.⁵¹

Hutchins was succeeded in the Michigan presidency by Marion LeRoy Burton, who at the time of his selection was president of the University of Minnesota.⁵² Neither Hutchins' predecessor nor his successor were placed on a term appointment. The original term which had been offered Hutchins apparently was a means by which the Board of Regents of the University of Michigan sought to fill the presidential vacancy, following the long and popular tenure of Angell, without entering into a long-term commitment. The term was a pro tempore policy of the board of control.

Summary

The basic literature was searched for precedents of presidential term appointments in the history of American universities. It has been concluded from this survey that occurrences were infrequent. Four universities were cited which have employed the specified term for the chief

⁵⁰Howard H. Peckham, The Making of the University of Michigan (Ann Arbor: The University of Michigan Press, 1967), p. 114.

⁵¹Ibid.

⁵²Ibid., p. 138.

administrator. In most of the histories, serving in the presidency at the pleasure of the board of control seems to have been taken for granted to the extent that its mention was unnecessary. For the most part little information has been made available concerning the appointive relationship of the president to the institution. This circumstance can be contrasted with an extensive record concerning search activities for filling vacant presidencies.

The four historical cases of presidential term appointments occurred at New York University, the University of Missouri, the University of Illinois, and the University of Michigan. These four occurrences demonstrate the variety of the practice. The conditions of the term were determined internally, and no institution was the national model for others. The conditions of the practice were situational. These four institutions also illustrate the limited extent of the practice. No other presidential term policies have been uncovered.

It was only in the nineteenth century that the practice was found to span more than one incumbent in the same institution. In each instance, after a period of time, the practice was discontinued.

CHAPTER V

FINDINGS CONCERNING CURRENT PRESIDENTIAL TERM APPOINTMENTS

Introduction

Three direct approaches were used to gather the data recorded in this chapter: (1) a postal card survey, called Survey I; (2) an expanded survey instrument with thirty-two items, called Survey II; and (3) telephone interviews.

Chief consideration was given to the data from the instrument in the second survey. In selected cases, presidents were requested to clarify information that had been provided in Survey I. Telephone interviews were conducted in order to obtain additional perceptions and interpretations from the presidents, and the length and quality of these interviews varied according to the demands upon and availability of the contacted presidents.

Survey I, with 259 responses tabulated from a population of 272, established that 232, 89.6 percent, did not use a term appointment for the president while 27, 10.4 percent, presidents served under a term arrangement. Survey II, which produced responses from seventeen of the presidents appointed on a term basis, demonstrated that fifteen of the terms have

been established since 1970, and nearly two-thirds, eleven, of the terms were for periods of five years. When term institutions were compared with similar non-term institutions some differences emerged. The trend in the term institutions clearly was for shorter tenures in office, for example, when the length of service of the last three presidents of each institution was compared. More term presidents were given the security of faculty tenure, and, notably, more term presidents were held accountable by means of formal evaluation periods. The interviewed presidents were, for the most part, satisfied with holding office on a term appointment basis.

The findings below are presented so as to treat the following key questions: (1) To what extent is the practice of presidential term appointments currently being used?, (2) How can the current presidential term appointment be characterized?, (3) What comparisons can be drawn between two groups of similar institutions, one in which presidential term appointments are in use and one in which they are not?

Extent of the Current Practice

A chief function of this research was to bring clarity to the question of the degree to which presidential term appointments are in effect in American universities. The current use of the specified term for presidents was determined by surveying the chief executives of the 272 univer-

sities in the United States which are accredited to confer doctoral degrees. The letter accompanying the response form defined a presidential term appointment as a limited term which is more than a duration of one year.

Both initial and follow-up mailings were used in this survey. The return in response to the first mailing totaled 232 responses. A follow-up mailing resulted in 27 additional responses. The total response to this survey was 259 from the population of 272, or a 95 percent return. The total number reporting a negative response to the question of current uses of a presidential term appointment was 232, and the total affirmative response was 27. From the 259 responses 10 percent reported that the president of the institution did have a term appointment while 90 percent responded that the president did not have a term appointment.

TABLE 1
RESPONSES TO FIRST SURVEY

<u>Population</u>	<u>Respondents</u>	
(doctoral degree granting universities)	Num- ber	Percent- age
272	259	95

An item in the second survey instrument also sought to determine, more specifically, if the president of the institution held office by continuous appointment, annual renewal of the appointment, or for a specified term. Seven

TABLE 2

SURVEY I: DOCTORAL PROGRAM INSTITUTIONS WITH
PRESIDENTIAL TERM APPOINTMENTS ACCORDING TO
SOURCE OF CONTROL

<u>Institutions</u>	<u>Public</u>	<u>Private</u>	<u>Total</u>
With Term	14	13	27*
Without Term	<u>127</u>	<u>105</u>	<u>232</u>
TOTAL	141	118	259

*In the interest of anonymity it has been agreed not to publish the names of the institutions. They are available upon request.

respondents who reported in the initial survey that the president held office by means of a term appointment indicated a different response on the second survey. Four of those who altered their responses reported that the president served at the pleasure of the board on a continuous appointment; the other three changed their response to show that their president serves on an annual basis. Since twenty-seven presidents of institutions reported in the first survey that they held office on a term appointment arrangement, the seven who shifted their response from the specified term to a continuous or an annual appointment represented a 26 percent loss in the number of institutions which use the term appointment. Five of the institutions from which responses were received were private institutions and two were publicly controlled. One private institution which

was paired as a non-term institution with one of these five private universities which changed from term to non-term indicated in the second survey that it did, after all, have a specified term for its president. Consequently this pairing was continued for comparison purposes, but the classifications of term and non-term were reversed. Finally, then, there was in reality a net loss of six institutions who were reported as having a specified presidential term in Survey I but did not indicate this to be true in Survey II.

Therefore, the number of universities with a presidential term appointment, as qualified by the Survey II instrument, was twenty-one. Three of these twenty-one institutions had the same president and only one instrument was completed for this group and included in the study. Two others who reported that a specified term appointment existed for their president in Survey I did not return Survey II. The actual number of completed instruments, therefore, which represent the nineteen presidents serving on a term appointment, is seventeen.

Two state-wide university systems have adopted a policy of a term appointment for their presidents; one was the State University of New York system and the other was the South Dakota system.

The first survey produced the information that two additional institutions, Clark University and Long Island

University, both private, have plans for inaugurating a term appointment for their presidents, but no details of the policies were available.¹

One rationale for the specified term has been to provide for regular review of the presidential performance. The existence of concern for evaluation by some respondents, therefore, may be an indicator of a de facto term arrangement. Three presidents noted that, although they did not formally have a term appointment, they have asked that their presidential performance be reviewed periodically. Letters were sent to these presidents asking for further details concerning the reassessment. The president of the Carnegie-Mellon University, who reported serving at the pleasure of the board and understood himself to be evaluated continually, had asked that the board arrange for formal evaluation of his performance whenever they thought it desirable, with the suggestion that it be done every five years.² The current president assumed his office of July 1, 1972, and this review has not yet been undertaken. Also, the president of the University of New Mexico, serving at the pleasure of the board, requested in 1973, following five years in office, that the Regents evaluate his performance as president.

¹Further investigation revealed that one of these institutions does not plan to begin a specified term.

²Letter from Raymond E. Parshall, Assistant to the President, Carnegie-Mellon University, Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania, May 3, 1974.

Discussions among the members of the Board took place concerning the president's conduct in office, but, as far as the president was aware, no systematic or wide-spread consultation among components of the university took place.³ The president of Yale University asked for and was given a formal review after seven years of service. He did not request a seven-year term, and he was asked to continue as president following a thorough review by the trustees.⁴

Nine of the Survey I responses indicated that the possibility of a term appointment had been formally studied and rejected as a model for the presidential appointive relationship at that institution. Three of the nine institutions

TABLE 3

SURVEY I: NUMBER OF INSTITUTIONS WITH REPORTED
CONSIDERATION AND SUBSEQUENT ACTION REGARDING PRESIDENTIAL
TERM APPOINTMENTS

<u>Action Taken</u>	<u>Frequency</u>		
	Public	Private	Total
Plans to install term	0	2	2
Formal rejection of term	3	6	9

were public and six were private: DePaul University, Johns Hopkins University, Marquette University, Texas Tech

³Letter from Ferrell Heady, President, The University of New Mexico, Albuquerque, May 21, 1974.

⁴Letter from Henry Chauncey, Jr., Secretary, Yale University, New Haven, Conn., April 3, 1974.

University, University of Santa Clara, University of Louisville, University of Virginia, Wesleyan University, and Worcester Polytechnic Institute. The president of DePaul University, who had previously served on an annual basis, initiated the change away from annual election and continued in the position at the pleasure of the board.⁵ At Johns Hopkins the decision to reject the idea of a term contract for the president was made by an ad hoc committee of the Board of Trustees charged with revision of the By-Laws.

The reasons that prevailed in rejecting the idea of a term contract were that the Trustees were anxious to avoid a particular period when the presidency of the University might take on lame duck aspects. The feeling was also expressed that as long as a president was doing well the reaffirmation involved in renewing his contract would be relatively meaningless; and that when a president is not doing well the Board should act decisively to make a change without postponing its decision until the expiration of a stated term. Further, most of the Trustees believe that it is not possible to decide on the appropriate length of service for presidents in the abstract, believing rather that this varies with changing circumstances and changing incumbents.⁶

The Texas Tech University president was reported to serve on an annual contract arrangement, which was selected by that board as a better plan than the term contract.⁷

⁵Letter from John R. Cortelyou, President, DePaul University, Chicago, May 6, 1974.

⁶Letter from Steven Muller, President, The Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, May 6, 1974.

⁷Letter from Grover E. Murray, President, Texas Tech University, Lubbock, May 10, 1974.

Both the presidents of the University of Virginia⁸ and the Worcester Polytechnic Institute⁹ served at the pleasure of their boards, and inquiries concerning the rejection of a term appointment arrangement at their institutions were met with implicit denials that such action had been taken.

Two respondents noted that the state systems of which they are a part were studying the feasibility of presidential term appointments for all state-supported institutions in the system. The two state systems mentioned were Florida and North Dakota. In each of these states the state-wide board was a governing board for the public institutions and not a coordinating board. Correspondence from the Florida system clarified that no firm recommendations have been developed, but staff discussions with the board concerning a five-year term, renewable for one additional five-year term, with evaluation prior to the close of any appointive period, were met with opposition and consequently abandoned.¹⁰

One institution, the University of Dayton, acknowledged that it had used the term appointment procedures for its president but discontinued the practice in 1965. Further

⁸Letter from C. Tom Reese, Assistant to the President, University of Virginia, Charlottesville, May 14, 1974.

⁹Letter from George Hazzard, President, Worcester Polytechnic Institute, Worcester, Mass., May 8, 1974.

¹⁰Letter from Robert B. Mautz, Chancellor, State University System of Florida, Tallahassee, May 22, 1974.

study of the university uncovered that prior to 1965 the president of the University of Dayton was also Religious Superior of the Community responsible for the institution. The term appointment was attached to the religious position and not to the presidency. However, from 1850 until 1965, the president at Dayton and the Religious Superior were the same person. Canon law dictated that such superiors should have terms of three years, and they normally were renewed once. With few exceptions presidents of Dayton served for six year periods. In 1965, because of the enlarged responsibilities of both offices, the two positions were separated. The university president was made subject to the pleasure of the board.¹¹

Some incidental information was provided on the Survey I response forms. Nine institutions indicated having had discussions, at some level and to some degree, concerning the possibility of a presidential term appointment.

This research determined the extent of the use of presidential term appointments among accredited, doctoral-granting institutions of higher education. From among 272 institutions 21, or 7.4 percent had adopted a term appointment for their chief executive, and three of these institutions had the same president.

¹¹Letter from Raymond A. Roesch, President, University of Dayton, Ohio, May 6, 1974.

Description of the Current Practice

Responses to the Survey II instrument, designed in part to gain a description of the term institutions, indicated that all seventeen of the respondents which held a presidential office defined by a term appointment served institutions which had coeducational student bodies; eleven were public institutions and six were private; the largest was a state university with over 36,000 students and the smallest was a private seminary with an enrollment of one hundred fifty. The number of doctorates awarded for the year ending June 20, 1971, ranged from zero, at a private institution accredited to confer the doctorate but awarding none, to 561 at a public university.

Nearly one-half of the term appointments represented in the seventeen institutions returning the second survey instrument were initiated in 1973. The years in which the institutions that currently use a presidential term appointment began the practice range from an estimated 1944 ("thirty years ago") to 1974 ("this one"). Only two of the seventeen

TABLE 4

YEARS IN WHICH INSTITUTIONS INITIATED
PRESIDENTIAL TERM APPOINTMENT POLICIES
CURRENTLY IN EFFECT

<u>1944</u>	<u>1964</u>	<u>1970</u>	<u>1971</u>	<u>1972</u>	<u>1973</u>	<u>1974</u>
1	1	1	3	2	8	1

were begun before 1970. For purposes of formal review of presidents some terms were made retroactive to the year the incumbent took office. Therefore, the evaluation of some presidents may take place before a time that is arrived at by adding the length of the term to the starting date of the policy.

The most easily documented fact was the length of the term appointments in effect. The majority of the terms were for a length of five years. Eleven of the seventeen respondents held office for a five-year term. A sabbatical leave during the sixth year with full salary was provided in one case. A ten-year term, adopted by one state system, was the second most frequently reported. Two institutions had four-year terms, and one had a three-year term. When a grouping was made of the institutions which use the three-year, four-year, and five-year terms the resulting total was over 80 percent of the term institutions. It is notable also that no institution used a six-year, seven-year, eight-year, or nine-year term.

TABLE 5

LENGTH IN YEARS OF PRESIDENTIAL
TERM APPOINTMENTS IN EFFECT

<u>Length of term (years)</u>	<u>No. institutions involved</u>
3	1
4	2
5	11
10	3

The predominance of the five-year term mode was reinforced by two other observations. The presidents holding office under the ten-year term were part of a state system in which there was an annual evaluation of the president's performance, and the total term was for a maximum of ten years. Five years was the longest period reported in which a president with a term appointment led a university without evaluation and/or reappointment taking place. Secondly, one president holding office for a three-year term had served the institution as Acting President for two years before being asked to accept the presidency for a five-year term. This president decided that five years was the total time that he wished to serve as president and, therefore, proposed that the term be specified as a three-year appointment.

Eleven of the incumbent term presidents held their positions before the term was established. They did not resign when the term was put into effect. Four others reported that their presidency and the establishment of the term appointment at their institutions coincided. Only two of the universities have had more than one president serve with a specified term.

In over one-half of the universities using the presidential term appointment the governing board provided the chief impetus which led to the adoption of the term appointment policy. The board alone was credited with the respon-

sibility for bringing about the term arrangement in ten of the seventeen institutions. Two institutions gave credit to the president alone for initiating the term, one named the state commissioner, one designated the board along with administrators, and one respondent mentioned a combination of board, faculty, administrators, and students as having been influential in discussions concerning a specified term for the president. In no case did alumni receive credit for the term policy, nor did such external elements as governor, legislature, news media, etc., play an influential role. Terms seem to have been internally initiated.

Among the constituencies which were part of the formal study of the term concept before adoption, the governing board was again the most potent force. In ten of seventeen term institutions the board was the only sub-system studying the possibility of a presidential term appointment policy. In three institutions both the board and the administration were involved in the pre-adoption study, in another a combination of board, faculty, and administration participated, and still another added student involvement to the process.

The ten institutions in which the board alone initiated the term for the president were identical to the ten institutions in which the board was the sole body which studied the term proposal. Faculty were only included in the process in two of the seventeen situations. As demands for the term appointment did not arise from the faculty, neither did

TABLE 6

REPRESENTATION OF UNIVERSITY ELEMENTS INITIATING
AND FORMALLY STUDYING PRESIDENT TERM APPOINTMENTS
(NUMBER OF CASES)

	<u>Initiated term</u>	<u>Participated in study of term</u>
Board	12	16
Faculty	1	2
Administration	4	5
Students	1	1
University Employees	0	0
Alumni	0	0

faculty have a structured means for contributing to the form the term practice would take. Students had even less formal input. Alumni and university employees had none. The board clearly was credited with being the most prominent force in bringing about the term policy.

However, local variations in state systems can be noted. Presidents of campuses that were part of the same state system where the specified term decision was made at the state system governing board level did not report identical influences for bringing about the term appointment. One respondent viewed the decision to be the board's entirely while others in that system saw several local campus constituencies participating in the decision. Perceptions, memories, and/or experiences on the various individual campuses did not coincide.

Interview data from two chief administrators of component campuses of the same state-wide system indicated that the governing board of the system, by advancing a specified term, placed a positive value on internal assessment and understood a presidential term appointment to be a potential face-saving device for both the board and the president. Two other forces more subtly at work in this system were, reportedly, the concern of members of the state legislature and university faculties for formal evaluation periods for the presidents of the universities. The legislature, which appropriated funds and periodically were evaluated themselves by the voters, and the faculty, which found chief administrators being tougher on tenure decisions and faced the possibility of being reviewed themselves during their tenure, thought it only fair that the presidents also stand for evaluation. In this system it appeared that accountability concerns weighed more heavily than security considerations in bringing about the policy. However, when provisions of the term policy were examined, it was noted that the trustees granted faculty tenure to each of the presidents in the system. Therefore, if the incumbent were not continued as president, he/she would be able to serve in a faculty position at one of the campuses within the system.¹²

Security for the president, however adequate, was less a

¹² Minutes, Board of Regents, State University of New York, January 24, 1973.

part of the new conceptualization of the president's appointment and more related to older provisions of academic tenure. The academic rather than the presidential career was protected.

Description of the practice also involved determining the level of satisfaction found among presidents whose appointment was defined by a specified term. General satisfaction existed among those interviewed for holding office under the term arrangement. Eight of the nine presidents interviewed reported that they were satisfied with their appointment. Some were enthusiastic about it. Three of the

TABLE 7

PRESIDENTS EXPRESSING SATISFACTION
WITH TERM APPOINTMENT

Satisfied	8
Unsatisfied	<u>1</u>
	9

nine presidents requested that a term be set as a qualification for their acceptance of the presidency. Another who stated satisfaction with the term was a member of the denominational board that set the term policy before becoming president of the institution affected. One of the more satisfied presidents saw himself as a motivator at the state system level for establishing presidential terms across that state.

The expressed causes for satisfaction can be described in three groupings. Some of the presidents were eager to have additional years of research and teaching before retirement and understood their term to be a means of serving as a chief administrator and gracefully returning to academic pursuits. Others described satisfaction with generous retirement benefits, and the security of income and/or position following the term. The time limitations of the term were not understood to be an unpleasant constraint. Several presidents stated appreciation for a defined time to lead and a formalized time to step aside. Therefore, the causes for satisfaction most expressed were (1) the chance for renewed scholarship before retirement, (2) the security involved with the term, and (3) the circumscribed period in which to exercise leadership within the institution.

The one president who was less than satisfied with the term appointment felt that nothing had been gained with the coming of the term appointment. In this case it was stated that security was not strengthened by the term. In addition, the evaluation period near the close of the first term served by this president resulted in what was characterized as a polarized campus with dismissal pressures applied against the president when it was understood that a waiting period of five more years would have to take place before the president was placed in a position of formal review again.

Over three-fourths of the presidents of term institutions were reported to be evaluated at or near the close of their specified terms, however only five of these institutions had established formal criteria for the evaluation. Each of these five were part of the same state system in which the decision for the term was made by the state-wide governing board. All other institutions, reportedly, have no formal criteria for presidential evaluation. One state system has an evaluation annually during the term.

TABLE 8

NUMBER OF INSTITUTIONS EVALUATING
PRESIDENTIAL TERM APPOINTMENT
INCUMBENTS AND USING FORMAL
CRITERIA

Evaluation	13
Criteria Formalized	5

In four of the term universities the governing board alone participated in the process of evaluating the president, and the board was represented in every evaluation practice. The faculty was the second most represented subsystem, followed in order by students and administrators. University employees and alumni were active in the fewest number of situations.

In ten of the institutions the provision had been made

TABLE 9

REPRESENTATION OF UNIVERSITY ELEMENTS
IN REVIEW OF PRESIDENTIAL TERM
APPOINTMENT INCUMBENTS (NUMBER OF CASES)

Board	14
Faculty	10
Administration	6
Students	7
University Employees	3
Alumni	2

by early dismissal of the president could take place if such action were proven to be absolutely necessary. Four of the seventeen respondents stated that no provision on this matter had been established.

TABLE 10

RENEWAL OF PRESIDENTIAL
TERM APPOINTMENT

	<u>Yes</u>	<u>No</u>	<u>Unknown</u>
Provision for renewal of term?	14	3	0
Term renewed for same no. of years?	9	1	7
Term automatically renewed?	0	12	5

In fourteen of the seventeen institutions with presidential term appointments the incumbent could be reappointed following expiration of the initial term. The three institutions whose presidents were unable to be given a renewed term belong to the same state system which had placed a maximum of ten years on the president's tenure in office while establishing a ten-year presidential term appointment. Nine of the fourteen institutions which had renewable terms for the president had determined that the new term for the incumbent would be for the same number of years as the initial appointment. No respondent reported that renewal of the president's term was automatic. Clearly these responses concerning reappointment indicate that a term appointment was not just another way of speaking about serving continually at the pleasure of the board.

Comparisons of Term and Non-term Appointments

Information for comparative purposes was obtained from both presidents with term appointments and a group of presidents without term appointments but who head similar institutions. The purpose was to determine if there were any identifiable factors that could be isolated which would demonstrate why some institutions have opted for the presidential term appointment and others have not. The data which follow in this section were gathered from responses on Survey II from both the institutions with presidential term appoint-

ments and the similar institutions paired with them according to size, control, and region. Sixteen of the non-term institutions returned their completed instruments.

The institutions selected for comparison purposes were all coeducational. From the sixteen represented in the return seven were public and nine were private. The largest was a state university with over 41,000 students, and the smallest was a private seminary with three hundred seventy students. The largest number of doctorates given was 810 and the smallest was zero.

A series of items was directed toward the current presidents of both groups in order to ascertain the length of service of the current and past two presidents and the means by which the two former presidents vacated the presidential office. For the seventeen presidents currently serving with a term the longest to be in office was sixteen years and the shortest was one year. The longest tenure for the non-term group was eleven years in process and the shortest was one year. The average tenure for the term group was 4.8 years and 5.1 for the non-term group. The immediate past predecessors for the term group had an average tenure of 8.4 years and 9.3 for the non-term group. The presidents which served immediately prior to the predecessors of the current presidents had an average tenure of 11.6 at institutions which now have a term appointment compared with 14.0 at non-term institutions. It cannot be said that long average terms

TABLE 11

LENGTH OF TENURE IN PROCESS
FOR CURRENT PRESIDENTS

Years	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
Term	2	3	2	4	1	1	1	1
Non-term	1	0	4	3	4	1	0	0

are foreign to either group, but in each grouping the non-term institutions' presidents have slightly out-distanced the tenure of the presidents in universities which have adopted the term appointment.

TABLE 12

LENGTH OF TENURE FOR PAST
TWO PRESIDENTS, (NUMBER OF CASES)

Years	1-5	6-10	11-15	16-20	21-25	26+
Term	12	8	4	2	3	1
Non-term	8	11	1	4	4	2

When the two categories measuring the length of tenure of the two previous presidents were collapsed, the term institutions had twenty presidencies lasting five years or less, and the non-term institutions had eight that were for

five years or fewer. That is, 69 percent of the two preceding presidents of the term institutions held office five years or less, but only 25 percent of the two preceding presidents of non-term institutions served terms of that length. The recent presidencies at term institutions register more brief tenures than do those of non-term institutions.

Clearly the trend over the past three presidents has been a shorter average tenure of office for presidents of institutions which currently have a presidential term appointment as compared with those that do not.

The immediate predecessors of presidents in the term group vacated the office chiefly by resignation, 59 percent, and retirement, 18 percent. Two presidents left office by dismissal and two by death. In the non-term group the immediate predecessors vacated the office by resignation, 44 percent, retirement, 38 percent, and death, 12 percent. None in the non-term group were listed as being dismissed.

TABLE 13

MEANS OF VACATING OFFICE BY
PAST TWO PRESIDENTS (NUMBER OF CASES)

	Term	Non-term
Resignation	17	15
Retirement	7	13
Dismissal	2	0
Death	4	2

The means by which the predecessor immediately prior to the current president's predecessor vacated the office were also examined. In the term group thirteen responses were given, seven of these resigned, four retired, and two died in office. In the non-term institutions, with fifteen responses, eight resigned and seven retired.

If it is reasonable to associate retirement with more satisfaction and resignation and dismissal with less satisfaction, then the non-term institutions demonstrate more contentment between the president and the constituencies of the institution. A less happy termination for both incumbent and institution seems to be associated with the two past presidents of the term institutions. The absence of dismissal as a method of vacating the presidential office in the non-term institutions as compared with two dismissal terminations among the term institutions also tends to demonstrate more contentment among former presidents of institutions which currently have no presidential term appointment.

The two groups were also compared with regard to what internal elements of the university were included in the presidential selection and appointment process for the current presidents. The term institutions had four instances in which the governing board alone selected the president. The non-term group had only one such situation, and that occurred at a private institution. For the term group two

TABLE 14

REPRESENTATION OF UNIVERSITY
ELEMENTS IN SELECTION AND
APPOINTMENT OF PRESIDENT

	<u>Term</u>	<u>Non-term</u>
Board	17	16
Faculty	12	15
Administration	9	10
Students	9	9
University employees	5	1
Alumni	7	9

private institutions and two public were represented in the "board only" selection. In every instance the board was a significant feature of the process. Faculty was part of the decision 71 percent (12 of 17) of the time in the term group, but they participated 94 percent (15 of 16) of the time in non-term selections. In both groups faculty participation was only excelled by that of the boards. Students and administrators both participated in 53 percent of the selection decisions at the term institutions. In the non-term institutions students entered into the process 56 percent of the time and administrators in 63 percent of the cases. Alumni help select the president in the term group in 41 percent of the institutions and 63 percent of the non-term institutions. However, university employees participated in 29 percent of the term institutions, but only in 6 percent of the non-term institutions.

Responses were also sought concerning the extent to

which the presidents in each of the groups held faculty rank and tenure. These inquiries were made to indicate the formal academic security of the presidents. In the term institutions 71 percent of the presidents have faculty rank with tenure, but only 50 percent of the presidents without a term appointment have both faculty rank and tenure. Two of the presidents with terms have faculty rank but no tenure, and four of the presidents in the non-term group have faculty rank without tenure. Three of the term presidents have no faculty rank while four of the non-term presidents fall into this category. More of the term appointed presidents have traditional academic security than non-term presidents.

TABLE 15

PERCENTAGE OF TERM AND NON-TERM PRESIDENTS
HOLDING FACULTY RANK AND TENURE

	<u>Faculty rank</u>	<u>Faculty tenure</u>
Term	82	71
Non-term	75	50

Professional backgrounds of the presidents were obtained in order to determine if particular service and experience might have contributed to the establishment of the term appointment. Possible backgrounds were grouped into the following categories: university administration, academic, government, business, and clergy, with a space

provided for "other." Where more than one category applied to an individual president all pertinent categories were reported. In the term group five presidents stated that their background was academic alone, one has had governmental experience alone, one listed medical experience only, and one listed a combination of academic and clergy. All the others included university administration in the combination of professional backgrounds prior to becoming president. Six listed both administration and academic, one listed administration and government, and one listed administration and business.

TABLE 16

AGGREGATE PROFESSIONAL BACKGROUND
OF CURRENT PRESIDENTS

	<u>Term</u>	<u>Non-term</u>
University administration	9	11
Academic	12	15
Government	2	3
Business	1	3
Clergy	2	0

Among the presidents in the non-term group six stated that they have had academic backgrounds only, and none have had only university administration experience. However, university administration was a factor in the combination of backgrounds that the remaining presidents acknowledged. Five listed both administration and academic; two listed

administration, academic, and business; two listed administration, academic, and government; and one listed administration, government and business.

Background items have been collapsed in order to indicate the areas of emphasis in both the term and non-term groups. An academic background was listed in 71 percent of the term responses and in 94 percent of those from non-term presidents. A university administration background was listed nine times, or 53 percent of the time, by the term presidents and eleven times by the non-term presidents, for 69 percent of the time. Governmental background was listed twice by the term presidents and three times by the non-term group. Business experience was listed once by the term group and three times by the non-term group. Two of the term presidents had some clerical background while none of the non-term presidents had. The weight of past experience with both groups was in university administration and academic work.

Five of the term presidents and six of the non-term presidents stated that their background was academic alone, but no president in either group had higher education administration as the sole professional experience. However, university administration in conjunction with other professional enterprises was prevalent in both groupings.

Data were collected concerning presidential evaluation within both the term and non-term institutions. Thirteen of the respondents with term appointments reported that a

policy for evaluation to take place at regularly prescribed intervals existed. Four indicated no evaluation policy. Only four of the non-term presidents were evaluated on a regular basis. There was an obvious difference in formal accountability structures. Evaluation was part of the practice of most term appointments but not of the non-term appointments.

The constituencies involved in the evaluations were compared. In the non-term group of presidents, three had regular accountability to the board alone and one to administrators alone. However, the presidents in the term group included to some degree all of the internal constituency groups. The board participated in 100 percent of the evaluations, faculty 81.7 percent, students, 72.7 percent, administrators 45.4 percent, alumni 27.2 percent, and university employees 17.3 percent. The term presidents were not only responsible, whether formally or informally, to the "higher powers" of the board, state system, governor

TABLE 17

OCCURRENCES OF EVALUATION POLICY
AND CRITERIA FOR TERM AND
NON-TERM PRESIDENTS

	<u>Term</u>	<u>Non-term</u>
Evaluation	13	4
Criteria	5	0

legislature, mass media, etc., but also to the internal elements of the university. There was responsibility to the academic powers as well as to the non-academic. In this sense the university presidency was reflecting a more political model than a corporate one. It was not only the lay board of directors who decided the future of the president but also the sub-system constituents, who were influenced by the presidential leadership, shared in the evaluation and had structured contributions to make to the board's final action.

Five of the term group stated that formal evaluation criteria for the president had been established, but no formal criteria had been adopted by any institution in the group without presidential term appointments.

Compared also was the salary obligation to the incumbent if the board might elect to sever the appointment before the stated completion of the term. Nearly one-fourth of the term institutions would continue the salary payments to the end of the appointment period, but only one of the non-term institutions would act in this manner. Predominantly, for both groups, the discretion of the board would prevail in a particular situation.

Information was also sought on the existence of a formal contract for the presidents with term and non-term appointments. More than one-half of each of the respondents in each of the groups stated that no formal contract decision

had been made.

When compared with a similar group of institutions which did not provide a term appointment for their chief administrator, 77 percent of the universities with presidential terms regularly evaluated the performance of their presidents as contrasted with 25 percent of the institutions without presidential terms. Formal evaluation criteria have been established in one state system which includes five of the term institutions in this study.

Those presidents serving under a specified term appointment expressed general satisfaction with the arrangement. Descriptions of the origins and development of the term concept and practice varied with the individual institutions, but in each there was expressed concern for executive security and accountability. Three of the presidents interviewed stated that they required from the governing board a term appointment as a condition for accepting the presidency. As a whole they felt that other institutions would be well-advised to investigate the possibility of a term appointment for their presidents. Those presidents serving under term provisions were doing so because they wanted to.

Summary

The number of response cards mailed was 272, and the number returned for use in determining the institutions which

use the term appointment was 259, 95 percent. The number of responses to the second survey that were available for analysis was thirty-three, an 87 percent return. The number of presidents of the term universities who were available and/or willing to be interviewed on the topic of their appointment was nine, or slightly over one-half of the university presidents with a term appointment.

A survey of 272 accredited, doctoral-granting, institutions showed that 232 of the institutions did not have a term appointment for their president and twenty-seven did. In response to a second questionnaire sent to the presidents, twenty-one institutions reported having a presidential term appointment and three of this group have the same president.

The most frequent length of term was five years and nearly one-half of all the terms were inaugurated in 1973. Both private and public, large and small institutions were represented. Most of the institutions with presidential term appointments were located in the east and mid-west. In a majority of situations the governing board alone was given credit for initiating and carrying through the processes which led to the term arrangement.

Therefore, a presidential term appointment at an American university can be characterized as one which was initiated in 1973 by the governing board in concert with faculty, students, and administrators within the university. The university would be a public, coed, institution. Five

years would be the specified length of the term, and a formal review of the president's performance would be undertaken prior to the close of the term. The major elements participating in the review would be the governing board, faculty, and students. The body formed to conduct the evaluation would also be asked to develop criteria for assessing the president's leadership. The president would hold faculty rank with tenure and would have had chiefly an academic background with some university administration experience. The incumbent would have been in office prior to the establishment of the term arrangement, would be satisfied with the appointment, and would have the possibility of being reappointed to the presidency following the expiration of the term in process.

CHAPTER VI

DISCUSSION OF THE FINDINGS AND IMPLICATIONS FOR FURTHER STUDIES

Introduction

A general discussion of the findings below is followed by a placing of the findings in the context of the current literature. The background materials of the research are viewed in light of the findings. Implications from the findings for further research are suggested in the final section.

Discussion of the Findings

General Findings

Of the 272 universities which were investigated to determine the current practice, 214 neither used a specified term for their president nor have they reportedly examined the possibility. The practice, where it was in effect, had been recently adopted. Presidential term appointments were used by an extensive range of the universities. The term institutions included large state universities, a large state system, a smaller state system, small private institutions, a municipal university, graduate centers, and a

mid-sized private institution. Each accrediting region was represented except New England and the Northwest. Two of the institutions have membership in the Association of American Universities. The universities which did employ a presidential term appointment were representative of the variety of accredited institutions with doctoral programs in the United States. No single descriptive pattern typified the practice.

The existing term appointment practices had been situationally developed through the interaction of presidents, trustees, and other elements within the individual institutions and the two state systems. There was no general model for defining the practice. The broad concept included the appointment of the chief administrator for a limited number of years before review and/or reappointment was enacted. The shared concerns of the governing boards who adopted the practice included provision for presidential security and accountability, but the expressions these concerns took were not uniform.

The formal evaluation periods, which were applied to two-thirds of the presidents with term appointments, superseded the ad hoc evaluation that is continually being applied to presidential performance. The formal status of the review has the potential of weakening pressures which attempt to achieve dismissal by attrition. The formalized

evaluation brings a "due process" dimension to the assessment of the president and reduces the "gun-slinger" affect of those who may decide to oppose the incumbent.

The Findings in Context

The concern of Louis Heilbron in the current literature, as a former trustee, was chiefly one of retaining the freedom of the board and president to terminate their relationship promptly without the encumbrance of an unexpired term contract period.¹ Underlying this stance was a traditional commitment to the final power and authority of the governing board.

The data did not indicate that a term appointment was synonymous with a term contract. Fewer than half of the term appointments were considered a formal contract. The other terms were periods for which it was expected that the president would lead and manage the institution. Although the governing boards have shared a degree of their power with the various constituencies of the universities by including their counsel and recommendations in the formal processes, the final authority belonging to the boards' was not relinquished in adopting specified terms. If the presidential term appointments evolve into term contracts, as in the Canadian examples, then a board's power to dismiss a

¹Supra, p. 22.

president could have definite constraints. The term appointments in this research were chiefly protected periods of time for which the president was expected to serve without arbitrary dismissals or accountability confrontations, except for the gravest of matters.

The governing boards were quite visible in developing the term appointment practices. In more than one-half of the instances the board was credited solely with initiating the interest which brought about the term policy, and it was a central force in others. The governing board was also the major university element which studied the possibility of adoption of the limited appointment for the president, and the board was the only university sub-system that was represented in every formal presidential evaluation. The board retained the predominant role in the term practice, but Heilbron's concern for "instant response" on the part of the board, in the findings, resembled more closely a due process pattern.

Clark Kerr's proposal for presidential term appointments made review of the president's performance a necessary element in the definition of the practice.² He stated that at the close of a fixed term of reasonable length a review, followed by reaffirmation of the president's leadership or a decision to search for new leadership, should be conducted.

²Supra, p. 23.

Kerr suggested a term of 5-10 years. Five years, as demonstrated by the data of this study, was the most frequent definition of length of the term. The ten-year term was the maximum length as determined for three universities belonging to a state system.

A formal evaluation was an element of the policy for two-thirds of the institutions with presidential term commitments, but it was not determined to be an essential element in the practice in every case. No policy of review existed in four of the term institutions, and in each of these the term was renewable. Nevertheless, the tendency indicated by the findings was to include a review of presidential performance in the scope of the practice.

The general absence of established, objective criteria under which the president's work would be evaluated was a notable finding from the data. The five term institutions which reported that criteria have been developed belong to the same state system. The criteria were developed at the system level and were chiefly procedural. With the recent establishment of the term practice in fifteen of the seventeen responding term institutions, several institutions have not yet reached the point of evaluation and, therefore, may not yet have been faced with the need for guidelines in this matter. Review without criteria may allow impressions about the president and feelings for the president's performance to have undue influence. Then, confidence in the president would

be based on intuition alone.

Kerr's stress upon a time of reaffirmation for the president was underscored in the data. Fourteen of the institutions provided for the possibility of renewal of the president's term, but none of these stated that renewal was automatic.

If the term could not be renewed, the evaluation would lose some of its strength. Without renewal the result of the evaluation might be to set standards, alter direction, give advice, and attempt to influence the successor-president. With the possibility of another term, the president could be released or bolstered by a vote of confidence by the board or from representatives of the sub-systems of the institution which the president leads. A new promissory bond has the potential of being made between the parties which make up the university if positive and supportive evaluation results are obtained.

Therefore, Kerr's concept of the review function of the term appointment is confirmed by this study. Presidential review was characteristically, although not unanimously, part of the term appointment practice. In comparison with the non-term appointments, the term appointments did result in a more structured and shared evaluation of the performance of the president.

The American Association of University Professors' Committee T on College and University Government expressed

concern for faculty involvement in the selection, retention, and dismissal of university presidents.³ The committee recommended that the faculty contribution be part of the formal process of presidential term appointments. This research indicated that faculty representation took place more often in the selection of presidents in non-term institutions. In fifteen of the sixteen non-term institutions the faculty was represented in the presidential selection process, but the faculty in selection procedures in the term institutions, was represented in twelve of seventeen instances.

The faculty, however, had no formal contribution to make in the evaluation of the non-term presidents. Only one-fourth of the non-term institutions provided for presidential evaluation, and in each case the governing board was the sole evaluating body. On the other hand, faculty participated in ten of the thirteen institutions which provided for formal evaluation of the president's performance. The influence of the faculty was felt initially more strongly in the selection of the non-term presidents; but the faculty had a stronger formal contribution in the review of the term presidents. Therefore, the AAUP committee's concern for influence in the selection had more acceptance generally than its concern for formal influence in the retention and dismissal activities which were structured more normally into the process in term institutions.

³Supra, p. 24.

The "clear and welcomed trend" that Bennis saw for the prospects of presidential term appointments has not yet developed.⁴ With less than 8 percent of the doctoral program universities using the practice, it seemed premature to label it a trend. What was clear was that the presidents, whose appointments were defined by a term, were pleased with the arrangement and are being positive in their assessment of it to inquiries from boards and other presidents. There was no evidence from presidents serving with terms that they viewed themselves as having second-class appointments, and, in fact, the prevailing stance was that the term should have widespread acceptance.

Bennis' concern that the term appointment be a remedy for one becoming locked into a presidency for life was not sustained by the data. He urged that boards ask presidents to continue in office following expiration of the term only under extraordinary circumstances. Only three institutions reported that the president's term could not be renewed, and those three had a maximum of ten years for presidential service. The possibility of several end-to-end terms was open, but this must be viewed in light of the evaluation procedures which over two-thirds of the term institutions made a part of their policy for presidents. Future tenure studies of university presidents will demonstrate if the

⁴Supra, p. 24.

total completed terms of office are shorter for presidents which are awarded term appointments than for non-term presidents.

Implications for Further Research

Implications for further research have emerged for the researcher through the processes of this study and from the findings developed. The recommendations proposed below are considered to be legitimate speculations around which future investigations might be organized.

The Delphi Method for converging opinions in order to predict future possibilities could be used among the identified presidents serving on term appointments, and their boards, and presidents serving on continuous appointments, and their trustees, in order to project the probability of the specified term as the mode of the future for university presidents. Through uses of the procedures used in the Delphi Method one could more accurately forecast the possibility of the term appointment becoming the model of the future for university presidents.

Subsequent studies will also be able to determine if presidents currently serving with term appointments are willing to accept a renewal of the term once having held office under these conditions. As a number of terms in process are completed it can be determined if an appointment defined by term limitations caused interest to be discontinued

in the office by incumbents.

Increasing adoptions of presidential term appointment policies by governing boards will cause alterations in the career expectations of incumbent and potential presidents. Former career patterns, based on presumptive permanence in office until a fixed retirement age or until another, perhaps more attractive, presidency is available, will be changed in light of the specified terms. In fact, being a university president may no longer be a career. The presidency may be a special but temporary leadership position in the university, which is accepted by academicians with special leadership and management skills. A shift from appointments without terms to renewable term appointments raises questions of post-presidential employment. The re-entry of the president into teaching, research, or other administrative positions is a circumstance that boards will need to make provisions to facilitate. The presidential career and the means to provide for professional contributions following the term of office as president need to be researched in light of specified presidential terms.

A hypothesis to be tested, if a more general acceptance of term appointments occurs, would be that presidential term appointments tend toward younger administrators in the university. That is to say, do term appointments, as distinct from career appointments, cause acceptance of presidential

administrative responsibility by those who might otherwise refuse to do so because of the impact upon their teaching and research careers?

An outgrowth of this research would be a study of term appointments for chief executives at other levels of higher and post-secondary education. Background investigation for this research found no studies of specified presidential term appointments at any level of American higher education. Cases of term appointments were found on the college level, and a Carnegie Commission report credited community colleges as being the notable exception to the no-term appointment practice for presidents.⁵ However, the report listed no institutions using the practice and referred to no studies from which the statement could be made. The total picture of presidential term appointments in the United States has not yet been drawn, and other research efforts need to be undertaken to add to this present contribution concerning term appointment among American universities.

This researcher suspects that there is a positive relationship between job security structures and job satisfaction. The present work included the examination of satisfaction among presidents with term appointments who

⁵The Carnegie Commission on Higher Education, Governance of Higher Education: Six Priority Problems (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1973), p. 37.

openly expressed their satisfaction with the term arrangement. Satisfaction levels of presidents of both term and non-term institutions could be investigated.

Canadian universities have had presidential term appointments in effect for a long enough period of time for the completion of several terms to have occurred. Former presidents, presidents with renewed terms, and board members of the term institutions are sources of data for testing satisfaction with the arrangement. The completed presidencies should be compared with other presidencies in Canada which were not defined by term conditions to test change that was brought about within the two practices, accountability structures, and security provisions for presidents within the two styles of governance.

Researchers also need to be alert to testing the possibility that change takes place more rapidly and to a greater degree in term institutions than in those without term presidencies. This potentiality could be tested using term institutions, following the completion of terms in process, as compared with institutions during the same period of time which have no term limitations for the president. Change also can be measured among institutions which follow a pattern of review and reappointment of terms as contrasted with those which review and dismiss the incumbent. If term appointments bring about more reduction of continuity among administrations will the result be more effectiveness

or ineffectiveness because of the drive to complete goals before the expiration of the term? Is change more easily brought about in term administrations because of a reduction of internal resistance to an incumbent with a limited appointment or do the constraints of the term appointment so shift power within the system as to restrict the president's role as change agent?

The impact of presidential term appointments on other organizational levels within the institution is yet to be determined. The measure of the influence of a term appointment on other parts of the system is an area for potential research. Will faster changes at other levels indicate that the presidential power is not diminished with a term appointment, or, on the other hand, will a slower rate of change of leadership on other administrative levels demonstrate that power has shifted to those areas and away from the president. Also, if term appointments are in effect at administrative levels below the presidency will a newly appointed president have an influence in the selection of those administrators who will help implement the mission of the university as understood by the new president?

University presidential term appointments currently have not been adopted widely, but interest found in this form of appointive relationship of presidents to boards indicates to this researcher that further investigations will be needed. Adoptions of term appointments have

been increasing, and if the dynamics of accountability and security continue to be forceful more information on presidential term appointments will be requested.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Books

- Adams, Herbert B. The College of William and Mary.
Washington, D. C.: Government Printing Office, 1887.
- The Association of Commonwealth Universities. Commonwealth Universities Yearbook: 1973. London: The Association of Commonwealth Universities, 1973.
- Baldrige, J. Victor. Power and Conflict in the University.
New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc., 1971.
- Battle, Kemp P. History of the University of North Carolina. Vol. II. Raleigh: Edwards and Broughton Printing Company, 1912.
- Becker, Carl L. Cornell University: Founders and the Founding. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1943.
- Belcher, Donald R. The Board of Trustees of the University of Pennsylvania. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1960.
- Bennis, Warren G. The Leaning Ivory Tower. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, Inc., 1973.
- Bockstael, Eric, and Feinstein, Otto. Higher Education in the European Community. Lexington, Mass.: D. C. Heath and Company, 1970.
- Bolman, Frederick deW. How College Presidents Are Chosen.
Washington: American Council on Education, 1965.
- Brewster, Kingman, Jr. "Politics of Academia." Power and Authority. H. L. Hodgkinson and R. Meeth (eds.) San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Inc., 1971.
- Bronson, Walter C. The History of Brown University.
Providence: Brown University Press, 1914.

- Burn, Barbara B., Altbach, Phillip G., Kerr, Clark, and Perkins, James A. Higher Education in Nine Countries: A Comparative Study of Colleges and Universities Abroad. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1971.
- Burns, Gerald P. (ed.), Administrators in Higher Education: Their Functions and Coordination. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1962.
- Cabaniss, Allen. The University of Mississippi: Its First Hundred Years. Hattiesburg, Mississippi: University and College Press of Mississippi, 1971.
- Carnegie Commission on Higher Education. Governance of Higher Education: Six Priority Problems. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1973.
- Cattell, J. McKeen. University Control. New York: The Science Press, 1913.
- Clark, Thomas D. Indiana University: Midwestern Pioneer, Vol. I, The Early Years. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1970.
- Cohen, Michael D., and March, James G. Leadership and Ambiguity: The American College President. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1974.
- Coon, Horace. Columbia: Colossus on the Hudson. New York: E. P. Dutton and Company, Inc., 1947.
- Cope, Alexis. History of the Ohio State University, Volume I (1870-1910). Columbus: The Ohio State University Press, 1920.
- Corson, John J. Governance of Colleges and Universities. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc., 1960.
- Curti, Merle, and Carstensen, Vernon. The University of Wisconsin: 1848-1925. 2 vols. Madison: The University of Wisconsin Press, 1949.
- Demarest, William H. S. A History of Rutgers College, 1766-1924. New Brunswick: Rutgers College Press, 1924.
- Dexter, Franklin Bowditch. Biographical Sketches of the Graduates of Yale College with Annals of the College History, 1701-1745. New York: Henry Holt and Company, 1885.

Dexter, Franklin Bowditch, ed. Documentary History of Yale University. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1916.

Dobbs, Harold W. The Academic President: Educator or Caretaker. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc., 1962.

Duff, Sir James, and Berdahl, Robert O. University Government in Canada: Report of a Commission Sponsored by the Canadian Association of University Teachers and the Association of Universities and Colleges in Canada. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1966.

Dyer, John P. Tulane: The Biography of a University, 1834-1965. New York: Harper and Row, 1966.

Elliott, Edward C., and Chambers, M. M. eds. Charters and Basic Laws of Selected American Universities and Colleges. New York: The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, 1934.

Eschenbacher, Herman F. The University of Rhode Island: A History of Land-Grant Education in Rhode Island. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1967.

Federation of Regional Accrediting Commissions of Higher Education. Accredited Institutions of Higher Education: 1972-73. Washington, D. C.: American Council on Education, 1972.

Ferrari, Michael R. Profiles of American College Presidents. East Lansing: Michigan State University Press, 1970.

Foote, Caleb, Henry Mayer, and Associates. The Culture of the University: Governance and Education. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Inc., 1968.

Franklin, Fabian. The Life of Daniel Coit Gilman. New York: Dodd, Mead and Company, 1910.

Furniss, W. Todd, ed. American Universities and Colleges. 11th ed. Washington, D. C.: American Council on Education, 1973.

Geiger, Louis G. University of the Northern Plains: A History of the University of North Dakota, 1883-1958. Grand Forks: The University of North Dakota Press, 1958.

- Gittinger, Roy. The University of Oklahoma: 1892-1942.
Norman: The University of Oklahoma Press, 1942.
- Goodspeed, Thomas Wakefield. The Story of the University of Chicago, 1891-1925. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1925.
- Gray James. The University of Minnesota, 1851-1951.
Minneapolis: The University of Minnesota Press, 1951.
- Greene, Jon S., ed. Yearbook of Higher Education: 1973-74.
Orange, N. J.: Academic Media, 1973.
- Hawkins, Hugh. Between Harvard and America: The Educational Leadership of Charles W. Eliot. New York: Oxford University Press, 1972.
- Heilbron, Louis H. The College and University Trustee: A View from the Board Room. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers, 1973.
- Hislop, Codman. Eliphalet Nott. Middleton, Conn.: Wesleyan University Press, 1971.
- Historical Register of Harvard University: 1636-1936.
Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1937.
- Historical Register of Yale University: 1701-1937.
New Haven: Yale University Press, 1939.
- Hodgkinson, Harold L. Institutions in Transition: A Profile of Change in Higher Education. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1971.
- Hofstadler, Richard, and Metzger, Walter P. The Development of Academic Freedom in the United States. New York: Columbia University Press, 1955.
- Hungate, Thad L. Management in Higher Education.
New York: Teachers College, Columbia University, 1964.
- Ingraham, Mark H. The Mirror of Brass. Madison: The University of Wisconsin Press, 1968.
- Jones, Theodore Francis, ed. New York University: 1832-1932. New York: The New York University Press, 1933.

- Jordan, David Starr. The Days of a Man. Vol. I.
New York: World Book Company, 1922.
- Kerr, Clark. "Presidential Discontent." Perspectives on Campus Tension. Edited by David C. Nichols.
Washington: American Council on Education, 1970.
- Kersey, Harry A., Jr. John Milton Gregory and the University of Illinois. Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1968.
- Kirkpatrick, J. E. The American College and Its Rulers.
New York: New Republic Inc., 1926.
- Klaperman, Gilbert. The Story of Yeshiva University: The First Jewish University in America. London: Collier-MacMillan Limited, 1967.
- Klein, Arthur J. Survey of Land-Grant Colleges and Universities. 2 vols. Washington: Government Printing Office, 1930.
- Knowles, Asa S., ed. Handbook of College and University Administration: General. Vol. I. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1970.
- LaBorde, Maximillian. History of South Carolina College.
Charleston: Walker, Evans and Cogswell Printers, 1874.
- Manley, Robert N. Centennial History of the University of Nebraska. Vol. I. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1969.
- McCormick, Richard P. Rutgers: A Bicentennial History.
New Brunswick, New Jersey: Rutgers University Press, 1966.
- Mendenhall, Thomas C., ed. History of the Ohio State University. Vol. I. Columbus: The Ohio State University Press, 1920.
- Mirrielees, Edith R. Stanford: The Story of a University.
New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1959.
- Morison, Samuel Eliot. Harvard College in the Seventeenth Century. 2 vols. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1936.

- Morison, Samuel Eliot. The Development of Harvard University: 1869-1929. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1930.
- Morison, Samuel Eliot. The Founding of Harvard College. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1935.
- New York State Regents Advisory Committee on Educational Leadership. College and University Presidents: Recommendations and Report of a Survey. Ithaca: New York State Regents Advisory Committee on Education Leadership, 1968.
- Paley, William S. The Role of the Trustees of Columbia University. New York: Columbia University Press, 1957.
- Peckham, Howard H. The Making of the University of Michigan. Ann Arbor: The University of Michigan Press, 1967.
- Peirce, Benjamin. A History of Harvard University. Cambridge: Brown, Shattuck, and Company, 1833.
- Perkins, James A., ed. The University as an Organization. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1973.
- Pierson, George Wilson. Yale: The University College (1921-1937). New Haven: Yale University Press, 1955.
- Quincy, Josiah. History of Harvard University. 2 vols. Cambridge: Folsom, Wells, and Thurston, 1840.
- Rauh, Morton A. The Trusteeship of Colleges and Universities. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1969.
- Reeves, Floyd W., et al. The Organization and Administration of the University. Vol. II of The University of Chicago Survey. vols. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1933.
- Ruthven, Alexander G. Naturalist in Two Worlds: Random Recollections of a University President. Ann Arbor: The University of Michigan Press, 1963.
- Schneider, Herbert, and Schneider, Carol, eds. Samuel Johnson: President of Kings College, His Career and Writings. Vol. IV. New York: Columbia University Press, 1929.

- Sellers, James B. History of the University of Alabama: 1818-1902. Vol. I. University, Alabama: University of Alabama Press, 1953.
- Sherwood, Sidney. The University of the State of New York: History of Higher Education in the State of New York. Washington: Government Printing Office, 1900.
- Solburg, Winton U. The University of Illinois, 1867-1894. Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1968.
- Stadtman, Verne A. The University of California: 1868-1968. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1970.
- Stahl, O. Glenn. Public Personnel Administration. New York: Harper & Row, 1962.
- Stephens, Frank F. A History of the University of Missouri. Columbia: University of Missouri Press, 1962.
- Stoke, Harold W. The American College President. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1959.
- Viles, Jonas. The University of Missouri: A Centennial History. Columbia: University of Missouri Press, 1939.
- Wertenbaker, Thomas Jefferson. Princeton: 1746-1896. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1946.
- Wilson, Logan. The Academic Man. New York: The Oxford University Press, 1942.
- Yeomans, Henry A. Abbott Lawrence Lowell: 1856-1943. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1948.

Periodicals and Papers

- Adams, Arthur S. "Relationships Between Governing Boards and Administrative Officers of Colleges and Universities." Proceedings of the Association of Governing Boards, 1952, 51-57.
- Association of Universities and Colleges of Canada. "Guidelines on University Organization," Ottawa, 1971. (Mimeographed.)
- Berlin, Seymour S. "The Federal Executive Service." Civil Service Journal, XI (April-June, 1971), 7-13
- Board of Regents, State University of New York, "Minutes," Albany, New York, Jan. 24, 1973.

- Bossing, Nelson L. "Some Suggested Criteria for the Selection of College Presidents." Education, LXI (March, 1941), 399-402.
- Bryan, William L. "The Share of Faculty in Administration and Government." Transactions and Proceedings of the National Association of State Universities, XII (1914), 92-96.
- Burgess, Kenneth F. "The Trustee Function in Today's Universities and Colleges." Association of American Colleges Bulletin, XVIV (October, 1958), 399-407.
- By-Laws, Board of Trustees, University of Cincinnati. Article II, Section 2, April 4, 1972.
- Crabb, Alfred L., and Jones, William C. "Tenure of Presidents of State Teachers Colleges." Peabody Journal of Education, IX (July, 1931), 46-50.
- Day, Edmund E. "The Role of Administration in Higher Education." Journal of Higher Education, XVII (October, 1946), 339-343.
- Discussion Memorandum Concerning the Choice of a New President, John T. Dunlap, chairman, The University Committee on Governance, Harvard University. Cambridge, April, 1970.
- Edmiston, R. W. "The Tenures of Presidents of Publicly and Privately Controlled Colleges and Universities." School and Society, XLIX (February, 1939), 254-56.
- "Faculty Participation in the Selection and Retention of Administrators: A Report by Committee T." AAUP Bulletin, LVIII (June, 1972), 174.
- Keeney, Barnaby C., "The Function of the President as Interpreted in the Memo." Journal of Higher Education, XXX (November, 1959), 426-431.
- Minnesota State College System. "Minnesota State College System Policy on Appointment, Evaluation, Retirement, and Distinguished Service Professorships for College Presidents," St. Paul, 1973. (Mimeographed.)
- Palmer, Archie M. "The College Presidency Under Scrutiny." School and Society, XXXVI (August, 1932), 230-235.

Selden, William K. "How Long Is a College President?"
Liberal Education XXVI (March, 1960), 5-15.

Snavely, Guy E. "The Continuing College President."
Association of American Colleges Bulletin, XXXI
(March, 1945), 122-123.

Special Committee on the Structure of the University,
The Governing of Princeton University: Final
Report of the Special Committee on the Structure
of the University. Princeton, April, 1970.

The Oklahoma Observer. Editorial, February 25, 1974.

U. S., Department of the Air Force. Air Force Assignment
Manual, AFM 36-11, July 19, 1972, Table 9-1.

Upham, Alfred H. "State University Presidents."
School and Society, XXXVII (May, 1933), 686.

APPENDICES

THE UNIVERSITY OF OKLAHOMA

November 14, 1973

Dear Sir:

The Center for the Studies of Higher Education at the University of Oklahoma is conducting a study of universities which employ a term appointment for their president or chief administrator. The enclosed census card will identify those institutions which do use this appointive relationship.

"Term appointment" is understood here to mean a formalized presidential appointment period which spans a time block longer than a year and at the end of which, upon review, the president may or may not be reinstated for another term. Neither presidential contracts that are reviewed annually with the goal of terminating or continuing nor open-ended appointments that are expected to last until retirement or resignation are our concern in this study.

In order to register the current status of your institution's presidential appointment you are asked to mark the enclosed card and send it by return mail. We hope to contact the schools which do utilize presidential term appointments for further information. We greatly appreciate your help in this effort.

Sincerely yours,

John H. Crooch, Jr.

JHC:fm

Enclosure: (1)

THE UNIVERSITY OF OKLAHOMA

January 16, 1973

Dear Sir:

Last November I wrote you concerning a study being conducted through the University of Oklahoma Center for Studies in Higher Education on universities which employ a term appointment for their president or chief administrator. I am in need of your response in order to complete the survey. Would you please mark the enclosed survey card and send it to me by return mail?

A "term appointment" is defined in this study as a formalized presidential appointment which spans a time block longer than a year and at the close of which the president may or may not be reappointed. Annual terms and those appointments that are expected to run until retirement or resignation do not fit the definition.

I particularly want a response from you, since you represent a doctoral-degree granting institution. I greatly appreciate your help in this effort.

Sincerely yours,

John H. Crooch, Jr.

JHC:fm

Enclosure: (1)

THE UNIVERSITY OF OKLAHOMA

February 15, 1974

Dear _____:

The enclosed questionnaire is an extension of the "Presidential Term Appointment Survey" that was sent to you earlier. The reply from your institution indicates that the president of your university does have a term appointment.

I need your cooperation in completing this questionnaire. Please check the information that I have filled in for accuracy and change any item that is in error.

Your aid in this study will help us report on current conditions of presidential appointments and presidential employment security.

A return envelope is included, and a speedy return is most appreciated.

I thank you for your help.

Sincerely yours,

John H. Crooch , Jr.

JHC:fm

Enclosures (2)

THE UNIVERSITY OF OKLAHOMA

April 12, 1974

Dear _____:

Earlier I sent you a copy of the enclosed questionnaire asking for your help in contributing to research I am conducting on current conditions of university presidential appointments. Your filling out this questionnaire is necessary for the completion of my dissertation, and I will be most appreciative to have your important assistance. The data collected will be used for the purpose of making general statements, and individual responses will not be disclosed.

Please note the information I have listed at the top of the questionnaire and correct any items that are in error. The enrollment figure is FTE from the Yearbook of Higher Education, 1973-74, and the number of doctoral degrees was found in American Colleges and Universities, 11th edition. Only doctoral granting institutions are included in this study.

I thank you for your time and help.

Sincerely yours,

Joan H. Crooch, Jr.

JHC:fm

Enclosure: (1)

SURVEY I RESPONSE FORM

1. Institution _____
2. public _____ private _____
3. Does your institution now have a term appointment for its chief administrator? yes ___ no ___
4. Does your institution have formal plans to initiate a term appointment in the future?
yes ___ no ___
5. Has the possibility been studied and rejected?
yes ___ no ___

Person responding _____

Position _____

Address _____ zip _____

SURVEY II: A QUESTIONNAIRE PERTINENT TO AN ANALYSIS OF
PRESIDENTIAL TERM APPOINTMENTS

I. (Please correct any information in this section that is inaccurate.)

1. Institution _____
2. Control _____ 3. Student Body _____ 4. Enrollment _____
5. Doctorates awarded year ending June 30, 1971. _____

II. (Please circle, fill in, or check the appropriate responses.)

Length and Termination of Service

6. How many years has your current president been in office? 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9
10 11 12 13 14 15 _____
7. How many years did the current president's immediate predecessor hold the office? 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9
10 11 12 13 14 15 _____
8. How many years did the president serve who held the office prior to the immediate predecessor? 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9
10 11 12 13 14 15 _____
9. How did the immediate past president vacate the office? retirement___ dismissal___
resignation___ death___
10. How did the president who held the office prior to the immediate past president vacate the presidency? retirement___ dismissal___
resignation___ death___

Nature of Appointment and Service

11. What university elements were included in the presidential selection and appointment process for the current president? board___ faculty___
administrators___ students___
univ. employees___ alumni___
Other _____
12. Does the president hold faculty rank? yes___ no___
department _____
13. Does the president hold faculty tenure? yes___ no___
14. What is the professional background of your current president? university administration___
academic___ government___
business___ clergy___
other (please state) _____

Evaluation

15. Is the current president evaluated at regularly prescribed intervals? yes___ no___
16. If your response to "15" was "yes" who is involved in the evaluation? board___ faculty___
administrators___ students___
univ. employees___ alumni___
other_____
17. Have formal criteria been established for presidential evaluation? (Please enclose a copy with this instrument if available). yes___ no___
18. Will the president's salary be paid through the contract period if early dismissal occurs? yes___ no___
at board's discretion___

Nature of Contract

19. Was there a formal decision made on the nature of the president's contract? yes___ no___
20. What is the nature of the president's contract? annual renewal___
continuous (pleasure
of the board)___
specified term___

(if "specified term" was marked on #20, please answer III)

III. (For institutions using term appointments)

Nature of the Term

21. What year did your institution establish a presidential term appointment? _____
22. Did the incumbent president hold the position before a term appointment was adopted? yes___ no___
23. Who initiated the procedures for a term appointment at your institution. board___ faculty___
administrators___ students___
univ. employees___ alumni___
other_____

24. Who served on the committee that studied your institution's adoption of the term appointment for the president?
 board____ faculty____
 administrators____ students____
 univ. employees____ alumni____
 other_____
25. What is the length of the specified term appointment for your president?
 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10
 other_____

Evaluation

26. Is the president evaluated at or near the close of the term?
 yes____ no____
 policy not determined____
27. Who is involved in the review process?
 board____ faculty____
 administrators____ students____
 univ. employees____ alumni____
 other_____
28. Are formal criteria established for the presidential evaluation? (please enclose a copy with this instrument if one is available)
 yes____ no____
29. Has provision been made whereby the board of control is able to dismiss the president before the term expires?
 yes____ no____

Renewal

30. Is the president's term renewable?
 yes____ no____
31. If the term is renewable, is it for the same number of years as the initial term?
 yes____ no____
32. Is it understood that the term will be renewed automatically?
 yes____ no____

UNIVERSITIES COMPRISING THE POPULATION BY STATES

Auburn University	University of Delaware
University of Alabama, Birmingham	American University
University of Alabama, University	Catholic University of America
University of Alaska	George Washington University
Arizona State University	Georgetown University
Northern Arizona University	Howard University
University of Arizona	Florida State University
University of Arkansas	Nova University
California Institute of Technology	University of Florida
California State University,	University of Miami
San Diego	University of South Florida
California State University,	Atlanta University
San Francisco	Emory University
Claremont Graduate School	Georgia Institute of Technology
Fuller Theological Seminary	Georgia State University
Graduate Theological Union	University of Georgia
Hebrew Union College	University of Hawaii
Loma Linda University	University of Idaho
Pacific School of Religion	DePaul University
School of Theology at Claremont	Garrett Theological Seminary
Stanford University	Illinois Institute of
U. S. International University	Technology
University of California, Berkeley	Illinois State University
University of California, Davis	Loyola University
University of California, Irvine	Northern Illinois University
University of California,	Northwestern University
Los Angeles	Southern Illinois University
University of California, Riverside	University of Chicago
University of California, La Jolla	University of Illinois,
University of California,	Chicago Circle
San Francisco	University of Illinois, Urbana
University of California,	Ball State University
Santa Barbara	Indiana State University
University of California, Santa Cruz	Indiana University
University of Judaism	Purdue University
University of the Pacific	University of Notre Dame
University of Santa Clara	Drake University
University of Southern California	Iowa State University
Colorado School of Mines	University of Iowa
Colorado State University	Kansas State University
University of Colorado	University of Kansas
University of Denver	Wichita State University
University of Northern Colorado	Southern Baptist Theological
Hartford Seminary Foundation	Seminary
Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute	University of Kentucky
University of Connecticut	University of Louisville
University of Hartford	Louisiana State University
Wesleyan University	Louisiana State University,
Yale University	Medical Center

Louisiana State University, New Orleans	University of Missouri, St. Louis
Louisiana Tech University	Washington University
Loyola University, New Orleans	Montana State University
Northeastern Louisiana University	University of Montana
Northwestern State University of Louisiana	University of Nebraska
Tulane University	Creighton University
University of Southwestern Louisiana	University of Nevada
University of Maine, Orono	University of New Hampshire
University of Maine, Portland	Dartmouth College
Johns Hopkins University	Drew University
Peabody Conservatory of Music	Fairleigh Dickinson University
University of Maryland	Newark College of Engineering
Boston College	Princeton Theological Seminary
Boston University	Princeton University
Brandeis University	Rutgers University
Clark University	Stevens Institute of Technology
Harvard University	New Mexico Institute of Mining and Technology
Lowell Technological University	New Mexico State University
Massachusetts Institute of Technology	University of New Mexico
Northeastern University	Adelphi University
Smith College	Alfred University
Springfield College	City University of New York
Suffolk University	CUNY Graduate School and University Center
Tufts University	Clarkson College of Technology
University of Massachusetts	Columbia University
Worcester Polytechnic Institute	Teachers College, Columbia
Andrews University	Cooper Union
Michigan State University	Cornell University
Michigan Technological University	Fordham University
Oakland University	Hebrew Union College
University of Detroit	Hofstra University
University of Michigan	Jewish Theological Seminary of America
Wayne State University	The Julliard School
Western Michigan University	Long Island University
University of Minnesota	New School for Social Research
Mississippi State University	New York University
University of Mississippi	Polytechnic Institute of Brooklyn
University of Mississippi, Medical Center	Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute
Midwestern Baptist Theological Seminary	St. Bonaventure University
Saint Louis University	St. John's University
University of Missouri, Columbia	State University of New York, Albany
University of Missouri, Kansas City	State University of New York, Binghamton
University of Missouri, Rolla	State University of New York, Buffalo
	State University of New York, Stonybrook

SUNY College of Environment
 SUNY Downstate Medical Center,
 Brooklyn
 SUNY Upstate Medical Center,
 Syracuse
 Syracuse University
 University of Rochester
 Yeshiva University
 Duke University
 North Carolina State University
 University of North Carolina,
 Chapel Hill
 University of North Carolina,
 Greensboro
 Wake Forest University
 North Dakota State University
 University of North Dakota
 Air Force Institute of
 Technology
 Bowling Green State University
 Case Western Reserve
 University
 Hebrew Union College
 Kent State University
 Miami University
 Ohio State University
 Ohio University
 University of Akron
 University of Cincinnati
 University of Dayton
 University of Toledo
 Oklahoma State University
 University of Oklahoma
 University of Tulsa
 Oregon State University
 University of Oregon
 University of Portland
 Bryn Mawr College
 Carnegie-Mellon University
 Drexel University
 Dropsie University
 Duquesne University
 Indiana University of Pennsylvania
 Lehigh University
 Pennsylvania State University
 Philadelphia College of Pharmacy
 and Science
 Temple University
 University of Pennsylvania
 University of Pittsburgh

Villanova University
 Westminster Theological
 Seminary
 University of Puerto Rico
 Brown University
 Providence College
 University of Rhode Island
 Clemson University
 Medical University of
 South Carolina
 University of South Carolina
 South Dakota School of Mines
 South Dakota State University
 University of South Dakota
 George Peabody College for
 Teachers
 Memphis State University
 University of Tennessee
 University of Tennessee
 Medical Units
 Vanderbilt University
 Baylor College of Medicine
 Baylor University
 Dallas Theological Seminary
 East Texas State University
 North Texas State University
 Rice University
 Southern Methodist University
 Southwestern Baptist Theo-
 logical Seminary
 Texas Agricultural and
 Mechanical University
 Texas Christian University
 Texas Tech University
 Texas Woman's University
 University of Dallas
 University of Houston
 University of Texas,
 Arlington
 University of Texas,
 Austin
 Brigham Young University
 University of Utah
 Utah State University
 Middlebury College, Vermont
 Norwich University
 University of Vermont
 College of William and Mary
 Union Theological Seminary
 in Virginia

University of Virginia
Virginia Commonwealth
University
Virginia Polytechnic Institute
University of Washington
Washington State University
West Virginia University
Lawrence University
Marquette University
Medical College of Wisconsin
University of Wisconsin,
Madison
University of Wisconsin,
Milwaukee
University of Wyoming