

STARS

University of Central Florida
STARS

Electronic Theses and Dissertations, 2004-2019

2006

Trends In The Selection, Evaluation, And Compensation Of University Presidents In The Florida State University System

Nancy L. Marshall
University of Central Florida

 Part of the [Educational Assessment, Evaluation, and Research Commons](#)

Find similar works at: <https://stars.library.ucf.edu/etd>

University of Central Florida Libraries <http://library.ucf.edu>

This Doctoral Dissertation (Open Access) is brought to you for free and open access by STARS. It has been accepted for inclusion in Electronic Theses and Dissertations, 2004-2019 by an authorized administrator of STARS. For more information, please contact STARS@ucf.edu.

STARS Citation

Marshall, Nancy L., "Trends In The Selection, Evaluation, And Compensation Of University Presidents In The Florida State University System" (2006). *Electronic Theses and Dissertations, 2004-2019*. 6119.
<https://stars.library.ucf.edu/etd/6119>



TRENDS IN THE SELECTION, EVALUATION, AND COMPENSATION OF
UNIVERSITY PRESIDENTS IN THE FLORIDA STATE UNIVERSITY SYSTEM

by

NANCY L. MARSHALL
B.A. Florida Technological University, 1976
M.A. University of Central Florida, 1989

A dissertation submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the degree of Doctor of Education
in the Department of Educational Research, Technology, and Leadership
in the College of Education
at the University of Central Florida
Orlando, FL

Fall Term
2006

Major Professor: Rosemarye Taylor

© 2006 Nancy L. Marshall

ABSTRACT

Recent literature suggested that while the discussion of presidential selection, evaluation, and compensation was common to both private and public institutions, special attention was paid to public university presidents. They and their presidencies were subject to intense public debate and scrutiny. Florida's public university presidents have contended with the same issues as their counterparts in other states. However, the 2001 changes in the state's higher education governance created distinct challenges and opportunities for the 11 presidents in the Florida State University System.

The purpose of this study was to analyze the trends in the selection, evaluation, and compensation of the 11 university presidents in the Florida State University System (SUS) from 1996-2006, the period five years before and five years after the changes in governance. Interviews with university presidents, members of boards of trustees, and members of the Florida Board of Governors, members of the Florida Legislature, and salary histories from seven of the 11 Florida institutions were used to analyze the trends in light of the shift in perceptions of the presidents' roles and the changes in higher education governance.

Since 2001, and the establishment of boards of trustees and by Florida statute, presidents were seen as the chief executive officer of their institutions, a change from an academic to a business model. Trustees, who primarily came from a business background, viewed them as CEOs and chose to compensate presidents at a higher level than they had previously been paid. The Board of Governors, a majority of whose

members also had corporate backgrounds, implied the need for a CEO-type leadership style and more corporate-style accountability. In 2003, the Florida Legislature responded to the salary surge at the chief executive level and placed a \$225,000 salary cap from appropriated funds on the university presidents' salaries. The legislation did not place any restrictions on university foundations or other sources for supplementing the compensation package.

To my parents

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I wish to express my sincere gratitude to the members of my committee for their support during the entire dissertation process. To Dr. Rosemarye Taylor, my dissertation chair, thank you for your guidance, your constant encouragement, and your generous gifts of wisdom and time. To Dr. William Bozeman, thank you for the great advice, the on-target recommendations, and the quick turnarounds. To Dr. George Pawlas, thank you for your insightful remarks, your attention to detail, and your invaluable and unfailingly kind counsel. To Dr. Daniel Holsenbeck, thank you for your keen insight and the benefit of your rare insider's view of the politics of Florida.

Thanks to my friends and colleagues. To Dr. Beth Barnes, my mentor and my friend, thank you for your advice, constant support, and encouragement. To Betty Barr, thank you for your tireless editing and for being such a cheerleader when I needed it most. To Ryan Retherford, thank you for your patient assistance with the dissertation formatting. For Vanessa Fortier and Scott Kirkman, thank you for helping me illustrate my discoveries. To Diane Trees, thank you for blazing the trail and pointing out the potholes. To Joanne Chive and Teresa Wilkerson, members of my cohort, thank you for your support and for making our dissertation journey so much fun.

I am also appreciative of the university administrators around the state who provided data and arranged for interviews, especially Dr. Cindy Visot and Dr. Jennifer O'Flannery. Thanks to all the research participants who so graciously gave their time and offered their insights.

Most of all I am grateful to my family who has not seen much of me in the last few months as I completed my writing. To my mother, thank you for teaching me how to create a product and imagine the possibilities in any situation. To my father, thank you for teaching me how to craft a product and to always sand with the grain. I know you would have been proud of me, Dad. To my brothers, Ken, Tim, and Chris, and their families, I am humbled by your love, your support, and your pride in me for this accomplishment. Thank you.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES	x
LIST OF FIGURES	xi
CHAPTER 1 INTRODUCTION	1
Historical Perspective	1
Statement of the Problem.....	5
Research Questions.....	6
Definition of Terms.....	6
Methodology	10
Selection of the Population and Sample	10
Instrumentation	11
Data Collection and Analysis.....	11
Assumptions.....	12
Delimitations and Limitations.....	13
Significance of the Study	13
Organization of the Study	13
CHAPTER 2 REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE	15
Introduction.....	15
History of the College Presidency	15
The Role of the College President	21
Selection of the University President.....	32
Evaluation of the University President	38
Compensation of the University President	45
Summary	54
CHAPTER 3 METHODOLOGY	55
Introduction.....	55
Statement of the Problem.....	55
Research Questions.....	56
Selection of the Population	56
Selection of the Sample	57
Instrumentation	59
Data Collection	59
Data Analysis	62
Summary	71
CHAPTER 4 RESULTS	72
Introduction.....	72
Population Profile and Demographics	72
Research Questions and Results	82
Summary	139
CHAPTER 5 CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS	140
Introduction.....	140

Summary	140
Purpose of the Study	140
Sample and Data Collection.....	140
Instrumentation	142
Threats to Validity	142
Discussion of Findings.....	143
Research Question 1	144
Research Question 2	146
Research Question 3	148
Research Question 4	150
Conclusions.....	151
Implications for Policy and Practice	153
Recommendations for Further Research.....	154
APPENDIX A: AMENDMENT 11 TO THE FLORIDA STATE CONSTITUTION, NOVEMBER 2002	157
APPENDIX B: BOARD OF GOVERNORS’ MASTER POWERS AND DUTIES, 2003	159
APPENDIX C: BOARD OF GOVERNORS’ MEMBERS 2006	163
APPENDIX D: FLORIDA STATE UNIVERSITY SYSTEM PRESIDENTS	165
APPENDIX E: INTERVIEW: SUS PRESIDENTS.....	167
APPENDIX F: INTERVIEW: MEMBER OF A BOARD OF TRUSTEES.....	169
APPENDIX G: INTERVIEW MEMBER OF THE BOARD OF GOVERNORS.....	171
APPENDIX H: INTERVIEW MEMBER OF THE FLORIDA LEGISLATURE.....	173
APPENDIX I: INSTITUTIONAL REVIEW BOARD APPROVAL	175
LIST OF REFERENCES.....	177

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1	Characteristics of College Presidents, 2001 and 1986.....	33
Table 2	Participant Interview Dates and Interview Methods.....	61
Table 3	Research Question 1	63
Table 4	Research Question 2	65
Table 5	Research Question 3	67
Table 6	Research Question 4	70
Table 7	Profile of Florida State University System Presidents.....	74
Table 8	Demographics of Florida State University System Presidents	75
Table 9	Boards of Trustees' Occupational Backgrounds (N=143).....	77
Table 10	Board of Governors Members' Occupational Backgrounds (N=17).....	78
Table 11	Research Question 1: Response Clusters and Themes	96
Table 12	Research Question 2: Response Clusters and Themes	107
Table 13	Research Question 3: Response Clusters and Themes	124
Table 14	Research Question 4: Response Clusters and Themes	133
Table 15	Florida SUS Presidential Salaries: 1996-2006.....	135
Table 16	Annual Percentage of Change in Florida SUS Presidential Salaries: 1996-2006	137

LIST OF FIGURES

Figure 1: Top Issues Occupying Presidents' Time, by Sector: 2001.....	26
Figure 2: Florida SUS Presidents' Salaries, 1996-2006 (from Table 15).....	136
Figure 3: Annual Percentage of Change in Florida SUS Presidents' Salaries, 1996-2006 (from Table 16).....	138

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

Wanted: dynamic business leader and academic visionary, with boundless energy, excellent communication skills, political shrewdness, and keen business acumen, to lead high-profile public university into a new era. The ideal candidate should be tireless, detail-oriented, comfortable with intense media pressure, possess strong negotiating skills, and be able to spearhead an aggressive fundraising campaign. Long hours, a fishbowl existence, and nagging headaches are position perks. Compensation: less than that at a private institution. (Goral, 2003, p. 21)

Historical Perspective

Goral's (2003) cynical classified ad for a modern, public university president is not far from reality. Basinger reminded us that the position comes with its own unique set of challenges, including the changing job description of the university presidency, a shrinking pool of high-quality candidates, ever-increasing salary and compensation packages, the changing roles of the governing boards, the realities of a market economy, and interpreting public and institutional perceptions (2003b). Recent literature suggested that while the discussion of presidential selection, evaluation, and compensation was common to both private and public institutions, special attention was paid to public university presidents and they and their presidencies are subject to intense public debate and scrutiny (Basinger, 2003a; Basinger, 2003b; Goral, 2003).

Florida's public university presidents must contend with the same issues as do their counterparts in other states. However, the 2001 changes in the state's higher education governance have created distinct challenges and opportunities for the 11 presidents in the Florida State University System (SUS).

Until 2001, Florida's public universities were centrally governed by the Board of Regents (BOR), which was established in 1965 and was

authorized to adopt system-wide rules pursuant to ss. 120.536(1) and 120.54 to implement provisions of law conferring duties upon it; to plan for the future needs of the State University System; to plan the programmatic, financial, and physical development of the system; to review and evaluate the instructional, research, and service programs at the universities; to coordinate program development among the universities; and to monitor the fiscal performance of the universities. (Title XVI, Chapter 240.209, The 2000 Florida Statutes)

In 2001, supported by members of the legislature, Florida's governor, Jeb Bush, signed into law legislation that dissolved the BOR and replaced it with a new system of decentralized governance. With the addition of New College in Sarasota on July 1, 2001, each of the state's 11 public universities were to be led by individual boards of trustees appointed by the governor.

According to Florida Statute:

The boards of trustees shall be responsible for cost-effective policy decisions appropriate to the university's mission, the implementation and maintenance of high quality education programs within law and rules of the State Board of Education, the measurement of performance, the reporting of information, and the provision of input regarding state policy, budgeting, and education standards. (Title XVIII, Chapter 1001.74, The 2006 Florida Statutes)

And, with respect to the relationship between the boards and their presidents, the statutes added:

(21) Each board of trustees shall appoint a presidential search committee to make recommendations to the full board of trustees, from which the board of trustees may select a candidate for ratification by the State Board of Education. And, (22) Each board of trustees shall conduct an annual evaluation of the president in accordance with rules of the State Board of Education and submit such evaluations to the State Board of Education for review. The evaluation must address the achievement of the performance goals established by the

accountability process implemented pursuant to s. 1008.46 and the performance of the president in achieving the annual and long-term goals and objectives established in the institution's employment equity accountability program implemented pursuant to s. 1012.95. (Title XVIII, Chapter 1001.74, The 2006 Florida Statutes)

In 2002, the United States Senator from Florida, Bob Graham, objected to the dissolution of the BOR and sought to create a new, centralized board to oversee the universities, much like the former BOR. NBC.com reported that:

Senator Bob Graham says putting politicians in charge hurts universities' independence. Programs, positions within the universities, even the establishment of universities themselves have become a political football, rather than have something that's decided by a citizen's board. (cited in http://www.nbc-2.com/News/stories/archive/2002/103102-amend_11.shtml)

Graham was able, through a statewide petition, to get Amendment 11 on the November 2002 ballot, which passed by a 60% margin. The passing of the amendment resulted in the creation of the Board of Governors (BOG), a majority (14) of whose members were appointed by Governor Bush, including several members who were on the earlier BOR. In an effort to fulfill the intent of the amendment, the Florida legislature retained its responsibility for funding all areas of higher education. The BOG was unsure of its influence in the beginning when first exercising its constitutional authority, yet without funding resources, had difficulty in exerting its influence. It also had to handle lawsuits challenging its legitimacy (Hirth, 2006).

As a result of these changes, instead of university presidential searches being performed by the BOR, each of the universities' boards of trustees was charged with selecting, evaluating, and setting compensation for its presidents (Title XVIII, Chapter

1001.74, The 2006 Florida Statutes). The changes in Florida's higher education governance have complicated the presidential searches of the state's universities since the roles or spheres of influence that the BOG can exert is unclear. Candidates had to be able to maneuver between the local board of trustees and the BOG while encountering some of the most rigorous sunshine laws in the country. The task was a daunting one.

Presidential evaluations, previously performed by the Board of Regents, were now completed by individual boards, which employed a combination of in-house assessments and outside consultants to complete the process. In most instances, the evaluations resulted in significant increases in the size of Florida's university presidential compensation packages (Table 15). Articles in *The Chronicle of Higher Education* and other higher education journals indicated that the trend was on the rise in all public institutions (Basinger, 2003b; Goral, 2003). In 2003, after a round of substantial pay raises at several state universities, the Florida Legislature placed a cap of \$225,000 on presidential salaries from appropriated funds, although it did not prohibit supplements from the university foundations to reward and retain the state's 11 university presidents (Basinger & Henderson, 2003, p. S3).

Increasing salaries and compensation packages for university presidents were a national trend, but so was the greater scrutiny and criticism that follows these increases. Florida's public universities were not exempt from such scrutiny, as newspaper articles revealed (DeLuzeriaga, 2006, p. A1). The issue is one that the boards of trustees and the Board of Governors should be prepared to address. They must also accept the fact that the

legislature may exert its authority on its own because it holds the purse strings, a major advantage. The BOG is a constitutional body without funding authority.

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study was to analyze the trends, if any, in the selection, evaluation, and compensation of the 11 university presidents in the Florida SUS from 1996-2006 and to add to the literature on Florida's SUS university presidents. Two areas of interest within the study were how the changing perceptions of the university presidents' roles and how the 2001 changes in Florida's higher education governance have impacted the Florida SUS presidents' compensation packages.

Statement of the Problem

A review of the literature showed that although much has been written about the university presidency in general, minimal research has been conducted on the subject of Florida's SUS presidents in particular, especially since the 2001 changes in Florida's higher education governance. Using interviews with university presidents, members of boards of trustees, members of the Florida Board of Governors, and members of the Florida Legislature, the researcher examined the trends in the selection, evaluation, and compensation of the university presidents in the Florida SUS, resulting from the changes in the perceptions of the presidential roles and the changes in Florida's higher education governance.

Research Questions

1. What are the roles of the university presidents in the Florida State University System?
2. What are the trends, if any, in the selection of university presidents in the Florida State University System from 1996-2006?
3. What are the trends, if any, in the evaluation of university presidents in the Florida State University System from 1996-2006?
4. What are the trends, if any, in the compensation of university presidents in the Florida State University System from 1996-2006?

Definition of Terms

The following definitions are included to clarify terms used in the study. The researcher created all definitions not accompanied by a citation.

Amendment 11: Amendment proposed by United States Senator from Florida, Bob Graham, to reestablish a centralized system of higher education in the state of Florida through the establishment of a Board of Governors (BOG). The amendment passed in November 2002. (Article IX, Section 7). The full text of the amendment is in Appendix A.

Board of Governors (BOG): Established by the passage of Florida's Constitutional Amendment 11 in November 2002. The board consists of 17 members, 14 of whom are chosen by the governor of the state of Florida to serve staggered 7-year terms. The remaining three members are the Commissioner of Education, the chair of the

Advisory Council Faculty Senates, and the president of the Florida Student Association. The board is charged to “operate, regulate, control and be fully responsible for the management of the entire university system” (Board of Governors’ Master Powers and Duties, 2003, p. 1). The “Board’s management shall be subject to the powers of the Legislature to appropriate for the expenditures of funds.” (Board of Governors’ Master Powers and Duties, 2003, p. 1). See The Board of Governors’ Master Powers and Duties listed in Appendix B.

The board will ‘approve the policies and procedures of each constituent college and university governing their respective presidential search, including criteria used in the selection, appointment, and evaluation. The Board of Governors’ ratification of the final candidate is required.’ (Board of Governors’ Master Powers and Duties, 2003, p. 2)

A list of the current members of the Board of Governors is provided in Appendix C.

Board of Regents (BOR): Former governing body of the SUS. The BOR was established in 1965 and replaced the former governing body, the Board of Control. The BOR was responsible for the centralized administration and control of the 10 existing universities in the SUS and was abolished in 2001 and replaced by the 11 boards of trustees in July, 2001.

Board of Trustees (BOT): First established in July 2001 by Governor Jeb Bush, in an effort to decentralize the control by the BOR over the 10 universities in the SUS. The boards are composed of 13 members, six chosen by the governor and five chosen by the Board of Governors, who must be confirmed by the Florida Senate, and two ex officio members: the current student government president and the current chair of the Faculty Senate at each of the 11 SUS universities.

Compensation: For Florida SUS presidents, includes, but is not limited to, a salary capped at \$225,000 in appropriated funds from the state legislature and additional salary from university foundations and private donations, presidential home or home allowance, car or car allowance, club memberships, other board memberships, deferred compensation, bonuses, and other benefits as agreed upon by individual SUS universities and their presidents.

Evaluation: A periodic examination, usually conducted annually, of the SUS president's performance against measurable objectives and accountability factors agreed upon by the president and his or her board of trustees. Boards of trustees may also employ the services of an external and independent evaluator.

External Presidency: One in which the majority of the president's energies are focused on external priorities such as fundraising, community relations, and economic development.

Governance: In Florida, the 11 universities in the SUS are governed by individual boards of trustees, which are in turn governed by the BOG. "There shall be a single state university system comprised of all public universities. A board of trustees shall administer each public university and a board of governors shall govern the state university system" (See Appendix A).

Internal Presidency: One in which the majority of the president's energies are focused on internal priorities such as the university budget, administration and management of the university, and working with faculty, staff, and students.

Legislative Presidential Salary Cap: Created in 2003 by the Florida Legislature as a response to the university presidents' salary increases in 2003 and set at \$225,000 as the maximum allowable compensation from state funds for the SUS presidents.

Public University: An institution of higher education supported primarily by governmental appropriations and/or tax dollars.

Selection: process by which an SUS president was hired by the Board of Regents, or a board of trustees and the Board of Governors. These searches were usually national in scope and often employ the services of an external search firm.

State University System (SUS): Consists of the 11 public universities in the Florida system. They are: Florida A&M University, Florida Atlantic University, Florida Gulf Coast University, Florida International University, Florida State University, New College of Florida, University of Central Florida, University of Florida, University of North Florida, University of South Florida, and University of West Florida.

Sunshine laws: designed to make the business of government agencies public and in the open. Open records and open meetings allow members of the public and press to see the workings of government and are part of the laws in Florida.

University President: The chief executive officers at each of the 11 universities in the SUS. They were charged with the administration of their institutions and served as the corporate secretaries for their individual boards of trustees. They must possess a "combination of academic, business, political, and fundraising skills" (Basinger, 2003b, p. 2) The names of the 11 current presidents and their institutions are listed in Appendix D.

Methodology

Selection of the Population and Sample

The population of this study consisted of the 11 university presidents in the Florida SUS, the 17 members of the Florida BOG, the 143 members of the BOTs at the 11 Florida SUS universities, and 160 members of the Florida Legislature. Gall, Gall and Borg, (2003) suggested the use of a “maximum variation sample” (p. 179), a type of purposeful sampling that “involves selecting cases that illustrate the range of variation in the phenomenon to be studied” (p. 179) in a study of this kind. A maximum variation sample of each population was contacted for face-to-face or telephone interviews. For the university presidents, a sample size of four was selected according to geographic location in the state, size of the institution, age of the institution, and academic or non-academic background of the president, and his or her availability. For members of the boards of trustees, a sample size of six was selected by geographic location and his or her availability. For members of the Florida Board of Governors, a sample size of three was selected by geographic location and the governors’ availability. For members of the Florida Legislature, a sample size of two was selected since most members were involved in re-election campaigns during 2006 and were unavailable. A more complete description of the sample members can be found in Chapter 4. The researcher also gathered archived compensation data on Florida SUS university presidents for 1996-2006 from selected university human resources departments.

Instrumentation

The researcher created and used four sets of interview questions for the sample populations. These included a 16-item instrument for current SUS presidents (Appendix E), a 17-item instrument for the members of the boards of trustees (Appendix F), an 14-item instrument for the members of the Board of Governors (Appendix G), and a 18-item instrument for the members of the Florida Legislature (Appendix H). The researcher conducted a pilot study for content validity of the interview questions with university faculty members and educational leadership doctoral students. Adjustments were made based on their suggestions. All questions and related materials for the interviews were then submitted to the University of Central Florida's institutional review board (IRB) for approval. After IRB approval, interviews were conducted in face-to-face sessions or by telephone (Appendix I).

Data Collection and Analysis

The researcher collected selected data on the selection criteria, evaluations, and compensation packages used by the Board of Regents, the former controlling body of the SUS, in the hiring and compensation of university presidents from 1996 through 2001. Data on the selection criteria, evaluations, and compensation packages used by the boards of trustees and the Board of Governors from 2002 through 2006, were examined and analyzed. The researcher used qualitative data gathered from the interviews with the six SUS university presidents, the seven members of university boards of trustees, the four members of the Florida Board of Governors, and the two members of the Florida

Legislature. Quantitative data were collected from the 11 SUS university human resources departments. The quantitative and qualitative data were used to determine the trends in the selection, evaluation, and compensation of the SUS university presidents.

Assumptions

The following major assumptions were made in this study:

1. The historical compensation data collected on the SUS university presidents from the Human Resources Offices at the 11 universities were accurate.
2. Respondents selected for this study were representative of current SUS university presidents, boards of trustees, the Board of Governors, and the Florida Legislature.
3. Respondents provided factual information in response to interview questions.
4. Interview questions accurately measured the key elements under consideration.
5. The data collected were accurate and suitable for quantitative and qualitative analysis.

Delimitations and Limitations

1. The population for all categories of participants was relatively small.
2. Due to the lack of anonymity for some participants, it is possible that participants were not as candid as they might have been.
3. Due to the small sample available for the study, results and findings may be applicable only to the state of Florida.

Significance of the Study

This study contributed to the existing research on the 11 university presidents in the Florida State University System, especially since the 2001 changes in higher education governance. It identified the trends in the selection, evaluation, and compensation of the university presidents and revealed the impact that the perceptions of presidential roles and the changes in governance has had on compensation packages. The study contributed to the literature on the topic and provided a resource for the Board of Governors, individual boards of trustees, and members of the Florida Legislature for making important decisions that may affect higher education in the state.

Organization of the Study

Chapter 1 provides an introduction, statement of the problem, research questions, the significance of the study, definitions, assumptions, and limitations of the study. Chapter 2 reviews relevant literature and research related to the study. Chapter 3 describes the methodology and procedures used for data collection and analyses of the

study. Chapter 4 presents the results and findings of the data analyses. Chapter 5 contains a summary of findings, conclusions of the study, and recommendations for further study.

CHAPTER 2

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

Introduction

Chapter 2 is divided into five general sections. The first section is a history of the college presidency from the early 19th century to the modern day. The second section details the roles of the college presidency from the earliest days of Harvard to a contemporary review of the job description. The third section outlines the literature on the selection of a college president. The fourth section reviews best practices and contemporary literature on presidential evaluation. The final section summarizes the literature on university presidential compensation packages.

History of the College Presidency

In discussing the evolution of the university presidency, Greenburg (1998) described modern university presidents as small men on campus compared to their larger-than-life predecessors. Dennison (2001) compared and contrasted the “giants” (p. 271) who ruled the universities of the 19th century to the celebrated presidential icons of 50 years ago to the modern president. Surprisingly, he found many similarities.

Presidents in more recent times were described by Hahn (1995) as being “like baseball managers—they turn over often, are blamed for what they can’t control, and are eagerly accepted by other organizations after they’ve been driven out of town by their last one” (p. 3). According to Bart Giamatti, former president of Yale, “being president of a

university is no way for an adult to make a living It is to hold a mid-nineteenth century ecclesiastical position on top of a late-nineteenth century corporation” (cited in Dennison, 2001, p. 270). These descriptions represent significant changes in the office in the past century.

Dennison cited the American Council on Education’s profile of the average university president in its *The American College President: 2002 Edition, Executive Summary*. One interesting revelation in the study included that “the [academic] discipline of presidents changes in response to shifts in the academic marketplace” (cited in Dennison, 2001, p.270). In the 1960s and 1970s, the majority of presidents were engineers and natural scientists. In the 1980s and 1990s, the predominant disciplines were the social sciences. The average tenure dropped from approximately 6 years to 5 years for presidents at “research-oriented, doctorate-granting, public universities.” (cited in Dennison, 2001, p.270). Dennison (2001) stated that this decline could be directly correlated to the effectiveness of university governance.

Dennison (2001) also noted that, for the most part, the research on the topic was “trivial at best and offensive at worst” (p. 270). The studies tended to be interviews of past and current presidents with little regard to “differences in campus conditions and cultures” (p. 271). Shaw (1999) cautioned against a “cookbook approach” (Cited in Dennison, 2001, p. 272) that provided a formula for the process of becoming a university leader. He also noted that educational fads and individual campus differences affect research reliability.

Dennison (2001) observed that “virtually all commentators agreed that presidents in recent years have not lived up to the standards set by the energetic leaders of the late nineteenth century who established the modern American university” (Dennison, p.271). He added that these same commentators said that modern presidents needed to have more power to be more effective. But this was not the 19th century, Dennison warned, and the checks and balances in place at most institutions were there for a reason. He likened these giants to the robber barons of the late 19th century, when the country was in “a marvelous flurry of creative energy” (p. 272). These energies led to the creation of the middle class America that “enshrined professionalism” (p. 272). These giants of the universities, such as Robert Maynard Hutchins of the University of Chicago and James Conant of Harvard, came out of this same time period of unlimited growth and possibility. They were the right people for the right job at the right time in history. Dennison suggested that, if the autocratic giants re-emerged today, they would quickly create havoc and fear. And, according to Dennison, given that option, most boards would select a president based on measurable criteria, with performance expectations and accountability factors built in (Dennison, 2001).

Greenberg (1998) studied one of the modern presidents, Harvard’s Neil Rudenstine, since his arrival at the institution in 1991, and suggested that Rudenstine’s major achievements were:

the insider’s triumphs of management: integrating Harvard’s unwieldy system of twelve balkanized schools, curing the \$1.5 billion budget of its chronic deficits, running the largest fund-raising drive in the history of higher education, and keeping an institution of 18,500 students and 2,200 professors humming along (p. 9).

According to Greenberg (1998), in spite of his high profile at the university, Rudenstine was still largely unknown.

In contrast, Dennison (2001) felt that the 19th century university presidents were revered public figures with great community influence. The modern day presidents were uninterested in such positions because their sphere of influence and compensation were so limited. “As universities become more like businesses, their presidencies have attracted administrators and fundraisers more than scholars and visionaries” (Greenberg, 1998, p. 17). This trend led to a change in the profile of the presidency. One of the most obvious was that in 1998, “only 57% of sitting presidents held earned doctorates, with 11% holding master’s degrees” (Dennison, 2001, p. 274).

In comparing the giants of the 19th century and the moderns, Dennison (2001) saw little real differences. Few of the early university presidents had academic careers and tended to follow a “career rather than serve the institution” (p. 275). They too, tended to move frequently and manage the delicate balance of pleasing their boards of trustees and the public. He also mentioned the glaring failures of the earlier presidents that many critics tend to ignore.

As Dennison (2001) stated, the need to “identify clearly the call to leadership” (p. 278) must be defined and articulated. Presidents should not be faulted for failing to address national educational issues when they have problems to address on their own campuses.

Dennison's (2001) article was particularly useful in that it provided an historical reference for the evolution of the university presidency. It also effectively made the case for the many parallels with yesterday's giants and the modern presidents. He concluded that although the times and the institutions have changed significantly, there were still some remarkable campus leaders. He offered advice for a successful modern presidency, including the need for a good sense of humor and the ability for self-reflection. Finally, he reflected that a presidency is a work in progress and that its success or failure may not be judged accurately until the president had moved on to retirement or another institution.

Much of what we know of higher education and the history of the college and university presidency have been passed down from the college and university presidents themselves. Beach (1972), in his article, *Presidents-Eye View of the History of Higher Education*, stated that "the written records left to us by presidents may be divided into four categories: biographies and autobiographies, collections of speeches and other documents, personal papers and manuscripts, and books about the process of administration" (p. 575). He noted that most of what we know was gleaned from the first three, and that little was known about the practical aspect, administration, because so little was written about it.

Beach (1972) also observed that much of the research has focused on the institution, rather than the university president. He suggested that:

historians may find administrators of complex universities too complicated or too elusive to capture in print. Or perhaps historians . . . agree that the president of a modern university really has very little to say about its personality or direction. Or perhaps we simply find university presidents in the past too similar to the ones in

the present, and seek scholarly labor which does not remind us of our life on campus. (p. 577)

A more current view of the college presidency was provided in *The American College President: 2002 Edition, Executive Summary*, which described the changes in the education, career paths, lengths of service, race/ethnicity, gender, and experiences of college and university presidents since the report was last completed in 1986. The study provided a contemporary description of college and university presidents and its highlights included:

1. The percentage of presidents who were women more than doubled, from 9.5% in 1986 to 21% of the total in 2001.
2. The proportion of presidents who were members of racial or ethnic minority groups showed a smaller increase, from 8% in 1986 to 13% in 2001.
3. The average length of service as president remained steady at 6.3 years in 1986 and 6.6 years in 2001.
4. The average age of presidents increased from 52.3 years in 1986 to 57.5 years in 2001.
5. One in five (20%) presidents in 2001 had served in a presidency in their immediate prior position, compared to 17% in 1986. The current figure is a decrease from the 25% of presidents who had served in a presidency in their immediate prior position in 1998.
6. More presidents have served in other campus leadership roles prior to assuming the presidency. Approximately 28% of presidents served as provost or chief academic officer prior to becoming president, compared with 23% in 1986.
7. An increasing number of presidents have experience from outside higher education. In 2001, nearly 15% of presidents' immediate prior positions were outside academe, compared with 10% in 1986. More than 60% of presidents have some experience outside higher education.
8. Thirty percent of presidents in 2001 have never been a full-time faculty member, compared with 25% in 1986. (*The American College President: 2002 Edition, Executive Summary*)

Interesting data related to recently hired presidents were even more revealing of the demographic changes in the presidency. The research indicated:

1. New presidents were younger at the time of hire than those who were hired five or more years ago. The average age of new presidents was 54.7.
2. 24% of all newly hired presidents were women, compared with 21% of the total group of presidents.
3. More than one-third of new presidents at two-year colleges were women—a larger proportion than at any other institutional type.
4. A higher proportion of new presidents were members of minority groups (15 %) compared to the total presidential population (13%). (*The American College President: 2002 Edition*)

The Role of the College President

The subject of role of the college and university presidents is not a new one. When Joseph Willard was inaugurated as president of Harvard in 1781, one of his first challenges was of an administrative nature (Fowler, 1977). The professor of mathematics had petitioned for a raise. The American Revolution had severely taxed the economy, inflation was rampant, and the university “found itself facing rising expenditures with decreasing revenue” (p. 197). According to Fowler, rather than respond directly to the professor, he compiled an elaborate study of the history of salaries at Harvard and presented it to the college officers. Willard created a system of salary ratios between the president and the faculty members and concluded that, “while he was certainly not requesting an increase for himself, the fact remained that the president’s salary had not kept pace with the faculty’s increases” (p. 197).

Foster, in his 1913 study of the college presidency, found that most trustees, faculty, and students were dissatisfied with the performance of their institutions. He suggested that many of those who were unsuccessful failed to recognize the complexity of the role. He noted that the “bold college professor who seeks the office” should know

that “he must be all things to all men at all times and under all circumstances” (p. 654).

He suggested that the candidate for the presidency must be aware of at least eight obligations inherent in the office:

1. He must be a scholar and achieved distinction in a particular field, and he must continue to advance knowledge in that field . . . otherwise he will not be regarded as a respectable head for an institution of higher learning.
2. He must be a good teacher and continue to teach, in order that he may keep in close touch with the students and with the teaching problems of his faculty.
3. He should supervise the teaching. If he is to be held responsible for the college of a teaching institution, and for the retention and promotion of men partly because of teaching ability, it is reasonable to expect him to supervise the teaching, until that duty is definitely assigned to another person.
4. He must be a business manager. The increasing complexity of college affairs, the larger and more elaborate budgets, the development of new departments, the promotion of profitable relations with other institutions, the growth of the material equipment—buildings, laboratories, gardens, farms, museums, hospitals, dormitories, dining halls, experiment stations, libraries, playgrounds—all thrust upon the college executive obligations similar to those of the head of a commercial enterprise.
5. He must be a fund raiser. The raising of funds is akin to the last obligation, but a highly specialized form of business. It has no counterpart among the obligations that fall on the head of an ordinary commercial establishment. No matter how well-endowed the institution may be, or how liberally supported by the public taxation, the president is expected to increase its resources.
6. He must honor his social obligations. The sixth group of duties is real and heavy, and they become more exacting every year. Several men who a decade or two ago were regarded as admirable for the presidency of a certain university are now considered impossible because they *or their wives* are not socially notable, or because they have insufficient income for the extensive entertaining that now seems inseparable from the position. A man might be elected president of a railroad because of what he himself could do. Not so with the college president. He and his wife are elected. Some men disqualify themselves early in life by falling in love with a woman who could never become the social servant of a university. The social duties include keeping in close touch with the students, the faculty, the alumni, visitors from abroad, and most importantly, the trustees.
7. He must be an excellent public speaker. The president is called upon for every known form of public speaking and should be able to speak at any time, on any subject, to any audience, anywhere. These include delivering eulogies, after dinner speeches, addressing chambers of commerce, political mass meetings,

read poetry, preach sermons, conduct funerals, speak at teachers' conventions, alumni meetings, women's clubs, and legislative hearings.

8. And the most essential qualification is that he be a leader. He must get on with men and women and somehow keep them working harmoniously and enthusiastically for the really important things in the like of the institution. He must be a spiritual force. (p. 654-657)

Harold Dodds, former president of Princeton, stated in his 1960 article entitled,

Some Thoughts on the University Presidency that:

American university presidents are prone to think that their job is like nothing else in the world. They love to recite the incredible variety of mutually exclusive capacities demanded for success. As a former practitioner in the field, I think they may have some cause for these views, although on occasion they may exaggerate the uniqueness of their situation. Nevertheless, I have seen tables of job specifications prepared by trustees and even faculty committees which were marvels of contradictions and inconsistencies (p. 10).

Dodds (1960) found that when he questioned a trustee on the requirements his board wanted in a president, the trustee replied that the successful candidate be a good administrator with "business sense" (p. 10), get along well with the state legislature in order to ensure that it be "liberal with appropriations" (p. 10), "cultivate popularity" (p.10) with alumni so that they would continue to give, and be a "good speaker, reasonably religious, etc" (p. 10). He interrupted the trustee to ask him if educational leadership was important, and the trustee replied that he had not thought of that (p. 10). From this commentary, it seems obvious that the notion of the college president's role as being one primarily that of an administrator, rather than an academic, was also a rather historical one.

The American College President: 2000 Edition, Executive Summary noted that today's presidents rated and defined their duties as the following:

1. They were most likely to cite relations with the faculty, legislators, and governing boards as their greatest challenges.
2. They spent most of their time on planning, fund raising, and budgeting
3. They remain active in their academic disciplines. Since becoming president, more than 25% had written for scholarly publications and 20% taught at least one course regularly.

The number of women in the presidency had increased and they faced particular struggles in their quest for a balanced life as president. Basinger (2001a) addressed the particular problems and pressures faced by female campus chiefs. While not just an issue for female presidents, Basinger (2001a) made felt that they made a balanced life a priority. Unlike the male presidents before them, these women made a concerted effort to seek each other out at conferences and create strong, effective networks for problem solving and shared support. While the pressures of the job were not unique for them, they had to cope with family demands that their counterparts did not have. (Basinger, 2001a). Furthermore, "fewer women presidents have a spouse to help out" (p. 2).

Jan Greenwood, vice president of AT Kearney Executive Search stated:

the basic nature of the major job responsibilities has not shifted since the early '80s. Back then, presidents were doing three things: They were providing leadership and vision for their institutions, they were responsible for the overall management of the institution, and they provided for resource development. They're still doing those three things, but there has been a substantial shift to the resource development side. (cited in Goral, 2003, p. 22)

Greenwood also suggested:

some university presidents may spend as much as 80 percent of their time on fundraising efforts, a far cry from a time not long ago when one day a week might have been spent in such directions. That increased fundraising activity puts additional pressure on hiring very solid people in the vice-presidential role as well; individuals who can help carry forward the leadership and management of the institution as well as oversee its management." (cited in Goral, 2003, p. 22)

And, Anne Hayes Die, managing director of Academic Search Consultation Service, stated that:

. . . the job of a college president has been transformed dramatically in the last 10 to 15 years. And that's because it's not the same universe . . . today's higher education leaders face far more challenges than did their counterparts of an earlier time. The legal issues that must be dealt with, the regulatory issues that come from a number of federal bodies, and the enormous pressure to raise large amounts of money call for skills and experience that simply would not have been required 20 years ago. I know few college presidents who get home before 10 p.m. or later, and they're often still wearing the suit they put on for their breakfast meeting. It continues all weekend. It's like being a physician and virtually living in the hospital with your patients. It's a very demanding job. (cited in Goral, 2003, p. 22)

College and university presidents often play the role of a chief executive officer.

Margaret Bauer, in her dissertation, *Are the Leadership Practices of College Presidents in the Northeast Distinct from Those of Leaders in Business and Industry?*(1993) argued that there were numerous parallels between the chief executive officer of a large corporations and a college president. She contended that both must cope with a shifting economy, scant resources, and other equally destabilizing factors. The study cited several areas in which both chief executives, academic and corporate, must exhibit a similar leadership style. The underlying premise of her study was that:


higher education institutions are business enterprises and must be managed as such in order for them to survive and thrive in today's turbulent environment. Thus, presidents of higher education institutions must exhibit leadership skills in the areas of management concepts that apply to strategic planning, finance, marketing, physical facilities, human resources, and public policy issues as their business counterparts must do. (p. 2)

Bauer further acknowledged:

the candidate for a higher education presidency must now provide evidence of demonstrated abilities in performing inter-institutional planning, fiscal planning,

employee contract administration, community relations, team building, and support of cultural diversity and affirmative action/equal opportunity programs. (p. 3)

The American Council of Education surveyed public and private university presidents in *The American College President: 2002 Edition* to identify the major issues that occupied the presidents' time. Figure 1 provides the results of this survey.



Note: *Presidents were asked to select the four areas that occupy most of their time, therefore percents total more than 100.

Figure 1: Top Issues Occupying Presidents' Time, by Sector: 2001
(The American College President: 2002 Edition, Executive Summary)

Judith McLaughlin (2006), the educational chair of the Harvard Seminar for New Presidents and director of the Higher Education Program at the Harvard University Graduate School of Education, wrote a recent article in *Trusteeship*, where she suggested

that there are four trends that “significantly affect the presidency: 1) the urgent need for funding, 2) the increased calls for colleges and universities to demonstrate their worth, 3) the pace and crush of communications, and 4) the changing landscape of governance” (McLaughlin, p.8). She stated that “these pressures raise questions about the qualifications of presidents, the manageability of presidential responsibilities, and the relationship between the president and the board” (McLaughlin, p. 8).

As a matter of course, colleges and universities must attend to the serious demands for money. “Senior development officers at wealthier schools say. . . . the only difference between them and their poorer peers is the number of zeroes in the figures they are expected to raise” (McLaughlin, 2006, p. 8). The brunt of this fundraising fell on the shoulders of the president. In her interviews with presidents, McLaughlin found that the presidents spent 30 to 60% of their time on fundraising activities, rating it as their “single greatest challenge” (p. 9), a role that was often the primary one addressed by search committees looking for a new president. She noted that while the presidents acknowledged that the public perceived their fundraising activities as the most challenging, most of them did not consider fundraising the most important qualification for their job, according to a recent poll conducted for the *Chronicle of Higher Education* (p. 9). Only 12% of the presidents cited fundraising “most important to the success of their presidencies” while “almost half considered the attributes of strong leadership ability, interpersonal skills, and institutional vision to be essential to their success” (pp. 9-10).

Colleges and universities must compete with peer institutions and for-profit institutions for “customers and capital” (McLaughlin, 2006, p.10) and their presidents “must become familiar with such concepts as integrative marketing, institutional positioning, and enrollment strategy so that the institution can attract enough numbers of the right kinds of students to meet its budgetary and competitive goals” (p. 10).

Presidents must also face accountability pressures from “state and federal political leaders who, having successfully pushed public schools to identify standards, establish metrics, and prove outcomes, now want colleges and universities to follow suit” (McLaughlin, 2006, p. 10). These same political leaders applied pressure for financing and governance oversight to local governance boards of both public and private universities to ensure they are performing their fiduciary responsibilities. McLaughlin (2006) noted that “negative publicity about high presidential salaries and benefits further fuels the public perception that higher education needs close regulation” (p. 10). As a result of this increased scrutiny, many governance boards became progressively more involved in decision making, often creating additional demands on the presidents’ schedules.

Robert Atwell, President Emeritus of the American Council on Education, and Jane Wellman, a senior associate with the same group, argued that while most college and university presidents were willing to discuss matters of institutional interest, they were not prepared to discuss higher education policy on a state and national level (Atwell & Wellman, 2002). In the void created by their lack of response, governors and legislators are rushing in to make decisions for them on “how to accommodate-and pay

for-the next generation of college students, about institutional governance, and accountability structures” (p.1). These decisions would be aided by the effort of these presidents, who knew the practicalities of higher education. Most presidents were reluctant to participate or advocate for public policy for several reasons.

1. Their most important responsibility is to raise and protect the resources available to their institutions. This means fundraising from public and private sources. The last thing any politically astute president would want to do (and most are quite politically astute) is to take positions that their employers and public and private donors might find offensive.
2. The jobs of system heads-those public sector jobs for presidents and chancellors who have the primary responsibility for working with state and federal governments-have become almost impossibly politically complicated. Many of these presidents and chancellors live with uncomfortable ideological divisions within their own boards with little support from campus presidents and faculty within the institution. They learn to choose just two or three issues where they have a chance of succeeding before their political capital runs out.
3. Institutional autonomy is viewed in almost theological terms, and this translates into the view that the path to excellence is to be found through competition and promotion of individual institutions rather than through collaborations across sectors.
4. At the federal level, where there is little general institutional funding, presidents generally defer to the Washington associations to represent their interests on public policy issues. However, it is very difficult for membership-based associations to do much to advance any agenda which advantages one sector over another and leads to publicly embarrassing squabbling between institutions. The associations have learned to navigate around the most sensitive issues by deferring to "lead associations" to carry the water on their collective behalf (such as community colleges on workforce development, or research universities on graduate education). This leaves them in an almost entirely reactive posture, and they typically fire up their public policy capacity only to kill the occasional wacky idea that emanates from some think tank or staff member. The agenda that emerges has a weary predictability to it, and almost guarantees that new initiatives are ones that fit well within the existing division of labor in higher education. Since the cross-sector issues that require new attention do not fit within that division, the status quo prevails.
5. The last two decades have been characterized by a de-emphasis on public policy solutions in all areas of government except for elementary and secondary education. This has been a time of romance with the presumed benefits of market-based approaches, in contrast to those that are regulated or managed. This hasn't

been all bad in higher education, and has helped to get rid of (or to reduce the roles of) some of the overly regulatory state agencies. But the industry has become accustomed to viewing public policy as a zero-sum game to be played almost entirely defensively: The job is to protect the status quo, increase institutional funding, and stamp out bad ideas. (p. 1-2)

Atwell and Wellman (2002) concluded that “the last time America paid serious attention to the public policy agenda of higher education was in the 1960s—a time of building of institutions and programs” (p. 2). They agreed that with the difficult problems higher education was facing presently and into the next 20 years, “political will and intellectual capacity are needed from within higher education to step up to the responsibility” (p. 6).

Presidents must also respond to the immediacy of information created by new technology. According to McLaughlin (2006):

This extended dissemination of campus events and controversies often distorts the issues and creates a rush of correspondence for the president’s office. And, with this greater access, external and internal constituents expect a rapid response, creating an additional drain on the presidents and their staffs. (p. 10).

McLaughlin (2006) also noted:

The grave concern about money, the greater importance of market and political pressures, and the flood of electronic communications have caused shifts at many institutions. These shifts have occurred both in the focus of the president and in the center of gravity in governance toward the outside of the institution (p. 11).

Modern institutions must also contend with shifts in the “professoriate—from larger numbers of adjunct faculty to the growing disaffection of younger faculty” (p. 11). The rapid pace set by presidents and the governing boards are often at variance with the faculty, even with those members who are involved in academic decision making.

Because of the frustration governing boards experience in dealing with academic issues, many boards seek to avoid them whenever possible (McLaughlin, 2006).

According to McLaughlin (2006):

New presidents sometimes are told during their first year that they should expect to run as fast as they can, only to discover in future years that they are expected to pick up the pace. It is reasonable, therefore, to ask if there might be some way to make the job of president more manageable, especially given the increasing time that presidents need to spend off campus. (p. 12)

McLaughlin (2006) suggested that some solutions included delegating internal responsibilities to the provost or an executive vice president while the president manages external affairs. And, she advised that past presidents may prove useful allies for their successors, mindful that they should provide their expertise and not competition.

These challenges make it of paramount importance that the president and the board establish an active relationship—one that places responsibilities where they should appropriately lie. “When their efforts are aligned with institutional priorities, active boards can provide greater intellectual, strategic, and financial contributions and help presidents interpret the relevance of external markets and political forces” (McLaughlin, 2006, p. 12).

Shelly Weiss Storbeck, managing director of the higher-education division of AT Kearny Executive Search, suggested that the role of the university president has evolved over the last 15 years and was not considered to be as attractive as it once was (Basinger, 2003b). Storbeck said that, “the lifestyle is a real negative for most people. You do 12- to 15- hour days, with every 15 minutes of your life parsed out to someone else” (as cited in Basinger, 2003b, p. 2).

Selection of the University President

With regard to presidential qualifications, McLaughlin (2006) suggested that while many boards consider hiring presidents from outside of academe, the results of those hires have been mixed. “Lack of appreciation for academic norms has caused unproductive cultural clashes within institutions, and prior experience in politics, business, the military, or fundraising has not necessarily made such presidents effective” (p. 11). She further suggested that success outside of the academy does not always translate well and “fails to recognize the complexity of the presidency and the need for internal as well as external leadership” (p.11). She also noted that many of the presidents most adept at working with legislatures and fundraisers have come up through the traditional academic ranks.

A comparison of the characteristics of college presidents in 2001 and 1986 illustrates some of the changes that have occurred (The American College President: 2002 Edition).

Table 1

Characteristics of College Presidents, 2001 and 1986

	2001 Percent		1986 Percent
Women	21.1		9.5
Monthly	12.8		8.1
Current married	83.1		85.0
Had doctorate degree	76.4		76.6
Three most common Prior positions			
Other senior campus executive	32.7		22.5
CAD/Provost	27.8		18.4
President/CEO	20.4		17.3
Had tenure as faculty member in current position	30.1		38.8
Had tenure as faculty member in immediate prior position	34.8		38.8
Had altered job circumstances for child-rearing	7.0		N/A
Presidents' top three fields of study:			
Education	43.8	Education	43.9
Humanities	14.3	Humanities	16.5
Social sciences	13.5	Social sciences	11.7
	Average		Average
Age (in years)	57.5		52.3
Years in present job	6.6		6.3
Years in prior position	6.5		5.6
Years as full-time faculty	8.0		6.4

(The American College President: 2002 Edition, Executive Summary)

Although some of the characteristics changed over the 15-year time period studied, boards of trustees were still concerned with attracting and retaining a successful presidential candidate so they could provide their universities with “the kind of leadership that leads to growth and prosperity” (Cotton, 2003, p. S36). However, boards were also

concerned with the bottom line. Jean Dowdall (2003) offered the boards' viewpoint in her article entitled, *Presidential Pay from the Board's Point of View*, and noted that in the presidential-search process, the candidates want the most generous compensation package they can negotiate and the hiring institution's chief financial officer wants to "rein in the new president's compensation" (p. S38). The boards must conduct a successful search by setting the compensation high enough to attract viable candidates without creating bad feelings among existing administrators and faculty members. At certain institutions, the "star" (p. S38) candidate may be asked, "What would it take to attract you here?" The result leaves the candidate in the enviable position of naming his or her own price (p. S38). The other factors involved in presidential recruitment included the institution's academic stature, financial health, fund-raising capacity, and location. Of equal importance was the candidate's ability to mesh with the board, and especially, the board's chair, according to Dowdall.

According to Atwell and Wellman (2000), the presidential search committee was therefore compelled to create an attractive compensation package and reasonable expectations for the caliber of candidate that it hoped to attract. Search committees do have some flexibility in arriving at a salary range but sometimes lose interest in candidates whose prices were set too high and gave the appearance of inflexibility on the issue (Atwell & Wellman, 2000). This was especially the case when the candidate's prior salary was compared to the new package (Atwell & Wellman, 2000). A candidate's request may appear to be unreasonable and can be used as the excuse to take the second or third choice or an internal candidate (Atwell & Wellman, 2000). Atwell and Wellman

(2000) provided a guide for leaders of higher education to set and negotiate compensation for academic presidents in their guide, *Presidential Compensation in Higher Education*.

A review of *The Chronicle of Higher Education's: Chronicle Careers* section revealed the type of candidate public institutions are seeking in their national searches for a chief executive officer. In a July 7, 2006, advertisement for a new president for the University of Delaware, the university sought an individual who:

reports directly to the Board of Trustees and is the chief executive officer of the institution. The President is charged with effectively carrying out Board policies and the efficient and fiscally sound general management of the institution. It is expected that the next President will be a person of unquestioned integrity, possess outstanding interpersonal and communication skills, and have a passion for the mission of educating students. The President will understand a dynamic and complex organization and will have strategic knowledge of the role and mission of a dynamic major research institution in an ever-changing world. (p. C37)

The University of Alabama Board at Huntsville sought:

a visionary, charismatic and dynamic leader of national stature who has a record of successfully managing complex academic institutions, and an appreciation for the importance of research and teaching excellence in a comprehensive research university. The successful candidate must have strong interpersonal and communications skills, a record of substantial fund-raising success, the ability to attract and retain exceptional faculty and students, success in the design and implementation of an academic strategic plan, and a commitment to diversity. It will be important as well for the successful candidate to support and enhance the University's expanding technology transfer portfolio. The successful candidate will be expected to build strategic alliances with governmental agencies and with the full range of Fortune 500 and 1000 companies that have established a presence in the Huntsville community. And, as the leader of the campus, it will be highly desirable for UAH's President to be engaged fully with faculty, students, staff, alumni and indeed the entire extended University family, including those who reside in Huntsville and the surrounding areas. The President of UAH reports to the Chancellor of The University of Alabama System; he/she is responsible for the management of the UAH campus, and its full range of academic and non-academic programs and initiatives. (*Chronicle Careers Online*, September 13, 2006)

The State University of New York College of Technology at Farmingdale

advertised for a candidate for the position of president with the following qualifications:

Position and Qualifications: As the leader and chief administrator of Farmingdale State, the President exercises broad responsibilities for all aspects of the institution, inspires and guides members of the campus community, and serves as its chief representative externally. The President reports to the Chancellor of the State University of New York. The ideal candidate for the presidency will have the following qualifications, among others: academic experience and credentials (Ph.D. or equivalent), and other qualifications sufficient to lead and inspire the academic community and to build academic programs of high quality; administrative experience demonstrating the capacity to manage a complex institution in all of its dimensions; an open, collaborative leadership style and a demonstrated commitment to participatory governance; the ability to effectively represent and advocate for Farmingdale within a multi-campus state system and with the business community; the background and skills to exercise leadership in fund raising; the highest personal integrity; the ability to formulate and communicate a clear vision; be committed to academic freedom and the full exchange of ideas; enjoy and value personal interaction with the diverse members of the campus and surrounding community; and a sense of humor. (*Chronicle Careers OnLine*, September 11, 2006)

Coastal Carolina University searched for its next president with the following qualifications:

Coastal Carolina University invites nominations and applications for the position of President. Coastal Carolina University is a public, mid-sized, comprehensive liberal arts institution with an enrollment of nearly 8,000 students. The President, as chief executive officer of the University, reports directly to the Board of Trustees and enjoys broad delegated authority for the administration of the University, overseeing an annual operating budget of \$105 million. Coastal Carolina's next President will be an experienced and successful leader, visionary, and communicator who has a distinguished record of executive leadership. Candidates must be able to lead successful fundraising efforts. The President is expected to maintain and further positive relationships with the founding organizations of the University: the Horry County Higher Education Commission and the Coastal Educational Foundation. It is preferred that applicants and nominees possess an earned doctorate, appropriate terminal degree, or academic credentials sufficient to engender respect from the academy and the community at large. (*Chronicle Careers OnLine*, September 11, 2006)

In 2006, Florida A&M University, a member of the Florida SUS, had an interim president and sought a permanent candidate to fill the position of president. Its board of trustees seeks a president with the following qualifications:

The Board of Trustees of Florida A&M University (FAMU) invites nominations and applications for the position of President. The President will serve as the chief executive officer of the University and work closely with the Board of Trustees. The University seeks a dynamic leader with high professional and personal standards . . . Ideal candidates for the position should demonstrate broad leadership qualities and experience, including:

- * An earned terminal degree is required (Ph.D. or Ed.D. preferred).
- * Minimum of 5 years of proven leadership and management experience in an organization of size and complexity comparable to FAMU. (President or senior executive in higher education highly preferred).
- * Strong moral character and integrity.
- * A strategic vision for advancing the future of the University.
- * The ability to work effectively with the Board of Trustees, agencies of the Florida State Government and other decision-making bodies associated with the University.
- * Understanding of the history and significance of HBCU's and a commitment to their survival and advancement.
- * Exceptional communication skills that will facilitate the marketing and promotion of the University among internal and external stakeholders.
- * A proven record of fund development in support of academic programs, scholarships and endowment.
- * A consensus builder among internal and external stakeholders.
- * A commitment to shared governance.
- * A commitment to the development of FAMU as a research intensive institution.
- * A commitment to improving the quality of campus life.
- * A commitment to open access to all campus constituencies.
- * Experience in successfully assessing and navigating political and media issues.
- * Ability to build partnerships with Corporate America and university support organizations.
- * A commitment to recruiting, retaining and developing an increasing number of high-caliber faculty and students.
- * A thorough knowledge of interacting with compliance and accreditation entities (i.e., NCAA, SACS, etc.). (*Chronicle Careers On-Line*, September 11, 2006)

Also noteworthy was the fact that many of these positions were being conducted through an outside search firm. According to the *American Council on Education: 2002 Edition, Executive Summary*, a review of the presidential search process revealed that:

1. Search consultants were used to recruit more than half of recently hired presidents, up from 16% of those hired prior to 1985.
2. One in five presidents indicated they did not have a clear understanding of some aspect of the campus or job at the time they took the position.
3. Seventy percent of all presidents had a written contract when they were hired.
4. One-third of presidents sought negotiating advice from someone prior to accepting an offer. Typically they turned to colleagues in higher education, an attorney, or a financial expert. (p. 2)

Evaluation of the University President

After a successful search was completed and a qualified candidate was chosen, universities must eventually attend to the task of evaluation. According to Schwartz (1998), a poorly conducted evaluation survey can be damaging to both the president and the institution, while a well-done and thoughtful evaluation of a university president can be a useful tool for improving the institution's chief executive officer's performance. Although the practice has become commonplace, presidential evaluation remains controversial because the stakes are so high for all concerned (Schwartz, 1998). And, it is because of these high stakes that presidential evaluations will remain high on the list of accountability issues (Schwartz, 1998).

The Association of Governing Boards (AGB) was one of the leaders in providing models for successful university presidential evaluations. In its *Presidential & Board Assessment in Higher Education: Purposes, Policies & Strategies*, it remarked that

“colleges and universities are among the most ‘political’ of all institutions in our society” (Ingram & Weary, 2000, p. 1). Although presidents’ relationships with faculty were important, the encouragement and support of their governing boards was crucial (Ingram & Weary, 2000).

One of the main reasons the presidential evaluation became a common practice was because governing boards and others are “making an effort to demonstrate to the public that higher education is accountable and performing up to expectations” (Schwartz, 1998, p. 4). In the mid 1970s, approximately one quarter of colleges and universities evaluated their chief executive officers. By the mid-1980s, the practice had increased to 55% and, by the 1990s, to approximately 81% that were conducting performance reviews (Schwartz, 1998).

The AGB suggested that sound governing board assessment policies should:

1. Recognize that finding and retaining exceptional executive leadership is the governing board’s first responsibility, followed by its parallel responsibility of keeping its own house in order ...
2. Integrate presidential and board performance reviews and link them with presidential search policies and practices.
3. Make clear that the governing board is responsible for reviewing the chief executive’s performance and that the chief executive plays a critical role in helping to shape the board’s policies and practices.
4. Clearly articulate the primary purposes the review process should serve.
5. Respect and reflect the organization’s traditions and values to ensure the institution’s viability, health, and welfare.
6. Protect the integrity of the incumbent chief executive, the presidency, the board, collaborative governance, and the institution.
7. Make the best use of reliable information without trivializing the complex and interdependent behaviors and performances that are being reviewed. In practice, this means the performance review process relies heavily on interviews and self-assessment, makes proper use of written materials, and benefits from the highest quality professional assistance when appropriate. (Ingram & Weary, 2000, p.1)

Ingram and Weary (2000) further advocated a systematic approach to performance acceptance and an annual review of “presidential stewardship that emphasizes mutual goal-setting, principally by means of a written management review or self-assessment prepared by the chief executive and formally reviewed by the board” (p. 2).

The Association of Governing Boards was clear on what constituted a successful annual review of the president. For both the president’s and the board’s responsibility and “shared commitment to making the evaluation a productive process” (p. 11), it suggested the following to-do list:

1. Lay the foundation for assessment during the search process with clear expectations for performance.
2. Establish a board policy for the review process. Consult with the president and revise it as appropriate.
3. Base the assessment on agreed-upon goals and benchmarks.
4. Make the president’s written self-assessment statement the central element in the process.
5. Seek legal counsel in confidentiality and open-meeting and open-record laws to clarify what should or will be confidential, especially if the institution is a public college or university.
6. Complete the process in as short a time as possible (about one month).
7. Schedule a private meeting with the president and board committee, including the chair, to discuss the review. Include a synthesis of the board’s feedback on performance.
8. Use the review process to agree on goals for the coming year.
9. Follow up with appropriate recommendations about compensation adjustment.
10. Review the assessment process each year and make needed changes.
11. Make annual assessments part of the cycle that includes periodic self-assessment.
12. Remember that assessment is not a substitute for regular, on-going communication between the president, the board, and its leaders. (Schwartz, 2001, p. 11)

Presidents who reported positive experiences with their reviews offered a long and diverse list of results that included “ideas to strengthen their personal management and leadership styles, self-confidence, sense of reaffirmation, personal health, communication techniques with the board, goals and priorities, and relationships with faculty and staff” (Ingram & Weary, 2000, p. 5). The presidents also noted that the reviews helped them decide if they should stay or leave a particular institution, affected their compensation and employment agreements, and much more (Ingram & Weary, p. 5).

The Association of Governing Boards advocated a yearly presidential performance review that began with the chief executive “providing members of the institution’s governing board with a written, confidential self-assessment. (Ingram & Weary, 2000, p. 13). Most presidents reported that the process therapeutic although some consider it an onerous task. The annual written self-assessment was a powerful tool for both the president and the board. An effective one creates the opportunity for “focused conversation” (p. 13) between the board and the chief executive. It should “1) be flexible in format, 2) include personal as well as institutional achievements and needs, 3) focus on retrospective and prospective goals, 4) remain confidential between the chief executive and the board or system head, and 5) be consistent with the purposes of presidential assessment (to improve personal introspection and self-improvement” (Ingram & Weary, p. 13).

Several state university systems’ presidential assessment models were reviewed for this researcher’s study. They included the California State University System, the

Board of Governors for Higher Education; State of Rhode Island and Providence Plantation; Southeastern Louisiana University, and University of Nevada, Las Vegas; and they share many commonalities. The types and results of Florida's presidential evaluations are discussed in Chapter 4.

The California State University Criteria for Presidential Assessment included such factors as “1) general administrative effectiveness including management of human, fiscal, and physical resources, 2) working relation with the system and the campus, 3) educational leadership and effectiveness, 4) community relations, 5) major achievements of the campus and the president, and 6) personal characteristics.” (p. 1-2)

The Board of Governors for Higher Education, State of Rhode Island and Providence Plantation distinguished between the two types of evaluations it conducted: contract evaluations and annual evaluations. The Board suggested that the evaluation must be performed in the context of the institutions' mission. The Board further suggested that criteria should be rooted in three basic ideas: 1) How has the president performed against agreed-upon objectives? 2) What are the objectives and expectations for the future? and, 3) based upon performance to date, does the president appear to have the ability to meet the objectives and expectations for the future?” (p. 4.1). The Board evaluation criteria included: “1) professional qualities, 2) organization and management, 3) fiscal management, 4) academic affairs, 5) student affairs, 6) relationship to the board of governors, and 6) external relations” (pp. 4.4-4.6).

Southeastern Louisiana University developed a more detailed approach to its presidential evaluation policy and procedures. It listed as its purpose for evaluation “the

systematic analysis for the improvement of the institution and to meet SACS requirements” (p. 1). The evaluation should “reflect the role and scope of the president’s administrative duties and expectations while fostering a positive climate for growth in professional competence and leadership” (p. 1). It suggested that such a:

formal evaluation promotes accountability, provides an institutional context for judging performance, promotes and strengthens effective leadership, provides systematic evidence of effectiveness, thereby reducing capricious judgment, and provides a means for checking institutional goal achievement. (p. 2)

The university also suggested the following guidelines for effective evaluation: objectivity, clearly defined criteria that relate to the university’s missions and goals, meaningful evaluation, well-planned schedule of implementation, clear policy for reporting and use, opportunity for response and self-assessment, and finally, review of the evaluation process. (p. 2)

The UNLV’s bylaws, Section 14.2, (2003) also called for a presidential evaluation by the faculty to “determine the level of confidence in which the faculty holds the president.” The evaluation is to be conducted every three years and coincide with the Board of Regents’ presidential evaluation. It is a voluntary, anonymous, and confidential instrument of twenty-three multiple choice and three open-ended questions which sought to “assess the president’s performance of assigned duties within the standards of effectiveness and efficiency.” (p. 1). At UNLV, the faculty is composed of academic faculty and professional staff. A committee composed of the Faculty Senate chair, the past Senate chair, a senior faculty member, and a representative from the President’s Office considered the analysis and then prepared a summary for campus distribution. A copy of their review was also forwarded to the systems’ chancellor.

These four evaluation models share many elements. They all measured the president’s performance by outlining their expectations in advance, although some were

more detailed in intent and scope. They also sought to measure the achievement of goals, help the president develop, both personally and institutionally, build in methods for feedback and response by all parties, and probably most importantly in the current political climate, measured accountability.

The University of Nevada, Las Vegas model also addressed the role of the faculty in evaluating the president in light of the emphasis on accountability. Basinger (1999) discussed the growing concerns of faculty members who complained that their roles in presidential evaluations have diminished. She cited the example of Myles Brand of the Indiana University System who was judged by his governing board to be “a visionary leader with whom Indiana was most fortunate to be blessed” (p. A39). While the faculty did not fundamentally disagree with the evaluation, they were upset that the university’s governing board had hired an outside consultant to conduct the evaluation. In the past, they had been an integral part of the process, including gathering data and writing up the evaluation report. They were also concerned with a possible conflict of interest between the board, the president, and the outside consultant and alleged that they had a prior relationship. The Association of Governing Boards suggested that this will become the rule, rather than the exception, as presidents and their boards deal with accountability issues.

According to Basinger (1999), boards of trustees and presidents must develop clear and measurable goals to deal with those accountability issues. Ambiguity arises, however, in the changing role of the chief executive. Is he/she the academic leader or the chief fund raiser (Basinger, 1999)? It was sometimes difficult to define expectations.

Boards traditionally completed some sort of evaluation, “but they have often been quite informal” (p. A39).

Presidents and trustees were “understandably apprehensive” (Schwartz, 2001, p. 12) about presidential performance reviews. This needs not be the case if both the president and the board “were intimately involved in creating a clear review process, a timetable, and annual statements of goals and accomplishments for the president” (p. 12).

Compensation of the University President

Basinger (2003b) reported that college presidents’ annual salaries were nearing the \$1 million mark in 2002. Four presidents of private universities earned over \$800,000 in 2002. Three of those earned over \$1 million annually combined with their additional earnings from corporate boards. Shirley Ann Jackson, president of Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute in Troy, NY, was the highest paid college president in the country in 2002 and earned \$891,400 in pay and benefits. During the time Basinger’s article was written, she also served on eight corporate boards and received an additional \$591,000 for that activity (Basinger, 2003b).

Public university presidents’ annual salaries had not yet reached that level, but several were nearing the million dollar mark in 2002 (Basinger, 2003b). According to Basinger (2003b), the number of public university presidents who earn \$500,000 doubled in 2003 to 12. Basinger (2003b) also noted that the highest paid presidents lead doctoral universities where leadership competition was fierce, according to search firm consultants.

In an update in *The Chronicle of Higher Education* a year later, Fain (2005) noted that the 2004 pay packages of 139 public university presidents showed that:

1. Twenty-three have total compensation packages topping \$500,000 for the year, up 35% from the year before.
2. Another 30 received between \$400,000 and \$499,999 in compensation.
3. The median income for the post was \$360,000.

He reported:

the best compensated university leaders were: Mary Sue Coleman of the University of Michigan system (\$724,604); David P. Roselle of the University of Delaware (\$720,522); Mark G. Yudof of the University of Texas system (\$693,677); Carl V. Patton of the Georgia State University (\$688,406); and John T. Casteen III of the University of Virginia (\$659,670). (p. 2)

Basinger (2002) also noted that the highest paid presidents lead doctoral universities where leadership competition was fierce, according to search firm consultants.

Boards of trustees have been concerned with attracting and retaining a successful presidential candidate so that they could provide universities with “the kind of leadership that leads to growth and prosperity” (Cotton, 2003, p. S38). And, most boards were comprised of business people who brought in such bonuses as the performance bonus, the retention bonus, and the signing bonus (Cotton). The compensation packages reflected their business backgrounds and included, in addition to salary, such items as housing, transportation, disability insurance, life insurance, tuition waivers for the president’s children, and presidential spousal compensation (Cotton).

Julie L. Nicklin (2000) reported that 74 private-college presidents earned more than \$300,000 in 1998-99. Presidential salaries were climbing at a time when colleges

were acting more like corporations than educational institutions. This was cause for alarm for some observers.

But trustees, college officials, and headhunters argue that to get a quality leader, you have to pay top dollar. The job, they say, requires skills in many areas, including fund raising, financial management, and academic affairs, and demands long hours. The presidents are being paid what is fair and necessary (Nicklin, p. A26).

Faculty salaries did not match these high presidential salaries and could lead to unrest according to Basinger (2003b). She added that on some campuses, the president made up to 10 times the amount of salary as do faculty members. However, boards say these presidents were worth it and included performance incentives in their compensation packages (Basinger, 2003b). In the case of Shirley Ann Jackson at Rensselaer, a performance-based approach was used to determine her compensation. After she negotiated a \$361-million gift in 2001, the largest donation ever made to an American university, the chair of Rensselaer Board of Trustees, Samuel Heffner, affirmed that “she is just absolutely doing what we wanted a president to do”(cited in Basinger, 2003b, S1).

Basinger (2003b) addressed the issues being raised by faculty and higher-education scholars as to the appropriateness of \$1 million salaries for college presidents. In 2002, the 27 presidents earned \$500,000 or more and all but three of those were leaders of doctoral institutions (Basinger, 2003b).

Trustees and search-firm consultants say the high salaries were necessary to attract the high-quality applicant needed to run a “complex institution” (Basinger, 2003b, p. S1) and that the pool of such applicants was relatively small. Others, such as faculty and higher-education scholars, questioned the relative size of these pools. Trustees were

concerned that their presidents would be lured away by ever more attractive salaries and that their institutions' stability be maintained (Basinger, 2003b). The trustees also recognized the ability of a top administrator to raise large amounts of money during times of economic instability. As a result, trustees were willing to pay big salaries for the "combination of academic, business, political, and fund-raising skills required for successful college presidencies" (p. S1). Patrick M. Callan, president of the National Center for Public Policy and Higher Education, echoed that sentiment when he commented: "When we thought of presidents more as educational leaders, we didn't seem to want to pay them as much. Now that they're seen as fund raisers, we seem to put a higher financial value on their skills" (Callan cited in Basinger, 2003b, p. S1).

Another issue involved in the debate was that boards were less likely to promote internal candidates because of detractors, which further reduced the size of the applicant pool. Boards also tend to "take the path of least resistance" (Basinger, 2003b, p. S1) in their hiring processes, which reduced the pool of presidential candidates and made the offered compensation rise to even greater levels.

Top universities saw the need to increase salaries and provide competitive incentives for their top faculty and researchers. Many argued that university presidents and administrators should be similarly recruited and rewarded. The trend appeared to be growing at public universities around the country with a predictable response from public watchdogs, who fear undue influence and added access from private donors (Basinger, 2003b).

Some critics were ambiguous about the large compensation packages currently provided some university presidents. Derek Bok (2002), university professor and president emeritus of Harvard University, allowed that it was difficult to determine appropriate compensation for CEO's of non-profit organizations. "Precise performance indicators on which one can base a conclusion, like stock prices or annual profits, don't exist" (p. B20). He noted that it is difficult to compare salaries at leading institutions and even more challenging when trying to compare to like colleges and that: "When many corporate executives earn over \$50-million a year, "who can complain about paying the head of the vast University of Texas System a paltry \$800,000" (p. B20).

Bok (2002) also stated that there was little to support the theory that high salaries were needed to attract the most talented applicants or that incentives were needed to improve performance. Most college presidents did not enter the field to make huge salaries. "For them, the real appeal of the job is the chance to make a difference, to exercise influence in a worthy cause, to deal with interesting issues and tackle challenging problems" (p. B21).

There also seemed to be little support for the incentive factor to "ensure high performance" (Bok, 2002, p. B21). Since there was no accepted way to measure institutional performance until recently, trustees were unable to tie salary to presidential performance. Trustees based their performance indicators on a variety of sources such as: "successful fund raising, growing number of applicants for admission, indications of alumni satisfaction, impressions derived from trustee meetings of intelligent leadership and sound judgment" (Bok, 2002, p. B22). In reality, it was difficult for a president to

judge his/her own performance because the measurement indicators were so ambiguous.

Trustees could be aided in their search for equitable comparisons by assessing like institutions but the difficulty was in unreliable instruments to judge their own presidents.

However, Bok stated that even though trustees have no

convincing way to justify large presidential salaries does not necessarily mean that such salaries are harmful. By itself, paying \$200,000 or \$300,000 extra hardly matters in a multibillion-dollar budget, especially if enthusiastic alumni contributed the money for that purpose. (p. B22).

Since most university cultures were collegial rather than hierarchical by nature, the disparity in salary between the chief executive and the faculty may make it difficult to provide convincing leadership in the face of economic downturns when the faculty was asked to accept cutbacks or increased teaching loads. That disparity may also cause faculty and staff to see their leaders as distant figures and create a credibility gap too wide to bridge.

Lipka (2006) cited Robert Atwell, a former president of the American Council on Education, who argued:

Institutional governing boards are believing they are needing to pay salaries that emulate corporate America. We should be deploring what corporate America has done, not emulating it. Excessive compensation can threaten a president's rapport with his faculty and create an us-versus-them situation. (p. 4)

Julianne Basinger and Sarah H. Henderson (2004) noted the "compensation at public research universities is stagnant these days for just about everyone, except for the person in the presidency" (p. 3) In their comments on the disparity in compensation between the president and the faculty, they suggested:

Presidential compensation is being driven up by increasing competition for leaders with proven executive experience, board members from the business world who are used to high executive salaries, and a greater use of pay supplements from private sources. But the widening gap between professors' pay raises and presidential ones, and a backlash against the ideas of private donors having sway over executive compensation, may slow down the growth in presidential salaries. (p. 3)

Basinger and Henderson (2004) added:

But large disparities in compensation between presidents and faculty and staff members can lead to alienation between presidents and other people on campuses, as well as increase the perception that leaders are 'professional presidents' who put their own careers before those of the institution, say Mr. Breneman, and economist who is an expert on higher-education finances. Most states have minimal or no raises for faculty and staff members during the past two years, a period in which most presidents have accepted pay increases, although a few leaders have declined raises. (p. 3)

Basinger and Henderson (2003) addressed the high political price associated with big pay raises in hard economic times for public-university presidents. As more public-university presidents approached the salaries of their private-university counterparts, "professors, lawmakers, and higher-education experts are questioning whether such presidential pay is frivolous, particularly as states have increased tuition and slashed higher-education budgets, cutting programs, and freezing pay for faculty and staff members" (p. S3).

Jan Greenwood, vice president of AT Kearney Executive Search stated:

though the increasing pressures of the top jobs logically call for higher compensation, compensation at public universities is usually tied to state budgets-which, especially now, are rather limiting. And when it comes to state-funded compensation keeping pace with the increasing demands of a president's job, the differentials can be dramatic. (Greenwood cited in Goral, 2003, p. 22)

Goral noted:

Because of the decline in public funding, many public universities must turn to private sources to subsidize programs and provide compensation for their leaders. At the same time, those growing levels of private funding (often coming from foundations that don't fall under the watchful eye of a school's trustees) have brought criticism from some who think such funding may lead to undue influence on a school's direction. (p. 22)

Several state legislatures had recently or were in the process of placing caps on the state salaries of their public-university presidents. But the fierce competition for top candidates by doctoral institution showed no signs of abating. Even in the face of a poor economy, boards continued to offer large salaries to top candidates. Basinger (2003b) suggested, however, that the generous compensation generated “harsh scrutiny” by lawmakers, faculty, and the media (Basinger, 2003b, p.2). Florida’s legislature put a cap of \$225,000 on university presidents’ salaries after eight out of the 11 university boards significantly increased their president’s compensation packages in 2002 and 2003. Most presidents received additional compensation from their foundations.

A September 2006 article in *The Chronicle of Higher Education* noted that South Dakota taxpayers:

will have to pay a greater share of the salaries of public-university presidents, now that the State Board of Regents has decided to eliminate supplemental payments to the officials from college foundations. The regents had permitted colleges to use foundation funds for several years in order to attract top candidates without having to ask the state for more money, but board members expressed concern that the system could lead to pay inequities and possibly a lawsuit. In the short term, university finances will be rearranged to cover the salary differential, but colleges could have to ask legislators for extra financial support. (2006, p. 1)

Many comparisons have been made to the increasingly high salaries received by university presidents and CEOs of large corporations. Marquez (2006) stated much “bad press over executive pay has hurt the image of corporate America” (p. 8). She noted:

Eighty-five percent of institutional investors and 79 percent of corporate directors agree that the current executive pay model has damaged the image of American big business . . . However, 65 percent of directors think that the current executive pay model, which they believe is tied to performance, has improved corporate returns, while only 22 percent of institutional investors agree with that statement. (p. 8)

Echoing the same argument many boards of trustees use regarding compensation for their available pool of applicants, Marquez cited compensation consultant, Ira Kay, who speculated:

Directors realize that they have to pay high premiums to retain and recruit top talent . . . The highest-paid CEOs run the highest-performing companies, while the lowest-paid CEOs run the lowest-paid companies. . . If companies start cutting their incentive pay, they are going to have a hard time attracting and retaining the best talent to lead their companies. That will hurt corporate America as a whole. The dilemma is that directors have to recruit, retain and motivate these executives. (cited in Marquez, 2006, p.8)

Additional review of the literature on the salaries of the corporate giants revealed that “with CEOs now making 431 times more than the average worker, up from 142 times more in 1994, outrage is growing”(Foroohar, Rana, Sheridan & Barrett, 2006, p. 18). A study by academics Cabaix of MIT and Landier of New York University showed that:

since 1980 the pay of CEOs has risen in lock step with the market capitalization of their companies: both are up 500 percent. Using this logic, CEOs like Chevron’s David O’Reilly (who collected some \$25 million in 2005) aren’t overpaid, because they are running even bigger, riskier firms, making decisions that touch more and more people. (2006, p. 1)

The authors added, “Gabiex compares CEOs to actors and sports figures—‘if you have the talent to be among the best 500 in your field, you’ll be rewarded accordingly” (cited in Foroohar, Rana, Sheridan & Barrett, 2006, p.18).

According to Galloro, Benko, and Zigmond (2006), “the rabid interest in the pay and perks of chief executive officers shows no signs of abating. . .” (2006, p.6).

Frank Morgan, a Jefferies & Co. analyst . . .said analysts and investors now pay more attention to executive compensation because there is ‘heightened scrutiny’ around the topic, but added, ‘At the end of the day, it’s about performance. If you post good operating results, that’s what people pay attention to.’ (Galloro, Benko, and Zigmond, 2006, p.6)

Lipka (2005) cites Martha Sullivan of the Internal Revenue Service Exempt Organizations Division who remarked:

At a time when institutional accounting practices are under intense scrutiny amid high-profile corporate-fraud cases like Enron, executive compensation has become a contentious issue at colleges as well as companies. Many higher-education institutions are voluntarily complying with the Sarbanes-Oxley Act, a financial-reporting law that Congress passed in 2002 in an effort to restore public faith in corporate America. The Internal Revenue Service has begun an examination of compensation policies and procedures at about 2,000 nonprofit institutions, and colleges ‘are certainly in the mix.’ (p. 27)

Summary

This chapter reviewed the literature on the history, roles, selection, evaluation, and compensation of university presidents in the United States. The review appeared to suggest that while the roles have not changed significantly over the years, there has been a shift in the importance assigned to specific roles. The review also suggested the selection, evaluation, and compensation of the presidents appeared to be strongly influenced by the demands of a market economy.

CHAPTER 3 METHODOLOGY

Introduction

A review of higher education journals and news articles indicated that the issues of presidential selection, evaluation, and compensation of public university presidents are in the forefront of national academic and political debate (Basinger, 2003; Fain, 2004; Goral, 2003). The major political and organizational shift that occurred in higher education governance in Florida in 2001 caused the state to be included in the discussion. The purpose of this study was to analyze the trends, if any, in the selection, evaluation, and compensation of the 11 university presidents in the Florida State University System (SUS) from 1996-2006, the period 5 years before and 5 years after the change in governance.

Statement of the Problem

A review of the literature showed that although much has been written about the university presidency in general, minimal research has been done on the subject of Florida's SUS presidents in particular, especially since the 2001 changes in Florida's higher education governance. Using interviews with university presidents in the Florida SUS, members of boards of trustees, members of the Florida Board of Governors, and members of the Florida Legislature, this study analyzed the trends in the selection, evaluation, and compensation of the university presidents in the Florida SUS. It also addressed the impact that changes in the perception of the roles of the presidents and

changes in higher education governance has had on the compensation of university presidents in the Florida State University System.

Research Questions

1. What are the roles of the university presidents in the Florida State University System?
2. What are the trends, if any, in the selection of university presidents in the Florida State University System from 1996-2006?
3. What are the trends, if any, in the evaluation of university presidents in the Florida State University System from 1996-2006?
4. What are the trends, if any, in the compensation of university presidents in the Florida State University System from 1996-2006?

Selection of the Population

The original population of this study consisted of the 11 university presidents in the Florida State University System, the 17 members of the Florida Board of Governors, the 143 members of the boards of trustees at the 11 Florida State University System, the 160 members of the Florida Legislature, former university presidents in the Florida State University System, and members of the former Florida Board of Regents. Contacting the former presidents of the Florida State University System was difficult for a variety of reasons, including that the researcher was unable to obtain current addresses for some and because of health issues for others. Several attempts were made to contact former

members of the Florida Board of Regents, but also without success. Although their contributions would have been valuable for an historical perspective, because of their lack of availability for interviews, the researcher removed these two populations from the study.

Selection of the Sample

Moustakas' (1994) *Phenomenological Research Methods*, suggested “general considerations . . . that include age, race, religion, ethnic and cultural factors, gender, and political and economic factors” (p.107) be taken into account when selecting research participants. He also noted that it was essential that:

essential criteria include: the research participant has experienced the phenomenon, is intensely interested in understanding its nature and meanings, is willing to participate in a lengthy interview and (perhaps a follow-up interview), grants the investigator the right to be tape-record . . . , and be willing to have the results published in a dissertation or other publications. (p. 107)

Gall, Gall and Borg (2003) cited the researcher's need to have to use a purposeful sample, one in which the selected cases were “likely to be information-rich with respect to the purposes of a qualitative study” (p. 178). They listed several types of purposeful samples and the type most useful for this study was “maximum variation sampling,” which “involves selecting cases that illustrate the range of variation in the phenomena to be studied” (p. 179). They added that “this strategy serves two purposes: to document the range of variation in the . . . projects and to determine whether common themes, patterns, and outcomes cut across this variation” (p. 179).

A maximum variation sample of each population used was contacted for face-to-face or telephone interviews. The sample size of four university presidents was selected by their geographic location in the state of Florida, size of the institution, age of the institution, and academic or non-academic background of the president, and his or her availability. For members of the boards of trustees, the sample size of seven was selected by geographic location and his or her availability. For members of the Florida Board of Governors, the sample size of four was selected by geographic location and the governors' availability. For members of the Florida Legislature, the sample size of three was selected by availability. In compliance with the standards of the University of Central Florida Institutional Review Board (UCFIRB), all participants were over the age of 18 and were not compensated for their participation.

The data for university presidential compensation histories were originally requested from each of the 11 institutions for the period 1986-2006. Several of the human resources departments had difficulty in retrieving and providing archival data relating to presidential compensation, but most were able to provide a 10-year history. An additional reason for the change in the request for a 20-year history of presidential compensation was that two of the institutions did not exist as public universities for 20 years. Florida Gulf Coast University, located in Fort Myers, Florida, was established in 1991 as the 10th university in the Florida State University System. Its first president was appointed in 1993. New College of Florida, located in Sarasota, Florida, formerly New College of the University of South Florida, was established as a separate institution and the 11th university in the system by the Florida Legislature in May 2001.

Tables and figures in Chapter 4 were used to track the trends in university presidential compensation. To better compare the institutions, the researcher used a 10-year history of compensation, where available.

Instrumentation

The researcher created and used four sets of interview questions for the sample members. These included a 16-item instrument for current SUS presidents (Appendix E), a 17-item instrument for the members of the boards of trustees (Appendix F), a 14-item instrument for the members of the Board of Governors (Appendix G), and an 18-item instrument for the members of the Florida Legislature (Appendix H). The researcher conducted a pilot study of the interview questions with faculty members and educational leadership doctoral students and made adjustments based on their suggestions and revisions. All questions and related materials for the interviews were then submitted to the university's institutional review board for approval. After IRB approval, interviews were conducted in face-to-face sessions or by telephone (Appendix I).

Data Collection

Phenomenological interviewing techniques and analysis methods suggested by Moustakas were modified for use in this study. Moustakas (1994) suggested that after “developing a set of questions to guide the interview process” (p.103), the long interview was typically the method by which a researcher collected data on a topic in phenomenological research. He declared that human science researchers should be

“guided by the ethical principles in research with human participants” (p. 109). The interview should begin with “social conversation to create a relaxed and trusting atmosphere” (p. 114) and utilize open-ended questions to illicit responses that are “honest and comprehensive” (p. 114).

In face-to-face interviews conducted from July 21, 2006, to October 18, 2006, each participant was given a copy of the informed consent form as required by the UCF Institutional Review Board. Table 2 reveals the participant categories and interview dates and methods of interviewing. Participants were asked if they agreed to be tape-recorded. All participants, except for one, agreed to be tape-recorded. The exception was noted on the participant’s informed consent form and the researcher took extensive notes during that interview. In interviews completed by telephone, the researcher explained the informed consent process and form and asked permission of the participant to tape-record the interview, with the participant’s agreement noted on the informed consent form.

All interviews were preceded by general conversation and then the participants were asked several closed-ended questions such as how long they had been at their institutions and how their presidents had been selected. Next, they were asked for their own brief occupational histories. The participants were then asked a series of questions (see Appendixes E, F, G, and H) regarding their perceptions of the roles of a university president and their observations on the selection, evaluation, and compensation of their presidents.

Table 2

Participant Interview Dates and Interview Methods

Participant	Date of interview	Method of interview
President A	July 21, 2006	Face-to-face
President B	August 17, 2006	Face-to-face
President C	August 4, 2006	Face-to-face
President D	September 7, 2006	Face-to-face
Trustee A	September 1, 2006	Face-to-face
Trustee B	August 23, 2006	Face-to-face
Trustee C	September 7, 2006	Face-to-face
Trustee D	August 28, 2006	Face-to-face
Trustee E	October 18, 2006	Telephone
Trustee F	September 7, 2006	Face-to-face
Governor A	August 31, 2006	Telephone
Governor B	August 17, 2006	Face-to-face
Governor C	October 18, 2006	Face-to-face
Legislator A	October 16, 2006	Telephone
Legislator B	October 18, 2006	Telephone

Data Analysis

Moustakas (1994) offered two models of analysis modified from prior researchers, the Van Kaam Method and the Stevick-Colaizzi-Keen Method, to analyze data (1994). His modified Van Kaam Method seemed the most appropriate for the analysis of data in this study. Using this method, Moustakas suggested that after a complete transcription of each research participant's interview, the researcher should:

1. List every expression relevant to the experience. (Horizontilization)
2. Test each expression for two requirements
 - a. Does it contains a moment of experience necessary and sufficient for understanding it?
 - b. Is it possible to abstract and label it?
3. Cluster the invariant constituents of the experience that are related to a thematic label.
4. Identify the invariant constituents and themes by application. (Validation) (5. and 6. involve working with a co-researcher and are therefore not applicable to this study)
7. Construct *for each research participant a Textual-Structured Description* of the meanings and essences of the experience, incorporating the variant constituents and themes, followed by a *composite description of the meanings and essences of the experience, representing the group as a whole.* (p. 120-121)

After each of the interviews was transcribed, the researcher followed Moustakas' (1994) modified Van Kaam Method and "listed every expression relevant to the experience" (p.121). Next, each expression was tested for two requirements: a) did it contain a "moment of experience necessary and sufficient for understanding it and, b) was is possible to abstract and label?" (p. 121). The "invariant constituents of the experience" (p. 121) were clustered thematically. Next, the invariant constituents and the themes were identified. Finally, a "textual-structured description of the meanings and

essences” (p. 121) was constructed for each participant and a composite description, incorporating the “meanings and essences” (p. 121) of the group as a whole.

The interviews for the university presidents, members of the boards of trustees, members of the Board of Governors, and members of the Florida Legislature were designed to encapsulate the participants’ backgrounds, their perceptions of the roles of the university presidents, and their perceptions of the trends in the selection, evaluation, and compensation of university presidents in the Florida SUS. The four research questions for this study were analyzed using the participants’ response to selected questions in each interview instrument.

Table 3

Research Question 1

Participant Category	Interview Question	Appendix
SUS President	7, 8, 9, 10	E
Member of Board of Trustees	8, 10	F
Member of the Board of Governors	7, 8	G
Member of the Florida Legislature	10, 11	H

Research Question 1: “What are the roles of the university presidents in the SUS?” was analyzed using the participants’ responses to selected interview questions. From the *SUS President Interview* questions, the following set of questions was analyzed to determine the roles of the university presidents:

Interview Question 7: Describe your role(s) when you first became president of your university?

Interview Question 8: What is the most significant change in role(s) since you were hired?

Interview Question 9: Describe your role(s) today as president of your university?

Interview Question 10: What are most important attributes that you bring to your role(s) as president?

From the *Member of a Board of Trustees Interview* questions, the following set of questions was analyzed to determine the roles of the university presidents:

Interview Question 8: Describe the role(s) of the president of your university.

Interview Question 10: What is the most significant change in the role(s) since he/she was hired?

From the *Member of the Board of Governors Interview* questions, the following set of questions was analyzed to determine the roles of the university presidents:

Interview Question 7: Describe the role(s) of a president of a State University System university.

Interview Question 8: What is the most significant change in the role(s) after he/she is hired?

From the *Member of the Florida Legislature Interview* questions, the following set of questions was analyzed to determine the roles of the university presidents:

Interview Question 10: Describe the role(s) of the university presidents in the State University System.

Interview Question 11: What are the most significant change(s) in role(s) after he/she is hired?

The researcher also used the university presidents' position description as outlined by the state-wide classification system as well as the duties of the president as detailed in Florida statutes.

Table 4

Research Question 2

<u>Participant Category</u>	<u>Interview Question</u>	<u>Appendix</u>
SUS President	5, 6, 10	E
Member of Board of Trustees	5, 9, 11, 16	F
Member of the Board of Governors	6, 9	G
Member of the Florida Legislature	9, 12, 13, 14	H

Research Question 2: "What are the trends, if any, in the selection of university presidents in the SUS from 1996-2006?" This question was analyzed using the participants' responses to the following selected interview questions.

From the *SUS President Interview* questions, the following set of questions was analyzed to determine the trends, if any, in the selection of the university presidents:

Interview Question 5: Were you hired by the Board of Regents? Board of Trustees? Other?

Interview Question 6: Describe the process by which you were selected as president.

Interview Question 10: What are most important attributes that you bring to your role(s) as president?

From the *Member of a Board of Trustees Interview* questions, the following set of questions was analyzed to determine the trends, if any, in the selection of the university presidents:

Interview Question 5: Was your current president hired by the Board of Regents? Board of Trustees? Other?

Interview Question 9: Describe the process by which your president was selected.

Interview Question 11: What are most important attributes that he/she brings to his/her presidency?

Interview Question 16: How will your board select its next university president?

From the *Member of the Board of Governors Interview* questions, the following questions were analyzed to determine the trends, if any, in the selection of the university presidents:

Interview Question 6: Describe the process by which the Board of Governors approves the selection of a university president.

Interview Question 9: What are most important attributes that he/she brings to his/her presidency?

From the *Member of the Florida Legislature Interview* questions, the following question was analyzed to determine the trends, if any, in the selection of the university presidents:

Interview Question 12: What are most important attributes that he/she brings to his/her presidency?

Interview Question 13: What attributes are most important to the Florida Legislature?

Interview Question 14: What attributes are most important to you as a legislator?

The researcher also reviewed Florida statues to assess the legal, formal process used for selecting university presidents as well as the published biographies of the 11 university presidents to analyze their backgrounds, occupational histories, and other aspects that may have factored into their being selected as presidents.

Table 5

Research Question 3

Participant Category	Interview Question	Appendix
SUS President	11, 12, 13	E
Member of Board of Trustees	11, 12, 13, 14	F
Member of the Board of Governors	10, 11, 12	G
Member of the Florida Legislature	15, 16	H

Research Question 3: “What are the trends, if any, in the evaluation of university presidents in the SUS from 1996-2006?” This question was analyzed using the participants’ responses to the following selected interview questions.

From the *SUS President Interview* questions, the following set of questions was analyzed to determine the trends, if any, in the evaluation of the university presidents:

Interview Question 11: What attributes that you bring to your presidency are most important to your board of trustees?

Interview Question 12: How are those attributes evaluated and measured? How often?

Interview Question 13: Does your evaluation impact your compensation? If so, how?

From the *Member of a Board of Trustees Interview* questions, the following set of questions was analyzed to determine the trends, if any, in the evaluation of the university presidents:

Interview Question 12: What attributes of your president are most important to your board of trustees?

Interview Question 13: How are those attributes of your president evaluated and measured? How often?

Interview Question 14: Does your evaluation of your president impact his/her compensation? If so, in what way?

From the *Member of the Board of Governors Interview* questions, the following set of questions was analyzed to determine the trends, if any, in the evaluation of the university presidents:

Interview Question 10: Which of those attributes are most important to the Board of Governors?

Interview Question 11: How should those attributes be evaluated and measured?
How often?

Interview Question 12: Should the evaluation impact his/her compensation?
How?

From the *Member of the Florida Legislature Interview* questions, the following set of questions was analyzed to determine the trends, if any, in the evaluation of the university presidents:

Interview Question 15: How should those attributes be evaluated and measured?
How often?

Interview Question 16: How should the evaluation impact his/her compensation?

The researcher also used presidential evaluations provided by several SUS presidents that were completed by their boards of trustees and/or outside consultants.

Table 6

Research Question 4

Participant Category	Interview Question	Appendix
SUS President	14	E
Member of Board of Trustees	15	F
Member of the Board of Governors	13	G
Member of the Florida Legislature	17	H

Research Question 4: “What are the trends, if any, in the compensation of university presidents in the SUS from 1996-2006?” This question was analyzed using the participants’ responses to the following selected interview questions.

From the *SUS President Interview* questions, the following set of questions was analyzed to determine the trends, if any, in the compensation of the university presidents:

Interview Question 14: How has the 2003 legislative salary cap of \$225,000 impacted your compensation package, if at all?

From the *Member of a Board of Trustees Interview* questions, the following set of questions was analyzed to determine the trends, if any, in the compensation of the university presidents:

Interview Question 15: How has the 2003 legislative salary cap of \$225,000 impacted the presidential compensation package at your institution, if at all?

From the *Member of the Board of Governors Interview* questions, the following set of questions was analyzed to determine the trends, if any, in the compensation of the university presidents:

Interview Question 13: How has the 2003 legislative salary cap of \$225,000 impacted the presidential compensation package, if at all?

From the *Member of the Florida Legislature Interview* questions, the following set of questions was analyzed to determine the trends, if any, in the compensation of the university presidents:

Interview Question 17: How has the 2003 legislative salary cap of \$225,000 impacted the presidential compensation package, if at all?

The researcher also reviewed the 2003 Florida Legislative salary cap legislation. The 10-year compensation histories provided by the 11 university human resources departments were used to produce the figures in Chapter 4.

Summary

This study used data collected from interviews with Florida SUS presidents, members of SUS boards of trustees, members of the Florida Board of Governors, and members of the Florida Legislature. The researcher also collected compensation history data from 1996-2006 for Florida SUS presidents. The data provided in the interviews were analyzed using Moustakas' modified Van Kaam Method. The presidential salary histories were analyzed to reveal the trends in compensation. The results of the interview responses and the compensation histories statistics are presented in Chapter 4.

CHAPTER 4

RESULTS

Introduction

This chapter provides the results of the 15 interviews with the sample population and offers a review of presidential compensation from 1996 through 2006. The first section presents a profile of the 11 Florida SUS presidents and describes their demographic characteristics as well as those of the Florida SUS boards of trustees and the Florida Board of Governors. The second section analyzes the data and contains the participants' responses to the four research questions and compensation history data. The third section is a summary of the chapter.

Population Profile and Demographics

A profile of the Florida SUS presidents, their institutions, their institutions' enrollment figures for the fall semester of 2005, the highest degree attained by the president and the area of concentration, their career paths to the presidency, whether they were hired by the Board of Regents or by their board of trustees, and the number of years they had been in their current presidencies is presented in Table 7. The table shows that the average student enrollment of an SUS university was 25,935 in the fall semester of 2005; the most common degree attained by the presidents was a doctor of philosophy with a concentration in psychology; the most common career path to the presidency was

academic; the majority was hired by boards of trustees; and the average length of service in the current presidency was 6.3 years.

Table 7

Profile of Florida State University System Presidents

President	SUS Institution	Enrollment Fall 2005	Degree(s) Attained and Area of Concentration	Academic or Political Career Path	Hired BOR/ BOT	Years in Current Presidency
Castell V. Bryant (Interim)	Florida Agricultural & Mechanical University	12,179	Ed.D.	Academic	BOT	1.5
Frank Brogan	Florida Atlantic University	25,704	M.A. Education	Political	BOT	3.5
William C. Merwin	Florida Gulf Coast University	7,264	Ph.D. History	Academic	BOR	7
Modesto A. Maidique	Florida International University	36,975	Ph.D. Electrical Engineering & Computer Science	Academic	BOR	20
T.K. Wetherell	Florida State University	39,652	Ph.D. Education	Political	BOT	3.5
Gordon E. Michalson, Jr.	New College of Florida	762	Ph.D. Philosophy of Religion	Academic	BOT	3.5
John C. Hitt	University of Central Florida	44,953	Ph.D. Physiological Psychology	Academic	BOR	14.5
J. Bernard Machen	University of Florida	49,725	D.D.S. & Ph.D. Educational Psychology	Academic	BOT	3
John A. Delaney	University of North Florida	15,353	J.D.	Political	BOT	3
Judy L. Genshaft	University of South Florida	43,021	Ph.D. Counseling Psychology	Academic	BOR	6
John C. Cavanaugh	University of West Florida	9,701	Ph.D. Psychology	Academic	BOT	4

The demographic information of the Florida SUS presidents are summarized in Table 8. The average president was male, 60 years old, and Caucasian. A review of presidential diversity revealed that there were two female presidents, one African American president (one of the two females), and one Hispanic president.

Table 8

Demographics of Florida State University System Presidents

President	SUS Institution	Gender	Age	Race or Ethnicity
Castell V. Bryant	FAMU	Female	68	African American
Frank Brogan	FAU	Male	53	Caucasian
William C. Merwin	FGCU	Male	67	Caucasian
Modesto A. Maidique	FIU	Male	66	Hispanic
T.K. Wetherell	FSU	Male	60	Caucasian
Gordon E. Michalson	New College	Male	58	Caucasian
John C. Hitt	UCF	Male	65	Caucasian
J. Bernard Machen	UF	Male	62	Caucasian
John A. Delaney	UNF	Male	50	Caucasian
Judy L. Genshaft	USF	Female	58	Caucasian
John C. Cavanaugh	UWF	Male	60	Caucasian

The 11 boards of trustees were composed of 13 members each. Six members were selected by the governor, five members were selected by the Board of Governors, and the chair of each university's faculty senate and the president of each university's student

government association served as voting, ex officio members. According to Florida

Statute 1001.71:

(1) Pursuant to s. 7(c), Art. IX of the State Constitution, each local constituent university shall be administered by a university board of trustees comprised of 13 members as follows: 6 citizen members appointed by the Governor subject to confirmation by the Senate; 5 citizen members appointed by the Board of Governors subject to confirmation by the Senate; the chair of the faculty senate or the equivalent; and the president of the student body of the university. The appointed members shall serve staggered 5-year terms. In order to achieve staggered terms, beginning July 1, 2003, of the initial appointments by the Governor, 2 members shall serve 2-year terms, 3 members shall serve 3-year terms, and 1 member shall serve a 5-year term and of the initial appointments by the Board of Governors, 2 members shall serve 2-year terms, 2 members shall serve 3-year terms, and 1 member shall serve a 5-year term. There shall be no state residency requirement for university board members, but the Governor and the Board of Governors shall consider diversity and regional representation.

Table 9 revealed the results of a review of the occupational backgrounds of the 143 members of the 11 boards of trustees.

Table 9

Boards of Trustees' Occupational Backgrounds (N=143)

Boards of Trustees Members' Occupational Background	Number	Percentage
Chief Executive Officer	29	20%
Attorney	13	9%
Vice President	8	5%
Retired	8	5%
President	6	4%
Other	53	37%
Student Government Association President	13	9%
Faculty Senate Chair	13	9%

The Board of Governors was composed of 17 members, 14 of whom were appointed by the governor. The commissioner of education is a member of a board as well as a representative from the 11 faculty senates and a representative from the 11 student government presidents' association. According to Florida Statute 1001.70:

the Board of Governors is established as a body corporate comprised of 17 members as follows: 14 citizen members appointed by the Governor subject to confirmation by the Senate; the Commissioner of Education; the chair of the advisory council of faculty senates or the equivalent; and the president of the Florida student association or the equivalent. The appointed members shall serve staggered 7-year terms. In order to achieve staggered terms, beginning July 1, 2003, of the initial appointments, 4 members shall serve 2-year terms, 5 members shall serve 3-year terms, and 5 members shall serve 7-year terms.

A review of the demographics of the remaining 14 members of the Board of Governors revealed that the composition of the board was primarily male, the most common occupational designation was attorney, and the next most common occupational designation was business executive. There were also two physicians and one retired university president on the board.

Table 10

Board of Governors Members' Occupational Backgrounds (N=17)

Board of Governors Members' Occupational Backgrounds	Number	Percentage
Attorney	6	35%
Physician	2	12%
Real Estate	2	12%
Chief Executive Officer/President	2	12%
Retired University President	1	6%
Transportation	1	6%
Professor	1	6%
Student Government Association President	1	6%
Commissioner of Education	1	6%

Moustakas' (1994) *Phenomenological Research Methods*, suggested "general considerations . . . that include age, race, religion, ethnic and cultural factors, gender, and political and economic factors" (p.107) be taken into account when selecting research participants. He also noted the:

essential criteria include: the research participant has experienced the phenomenon, is intensely interested in understanding its nature and meanings, is willing to participate in a lengthy interview and (perhaps a follow-up interview), grants the investigator the right to be tape-record . . . , and be willing to have the results published in a dissertation or other publications. (p. 107)

Gall, Gall and Borg (2003) cited the researcher's need to have to use a purposeful sample, one in which the selected cases were "likely to be information-rich with respect to the purposes of a qualitative study" (p. 178). They listed several types of purposeful samples and the type most useful for this study was "maximum variation sampling," which "involves selecting cases that illustrate the range of variation in the phenomena to be studied" (p. 179). "This strategy serves two purposes: to document the range of variation in the . . . projects and to determine whether common themes, patterns, and outcomes cut across this variation" (p. 179).

A maximum variation sample of each population used was contacted for face-to-face or telephone interviews. The sample size of four university presidents was selected by geographic location in the state of Florida, size of the institution, age of the institution, and academic or non-academic background of the president, and availability. For members of the boards of trustees, the sample size of seven was selected by geographic location and availability. For members of the Florida Board of Governors, the sample size of four was selected by geographic location and availability. For members of the Florida Legislature, the sample size of three was selected by availability. In compliance with the standards of the University of Central Florida Institutional Review Board, all participants were over the age of 18 and were not compensated for their participation.

The data for university presidential compensation histories were originally requested from each of the 11 institutions for the period 1986-2006. Several of the human resources departments had difficulty in retrieving and providing archival data relating to presidential compensation, but most were able to provide a 10-year history. An additional reason for the change in the request for a 20-year history of presidential compensation was that two of the institutions were not in existence as public universities for 20 years. Florida Gulf Coast University, located in Fort Myers, Florida, was established in 1991 as the 10th university in the Florida State University System. Its first president was appointed in 1993. New College of Florida, located in Sarasota, Florida, was formerly New College of the University of South Florida was established as a separate institution and the 11th university in the system by the Florida Legislature in May 2001.

Tables and figures in Chapter 4 were used to track the trends in university presidential compensation. To better compare the institutions, the researcher used a 10 year history of compensation, where available.

In this study, presidents A, B, C, and D were interviewed in face-to-face sessions. President A came to the presidency from a political background and was hired by the board of trustees. President B also came to the presidency from a political background and was hired by the board of trustees. President C followed a traditional academic path to the presidency and was hired by the Board of Regents. President D also followed a traditional academic path to the presidency and was hired by the Board of Regents.

Six members of the boards of trustees were interviewed in this study. They were represented by Trustee A, a member of the University of Central Florida Board of

Trustees and a corporate consultant who started her career as a public school teacher. Trustee B was a member of the University of Central Florida Board of Trustees and a retired chief executive officer. She had a background in higher education, having served as an administrator at several universities. She also started her career as a public school teacher. Trustee C was a member of the University of South Florida Board of Trustees and an attorney and CEO. She was previously a higher education administrator. Trustee D was a member of the University of Central Florida Board of Trustees and the president of a business consulting firm and the retired chairman of a major tourist industry conglomerate. Trustee E was a member of the Florida State University Board of Trustees and is a retired senior vice president at a major tourist industry conglomerate. Trustee F was a member of the University of South Florida Board of Trustees and held an administrative position with an engineering firm. A member of the Florida State University Board of Trustees was also asked to participate, but after the researcher outlined the questions, she stated that the study was “too political and I’m going to have to decline.”

Three members of the Florida Board of Governors were represented in this study. Governor A was an attorney in north Florida and a former member of a board of trustees. Governor B was also an attorney in north Florida. Governor C was an ex officio member of the BOG. A fourth member of the BOG was contacted twice but did not return the researcher’s telephone calls.

Two members of the Florida Legislature were represented in this study. Legislator A was a member of the Florida Senate whose district encompassed part of the east coast

and part of the center of the state. She was the chair of the Education Committee. Legislator B was a member of the Florida House of Representatives and his district encompassed part of the center of the state. He is the chair of the Education Council. The researcher attempted three additional interviews with members of the Florida Legislature. One legislator initially agreed to be interviewed but then later suggested that the researcher talk to Legislator B. Another legislator said he did not have the time to be interviewed until after the November 2006 elections. Another legislator was contacted for an interview but did not return the researcher's telephone calls.

Research Questions and Results

The interviews for the university presidents, members of the boards of trustees, members of the Board of Governors, and members of the Florida Legislature were designed to encapsulate the participants' backgrounds, their perceptions of the roles of the university presidents, and their perceptions of the trends in the selection, evaluation, and compensation of university presidents in the Florida SUS. The participants were interviewed in face-to-face interviews and by telephone. Table 11 lists the participants, dates of interviews, and methods of interviews.

Moustakas' (1994) modified Van Kaam Method seemed the most appropriate for an analysis of data in this study. Using this method, Moustakas suggested that after a complete transcription of each research participant's interview, the researcher should:

1. List every expression relevant to the experience. (Horizontilization)
2. Test each expression for two requirements

- a. Does it contain a moment of experience necessary and sufficient for understanding it?
 - b. Is it possible to abstract and label it?
3. Cluster the invariant constituents of the experience that are related to a thematic label.
4. Identify the invariant constituents and themes by application. (Validation) (5. and 6. involve working with a co-researcher and are therefore not applicable to this study)
7. Construct *for each research participant a Textual-Structured Description* of the meanings and essences of the experience, incorporating the variant constituents and themes, followed by a *composite description of the meanings and essences of the experience, representing the group as a whole.* (p. 120-121)

After each of the interviews was transcribed, the researcher followed Moustakas' (1994) modified Van Kaam Method and "listed every expression relevant to the experience" (p.121). Next, each expression was tested for two requirements: (a) did it contain a "moment of experience necessary and sufficient for understanding it and, (b) was it possible to abstract and label it?"(p. 121). The comments that met the two requirements and were relevant to the research question were included in this section. All comments were paraphrased unless in quotation marks. Attempts to protect the confidentiality of the presidential participants were made by removing references to gender and location.

The researcher also used compensation history data from seven SUS universities to chart the trends in compensation from 1996-2006 for Research Question 4. The results are listed in Tables 15 and 16 and Figures 2 and 3.

Research Question 1: "What are the roles of the university presidents in the Florida SUS?" was analyzed using the participants' responses to selected interview

questions. Not all participants responded to each interview question. Please see Table 3 in Chapter 3.

Interview Responses from SUS Presidents

From the *SUS President Interview*, the following responses to the questions were collected to analyze the roles of the university presidents:

Interview Question 7: Describe your role(s) when you first became president of your university?

President B remarked that “the president doesn’t really run the university—it is run by the faculty. You don’t lead in a traditional sense—you push and steer in a particular direction.” According to this president, “it’s up to the president to set a direction and to map out a vision for the institution.”

President C stated that the roles were much the same when first arriving at the university to today, but that the “relative emphasis is different.” Upon arrival, it was a much smaller campus and the first priority was to construct buildings and develop the campus infrastructure. The focus was internal rather than external although there was competition with the other institutions for funding from the legislature for campus projects. The early presidency was described as an internal presidency although there were expectations to raise funds in the community.

President D recalled that when first assuming the presidency, the roles were “economic development, fundraising, community building, and raising the level of the university to that of a greater research university.”

Interview Question 8: What is the most significant change in role(s) since you were hired?

President C stated that if one looked at the original list of the roles performed, “the list remained the same but the percentages of the effort had shifted to a more external presidency.” Although a fundraiser, President C “still retained a strong interest in what happened on campus and in academics and what went on in the classrooms and labs.” President C “maintained a real interest in undergraduate education.” One of the most significant changes noted since beginning the presidency was the establishment of the board of trustees. President C acknowledged that the board of trustees had brought “greater scrutiny.” There was “adequate oversight under the Board of Regents but it was more oversight by the BOR staff.” President C’s university was “in the middle of the pack—it didn’t get a lot of attention from the BOR.” This university “wasn’t the factor it has become since the changes in governance.”

President D took over after one and a half to two years of interim presidents, “it was a little off balance. Everybody had been waiting for stability and leadership.” President D ran into issues that were a surprise, but declared that “all new presidents have surprises—things you weren’t told about.” Because of the exhaustive hiring process, President D was not able to ask the desired questions and get the “nitty-gritty.” President D noted that it was difficult to get information on the institution. Several issues were inherited such as “the restructuring of the regional campuses, athletics scandals, and lots of other problems.” As a result, some of the original goals could not be achieved. There

were “lots of fires to put out” and mistakes from many predecessors to be corrected. The president laughed and said “Now I’m correcting my own mistakes.”

Interview Question 9: Describe your role(s) today as president of your university.

President A asserted that the board expected the president of the university to:

1. oversee a \$500 million budget
2. recommend policies, practices, and procedures that are legal and ethical
3. oversee implementation of policies, practices, and procedures
4. hire and fire personnel who will implement policies, practices, and procedures to its satisfaction
5. plan for the growth of the institution from a facilities and infrastructure standpoint and from an academic and programmatic standpoint
6. interface with 28,000 students, every one of them, in a variety of venues
7. serve as a liaison to faculty, with the provost, and make sure that the faculty is world-class, to constantly be recruiting and adding world-class faculty
8. oversee the collective bargaining process that determined the compensation packages of faculty and staff
9. interface with entire community: region, state, nation, and world in higher education
10. work with the governance system that included the Board of Governors and the legislature, in tandem with the university’s strategic plan, to develop and secure funding for the growth and development of the university
11. conduct himself in a personal and professional way
12. be an ambassador for the university
13. to evaluate or oversee the evaluation of all employees and deal with any problems
14. see after every crisis from hurricanes to scandal and make sure it had minimal impact on the institution
15. oversee Division I, NCAA program composed of 18 teams and 450 student athletes, and a \$12 million budget with implications for public relations that could range from good to potentially bad
16. craft a research vision for the university and be the cheerleader and liaison to the research community, not only in higher education but in not-for-profit and with private research groups
17. be the chief executive officer of the university
18. be a fundraiser

President C cited the biggest change in the role was that the focus was now on external matters as opposed to internal matters.

Interview Question 10: What are the most important attributes that you bring to your role(s) as president?

President A was hired for a specific set of skills and . . . “obviously didn’t have university experience, but that also meant that I didn’t bring a pre-cast set to the university experience.” Since President A was not an academic, but was

viewed as the enemy by some, they thought I was going to run the place like Ford Motors or worse. They wondered if that signaled a sea change in the world of academia where all presidents become chief executive officers and they’ll be bringing them in from steel companies and politics and that would somehow diminish the importance of the academic.

President A believed that the two models, academic and non-traditional, were not mutually exclusive.

President C brought a wealth of experience to the presidency and “was probably as well prepared for a presidency as one could get without being a president.” As a provost for 10 years and having performed as a Chief Executive Officer (CEO) in that capacity, the president had to be responsible for income and expenditures. “Provosts usually spend money but do not have to bring it in.” It was unusual, but while provost, President C was also the chair of the budget committee and had responsibilities for student affairs. With experience at public and private universities, President C learned the politics of academia, managed a budget, worked with a faculty, organized research units, and provided instructional resources.

President D brought the attributes of “trustworthiness, vision of a top-level research university, connectivity with community groups as well as university groups,

and the ability to walk both lines, and a passion for improving and striving for a better university.”

Interview Responses from Members of the Boards of Trustees

From the *Member of a Board of Trustees Interview*, the following set of questions was analyzed to determine the roles of the university presidents:

Interview Question 8: Describe the role(s) of the president of your university.

Trustee A said that the most important role of the president was that of "general overall leadership and the tenor of his personality. His community activity and his persona were very important.”

Trustee B said the role of the president was much like a CEO in many respects. A CEO did fundraising as well, but in a different fashion. The role of the president was “to work with lots of other people and to set the tone and direction for the university.” Her president was in place before the board was established so the strategic direction was already in place, “which we heartily endorse.” She responded that:

the president should work with the board to establish strategic direction and critically, find strong leaders for each of the areas of the university: the provost, research, dean selection, leadership in financial area, recruitment, hiring, endorsement, direction of key leaders for the university and should also be the face of the university to the community. It also includes broad fundraising activities with the legislature, Board of Governors, political leaders in the community, and key donors. The role encapsulates vision, strategic direction, guidance of key leadership, face of university in all aspects.

Trustee C said that the role of the president is that of an administrator, leader, and the “outer face of the university. She is the one who pulls together the university community, which is the faculty, staff, and students.”

Trustee D said that the job of the president was “to be the CEO of the university. He is the COO [Chief Operating Officer] the way it’s set up now. If you look at the role of the presidents, they spend very little time in the day-to-day operations.” His president had spent an enormous amount of time in the last three years in the outside world, “trying to make things happen like the medical school and the Burnham Institute.” The role in the future “may be more like the CEO and the provost may become the COO, with more responsibilities than academics.”

Trustee E suggested that the role of the president was that of the CEO. His or her role was “to manage and oversee implementation of the strategic plan and to manage the day-to-day affairs of the university and work with multiple stakeholder groups both inside and outside of the university.” She speculated that she would “reiterate the challenges of the position. I don’t think the public really appreciates the need for balancing so many interests.”

Trustee F said that the role of the president was to set the course for the university. Her president has done that. “We will be in the top 50 research universities. It won’t be tomorrow, but soon. She’s stated and restated it, we all believe it, and with the progress we’ve made, there is no reason to doubt it.”

Interview Question 10: What is the most significant change in the role(s) since he/she was hired?

Trustee A said that the addition of the boards had not changed the roles. Her president was able to continue to move forward with a lot of support from the board.

Trustee B said the roles were the same in many respects, but have changed with the establishment of the boards. There was “lots of evaluation in the manner in which the roles play out in the community.”

Trustee C said the presidency was a much more transparent role than it was in the past. In the past, the university was not as interested in the community as it was today.

She said that:

the university is much more a part of the community, whether it be the economy, development, or fostering innovation. The board has layered on an accountability structure that has brought to the forefront what the goals are, what the specific criteria are for meeting those goals, and the process.

Trustee D said his president had changed dramatically. In the early days of his presidency “he was criticized for not getting more involved in the community.” He said

that was natural because it was a huge responsibility moving from a small to a large university. Because [the university] was large, he didn’t have time to get involved in the community. Now he looks to the community to see its needs and the university provides it. He is involved in the community in Central Florida and involved in state policy-making for the university system.

Trustee E said “serving as a university president is the most complex role in society. It is far more complex than the corporate CEO role because there are multiple stakeholders and often these stakeholders have interests that are at odds.”

Trustee F said that her president “becomes a part of the community. Her motives are to elevate the university, to make it known, to make it the best it can be.”

Interview Responses from Members of the Board of Governors

From the *Member of the Board of Governors Interview*, the following set of questions was analyzed to determine the roles of the university presidents:

Interview Question 7: Describe the role(s) of a president of a State University System university.

Governor A prefaced her statement with the comment that “some presidential roles are universal and some are individual.” She stated that university presidents should “be leaders, have a definite presence, have vision, and must work with the board, faculty, and community in which he or she is situated.” She said she thought of the president as “running a big corporation.”

Governor B described the role of the president was “to provide leadership, build consensus, and to be recognized and respected for their leadership.” She noted that “their constituents include the faculty, students, boards of trustees which are run like businesses, foundations for fundraising, the legislature, the BOG, and the community that requires economic development for the region.”

Governor C argued that the presidents today had very little contact with the faculty. He said:

their major contacts are with business corporations, community development and economic leaders, the federal government, and the state government. They are almost always on the road and not even present on campus. Essentially, their role

is to make sure the institution is articulated with broader goals. They try to push an agenda for the universities as they move to fulfill broader state-mandated goals.

He also noted:

the university president who is a scholar among scholars, to me, that's just gone and it's probably not going to happen again. Part of that is because most university scholars aren't trained to manage 50,000 students or any institution and a budget of that size. The agenda that the presidents are following are for the most part being set by the state and broader policies. The only way a university president is going to get in trouble is if they over run their budgets or do not successfully fund raise.

Interview Question 8: What is the most significant change in the role(s) after he/she is hired?

Governor C, a university professor, said that his earlier president were much more accessible to the faculty. "He was a faculty member. We saw him around campus all the time. He used to be in meetings and he taught one class—it was a small-campus feel." His current president was "initially very accessible when he first arrived, but that was gone." He used to be an internal president but that has completely shifted. The next president would be strictly an external president and the internal presidency would not be there. "Sometimes that leads to problems with articulating the needs of faculty with the needs of the institution, especially since the institution is articulating state goals."

Interview Responses from Members of the Florida Legislature

From the *Member of the Florida Legislature Interview*, the following set of questions was analyzed to determine the roles of the university presidents:

Interview Question 7: Describe the role of the Board of Governors in higher education in Florida.

Legislator A stated that “the BOG made all determinations for the universities in terms of direction except they have no control over money. They have tried to get more control over tuition and are allowing the individual schools to get control of tuition.” She added that the legislature had been “slow in allowing them to have that control and in putting limits on what can be increased, particularly for undergraduates.”

Legislator B suggested that the Board of Governors was the “operational board that works out the how’s and wherefores that our university system is under, particularly in strategic planning and what types of programs we’re going to offer, and how to best meet the needs of Florida’s post-secondary education.” He said that BOG chair, Carolyn Roberts, worked very well to advocate for the state’s university system. “They look for as much autonomy as they can and this is always a balance to legislate.” He said that:

the legislature and the BOG have constitutional requirements of what we owe to the people of Florida. There is always a built-in tug on how the BOG and the legislature interrelate. We have a great respect for each other and work very hard to accommodate each other.

Interview Question 8: Describe the role of the boards of trustees in higher education in Florida.

Legislator A noted that the individual boards of trustees were charged with “setting direction and advising on policy for the individual approach the universities take.” All universities have a different focus—some may be “more research-oriented as

opposed to four years [degrees] and master's." They all have different characters and a different direction.

Legislator B said the role of the boards of trustees was "local management to define the shape and mission of the individual universities." He said:

As the university system has grown to one of quite a few schools, we're going to see more specialization as each university finds its own character. I expect the trustees, with their business acumen and educational knowledge, will help to define the individual universities' identities by the types of things they engage in.

The trustees "are also the accountability partners that work with management to see that tax dollars and other funds handled by the university are done in an appropriate and successful way." He felt that "they have a lot of responsibilities and he was very much for the idea of devolution of as much authority we can give them."

Interview Question 10: Describe the role(s) of the university presidents in the State University System.

Legislator A stated that the university presidents' "biggest job is making sure they get the money in for the university. Florida has matching grants and challenge grants" and that "it is very important to get private money, certainly with all the costs of higher education. The presidents work very hard." She believed that their major function was "setting and establishing strong relationships with faculty" and developing "a rapport" with faculty and that "good interaction is very necessary, not only for working with the board, but going out and getting development going." She also cited "setting direction for the university" as important.

Legislator B declared that the role of the university president:

was to be that visionary leader who embraced the mission that the trustees have defined and who is able to exhibit his or her ability to complete and reach those objectives that the trustees have set. He or she is always responsible for setting the pace on alumni involvement and donor contributions. He'll have lots of people who specialize in that, but he'll have to set the tone and be the CEO of the company."

Interview Question 11: What are the most significant change(s) in role(s) after he/she is hired?

Legislator B said "I think that they have and we've been in some period of confusion as we tried to reexamine the disappearance of the Board of Regents."

He observed:

What all these new relationships mean is that it's been a wonderful opportunity to reassess and redefine some of these relationships which is very unnerving for some people, but I think it's very healthy. It's a great time to ask that Jeb Bush question—"If we weren't already doing it this way, how could we do it?" That's a very frightening question to some people who are already on a static, dependable pathway and very exciting for those of us who think there's all kinds of new potentials for the things we do.

Table 11

Research Question 1: Response Clusters and Themes

Participant Category	Response Clusters	Attributes	Themes:	
			Internal	External
SUS President	economic development			X
	community building and involvement			X
	fundraising		X	X
	strategic planning		X	
	budget		X	
	growth		X	X
	working with board		X	
	vision	X		
	CEO		X	X
	managing university		X	
Member of Boards of Trustees	leadership	X		
	CEO		X	X
	fundraising		X	X
	setting direction for university		X	X
	administrator		X	
	management of operations		X	
community involvement			X	
Member of Board of Governors	leadership	X		
	definite presence		X	X
	vision	X		
	work with board, faculty, and community		X	
	CEO		X	X
	build consensus		X	X
little contact with faculty		X		
Member of the Florida Legislature	fundraising		X	X
	establishing strong relationships with faculty		X	
	visionary leader	X		
	development		X	X

Table 11 demonstrated the responses clusters and themes for Research Question 1 and revealed that the presidents saw their roles as either internal or external and tied primarily to economic development and community building, fundraising, strategic planning, managing the university as CEOs, working in tandem with their boards, and creating a vision for the institution. The members of the boards defined the presidents' roles as providing leadership, fundraising, managing the university as CEOs, setting direction for the institution, and community involvement. The members of the Board of Governors defined the roles of the presidents as providing leadership, vision, managing the university as CEOs, working with the board of trustees, faculty, and the community. The members of the legislature saw the roles of the president as being fundraisers, visionary leaders, establishing strong relationships with the faculty, and development.

Research Question 2: "What are the trends, if any, in the selection of university presidents in the SUS from 1996-2006?" This question was analyzed using the participants' responses to the following selected interview questions. Not all participants responded to each interview question. Please see Table 4 in Chapter 3.

Interview Responses from SUS Presidents

From the *SUS President Interview*, the following set of questions was analyzed to determine the trends, if any, in the selection of the university presidents:

Interview Question 5: Were you hired by the Board of Regents? Board of Trustees? Other?

Presidents A and B reported that they were hired by their boards of trustees.

Presidents C and D reported that they were hired by the Board of Regents.

Interview Question 6: Describe the process by which you were selected as president.

President A was hired by the board of trustees.

President B was also hired by the board of trustees and had been the two-term mayor of [City X], Florida. During the last year as mayor, the president of the university had stepped down due to health issues. Two of the trustees suggested that President B consider the university's presidency while also considering other private sector offers that were far more lucrative. President B said he liked the "idea of continuing public service and felt that the presidency was a wonderful opportunity and that the university was going to take off."

President C was hired by the Board of Regents that conducted a national search that resulted in 140 candidates. Thirteen to 14 were interviewed, and President C was pleased and privileged to be chosen.

President D was also chosen by the Board of Regents in a long, arduous process. With the help of a search firm, former chancellor, Adam Herbert, chose a group of candidates to interview. President D was asked to come in for two interviews. Then, the chancellor and two regents came to the current university and interviewed 150 people. President D was responsible for all the logistics and had to set up the two days of interviews, a very disruptive process on the campus. The chancellor interviewed the mayor of the city, as well as the superintendents, members of the city council, airport and

chamber heads, and members of the state house. One of the regents interviewed the faculty and students and the other interviewed several of the university departments including financial aid and the foundation. There were three applicants in the final pool and all had to participate in the same process. President D stated that “I was not sure I wanted the exposure if I didn’t get the job—I wasn’t in it to lose and didn’t want to be seen as the unsuccessful candidate in my community.”

Interview Question 10: What are the most important attributes that you bring to your role(s) as president?

President A was hired for a specific set of skills and although “obviously didn’t have university experience,” also did not bring “a pre-cast set of university experience either.”

President C brought lots of experience from years in academic administration.

Interview Responses from Members of the Boards of Trustees

From the *Member of a Board of Trustees Interview*, the following set of questions was analyzed to determine the trends, if any, in the selection of the university presidents:

Interview Question 9: Describe the process by which your president was selected.

Trustee E served on the search committee for the selection of her university’s president. She said that over a four month period, they “used an outside search firm that had specific experience in presidential appointments.” They interviewed 22-23 candidates and as usual in such a process, narrowed that to five, then three, then one candidate over a period of weeks.

Interview Question 11: What are most important attributes that he/she brings to his/her presidency?

Trustee C said that the most important attribute for a president was to help focus on the future and make the changes that are necessary.

Trustee D said that his president was:

on top of the mountain and one of the strongest forces in [the region] and the state. That's helpful to the university. When he speaks, people listen, not just at the university but throughout the community and the state. He is a huge voice in the future of the university system and right in the middle of it.

Trustee E said that the most important attributes a president brings “beyond the need to walk on water” was to have “strong vision, courage to fight and stay true to that vision, strong interpersonal skills, diplomacy, and the ability to bring disparate groups together.” She said that the president must also have “personal charisma to relate to students and donors.”

Trustee F said that her president's most important attribute was “passion, absolute passion. Everything she does is for a goal and her top goal is to make the university a top research university.” She said:

she's served on the [City] Chamber of Commerce, [City] Partnership. Every time I turn around she is somewhere or in the middle of something. You can't help but know who she is or what she's about. The story is consistent. I read an article recently where she was giving a presentation and had the audience doing the [school mascot's] cheer. That's what people who have a passion do—they cheerlead for their cause. And the cause is always the same, whether it's at a [school mascot's] game or downtown at a meeting.

Interview Question 16: How will your board select its next university president?

Trustee A argued that “every time you get a new president, you get a new focus.”

She cited the example of Rollins College’s presidential history. Rollins, a private, liberal arts college in Winter Park, Florida, has had “an academician, a community person, a fundraiser, and now a scientist who’s focused on internationalization.” She noted:

[XXX’s] next president should be a fundraiser and carry forth sciences, technology, and research. We owe [the president] that as his legacy--to carry forward the institution. We’ll have lots of choices and people will want to come here. We are an institution ready to take that next step. We’ll get a really good pool to choose from.

Trustee B declared that she suspected her university will follow the historic process by establishing a fairly broad-based group of people, with leadership from the trustees. She stated that:

it’s more effective to use external search firms, particularly in Florida’s environment, which allows us to attract a better pool. It is difficult when peoples’ names get out and they’re in an extremely exploratory phase. They may be happy where they are and somebody suggests their name and suddenly it’s public and their existing university thinks they’re no longer content there. Sometimes that has ramifications that aren’t good. I hope we’ll use a search firm to do that. Hope we have a long enough lead time and have [her president] get involved. Hope he’ll help us identify and attract the best leadership and I don’t discount that that leadership could come from within.

She quoted a recent higher education article on the issue of selection and said:

in business, you tend to grow your own individuals and in academe, you tend not to do that. We should define what we want, what have been the strengths, what do we think we need for the next phase. Depends on where we are. What the most dominant of the attributes, don’t think attributes will change, but where is the emphasis going to be, where we are and where we think we’ll be in 5-10 years subsequent to that. A public process is dictated. Always skeptical and concerned about recruitment processes-sometimes people seem to do things extremely well, but they’re not the right person for the job. Some don’t interview as well, with

emphasis on personal charisma, and in fact they're the right person for you and the job. A planned transition should lead to better results.

Trustee C said that her board will look for:

someone with energy, smart, familiar with what's going on. Someone who will see the vision, implement the vision, and expand and run with the vision. The strategic plan is the long-range plan for how to figure out how to get there. What you've identified as your goal today is not going to be your goal when you get there. Must be able to adjust, assess, what's the next move, how do I get to where that goal is going to be. Bad to put arbitrary limits. The person who can bring an institution to its full capability is invaluable and you can't put a price tag on that. If you find someone who does that, you want to keep them. If you look at business, they don't put a limit on the price tag of compensation of a president or a CEO. Why should a university be any different? If you think about the economic impact of a university, a billion dollar a year budget, this is a big business. The university has all the components and problems of a major city with a \$3.2 billion dollar economic impact on the community. You need a CEO who can run the place. Shortsighted to say I'm going to limit that to \$225,000. You make a statement when you set a compensation package. You're setting a relative value on that person. It's not about the money really, it's about the recognition and the appreciation.

Trustee D said his board would hire an outside, professional organization who will know who to put on a short list for the board's review. He said that "sunshine laws prevent us from getting the caliber of people you'd like to apply. The new person should be able to meet the board and vice versa. The chemistry has to be there. It's a huge responsibility." The Board of Governors has final approval.

Trustee E said that her university would follow the same process it did three years ago. They would "determine where we are as an organization and based on the needs of the organization and the style and type of leadership that's needed, we'd develop a profile for a candidate."

Trustee F allowed that her president:

would be a hard act to follow. In her life and in her office, when you've had a star, the next person doesn't last very long. Would hate to think we'd have to do that. Your expectations have grown and that becomes your reality. Passion and excellence, there's a constant drive for that. When you have these things, I don't know that you can go very wrong.

Interview Responses from the Members of the Board of Governors

From the *Member of the Board of Governors Interview*, the following questions were analyzed to determine the trends, if any, in the selection of the university presidents:

Interview Question 6: Describe the process by which the Board of Governors (BOG) approves the selection of a university president.

Governor A was a member of the Board of Governors when University of North Florida president, John Delaney, was hired. A search team at the university, together with an outside search firm, recommended one name for consideration to the Board of Governors and John Delaney was approved.

Governor C stated the Florida Agricultural and Mechanical University presidential search was ongoing. Its board will probably recommend a candidate to the BOG by the end of 2006 or shortly thereafter. The selection of the president has shifted dramatically from what it was in the past. Previously, the president was seen as part of the faculty. "The presidents are no longer seen as having anything to do with the faculty because they are being selected for their management skills and their community and fundraising abilities, not for the fact that they have a strong academic background." He said that was particularly true in the state of Florida and cited "UNF where the local

mayor became head of the university, FAU where the lieutenant governor, with no background in education, became the head of the university, and T.K. at FSU who came out of politics as well.” With the creation of the boards of trustees, the way the presidents are selected is very different. “The faculty used to be part of the process, but the addition of search firms has transformed it into a business model in terms of hiring executives for the university system. That’s a view of education that wasn’t around 10-20 years ago.” He added, “it indicates a very different perception of education. You see this in other parts of the BOG, specifically with regard to targeted programs.”

Interview Question 9: What are most important attributes that he/she brings to his/her presidency?

Governor C initially laughed when answering this question and said the most important attribute that a president brings was “a Hawaiian shirt and flip flops.” He said “realistically, what you’re going to see is someone who dresses to the T and the major people who are going to be interviewing him are not faculty, but it’s going to be the community.” The most important attributes will be “how that individual articulates with the community and understands community interests and economic development.”

Interview Responses from a Member of the Florida Legislature

From the *Member of the Florida Legislature Interview*, the following question was analyzed to determine the trends, if any, in the selection of the university presidents:

Interview Question 12: What are most important attributes that he/she brings to his/her presidency?

Legislator A believed that “extremely strong and proven leadership skills” are important attributes to bring to a presidency, as well as the ability to interact well with people, to be able to convince people, and to be extremely honorable. “A president should have integrity” and “ideally a strong educator who relates well to faculty” are important attributes. She said, “that person should understand the academic aspects of the university as well as the major role he or she has in fundraising functions.”

Legislator B maintained that the most important attributes are “clearly leadership, to be able to share a vision, and to move a team.” He or she:

should be a good net-worker and have the ability to go between the faculty mechanisms and the foundation support mechanism and their business management team and coordinate those dimensions and different faces of the university so that they’re in alignment on common goals. That is a tremendous ability for a leader to put together a set of skills.

He stated “the president should also be a spokesperson. The president needs to have respect from academia as well as respect for the business community at large that they think like a CEO and know how to manage something rather than live in an isolated kind of view of academia.”

Interview Question 13: What attributes are most important to the Florida Legislature?

Legislator A said she was not sure that it was the role of the legislature to be involved in the presidential selection process. “We may have preferences for people being considered, but that is certainly up to a committee who represents the university

and understands its goals and its policies.” That committee “should be composed of board members, faculty members, staff, and experts in recruiting.”

Legislator B concluded the legislature wants:

someone who is responsible and a strong advocate for his or her university and will carry a banner for them and at the same time, will be very respectful of the other roles that we have and the difficulty with which we manage resources. You know, you’re making tough choices. I think we have that kind of respect with the presidents. I don’t know what they say when we’re not around. The presidents show lots of restraint and respect considering they have very powerful missions to accomplish and we can sometimes be viewed as standing in their way—if we don’t grab the resources.” For them to handle that kind of relationship with the dignity and respect they do—we want them to come share their vision and explain to us how and why they need certain resources and what their solutions are. We want them to bring us not only challenges but their plans for ways to solve and meet those challenges.

Interview Question 4: What attributes are most important to you as a legislator?

Legislator A cited “strong and proven leadership skill, ability to interact well, be convincing, extremely honorable, and a strong educator.”

Representative B personally wanted “a leader that commands a lot of trust and that their word is their bond—that he can count on whatever they tell him, they will be consistent and respectful in their message.” He added “they do not need to agree with me every day—I just need to know I can count on that kind of trustworthy relationship. That level of integrity is what’s most important to me.”

Table 12

Research Question 2: Response Clusters and Themes

Participant Category	Response Clusters	Themes:		
		Attributes	Hiring Process	Background
President	hired by BOR and BOTs outside search firms political and academic backgrounds		X X	X
Member of Boards of Trustees	Vision interpersonal skills passion fundraiser CEO position search firms need for competitive compensation package	X X X	X X	X X
Member of Board of Governors Members	management skills leadership fundraiser community involvement faculty no longer part of selection process	X		X X X X
Member of the Florida Legislature	leadership vision strong interpersonal skills honorable strong educator relates to faculty spokesperson academician and a fundraiser trustworthiness integrity	X X X X X X X X		X X

The responses to Research Question 2 revealed the presidents responded that they were hired for their academic and political backgrounds, by the BOR and their boards of trustees, and with the assistance of an outside search firm. The boards of trustee's members selected their presidents for vision, interpersonal skills, passion, and fundraising ability. They also used outside search firms, saw the position as a CEO, and stated the need for a competitive compensation package. The Board of Governors responded that presidents were selected for their management skills, leadership and fundraising abilities, community involvement, and that the faculty was no longer part of the selection process. The members of the legislature saw the most important attributes for selection as leadership, vision, strong interpersonal skills, honorable, trustworthy, integrity, ability to be a spokesperson, and a strong academician who relates to faculty.

Research Question 3: "What are the trends, if any, in the evaluation of university presidents in the SUS from 1996-2006?" This question was analyzed using the participants' responses to the following selected interview questions. Not all participants responded to each interview question. Please see Table 5 in Chapter 3.

Interview Responses from the SUS Presidents

From the *SUS President Interview*, the following questions were analyzed to determine the trends, if any, in the evaluation of the university presidents:

Interview Question 11: What attributes that you bring to your presidency are most important to your board of trustees?

President B said the governor felt that there was not an effective plan for each of the universities. The board “took very seriously the need for a strategic plan that was established with guiding principles in pursuit of the mission.” It “recast the mission with four guiding principles: accountability, excellence, linkage to the community, and quality.”

President B’s “is a small, intimate campus with the advantages of a big university. Its niche is the quality of its incoming students. It has been under funded for years.” President B cited the need to increase the profile and the advantage to growth and numbers. The most important attributes are “vision and a fifth to a half is fundraising.” External work, “like with the Chamber and the United Way, helps with recruitment, however, the outside activities that the board encourages cuts into family and private time.” The president cited a book on the presidency about competing demands that come from faculty, students, alumni, boosters, legislators, community, family, and staff “who are all your boss. It’s all about balance, I guess.” President B cited the 10 rules for a president and noted that “Number 10 is to not delude yourself into thinking that you can do anything about parking.”

President C said that boards wanted “stable, mature leadership. They look for someone with enough of a grasp of the operation and expect me to put in place and keep a competent team.”

President C added:

Most trustees have a business background and don’t expect him to run the day-to-day, \$800 million dollar operation. They expect [the president] to know enough and be enough of a leader to get things to cohere and get together a team that will

effectively manage the affairs of the institution. Boards look for mature leadership and a sense of vision for what the institution is and can hope to be and to chart a course to get there, then get people to follow them on that course.

President C quoted a young athletics director who said “if no one is following you, you may not be leading—you may just be out for a walk.” President C said

others need to buy into your vision and some sort of framework or means to get you there will take risks and help you get there. A leader wants to do right things and a manager wants to do things the right way . . . may have to shift. What was right three years ago may not be right thing today. Successful presidents change their views as the institution or environment they are operating in changes.

Fundraising was important. Others helped raise money but being a president is like being an NFL quarterback. “When you’re winning—you get too much credit and when you’re losing, you get too much blame.” President C “tries to share the credit—they’ll be plenty of credit for me. That pays dividends for the future—people like to be recognized for their efforts.” President C is not a micromanager, but if someone is not doing well, the president “calls their attention to it. They must own it and be willing to change the results.”

People choose an academic life because “it’s less hierarchical. Academic people like to be self-directed. If you want good talent in the academy, you’d better let people have as much sense of self-direction as you can manage. They want it and need it.”

President C advocated a restrained kind of leadership. “One should stake out the goals, they know what they are, and be held accountable, but they have the opportunity to get there their own way.”

President D stated that the most important attributes to the board are vision and passion and one “has to produce at the end, be very goal-oriented.” President D wants to

know, “What’s the end game?” and “has to move and be very focused to get to the end game.”

Interview Question 12: How are those attributes evaluated and measured? How often?

President A had a six-year contract. “Evaluations should tell us once a year what kind of year we had. We’ll decide if it’s good enough.” President A and chair decided that the evaluation process was not adequate. They refined the process to do an update on the previous year on whether the goals were met or not and to lay out goals for the next year. Not all board members had the opportunity to be involved in evaluation.

“Evaluations are “considerably more complex with accountability.”

President B stated that statute requires boards of trustees to evaluate every year and that “accountability is in pay.” This university studied other presidents’ evaluations in the state and material from Association of Governing Boards. On July 31 of every year, the president submitted a self-evaluation to the board. Each year, with concurrence of the board, a list of goals for the upcoming year under 11 chapter headings was compiled.

They were:

1. Student Learning
2. Flagship Programs
3. Research/Scholarship
4. Community Connections
5. Quality Students
6. Student Life
7. Quality Faculty
8. Quality Staff
9. Master Plan

- 10. Funding
- 11. Continuous Improvement

Each of the 11 headings was tied to goals and to the strategic plan and was a way to move each element of the strategic goals ahead. The board then approved goals as a way to advance the strategic plan. Some universities evaluations are succinct. According to President B, one university's

evaluation has five goals including SAT scores, imminent scholars, GPA, etc. If there are a low amount of scores, they will hit it every time. [U of XX] has broader [goals] and some are harder in nature—subjective in nature. Board had debated whether to score as a percentile of performance, for example, 70%, or parts and weigh those. It's easier and heavier to grade like an exam paper—overall sense is like scoring your spouse.

The self evaluation summarized each of the goals in a narrative format under the headings from the strategic plan. In the first two weeks of August, President B met with the general counsel who surveyed board members not on the executive committee, on 13 questions such as:

1. How do you feel about integrity and unity of purpose that the president has provided?
2. How do you regard the president?
3. What are the relations with the students?
4. How has he performed with the 11 elements of the self-evaluation?

The general counsel wrote a summary and presented it to the executive committee who then reviewed the comments. Any board member could attend and it was advertised in keeping with the sunshine laws. The executive committee augmented those comments and the board chair reviewed the summary with the president. The executive committee met in the beginning of September for the president's responses and then voted on the bonus. They set aside up to \$60,000 based on hard and soft data. The chair responded to

the president with the amount of the bonus. President B then made new goals for the next year and the process began again. Every third year, they brought in an outside individual from the Association of Governing Boards, who performed an independent evaluation of the president and evaluated the board's performance.

President C said that the Board of Regents evaluated the presidents once a year and nominally gave each president an evaluation.

Some years it was obvious and some years it was not. The most it was formalized was that [Chancellor] Charlie Reed would call up the Board of Regents' chair on the phone and go through each list . . . you did great here, less great here, here's what we're going to give you. It was better than no feedback at all. It was a very informal, catch as catch can.

President C was always "very happy with what was said and sometimes got helpful criticism." It was a review of past performance, not forward-based evaluation. President C "started writing goals with [Chancellor Adam Herbert], but there was no formal tie."

President C "liked the process with the board and the outside consultant was good. He came highly recommended." President C had some initial misgivings with the process because "after [X] years as president, you've had to tell a lot of people no . . . "friends come and go and enemies accumulate." The consultant talked to 140 people and came out with a very flattering evaluation . . . "So I think he's a genius." "It's not a bad plan if you get someone with enough experience to understand what they're hearing. The notion that it's a zero sum game . . . that you have to sacrifice quality if you are a growing university, is incorrect."

President C added:

The governor and the legislature did not put a university here to keep people out of school. There was a real need for access to affordable, good, higher education. We want to be selective and have high quality, but we don't want to be elitist and exclusionary.

The goal was to bring in as many good students as possible and “deliver on quality. SAT is important, but how do we look on diversity, first generation kids who may not be the most academic but are leaders in their professions and political communities make this a better state, city, and country.”

President D was evaluated every year and the evaluation was tied to the university's strategic plan. It was used to measure the achievement of goals. President D had a five-year contract and negotiation of the next contract would begin in 2006. President D started with the Board of Regents and did not have any contract at all. When President D asked the chancellor about the length of employment, he responded, “As long as I want you.” Since the board of trustees was established, President D has had a five-year contract.

Interview Question 13: Does your evaluation impact your compensation? If so, how?

All four presidents agreed that the evaluation did impact their compensation, both annually when completed by the board and every three to five years when it is completed by an outside consultant. The evaluated resulted in salary increases or bonuses.

Interview Responses from Members of the Boards of Trustees

From the *Member of a Board of Trustees Interview*, the following set of questions was analyzed to determine the trends, if any, in the evaluation of the university presidents:

Interview Question 12: What attributes of your president are most important to your board of trustees?

Trustee B stated that the most important attribute was integrity. The president should be the same person regardless of where he is. Her president “does not behave differently in different situations, but keeps his core values in different environments.” She cited the importance of personal values, integrity, intellect, communication skills, and leadership skills. These are the key traits anyone brought to any important role, particularly to the role of the university president. “A university president has one thing that is different from many other roles and that is that directly or indirectly, young people look up to them as a role model. That’s why integrity is so important.”

She also cited fundraising and strength of character during difficult times such as 9/11 [September 11, 2001] as absolutely critical.

Her president provided leadership and said:

we were in a time of grieving and he said that we should not be prejudiced for or against any group of people for who they are, personal, ethnic, or religious backgrounds, just because of what a few people may have done.

She stated that different things at different times were most important to the board. The selection of key leadership people and the ability to attract them is important.

Trustee C said that as chair, the most important job of the board was to be the very best it could be and to provide service to students to get the very best quality education. The most important attributes to the board were an emphasis on research for the region, state, country, and the globe. The president should be “the engine of the university.”

Trustee D said that the most important attribute was to have a president who was respected.

Trustee E argued that the most important presidential attributes were vision and courage. He should have “clear goals and be able to break those goals into specific steps and priorities on an annual basis but always keeping the longer term in mind while managing so many issues and challenges that can easily deter him from the long-term vision.” He should be able to be a “big thinker and visionary even while the day-to-day detail can interrupt that vision.”

Trustee F said that “passion is something that other people feed off of and it brings people along.” She said that her president “is a positive person and people are attracted to positive people.”

Interview Question 13: How are those attributes of your president evaluated and measured? How often?

Trustee A said that the evaluations were completed once a year by a committee using benchmarks such as fundraising, number of students, graduation rates that were created with the help of the human resources director. She believed that it was a systematic and efficient way of doing the evaluation. His fundraising activities were

evident when the entire community got together to get a medical school for the university. Her president “never presented himself with an extreme side and was not controversial. He does not annoy anyone and stays right down the middle and gets along with everyone in the community.”

Trustee B declared that the president was evaluated once a year and that the evaluations were very important. “It is unfortunate that it had to be done in such a public environment and that it is not helpful to have a discussion of a person’s performance in a public environment but as a board we are learning and it must be done in such an environment.” It was very important to have a clearly defined evaluation process. She stated that the three-year process with the outside consultant was more comprehensive. Her university just completed the three year process with an outside consultant and said that “it was a more advantageous situation this time. The use of the consultant was good and useful. Presidents should know upfront what is being evaluated, what are the objectives, and how the evaluation is conducted—shouldn’t be any surprises.”

Trustee C stated that a new evaluation process had just been instituted. A team was established and will use outside support to do research on what the market was for compensation packages and make suggestions for the president’s new contract. They will talk to faculty and student representatives to get a feel for whether or not the president had met the criteria set out for her. They will then come before the board with a proposal for the compensation package and a five-year contract.

Trustee D said his president was evaluated yearly and through an outside consultant every three years. He stated that that was more than adequate and it may be

that the board would decide to use an outside consultant every five years in the future but it would comply with BOG requirements.

Trustee E stated her university did an evaluation on an annual basis. She said “working together with the president, we have outlined some specific measures that are reviewed on an ongoing basis. Measures that extend beyond a single year are measured every three years.” Her board also had some priorities that were for a specific year and it “really is the president’s role to share with us those priorities and the board’s role to simply hold him or her accountable to those.”

Trustee F stated the executive committee did the evaluation, but that all of them “unofficially evaluate her every time we are around her.”

Interview Question 14: Does your evaluation of your president impact his/her compensation? If so, in what way?

Trustee A is on the compensation and evaluation committee and asserted that the evaluation “certainly does affect the compensation package.” She said she was on the “give them more side.” Her president deserved the raise he got this year. His salary was in the top third and his evaluation, which shows his effectiveness and all other factors, placed him in the top 10 percent. “So why should he be punished?” She felt that her president could get \$700,000 to \$800,000 easily and that there were presidents who make that. He was “running a university bigger than most corporations and corporate people make \$800,000 to more than a million.” She believed her president was still underpaid. “He is running a city, a corporation, but he also has lives in his hands.” She believed in “paying people what they are worth and if they are happy, they stay with you. For “all the

faculty who argue that their salaries should go up . . . as he goes up, the school goes up, and their salaries will follow.” “You want a good leader. No one complained about his raise this last time, not even the newspaper, and he is finally getting what he is worth.”

Trustee B said the evaluation and the compensation were tied together, “that is beyond a base.” There is a “range of compensation for any position and it is set by the market place, but when a person falls in that range, it is by large measure determined by the evaluation process, or it should be. They should be compensated in the higher quartiles if they are performing there.” She stated “I’m strictly a performance-based person.”

Trustee D said he “sure hopes so.” As chair he has just one vote, “but if you look at what he has accomplished in the last few years, he more than deserves a huge increase. He should be the highest paid president in the university system if you look at the total compensation package.”

Trustee E said that her university had “a bonus, which is performance-based and while it does not impact the base salary, it does impact the pay out of the bonus.”

Interview Responses from Members of the Board of Governors

From the *Member of the Board of Governors Interview*, the following set of questions was analyzed to determine the trends, if any, in the evaluation of the university presidents:

Interview Question 10: Which of those attributes are most important to the Board of Governors?

Governor A maintained that it was hard to speak for the board, but she could speak for herself. She believed that the two most important attributes for a president are vision and demonstrated leadership. The president should have a track record and could bring those skills to the university. With regard to a university hiring a president with an academic or a political background, one must look at the university and “see what kind of leadership can take the university to the next level.” She used the example of a president in North Florida. He had “already shown a tremendous amount of leadership during his tenure as mayor—he got it!” He brought the right skill set to the job even though he had no academic background. She noted:

[The university] was not integrated into the . . . community and because of his knowledge of the whole, he had the ability to bring [the university] in and make it a part of the community, more a part of the growth factor and development of the community . . . that’s why he would work or did work at the particular time.

She stated that it may be important for another university to have a president with academic training in addition to general leadership skills. “I would never say one versus the other, academic versus political.” “There are opportunities for people who don’t have an academic background to bring good things to a university.”

Governor C said the most important attributes to the Board of Governors is the ability to deal with the community and “to articulate the institution’s mission or the broader mission of the region. It’s tied to economic and legislative issues.”

Interview Question 11: How should those attributes be evaluated and measured?

How often?

Governor A believed that the university presidents should be evaluated annually or every two years. The only reason she would go to two years was that it is sometimes difficult to meet goals in one year.

Governor B stated the evaluation should be completed by the boards of trustees. They can best measure the progress for a president. A new president needs time to develop. She has admiration for the presidents. They must balance the BOG, the legislature, and others to compete for money for their universities.

Governor C said:

We over evaluate everything. There is too much assessment. We spend way too much of our time assessing and not producing. You know when somebody's doing a decent job—you don't need \$200,000 for an outside consultant to tell you they're doing a good job."

He added "the president is evaluated just like everybody else—all the time, on everything they are doing. Evaluations are ongoing and problems will rise to the surface."

Interview Question 12: Should the evaluation impact his/her compensation?

How?

Governor A avowed that all presidents should have a base, but incentives were important. "The board should sit down with the president and develop goals and expectations and let the president know them from the very beginning any additional compensation he or she may receive for reaching those goals."

Governor C said that if a president “is evaluated on an annual basis, the compensation is going to go up on an annual basis . . . that’s changed drastically. It used to be evaluations weren’t always tied to compensation.” He added that “evaluations in corporate America are always tied to advancement and compensation.”

Interview Responses from Members of the Florida Legislature

From the *Member of the Florida Legislature Interview*, the following set of questions was analyzed to determine the trends, if any, in the evaluation of the university presidents:

Interview Question 15: How should those attributes be evaluated and measured?
How often?

Legislator A maintained that the boards needed to evaluate the president every year. They should establish criteria when someone is hired and set goals for that person. “At the end of each year, the board should determine to what degree those goals have been met.” A major goal should always be “what have we done to improve the quality and access to higher education for our students, and the affordability, of course.”

Legislator B speculated that the presidents should be getting feedback on their performances. The trustees should give them “a clear reading, probably quarterly but at least annually, where they give an in-depth feedback of what they see. That is the closest relationship as far as them working with the trustees.” They should also get feedback annually from the BOG to see how they think these presidents are operating at these universities. “Feedback is helpful to give guidance. Finally, it has to come back to the

trustees because they are in the most intimate relationship with them.” The legislator said

he

came from a business mindset that when you reach objectives, there’s compensation for meeting objectives. In their original contracts, there should be a number of clearly delineated goals that are tied to rewards. Strictly providing salary is not an incentivizing methodology. Should have substantive salary so it’s not all based on performance measures alone. A good combination is a reasonable core salary and some fairly healthy incentives that if they do something, something good will happen.

He said that “money changes behavior and a lot of money changes a lot of behavior.”

Interview Question 16: How should the evaluation impact his/her compensation?

Legislator A said that there should be a direct relationship between the evaluation and the compensation. She was concerned with graduation rates, and “reaching down to make students aware of who we are, what we are, what we can do for them but also ensure access and a strong support system that leads to the completion of degrees.”

Table 13

Research Question 3: Response Clusters and Themes

Participant Category	Response Clusters	Themes:			
		Time Frame	Attributes	Internal	External
SUS President	vision leadership fundraising goal-oriented annual evaluation three-year evaluation with outside firm accountability strategic plan-based goal-based self-evaluation impacted compensation		X X X X X X X X X	X X X X	X X
Member of Boards of Trustees	Integrity leadership intellect community relations courage leadership team annual evaluation three-year with outside firm impacted compensation always being evaluated		X X X X X X X X	X X X X	X X
Member of Board of Governors	vision demonstrated leadership community relations too much assessment annual evaluation impacted compensation always being evaluated		X X X X X	X X X	X X
Member of Florida Legislature	annual evaluation from BOTs annual evaluation from BOG goals feedback impacted compensation	X X		X X X	X

The responses to Research Question 3 revealed that the presidents were evaluated annually by their boards of trustees and every three years by an outside consultant. They were evaluated on the attributes of vision, leadership, fundraising, and meeting strategic plan-based goals and the evaluations directly impacted their compensation. The members of the boards of trustees agreed that they evaluated their presidents annually and every three years with an outside firm. They evaluated on the attributes of integrity, leadership, intellect, courage, community relations, performance of the presidents' leadership teams and that the evaluation directly impacted the presidents' compensation. The members of the Board of Governors cited vision, demonstrated leadership, and community involvement as desired attributes for a president. They advocated an annual evaluation that impacted compensation. The members of the legislature advocated for an annual evaluation from the boards of trustees and the Board of Governors based on clearly defined goals with appropriate feedback to the presidents. They acknowledged the evaluations' impact on presidential compensation.

Research Question 4: "What are the trends, if any, in the compensation of university presidents in the SUS from 1996-2006?" This question was analyzed using the participants' responses to the following selected interview questions. Not all participants responded to each interview question. This question was also analyzed using compensation data collected through telephone calls and email requests to the 11 SUS university human resources departments. A total of seven human resources department provided compensation histories. Numerous attempts to secure information from the

remaining human resources departments were unsuccessful. Please see Table 6 in Chapter 3.

Interview Responses from the SUS Presidents

From the *SUS President Interview*, the following set of questions was analyzed to determine the trends, if any, in the compensation of the university presidents:

Interview Question 14: How has the 2003 legislative salary cap of \$225,000 impacted your compensation package, if at all?

President A had not been impacted by the salary cap. “I am handsomely paid for my work” but he believed the foundation “should use that overage for other university priorities.” “It’s bad public policy—a knee jerk reaction and then wink-wink, nudge-nudge, get it from your foundations.” President A questioned what would happen when presidents made a million dollars in the next decade and “three quarters of their salaries are paid for by the foundations, perhaps by one donor.” “Who’s in control then?”

President B said in regarding the salary cap of \$225,000 that the legislature did not want the taxpayers’ money to go above that amount and that the foundation could pay more. All but two of the universities have supplemented their presidents’ salaries from outside sources. President B hoped that devolution would have cleared up “red, yellow, and green money—red spent on red things, etc.” The foundation money “could have been spent on more faculty members or on student scholarships.” The result of the cap was that “it added a hiccup and made the legislature feel good.” President B understood the taxpayers’ concerns but believed that the marketplace should set the prices. “A lot of the supplement is from the board—they’re big donors.” The University of West Florida’s

board refused to go above the salary cap. “It may have achieved the desired downward pressure at its institution, but when the current president leaves, I doubt they will find someone at that price to replace him.”

President D had not been impacted personally by the salary cap. The university has gathered funds from a variety of sources to realize the contract, which seemed to be the case for all the universities. President D said:

\$225,000 will not buy a president like UCF’s or any university of any quality at all. It definitely will not buy a president through the corporate route. It’s very unrealistic. It was not a good way to get donors to support the president’s salary. They want their money to go to students or to help the university in some other way.

With regard to the longevity of a president, turnover every four-to-five years is costly. “You’re better keeping the person if you like them and like the direction the institution is going in.”

Interview Responses from Members of the Boards of Trustees

From the *Member of a Board of Trustees Interview*, the following set of questions was analyzed to determine the trends, if any, in the compensation of the university presidents:

Interview Question 15: How has the 2003 legislative salary cap of \$225,000 impacted the presidential compensation package at your institution, if at all?

Trustee A stated it is too bad the legislature put in the salary cap but “I guess they had to.” The trustees were aware that any extra compensation must be paid for separately,

but that it is “ridiculously low in this day and age to put that kind of salary on a university president.”

Trustee B said that she understood:

there are political reasons that these things happen and fortunately we have a foundation with money so it doesn't affect us significantly. It is an afterthought and kind of humorous that presidents are charged with fundraising and in some respects, they are raising their own compensation. Different universities have different charges and it limits universities that are young. They don't have well established foundations and generations of givers. That limits them on the kind of president they can attract. We are competing for talent with people throughout the country. She recognizes that money is not the only reason people take the presidential position; however, if an institution is not competitive in its compensation package, it is not going to attract the very best talent. One of the problems we have experienced in setting presidential compensation is that the institution has not kept pace with where competition is competitively and in order to bring yourself into a competitive environment, you've got to take big steps. We keep pace with faculty, athletics, but with the old system, presidential compensation did not keep pace. In order to bring it into the modern world, we as trustees have had to take big steps. Politically and from a communications perspective, that has been very challenging, especially when we were taking steps to raise tuition. Having those limits is not helpful overall. That's why it is much better to have local control with local evaluations copying other institutions but rather you can judge how your president is performing. At my university, the objectives we have agreed upon is a much better system.

Trustee C maintained the salary cap had not impacted her president's compensation package since part comes from state funds and part comes from other sources.

Trustee D stated the salary cap was put in by the legislators because they thought the presidents were overpaid. The legislature should understand that running a university was a big undertaking and that the president should be paid accordingly. The cap is “ridiculous” but does not seem to hinder his university. “When dealing with the outside world, you're getting money from the private sector and they understand that if you want

a great president, you've got to pay that person." He noted that "universities are big business and the more that we understand that, the better off we are. We should get a proper rate of return on our investments and that's what the board has been zeroing in on."

Trustee E said that like many other universities in the state, "we are subsidizing that salary from other funds."

Trustee F said in the corporate world, she has found that in the last few years "we've have had to do whatever it took, things we had never done before, in order to get and retain good people." She does not believe that arbitrary limits can be put on good performance.

Interview Responses from Members of the Board of Governors

From the *Member of the Board of Governors Interview*, the following set of questions was analyzed to determine the trends, if any, in the compensation of the university presidents:

Interview Question 13: How has the 2003 legislative salary cap of \$225,000 impacted the presidential compensation package, if at all?

Governor A said that "the salary cap raised the minimum and exploded the maximum." She was "bothered by the salaries of the presidents in that (1) they are public institutions, and (2) the money raised by the foundations could be used for more direct public benefit that padding the bottom line for the presidents." "The high salaries do not make good fiscal sense and it's a bad policy decision. Somewhere along the line,

someone has decided that presidential salaries should be comparable to running large corporations with similar budgets.”

She continued:

there may be some validity to that statement, but large corporations with similar budgets are private entities that ultimately want to make a profit for the company and the shareholders. To me, as a citizen, I am a shareholder in the university because my tax dollars are going in to pay the presidents and I don't know if . . . and I know all the money isn't coming from tax dollars . . . I don't know if it makes good sense to me. Am I really getting a good return by paying a president that much money? And, treating it as if it's a private entity, when it really isn't? It's government and they're paid more than the governor and the president. They're paid so much more than other public officials who deal with big budgets, big issues. The question becomes . . . what's so different? Why shouldn't the governor make more money?

She stated that the argument she remembers when the salary increases all started was:

Oh, we've got to have competitive salaries for other university presidents because we want to keep our good people in the state of Florida. If they want to make that kind of money, maybe they should go to these other universities that are willing to pay what I consider to be astronomical salaries? Part of being a good president is having a heart for this business and it shouldn't be about your bottom line. You're a government official and public university presidents make more than any other government official.

She further commented:

something is going to happen, some control is going to be placed on foundations. Someone will realize that this is not the best use of our dollars—to pad the pockets of the presidents. Someone needs to send the message that we said \$225,000 because we think that that may be a fairer number for the work that you're doing and maybe have some bonuses, but not a package that's going to get you \$500,000-\$600,000—not for a public job. You're welcome to make as much money as you want in the private sector. If you've chosen a profession to make as much money as possible, I don't think university president should be at the top of your list.

Governor B believed that the compensation package is “a hybrid of public and private sources.” “Mayors do not make \$225,000 per year.” She said it is getting harder to track talent in the public and private sector.

Governor C said that the salary cap was “ludicrous!” He said that the cap has had no impact and “what it means is that the foundations are now paying their salaries rather than state funds, so it’s actually impacting the foundations’ ability to raise money for other things.” He added that he does not know

why we are stuck on a \$225,000 figure because coaches aren’t legislated and they make more than the presidents. \$225,000 isn’t the limit for a dean’s or a faculty member’s salary. How can you cap a president’s salary lower than that of his employees? . . . The president or provost should make more than the highest paid faculty because they are doing more, by definition. The \$225,000 limit should be repealed.

Interview Responses from Members of the Florida Legislature

From the *Member of the Florida Legislature Interview*, the following set of questions was analyzed to determine the trends, if any, in the compensation of the university presidents.

Interview Question Interview Question 17: How has the 2003 legislative salary cap of \$225,000 impacted the presidential compensation package, if at all?

Legislator A said that the salary cap has had “no impact because we allowed foundations to pick up the difference if they felt somebody was entitled to more money.” “The largest universities were concerned about the cap because they have already paid or tried to pay larger salaries and wanted to attract people from all over the country and make sure that they have a good selection.” She added that “with foundation money, they

have been able to take care of them pretty well especially since the reality is that their salaries are quite high.” She said that she has not heard anyone complain, “Oh, I can’t do this.” In the beginning “there was a concern that they wouldn’t be able to attract people but I don’t think that’s been the case.”

Legislator B stated that the salary cap had not affected the total number.

The important thing is that it is a very important message to people as they look at rising tuition and the costs of financing their educations. They get pretty discouraged when they see these large numbers and it does affect legislators too who feel like if they have money to pay like that then they must be doing alright.”

“The salary caps with tax dollars were a good start as to limitation. Now universities have many, many pathways by which they draw revenue.” It is often depicted as being totally dependant on legislative action. “It is just a very important message that we’re going to be frugal with these dollars.” He stated that he was “proud of all of our university presidents” and that “we have attracted fantastic ones.” He added that in a competitive environment for good presidents:

we have almost got a gas war where people start piling on money because they’re afraid someone might leave. It needs a little more reason applied to it. Since we are obsessed with ranking in education, it drives some excess in that arena too. They may be worth every dime they’re earning—I’ll leave that to the trustees to assess.

The researcher also reviewed the 2003 Florida Legislative salary cap legislation. The 10-year compensation histories provided by seven university human resources departments were used to produce Figures 2 and 3 illustrating the compensation trends. Salary information on FGCU was not available for 1996-1998.

Table 14

Research Question 4: Response Clusters and Themes

Participant Category	Response Cluster	Themes:			
		Impact	Foundations	Needs	Policy
Presidents	salary cap had no impact foundations made up difference funds could go to other needs bad public policy	X	X	X	X
Boards of Trustees Members	salary cap had no impact foundations made up difference funds could go to other needs no arbitrary limits	X X	X	X	
Board of Governors Members	salary cap had no impact foundations made up difference funds could go to other needs bad public policy made more than other public officials	X	X	X	X X
Legislators	salary cap had no impact foundations made up difference taxpayers approved of cap	X	X		X

All participants agreed that the salary cap of \$225,000 had little or no impact on presidential compensation. They agreed that outside funding sources, primarily through the individual university foundations, made up the differences in salary and other

components of the compensation package. Most participants agreed that the supplements provided by the foundations would be put to better use by funding scholarships or other university needs. Several participants noted that the salary cap was a bad public policy decision by the legislature. Participants from the boards of trustees stated there should be no arbitrary limits on presidential compensation and the legislators felt that the taxpayers approved of the salary cap.

The researcher also reviewed the 2003 Florida Legislative salary cap legislation. The 10-year compensation histories provided by seven university human resources departments were used to produce Figures 2 and 3 illustrating the compensation trends. Salary information on FGCU was not available for 1996-1998.

A review of the salary histories of seven SUS university presidents showed that in 2000, one year before the change governance in Florida's higher education, the mean presidential salary was \$214,445 with a range of \$180,200 to \$247,900. Table 15 illustrates that in 2003, two years after the change in governance, the mean salary was \$304,693, an increase of approximately 42%, with a range of \$240,000 to \$375,000. The spike in the 2002-2003 salaries corresponded to the establishment of the boards of trustees at the 11 SUS universities in 2001. The 2006 salary mean was \$360,487, with a range of \$278,250 to \$450,000, an increase of approximately 18% since 2003. Tables 16 and 17 and Figures 2 and 3 illustrated the salary histories and percentages of change.

Table 15

Florida SUS Presidential Salaries: 1996-2006

	FAU	FGCU	FIU	FSU	UCF	UF	USF
1996	\$ 147,000	\$ -	\$ 159,600	\$ 203,200	\$ 156,500	\$ 216,730	\$ 180,300
1997	\$ 151,400	\$ -	\$ 164,388	\$ 209,296	\$ 161,195	\$ 223,034	\$ 190,872
1998	\$ 180,000	\$ -	\$ 192,000	\$ 235,003	\$ 190,000	\$ 241,948	\$ 227,000
1999	\$ 186,800	\$ 180,200	\$ 197,000	\$ 241,600	\$ 196,700	\$ 241,611	\$ 227,000
2000	\$ 191,500	\$ 180,200	\$ 202,000	\$ 247,900	\$ 202,100	\$ 245,414	\$ 232,000
2001	\$ 191,500	\$ 180,200	\$ 202,000	\$ 247,900	\$ 202,100	\$ 245,414	\$ 232,000
2002	\$ 191,500	\$ 240,000	\$ 285,000	\$ 254,098	\$ 295,000	\$ 341,500	\$ 237,800
2003	\$ 291,400	\$ 240,000	\$ 313,500	\$ 290,150	\$ 296,400	\$ 375,000	\$ 326,400
2004	\$ 301,599	\$ 265,000	\$ 313,500	\$ 290,150	\$ 311,220	\$ 390,000	\$ 342,720
2005	\$ 312,457	\$ 278,250	\$ 313,500	\$ 300,595	\$ 322,424	\$ 404,040	\$ 359,856
2006	\$ 312,457	\$ 278,250	\$ 397,072	\$ 309,613	\$ 450,000	\$ 416,161	\$ 359,856

(Note: Data gathered from the human resources departments at the seven universities listed. Usable data not received from FAMU, NCF, UNF, and UWF.)




Figure 2: Florida SUS Presidents' Salaries, 1996-2006 (from Table 15)

Table 16

Annual Percentage of Change in Florida SUS Presidential Salaries: 1996-2006

	FAU	FGCU	FIU	FSU	UCF	UF	USF
1996	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
1997	3%	0%	3%	3%	3%	3%	6%
1998	19%	0%	17%	12%	18%	8%	19%
1999	4%	0%	3%	3%	4%	0%	0%
2000	3%	0%	3%	3%	3%	2%	2%
2001	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
2002	0%	33%	41%	3%	46%	39%	3%
2003	52%	0%	10%	14%	0%	10%	37%
2004	4%	10%	0%	0%	5%	4%	5%
2005	4%	5%	0%	4%	4%	4%	5%
2006	0%	0%	27%	3%	40%	3%	0%

(Note: Data gathered from the human resources departments at the seven universities listed)

**Percent of Change in Florida SUS Presidential Salaries:
1996-2006**




Figure 3: Annual Percentage of Change in Florida SUS Presidents' Salaries, 1996-2006 (from Table 16)

Summary

This study used data collected from interviews with Florida SUS presidents, members of SUS boards of trustees, members of the Florida Board of Governors, and members of the Florida Legislature. The researcher also collected compensation history data from 1996-2006 for Florida SUS presidents. The data provided in the interviews were analyzed using Moustakas' modified Van Kaam Method. Presidential salary histories from seven SUS universities were analyzed to illustrate the trends in presidential compensation. The results of the interview responses and the compensation tables and figures, study conclusions, and recommendations for further study are presented in Chapter 5.

CHAPTER 5

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Introduction

Section one provides a summary of the study and section two addresses the threats to validity of the study. Section three discusses the findings of the study and section four discusses the conclusions of the study. Section five discusses the implications for policy and practice and section six suggests recommendations for further research.

Summary

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study was to analyze the trends, if any, in the selection, evaluation, and compensation of the 11 university presidents in the Florida SUS from 1996-2006 and to add to the literature on Florida's SUS university presidents. Two areas of interest within the study were how the changing perceptions of the university presidents' roles and the 2001 changes in Florida's higher education governance have impacted the Florida SUS presidents' compensation packages.

Sample and Data Collection

Gall, Gall and Borg (2003) suggested the use of a "maximum variation sample" (p. 179), a type of purposeful sampling that "involves selecting cases that illustrate the range of variation in the phenomenon to be studied" (p. 179). A maximum variation sample of each population was contacted for face-to-face or telephone interviews (See

Table 2). For the university presidents, a sample size of four was selected by geographic location in the state of Florida, size of the institution, age of the institution, and academic or non-academic background of the president, and his or her availability. For members of the boards of trustees, a sample size of six was selected by geographic location and his or her availability. For members of the Florida Board of Governors, a sample size of three was selected by geographic location and the governors' availability. Another member of the BOG who originally agreed to be interviewed, was contacted on several occasions but failed to return telephone calls made to her office. For members of the Florida Legislature, a sample size of two was selected by availability. Several additional members of the legislature were contacted; however, they either deferred to other legislators, did not return telephone calls, or stated they were currently too busy and involved in their 2006 re-election campaigns. A more complete description of the members of the sample can be found in Chapter 4.

The researcher also gathered current and archived compensation data on Florida SUS university presidents for 1996-2006 from selected university human resources departments. All 11 university human resources departments were contacted by phone and by email. Several were contacted numerous times, but only seven universities responded and supplied salary history data. They were FAU, FGCU, FIU, FSU, UCF, UF, and USF. No data were supplied by FAMU, New College, UNF, or UWF.

Instrumentation

The researcher created and used four sets of interview instruments designed to reveal the study participants' perceptions of the roles of SUS university presidents and the trends in their selection, evaluation, and compensation. These included a 16-item instrument for current SUS presidents (Appendix E), a 17-item instrument for the members of the boards of trustees (Appendix F), a 14-item instrument for the members of the Board of Governors (Appendix G), and an 18-item instrument for the members of the Florida Legislature (Appendix H). The instruments were reviewed for content validity and revised with feedback from faculty members and educational leadership doctoral students. Adjustments to the instruments were made based on their suggestions. All questions and related materials for the interviews were then submitted to the University of Central Florida's institutional review board for approval. After UCFIRB approval, interviews were conducted in face-to-face sessions or by telephone (See Table 2).

Threats to Validity

Answers to all interview questions were assumed to be accurate, but because the research topic was considered to be political in nature, responses were probably measured. One of the trustees who was asked to participate declined because the study was "too political." A legislator who agreed to participate initially, later suggested the researcher speak to another legislator who "had more knowledge on the topic."

Another threat to validity may be the relatively small sample size of two of the participant groups: the members of the boards of trustees and the Florida Legislature.

Moustakas' (1994) *Phenomenological Research Methods*, suggested “general considerations . . . that include age, race, religion, ethnic and cultural factors, gender, and political and economic factors” (p.107) be taken into account when selecting research participants. He also noted:

The essential criteria include: the research participant has experienced the phenomenon, is intensely interested in understanding its nature and meanings, is willing to participate in a lengthy interview and (perhaps a follow-up interview), grants the investigator the right to be tape-recorded . . . , and be willing to have the results published in a dissertation or other publications. (p. 107)

Gall, Gall and Borg (2003) cited the researcher's need to have to use a “purposeful sample, one in which the selected cases were likely to be information-rich with respect to the purposes of a qualitative study” (p. 178).

Although the sample size was small for two of the categories, all participants selected for this study met Moustakas' (1994) essential criteria for selection and Gall, Gall and Borg's (2003) purposeful sample criteria and should serve to ameliorate threats to validity.

Discussion of Findings

The researcher used Moustakas' (1994) modified Van Kaam Method to analyze the data in this study. The researcher used Step 1 of his “horizontalization” (p. 120) technique to “list every response relevant to the experience” (p. 120) and Step 2 to test each expression for two requirements: “a) does it contain a moment of experience necessary for understanding it? and b) is it possible to abstract and label it?” (p. 121). The results are listed in Chapter 4. Step 3 of Moustakas' analysis method calls for the

researcher to “cluster the invariant constituents that are related to a thematic label” (p. 121). Step 4 calls for the researcher to “identify the invariant constituents and themes by application” (p. 121). The results of Step 3 and 4 are listed in Tables 11, 12, 13, and 14. Because this study was not completed with a co-researcher, the researcher omitted Steps 5 and 6. Step 7 of the method calls for the researcher to:

Construct for each research participant a Textual-Structured Description of the meanings and essences of the experience, incorporating the variant constituents and themes, followed by a composite description of the meanings and essences of the experience, representing the group as a whole. (p. 121)

The researcher provided a “textual-structured description of the meanings and essences of the experience, incorporating the variant constituents and themes” (p. 121) in each participant category for each of the four research questions.

Research Question 1

What are the roles of the university presidents in the Florida State University System?

Table 11 demonstrated the response clusters and themes for Research Question 1 and revealed the presidents saw their roles as being either internally or externally oriented and primarily being tied to economic development and community building, fundraising, strategic planning, managing their universities as a CEO, working with their boards, and creating a vision for the institution. The internal themes were strategic planning, working with the boards of trustees, managing the university as a CEO, managing the budget, and having a vision for the institution. The external themes were economic development, community building, fundraising, vision, and growth. Interestingly, leadership did not

emerge as one of the themes by the president participants, although the other three response categories rated it as important.

The members of the boards of trustees' response cluster defined the presidents' roles as providing leadership, managing the university as CEOs, fundraising, setting direction for the institution, being an administrator, managing the operation of the institution, and community involvement. The internal themes that emerged were leadership, managing the institution as a CEO, being an administrator, managing the operation of the institution, and setting institutional direction. The external themes that emerged were leadership, fundraising, and community involvement. Leadership was seen as important both within the institution and outside in the community. Little mention was made of faculty and staff relations.

The members of the Board of Governors' response cluster defined the roles of the presidents as providing leadership, a definite presence, vision, managing the university as CEOs, working with the board of trustees, faculty, and the community, and a consensus builder. One governor stated the president had little contact with the faculty. The internal themes that emerged were leadership, managing the university as a CEO, setting direction for the institution, being an administrator and manager of the institution, and working with the board and the faculty, although one governor noted the lack of contact with faculty. The external themes were leadership, vision, providing a definite presence, and working with the community. Leadership was seen as important both within the institution and outside in the community.

The members of the legislature response cluster revealed the roles of the presidents as being fundraisers, establishing strong relationships with the faculty, visionary leaders, and development. The internal themes that emerged were establishing strong ties with faculty and visionary leadership. The external themes that emerged were fundraising, visionary leadership, and development. This participant category indicated a perception that the role included more internal presidential involvement in the day-to-day management of the institution than the other three response categories, particularly with regard to faculty relations.

Research Question 2

What are the trends, if any, in the selection of university presidents in the Florida State University System from 1996-2006?

Table 12 demonstrated the response clusters and themes for Research Question 2. It revealed the themes in selection as the hiring process and the importance of the professional backgrounds and personal attributes of the presidents in their selection.

The presidents' response cluster and themes for Research Question 2 revealed they believed they were hired by the BOR and their boards of trustees with the assistance of an outside search firm for their academic and political backgrounds. Two of the presidents had academic backgrounds and two were former politicians. The presidents with the academic backgrounds were hired by the Board of Regents and the presidents with the political backgrounds were hired by their boards of trustees, who were appointed by the governor.

The boards of trustees members' response cluster revealed they selected their presidents for vision, interpersonal skills, passion, and fundraising ability. They also used outside search firms, saw the position as a CEO, and stated the need for a competitive compensation package. The theme of professional backgrounds emerged in the trustees citing of fundraising and CEO position as important. The theme of personal attributes emerged with their citing vision, interpersonal skills, and passion as important for the position.

The Board of Governors' response cluster revealed the presidents were selected for their management skills, leadership, fundraising abilities, and community involvement. One governor argued the faculty was no longer part of the selection process. The professional background theme emerged as important in the governors' listing as well as management skills, leadership, fundraising, and community involvement as important. The personal attributes theme emerged in their response of leadership as important.

The members of the legislature response cluster revealed the most important attributes for selection as leadership, vision, strong interpersonal skills, honorable, trustworthy, integrity, ability to be a spokesperson, and a strong academician who relates to faculty. The theme of professional background emerged in their choices of leadership, strong educator, academician, and fundraiser as important. The theme of personal attributes emerged in their citing leadership, vision, strong interpersonal skills, honorable, relates to faculty, spokesperson, trustworthiness, and integrity as important. The members of the legislature appeared to advocate for the traditional, academic model of the

presidency. They cited being a strong educator and academician as important professional attributes for selection. They also placed a higher priority on the personal attributes in the selection process and included relating to the faculty on their list.

The members of the boards of trustees and the Board of Governors stressed the importance of the university president having a business background in their selection criteria more than did the members of the legislature. Since they selected for a corporate model, they felt justified in raising the compensation of their presidents. This finding could be related to the \$225,000 salary cap from appropriated funds imposed by the legislature. The legislators may consider the role of a university president to be more academic and less corporate than the other participant groups, and thereby justified the salary cap they imposed.

Research Question 3

What are the trends, if any, in the evaluation of university presidents in the Florida State University System from 1996-2006?

Table 13 demonstrated the response clusters and general themes for Research Question 3 and revealed the themes in evaluation as the time frame of the evaluations, that the presidents were evaluated on personal attributes and internal and external criteria, and the evaluations impacted their compensation packages. The responses to Research Question 3 revealed that the presidents were evaluated annually by their boards of trustees and every three years by an outside consultant. They were evaluated on the attributes of vision, leadership, and being goal-oriented. Internal criteria were leadership, accountability, and strategic planning and goals. External criteria were leadership,

fundraising, reaching goals, and accountability. The evaluations directly impacted their compensation.

The members of the boards of trustees agreed that they evaluated their presidents annually and every three years with an outside firm. They evaluated the presidents on the attributes of integrity, leadership, intellect, and courage. The internal criteria were leadership and the performance of the leadership team. The external criteria were leadership and community relations. The evaluation directly impacted the presidents' compensation.

The members of the Board of Governors cited vision, demonstrated leadership, and community involvement as desired attributes for a president. They advocated an annual evaluation that impacted compensation but one governor said there too much assessment. The internal criterion was demonstrated leadership and the external criteria were demonstrated leadership and community relations. The evaluation directly impacted compensation.

The members of the legislature advocated for an annual evaluation from the boards of trustees and from the Board of Governors based on clearly defined goals with appropriate feedback to the presidents. They acknowledged the evaluations' impact on presidential compensation.

All participant categories agreed that the evaluations were, or should be, performed on an annual basis. The presidents, trustees, and governors all stressed leadership as an important internal attribute to be measured. The trustees and the governors agreed that the external attributes to be measured were leadership and

community relations and the presidents added fundraising as important. All participant groups agreed that the evaluation impacted the compensation.

As a group, the participants were fairly consistent with their response in matching roles and selection criteria to the presidential evaluation. Most cited leadership, CEO-style of management, vision, and working with the board as internal roles. Most cited economic development, leadership, fundraising, and community relations as important external roles. The governors and the legislators also cited faculty relations as important. These were also fairly consistent with the responses for presidential selection, the notable exception being the emphasis placed on an academic background by the legislators.

Research Question 4

What are the trends, if any, in the compensation of university presidents in the Florida State University System from 1996-2006?

Table 14 demonstrated the response clusters and themes for Research Question 4. For all response categories, the themes in compensation were that the legislative salary cap of \$225,000 from appropriated funds had no impact on the compensation packages, university foundations made up the differences in the \$225,000 and the compensation package, and the funds used to supplement the compensation packages could be used for other institutional needs. All participant categories agreed that the salary cap of \$225,000 had little or no impact on presidential compensation. They agreed that outside funding sources, primarily through the individual university foundations, made up the differences in salary and other components of the compensation package. Most participants agreed

that the supplements provided by the foundations would be put to better use by funding scholarships or other university needs. Several participants noted that the salary cap was a bad public policy decision by the legislature. Participants from the boards of trustees stated there should be no arbitrary limits on presidential compensation and the legislators felt that the taxpayers approved of the salary cap.

A review of the salary histories of seven SUS university presidents showed that in 2000, one year before the change in governance in Florida's higher education, the mean presidential salary was \$214,445 with a range of \$180,200 to \$247,900. In 2003, two years after the change in governance, the mean salary was \$304,693, an increase of approximately 42%, with a range of \$240,000 to \$375,000. The spike in the 2002-2003 salaries corresponded to the establishment of the boards of trustees at the 11 SUS universities in 2001. The 2006 salary mean was \$360,487, with a range of \$278,250 to \$450,000, an increase of approximately 18% since 2003.

The average salary of the presidents has increased from \$214,445 in 2000, to \$360,487 in 2006, an increase of approximately 60% in six years.

Conclusions

This study sought to examine the roles of the Florida SUS university presidents and determine the trends in their selection, evaluation, and compensation. Based on the review of literature and the researcher's finding, several conclusions emerge.

In 2001, supported by members of the legislature, Florida's governor, Jeb Bush, signed into law legislation that dissolved the Board of Regents and replaced it with a new

system of decentralized governance. Each of the state's public universities, which numbered 11 with the addition of New College in Sarasota on July 1, 2001, were to be led by individual boards of trustees appointed by the governor.

Prior to the change in Florida's higher education governance in 2001, presidents were viewed as the academic authority at the institutions. Since 2001, and the establishment of boards of trustees and by Florida statute, presidents were seen as the chief executive officer (CEO) of their institutions, a change from an academic model to a business model. Trustees, who primarily come from a business background, viewed them as CEOs and have chosen to compensate presidents at a higher level, commensurate with their level of a chief executive officer. The member of the Board of Governors viewed the presidents as CEOs.

The trend in the selection of presidents appeared to be that the boards of trustees selected presidents for their ability to maneuver the political landscape, whether their backgrounds were academic or political. Presidents were selected for their leadership and fundraising skills, community relations expertise, and their ability to manage their universities as the CEO of a corporation. The trend appeared to be that half of the more recently appointed presidents have come from the political arena. Presidents Brogan, Delaney, and Wetherell all had political backgrounds and were all hired by their boards of trustees.

Evaluation trends indicated that boards of trustees evaluated the presidents as CEOs in charge of large corporations. They were evaluated on leadership, vision, integrity, fundraising, achievement of goals, and community relations on an annual basis

by the board and every three years with an outside consultant. Evaluations had a direct impact on compensation and boards tended to reward their presidents for their personal attributes using a business model.

There appeared to be an upward trend in the presidential compensation since the establishment of the boards of trustees in 2001 as revealed by the 42% average spike in compensation in the two years following their establishment. The boards were rewarding the presidents with increasingly competitive and market-based compensation packages. It also appeared that the salary cap of \$225,000 had had little or no impact on presidential compensation. The average salary of the university presidents in 2006 was \$360,487. Compensation packages for each president varied and may have included bonuses, deferred compensation, housing or housing allowance, car or car allowance, and club memberships.

Implications for Policy and Practice

It was evident from the discussions with SUS presidents and members of boards of trustees, the Board of Governors, and the legislators that the 2003 legislative salary cap of \$225,000 from appropriated funds was not effective in its original intent. The legislature may wish to readdress the issue and make adjustments to the range of the cap. Boards of trustees may want to collaborate to develop a framework for presidential evaluations around common themes like those revealed in this study. Those aspiring to a career as a university president should be aware that the changing landscape of the

presidency has far-reaching implications for appropriate early career choices as they prepare for the role.

Recommendations for Further Research

1. Further research with Florida SUS university presidents, members of Florida SUS boards of trustees, members of the Florida Board of Governors, and members of the Florida Legislature could be conducted. Participant categories and sample size should be expanded to include faculty, community, or other constituent groups.
2. This study could be broadened to include additional members of the samples.
3. This study was designed to review the impact that the 2001 changes in higher education governance in Florida and on the university presidency. The study could be broadened to include other states which may or may not have similar forms of governance.
4. The demographics of the SUS university president may change as the current presidents retire or move on to other universities. There may also be changes in the governance structure as it matures. A study could be conducted to profile the SUS presidents of five years from now and to examine the job description to reveal what traits will be desirable.
5. This research could be duplicated in a qualitative and/or quantitative study with a sample of different populations of stakeholders such as faculty. Other areas for study could indicate how does a change in governance, like that which happened

in Florida in 2001, affect the relationship of the president to his or her faculty?

How may the president's agenda be very different from the faculty members'

agenda? To whom is he or she accountable? And finally, how do these questions

influence the decisions of both the president and the board?

6. Another area for further research would seem to be additional studies of the roles of the university president. Establishing these presidents' roles and challenges may identify the common criteria that boards of trustees and state university systems can use to create equitable and reasonable evaluation instruments. Other considerations are what should the evaluation include to measure the modern president who is part academic, part politician, and part fund-raiser? How do governance issues affect the relationship of the president to his or her legislature, board, faculty, and institution? To whom is he or she accountable? What new theories need to be developed or older theories need to be modernized to address these issues? And finally, how do these questions influence the decisions of all of the stakeholders of the university?
7. Further research could study presidential evaluations, perhaps to identify the most prevalent models currently in use by boards of trustees to create a statewide instrument. What should the evaluation include to measure the modern president who is part academic, part politician, and part fund-raiser? How does a change in governance, like that which happened in Florida, affect the relationship of the president to his or her faculty? What implications does that relationship change have for collective bargaining when the chief executive officer of a university

must devote most of his or her energies into responding to a board's agenda, which may be very different from the faculty's? To whom is he or she accountable? What new theories need to be developed or older theories need to be modernized to address these issues. And finally, how do these questions influence the decisions of both the president and the board?

8. Another study could examine whether the universities still needs a leader who has come up through the academic ranks, or one who is a corporate executive or a politician. Which model is more useful for the modern university?
9. Another study could examine the relationship between CEO salaries and university presidents with a similar breadth of responsibilities.
10. A study could done to determine the relationship, if any, of the increase in SUS salaries and compensation to that of faculty and other SUS administrators.

APPENDIX A:

AMENDMENT 11 TO THE FLORIDA STATE CONSTITUTION, NOVEMBER 2002

AMENDMENT 11
ARTICLE IX, SECTION 7

Article IX of the Florida Constitution is hereby amended to add the following as Section 7:

TEXT: State University System.-

a. Purposes. In order to achieve excellence through teaching students, advancing research and providing public service for the benefit of Florida's citizens, their communities and economies, the people hereby establish a system of governance for the state university system of Florida.

b. State University System. There shall be a single state university system comprised of all public universities. A board of trustees shall administer each public university and a board of governors shall govern the state university system.

c. Local Board of Trustees. Each local constituent university shall be administered by a board of trustees consisting of thirteen members dedicated to the purposes of the state university system. The board of governors shall establish the powers and duties of the boards of trustees. Each board of trustees shall consist of six citizen members appointed by the governor and five citizen members appointed by the board of governors. The appointed members shall be confirmed by the senate and serve staggered terms of five years as provided by law. The chair of the faculty senate, or the equivalent, and the president of the student body of the university shall also be members.

d. Statewide Board of Governors. The board of governors shall be a body corporate consisting of seventeen members. The board shall operate, regulate, control, and be fully responsible for the management of the whole university system. These responsibilities shall include, but not be limited to, defining the distinctive mission of each constituent university and its articulation with free public schools and community colleges, ensuring the well-planned coordination and operation of the system, and avoiding wasteful duplication of facilities or programs. The board's management shall be subject to the powers of the legislature to appropriate for the expenditure of funds, and the board shall account for such expenditures as provided by law. The governor shall appoint to the board fourteen citizens dedicated to the purposes of the state university system. The appointed members shall be confirmed by the senate and serve staggered terms of seven years as provided by law. The commissioner of education, the chair of the advisory council of faculty senates, or the equivalent, and the president of the Florida student association, or the equivalent, shall also be members of the board.

APPENDIX B:
BOARD OF GOVERNORS' MASTER POWERS AND DUTIES, 2003

PREAMBLE

WHEREAS, Section 7(d), Article IX of the Constitution of the State of Florida was approved by the citizens of Florida in November 2002; and

WHEREAS, said section created the Board of Governors of the State University System of Florida effective January 7, 2003, and stipulated its governing responsibilities; and

WHEREAS, the Board of Governors shall operate, regulate, control, and be fully responsible for the management of the whole university system; and

WHEREAS, said Board is responsible to achieve excellence through teaching students advancing research, and providing public service for the benefit of Florida citizens, their communities and economies; and

WHEREAS, said Board consists of seventeen (17) members, 14 of whom are appointed by the Governor. In addition to the 14 members appointed by the Governor, the Board of Governors automatically includes the Commissioner of Education, the Chair of the Advisory Council of the Faculty Senates and the President of the Florida Student Association; and

WHEREAS, the appointed members shall serve staggered 7-year terms. In order to achieve staggered terms, beginning July 1, 2003, of the initial appointments, 4 members shall serve 2-year terms, 5 members shall serve 3-year terms, and 5 members shall serve 7-year terms; and

WHEREAS, said Board's management shall be subject to the powers of the Legislature to appropriate for the expenditure of funds; and

WHEREAS, said Board will conduct its business in an open and inclusive manner;

Be it therefore resolved that the Board of Governors shall:

I. Assume the following Duties and Responsibilities with respect to the State University System:

- 1 Establish the vision, mission, and goals for the State University System.
- 2 Establish a long-term plan for the State University System.
- 3 Develop, approve and advocate an annual budget for the State University System.
- 4 Determine the financial needs of the State University System; develop financial strategies to fund those needs and advocate those strategies. An element of the financial strategy includes a policy governing tuition and fees.
- 5 Develop policies governing student access, enrollment, admissions, matriculation, and graduation.

6 Develop policies that prevent wasteful, inefficient duplication of facilities and programs.

1

1 Account for expenditures from legislative appropriations.

2 Develop policies that ensure the delivery of high quality academic programs and services.

3 Develop policies in partnership with others that ensures seamless articulation with other educational sectors.

4 Develop policies that govern data collection, dissemination, and analysis.

5 Select or remove, with the advice and consent of the Commissioner of Education, the Chancellor of Colleges and Universities.

6 Review annually the Chancellor's performance.

II. Assume the following Duties and Responsibilities with respect to the Constituent Colleges and Universities:

1 Define the mission and approve the goals and key strategies of each constituent college and university through an inclusive model that provides due consideration of the mission, goals, and strategies approved by the university board of trustees of each constituent college and university as balanced against the higher education needs of the State and the resources available to fund those needs.

2 Approve the budget of each constituent college and university.

3 Measure the performance and efficiency of each constituent college and university using realistic accountability standards.

4 Seek to ensure the financial integrity of each constituent college and university.

5 Appoint 5 of the 13 University Board of Trustees members for each university subject to confirmation by the Senate and consider, along with the Governor, diversity and regional representation when making these appointments.

6 Approve the policies and procedures of each constituent college and university governing their respective presidential search, including criteria used in the selection, appointment, and evaluation. The Board of Governors' ratification of the final candidate is required.

III. Devolve the powers and duties enumerated in s. 1001.74, Florida Statutes, to the University Board of Trustees of the Constituent Colleges and Universities.

IV. Operate in the following manner:

1 A Chair and Vice Chair shall be elected by a majority vote of the Board at a meeting held during the first calendar quarter. The Chair and Vice Chair shall serve terms beginning July 1 of the year elected and shall serve for a two-year term of office. There shall be no term limits.

1 Convene no fewer than eight (8) times per year to be scheduled at least 24 months in advance. The Chair may convene additional meetings at her/his discretion subject to the notice requirements of Chapter 286, Florida Statutes (the “Sunshine Law”). It is expected that these additional meetings will typically be telephonic.

2

3. Form standing and ad hoc committees of the board as deemed necessary. In each instance, the standing committee shall be governed by the powers and duties delegated to the Committee and approved by the full board. The delegation of powers and duties shall include at a minimum:

a. The duties and responsibilities of the committee

b. The meeting schedule of the committee. The Chair may convene additional meetings at her/his discretion subject to the notice requirements of Chapter 286, Florida Statutes (the “Sunshine Law”). It is expected that these additional meetings will typically be telephonic.

c. The identity of the staff resources to the committee

V. By enumerating specific responsibilities above, the Board of Governors has not intended to limit its constitutional responsibility to operate, regulate, control and be fully responsible for the management of the whole university system.

APPENDIX C:
BOARD OF GOVERNORS' MEMBERS 2006

Carolyn K. Roberts, Chair
Sheila M. McDevitt, Vice Chair
Jorge Arrizurieta
Arlen Chase
John Dasburg
Akshay Desai
Ann W. Duncan
Charles B. Edwards
Frank S. Harrison
J. Stanley Marshall
Frank Martin
Lynn Pappas
Ava L. Parker
Tico Perez
John W. Temple
Commissioner John Winn
Zachariah P. Zachariah

APPENDIX D:
FLORIDA STATE UNIVERSITY SYSTEM PRESIDENTS

Dr. J. Bernard Machen – President
University of Florida
Post Office Box 113150
Gainesville, Florida 32611
(352) 392-1311 SC 622-1311
Fax (352) 392-9506

Dr. T. K. Wetherell – President
Florida State University
211 Westcott Building
Tallahassee, Florida 32306
(850) 644-1085 SC 284-1085
Fax (850) 644-9936

Dr. Castell V. Bryant - Interim President
Florida A & M University
400 Lee Hall
Tallahassee, Florida 32307-3100
(850) 599-3223 SC 286-3223
Fax (850) 561-2152

Dr. Judy L. Genshaft – President
University of South Florida
4202 East Fowler Avenue
Tampa, Florida 33620-6150
(813) 974-2791 SC 574-2791
Fax (813) 974-5530

Mr. Frank T. Brogan – President
Florida Atlantic University
777 Glades Road
Boca Raton, Florida 33431
(561) 297-3450 SC 238-3450
Fax (561) 297-2777

Dr. John C. Cavanaugh - President
University of West Florida
11000 University Parkway
Pensacola, Florida 32514-5750
(850) 474-2200 SC 680-2200
Fax (850) 474-3131

Dr. John C. Hitt - President
University of Central Florida
Post Office Box 160002
Orlando, FL 32816-1823
(407) 823-1823 SC 345-1823
Fax (407) 823-2264

Dr. Modesto A. Maidique -President
Florida International University
University Park Campus
11200 S.W. 8th Street, PC 528
Miami, FL 33199
(305) 348-2111 SC 441-2111
Fax (305) 348-3660

Mr. John A. Delaney - President
University of North Florida
4567 St. Johns Bluff Road, South
Post Office Box 17074
Pottsborg Station
Jacksonville, FL 32224
(904) 620-2515 SC 861-2500
Fax (904) 620-2515

Dr. William C. Merwin - President
Florida Gulf Coast University
10501 FGCU Boulevard, South
Ft. Myers, FL 33965-6565
(239) 590-1055 SC 731-1055

Dr. Gordon E. Michalson, Jr. -
President
New College of Florida
5700 North Tamiami Trail
Sarasota, FL 34243-2197
(941) 359-4310 SC 546-4310
Fax (941) 359-4655

APPENDIX E:
INTERVIEW: SUS PRESIDENTS

Interview: SUS President

1. President _____
2. SUS University: _____
3. Dates of presidential tenure: _____
4. Brief occupational history:
5. Hired by Board of Regents? Hired by the Board of Trustees? Other?
6. Describe the process by which you were selected as president.
7. Describe your role(s) when you first became president of your university.
8. What is the most significant change in your role (s) since you were hired?
9. Describe your role(s) today as president of your university.
10. What are the most important attributes that you bring to your role(s) as president?
11. What attributes are most important to your board of trustees?
12. How are those attributes evaluated and measured? How often?
13. Does your evaluation impact your compensation? If so, how?
14. How has the 2003 legislative salary cap of \$225,000 impacted your compensation package, if at all?
15. How have the changes in governance impacted your presidency, if at all?
16. Additional comments:

APPENDIX F:

INTERVIEW: MEMBER OF A BOARD OF TRUSTEES

Interview: Member of a Board of Trustees

1. Name: _____
2. SUS university: _____
3. University President: _____
4. Dates of presidential tenure: _____
5. Hired by Board of Regents? Board of Trustees? Other? _____
6. Brief occupational history of trustee:
7. Describe your role(s) as a member of your board of trustees:
8. Describe the role(s) of the president of your university.
9. Describe the process by which your president was selected.
10. What is the most significant change in the role (s) since he/she was hired?
11. What are the most important attributes that he/she brings to his/her presidency?
12. What attributes of your president are most important to your board of trustees?
13. How are those attributes of your president evaluated and measured? How often?
14. Does your evaluation of your president impact his/her compensation? If so, in what way?
15. How has the 2003 legislative salary cap of \$225,000 impacted the presidential compensation package for your institution, if at all?
16. How will your board select its next university president?
17. Additional comments:

APPENDIX G:
INTERVIEW MEMBER OF THE BOARD OF GOVERNORS

Interview: Member of the Board of Governors

1. Name: _____
2. City of residence and/or business: _____
3. Brief occupational history of governor:
4. Dates of service on Board of Governors: _____
5. Describe your role(s) as a member of the Board of Governors:
6. Describe the process by which the Board of Governors approves the selection of a university president.
7. Describe the role(s) of the president of an SUS university.
8. What is the most significant change in the role(s) after he/she is hired?
9. What are the most important attributes that he/she should bring to his/her presidency?
10. Which of those attributes are most important to the Board of Governors?
11. How should those attributes be evaluated and measured? How often?
12. Should the evaluation impact his/her compensation? How?
13. How has the 2003 legislative salary cap of \$225,000 impacted the presidential compensation package, if at all?
14. Additional comments:

APPENDIX H:
INTERVIEW MEMBER OF THE FLORIDA LEGISLATURE

Interview: Member of the Florida Legislature

1. Name: _____
2. Political party: _____
3. District: _____
4. Dates of service in the Legislature: _____
5. Brief occupational history of legislator.
6. Describe your role(s) in higher education as a member of the Florida Legislature.
7. Describe the role(s) of the Board of Governors in higher education in Florida.
8. Describe the role(s) of the boards of trustees in higher education in Florida.
9. How should university presidents be selected?
10. Describe the role(s) of the university presidents in the State University System.
11. What is the most significant change in role(s) since he/she was hired?
12. What are the most important attributes that he/she should bring to his/her presidency?
13. What attributes are most important to the Florida Legislature?
14. What attributes are most important to you as a legislator?
15. How should those attributes be evaluated and measured? How often?
16. How should the evaluation impact his/her compensation?
17. How has the 2003 legislative salary cap of \$225,000 impacted the presidential compensation package, if at all?
18. Additional comments:

APPENDIX I:
INSTITUTIONAL REVIEW BOARD APPROVAL



Office of Research & Commercialization

July 19, 2006

Nancy Marshall
University of Central Florida
Office of the President
MH 308
Orlando, FL 32816-0002

Dear Ms. Marshall:

With reference to your protocol #06-3634 entitled, "Trends in the Selection, Evaluation, and Compensation of University Presidents in the Florida State System" I am enclosing for your records the approved, expedited document of the UCFIRB Form you had submitted to our office. **This study was approved on 7/19/2006. The expiration date for this study will be 7/18/2007.** Should there be a need to extend this study, a Continuing Review form must be submitted to the IRB Office for review by the Chairman or full IRB at least one month prior to the expiration date. This is the responsibility of the investigator.

Please be advised that this approval is given for one year. Should there be any addendums or administrative changes to the already approved protocol, they must also be submitted to the Board through use of the Addendum/Modification Request form. Changes should not be initiated until written IRB approval is received. Adverse events should be reported to the IRB as they occur.

Should you have any questions, please do not hesitate to call me at 407-823-2901.

Please accept our best wishes for the success of your endeavors.

Cordially,

A handwritten signature in cursive script that reads "Joanne Muratori".

Joanne Muratori
UCF IRB Coordinator
(FWA00000351 Exp. 5/13/07, IRB00001138)

Copies: IRB File
Rosemarye Taylor, Ph.D.

LIST OF REFERENCES

- The American college president: 2002 edition, executive summary (2005). Washington, DC: American Council on Education. <http://www.acenet.edu/AM/Template.cfm?Section=CPA&Template=/CM/HTMLDisplay.cfm&ContentID=7445>.
- Atwell, R.H., & Wellman, J.(2000). *Presidential compensation in higher education: Policies & best practices*. Washington, DC: Association of Governing Boards of Universities and Colleges. , Vol. 70, No. 3, p 535-555.
- Atwell, R.H., & Wellman, J.V. (2002). College presidents and higher education policy. *Measuring up 2002: The state-by-state report card for higher education*. Washington, DC: American Council on Education.
- Basinger, J. (1999, August 13). In evaluating the college president, governing boards assert more authority. *The Chronicle of Higher Education*, p. A39.
- Basinger, J. (April, 2001a). Struggling for a balanced life as a president. *The Chronicle of Higher Education*, Vol. 47, 33-38.
- Basinger, J. (2001b, November 30). Private sources play more of a role in paying public-university chiefs. *The Chronicle of Higher Education*, p. A24.
- Basinger, J. (2002, November 22). The growing \$500,000 club. *The Chronicle of Higher Education*, Vol. 49, Issue 13.
- Basinger, J. (2003a, November 14). Closing in on \$1 million. *The Chronicle of Higher Education*, p. S1.
- Basinger, J. (2003b, November 14). Soaring pay, big questions. *The Chronicle of Higher Education*.
- Basinger, J., & Henderson, S. (2003, November 14). Hidden costs of high public pay. *The Chronicle of Higher Education*, p. S3.
- Bauer, M. (1993). Are the leadership practices of college presidents in the northeast distinct from those of industry leaders of business and industry? Unpublished doctoral dissertation, The University of New Haven Graduate School, West Haven.
- Beach, M. (Winter, 1972). Presidents' eye-view of the history of higher education. *History of Education Quarterly*, Vol. 12, No. 4, 575-587.

- Bok, D. (2002, November 22). Are huge presidential salaries bad for colleges? *The Chronicle of Higher Education*, p. B20.
- The California State University criteria for presidential assessment.* (amended 2001, November 13-14). Board of Trustees CSU.
- Coastal Carolina University. (2006, September 11). Chronicle Careers: President. *The Chronicle of Higher Education: Chronicle Careers*.
- Cotton, R.D. (2003, November 14). Negotiating your contract: Lessons from the front. *The Chronicle of Higher Education*, p. S36.
- DeLuzuriag, T. (2006, July 28). UCF president now highest-paid in state. *Orlando Sentinel*, pp. A1, A19.
- Dennison, G. M. *Small Man on Campus: Modern University Presidents*, Innovative Higher Education, Summer 2001, Vol. 25, Issue 4, p269.
- Dodds, H.W. (Winter, 1960). Some thoughts on the university presidency. *Public Administration Review*, Vol. 20, No. 1, p. 10-16.
- Dowdall, J. (2003, November 14) Presidential pay from the board's point of view. *The Chronicle of Higher Education*, p. S38.
- Evaluation of presidents/commissioner – policy and procedures.* (amended 2001, April 19). Board of Governors for Higher Education, State of Rhode Island and Providence Plantations. p. 40-46.
- Fain, P. (2005, November 11). Public-university presidents apt to feel underpaid. *The Chronicle of Higher Education*, Vol. 52, Issue 13, p. B4-B6.
- Faculty evaluation of the president.* (2003). UNLV Presidential Evaluation Committee, p. 1-4.
- Florida Agricultural & Mechanical University. (2006, September 11). Chronicle Careers: President. *The Chronicle of Higher Education: Chronicle Careers*.
- Foroorhar, R. & Sheridan, B. (2006, September 18). Are they worthy? *Newsweek*, Vol. 148, Issue 12. Academic Search Premier
- Foster, W.T. (May, 1913). The college presidency. *Science, New Series*. Vol. 37, No. 957, 653-658.

- Fowler, W.M. (Summer, 1977). Remarks upon the views of the livings of college officers, 1782. *History of Education Quarterly*, Vol. 17, No. 2, p. 197 +199-201.
- Gall, M.D., Gall, J.P., & Borg, W.R.(2003). *Educational research* (7th ed.). Boston, MA: Pearson Education, Inc., pp. 178-179.
- Galloro, V., Benko, L.B, & Zigmond, J. (2006, July 31), Controversy, salaries rise. *Modern Healthcare*, Vol. 36, Issue 30.
- Goral, T. (2003, February). Getting behind the salary surge. *University Business*, 6, 21-24.
- Greenberg, D. (1998, June 1). Small men on campus. *New Republic*. Vol. 218, Issue 22, Academic Search Premier.
- Hahn, R. (1995, September-October). Getting serious about presidential leadership: Our collective responsibility. *Change*, 27, 12-20.
- Hirth, D. (2006, October 2). Trustees insist they'll stay. *Tallahassee Democrat*, Tallahassee.com.
- Ingram, R.T., & Weary, W.A. (2000). *Presidential & board assessment in higher education: Purposes, policies & strategies*. Washington, DC: Association of Governing Boards of Universities and Colleges.
- Marquez, J., (2006, July 17). *Investor, company directors far apart in views on exec pay*. Workforce Management, Vol. 85, Issue 13, p. 8. Academic Search Premier.
- McLaughlin, J.B. (2006, July/August). The pressure cooker presidency. *Trusteeship*, p. 8-12. Vol. 14, No. 4.
- Moustakas, C. (1994). *Phenomenological research methods*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, Inc.
- Nicklin, J.L. (2000, November 24). 74 private-college president's earned more than \$300,000 in 1998-99. *The Chronicle of Higher Education*, p. A26.
- O'Connor, L. (September, 2004). Female college, university presidents are on the rise. *The Digital Collegian*. Penn State.

O'Flannery, J.L. (2005). Examining the governance and administration of public higher education in Florida: an exploratory study of organizational elite theory. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Florida Atlantic University, Boca Raton.

Policy and procedures for the evaluation of the president and vice presidents. (Spring, 1997). Southeastern Louisiana University. p. 1-25.

Schwartz, M.P. (1998). *A national survey of presidential performance.* Washington, DC: Association of Governing Boards of Universities and Colleges.

Schwartz, M.P. (2001). *Annual presidential performance reviews.* Washington, DC: Association of Governing Boards of Universities and Colleges.

State University of New York at Farmingdale.(2006, September 11). Chronicle Careers: President. *The Chronicle of Higher Education: Chronicle Careers.*

University of Alabama at Huntsville. (2006, September 13). Chronicle Careers: President. *The Chronicle of Higher Education: Chronicle Careers.*

University of Delaware. (2006, July 7). Chronicle Careers: President. *The Chronicle of Higher Education: Chronicle Careers,* p. C37.