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ABSTRACT

The purpose of this paper is to examine the role of colleges and universities presidents in the politically complex context of the colonial periods and the modern era of higher education. Furthermore, it identified traces of historical perceptions that may remain in today’s educational settings. It was found that several legislative higher education acts helped increase student enrolment and the responsibility of higher education institutions administrators expanded. Administrative bureaucracies began to rise in the modern era and the universities and colleges became much more like a corporate business with well-structured administrations. As administrative hierarchies and bureaucratic management developed, trustees became corporate directors responsible for institution maintenance and administrators became business managers. Modern era presidents’ salaries skyrocketed in the U.S. It was concluded that the modern president’s job has evolved from a cleric to a pure scholar position whose responsibilities span the vast array of functions represented in today’s contemporary universities. The roles of modern college administrators are not only centered on decision-making in developing long-term vision and communicating vision and goals to all stakeholders. Presidents in both public and private colleges and universities are now more accountable to stakeholders, government and the board of trustees. It was recommended that struggling colleges and universities could merge with other institutions that are either flourishing or struggling financially to form a viable institution. Standardizing colleges and universities high college presidents’ salaries would be an interesting topic for future research.
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INTRODUCTION

Presidents in both public and private colleges and universities are now more accountable to stakeholders, government and the board of trustees than they were in the colonial era. Institutions of higher education have become the vital player in reshaping the quality of leadership in America. Ponder (2003) advocated the focal point of transformation
usually begins with college administrators setting the tone by switching from top down management models to more inclusive and collaborative ones. These higher education presidents may rethink their roles, practices, and beliefs, with the explicit goal of producing future generations of effective leaders. Their involvement includes intentionally encouraging the development of leadership in all students seizing opportunities to model effective leadership. Thereby replacing hierarchical, individualistic, and competitive styles with collegial and collaborative ones; reaffirming campus connections to the community and to the common good. Astin (2000) concurred with this view by suggesting that college administrators model this collaboration by continually forming leadership groups such as committees, cabinets, and ad hoc groups which as a result of their activities would facilitate decision making.

In the presence of increasing competition for students, staff and resources at all levels of higher education and strategic thinking, planning and management have become a focus for administrators of universities (Bennett, 2002). Changes are inevitable in the contemporary era of higher education. Changes in university governing body and president roles bring forth a range of concerns, including the very definition of respective roles and duties and the ways in which they are enacted (Baron, 2008 and Trow, 1989). Contemporary universities continued to learn to adapt to the changing world, and have done so successfully, as evidenced by their longevity and administration (Aitkin, 2002). However, Collis (2004) argues that the challenges facing both college and university administration now are different from those of the past, as they are being pressed upon by the forces of the market and globalization rather than coherent policy directions of sovereign leader. Rytmeister (2009), maintained as government policy focuses on accountability and a stronger role for university governing bodies; interfaces and tensions between governance and university management roles have emerged, particularly in relation to strategic direction-setting and planning in the contemporary era of higher education. While a growing body of scholarly literature is devoted to the study of current university issues, much of the current work neglects the human aspects of decision-making established by the university administration between 1865 and twentieth first century. This research will examine the role of the university administrator between the period of 1865 and twentieth first century and its effects, if any, on current administration trends and models.
Purpose and Historical Background

This paper will examine the role of colleges and universities presidents in the politically complex context of the colonial periods and the modern era of higher education. It will identify traces of historical perceptions that may remain in today’s educational settings. During the colonial era, college administration consisted of church leaders whose cardinal interests were based on their religious affiliations. Education was considered authoritative and college presidents during early colleges were often clergymen and spiritual leaders (Boorstin, 1991). The clergymen not only governed the institution as an administrator, but were also primarily in charge of college instruction and disciplines. Private institutions were organized by churches and policies were based on biblical principles. Students had no input in the administration of the college and professoriates were weak but had dynamic presidents.

Significance of the Study

Information from this journal will significantly help increase the body of research on the importance of early college administrators. At this time, little is said about colonial administrators in the contemporary era. This journal will be used to improve college administrators setting the tone by switching from top-down management models to more inclusive and collaborative ones. This study will also help colleges and universities administrators to rethink their roles, practices, and beliefs, with the explicit goal of producing future generations of effective leaders.

The outcome of this journal allows for improvements to the performance of planning and forecasting in the colonial administrators by identifying inconsistencies to improve the way modern colleges and universities are run. Learning from the colonial era could help shape how colleges and universities currently function.

Method

A quantitative research approach was utilized using descriptive data from other journals and data. The shaping of American higher education by Cohen (2012) was a theoretical framework for this journal. Research design was selected to investigate the role of the university administrator between colonial and modern and its effect, on current administration trends was chosen as a theoretical framework to address some current issues in higher education. A secondary data on the web was used for this study. The expected outcomes of this journal were to identify inconsistencies to improve and shape the way modern colleges and universities are operated.
Governance Influence

There was a separation between religious owned college and public colleges. Private colleges encouraged clerical involvement from the president, governing board to administrators, since they were founded by religious denominations. In a contemporary era, such as Bob University and Pensacola Christian College remained to be unaccredited until recently as a result of a long-standing religious policy which it had held since theirs founding in 1927 and 1974. In the colonial era public colleges and universities, however, excluded clerics from administrative positions and seats on trustee boards. Most religious colleges still exclude government involvement in college affairs. American higher education was the 1862 passage of the Morrill Act known as the Land Grant Act. The Land Grant Act expanded opportunity to public higher education, teaching students previously had been excluded from higher education. The act had immense impact on colleges and universities. The transformation, influenced governance role of colleges and universities administration.

Effect of the Morrill Act

Following the great depression, donations from wealthy individuals shrank. Consequently, many private institutions struggled for financial survival. Research universities, on the other hand, grew considerably because they were able to obtain a larger proportion of funding due to the Morrill Act. The Morrill Act in 1862 was passed by Congress prior to the Civil War. This legislation was based on the assurance of equal access to higher education. The Morrill Act granted each state a certain amount of land to establish a university and was given the term land grant (Palinchak, 1973). In 1890, the second Morrill Act (AACC, 2010), withheld funds from any state that refused admission to the land grant colleges based on race unless the states provided separate institutions for minorities. This act expanded the public education population to include not only the privileged white male, but many blacks who were unable to attend college previously. Because the second Morrill Act increased students’ enrolment, the responsibility of higher (education) institution administrators expanded (Palinchak, 1973).

Cohen (2010), author of “The Shaping American Higher Education”, opined that since the origination of American higher education, one particular trend that has not declined is the role of administration in higher education. He maintained that “the governance forms established in the colonial college, solidified as self-perpetuating or legislatively appointed governing boards, maintained control and responsibility”(Cohen, p. 94). He further notes that
“presidents increasingly came to be seen as the representative of the trustees, less as a member of the faculty” (p. 92). The dynamic of the university administrator was changing to meet the need of securing institutional support. It was during this era that the presidents were less likely to be a cleric. Laymen as opposed to clergy often filled presidency positions during the colonial era. These presidents tended to be fundraisers and experts in public relations, as opposed to faculty members or administrators. The different financial sources reflected the different forms of influence that affected the curriculum. Since the developing era, private donations, legislative appropriations, sponsorship from founding church groups, and student tuition funded institutional finance. Administrative bureaucracies began to rise in the revolution era and the universities and colleges became much more like a corporate business and well structured colleges and universities administrators. As administrative hierarchies and bureaucratic management developed, trustees became corporate directors responsible for institution maintenance and administrators became business managers. The appointments differed between public and private schools. Whereas the state governor appointed trustees in public institutions, the church body elected trustees among many private institutions.

Vaughan (1989) discussed early administrators were basically pioneers blazing the trails others were to follow; many of their decisions were neither right nor wrong and they were groundbreaking decisions. The early presidents could not rely on past perspectives to guide them, but in many cases their words were policies and authoritative. The early presidents’ ‘perspectives’ about their jobs were never recorded. Furthermore, Vaughan (1989) maintained a founding president moved into an area, constructed buildings, employed faculty, developed curricula, recruited students, placed the teaching and learning process in motion, and spread the mission of the community college to anyone that would listen.

**Evolution and Roles of University President**

Sullivan (2001) maintained the effect of college and university administrators between 1865 between 1900 still had current traces on college administrators which were better managers. The roles of the administrators have shifted due to student population and current governing in higher education (Sullivan, 2001). Cohen and Brawer (2003) wrote that the president’s role shifted from an instigator of growth to a strategic planner. With this shift from growth to strategic planning, administrators were able to build on the strong foundation laid by early administrators (Sullivan, 2001). Further, Sullivan (2001) described the current era as one built on the strong foundation laid by the preceding generations. Administrators, during the transformation era, endured recessions, were pressured to be more accountable,
suffered public distrust and accepted increasing numbers of underprepared students, much like administrators of today.

During the transformational era, the make-up of governing boards moved from predominantly clergy and government members to laypersons in the community that did not necessarily have a background in higher education (Taylor & Machado, 2008 and Trow, 1989). As higher education moved to a more business-like structure, board members were often selected based on current contributions or the possibility of future contributions to the institution. The corporate board model developed for higher education governing boards during this era is still in use today. Boards of trustees are responsible for the financial and legal well-being of the institution or system as well as the final decision makers for policy and appointment of the chief executive officer or the president (Taylor & Machado, 2008).

Colleges and Universities in the transformational era began to resemble businesses in more ways than just the appointment of governing boards (Toma, 2007). Presidents and chief executive officers also resembled corporate officers with management experience and an entrepreneurial spirit. Now in time of drastic budget cuts, many colleges and universities are favoring individuals with business management skills over those with academic credentials for the top management positions (Toma, 2007). The most successful businesses are noted for not only strong financial management, but great customer service. Enrollment growth in the transformational era led to the need for the establishment of Student Affairs offices to provide the needed “customer” or student services. Colleges and universities today are experiencing tremendous enrollment growth and increased accountability for student completion rates, and student affairs will play a large role in making sure that students have access to the assistance needed to be successful (Toma, 2007 and Trow, 1989).

Another defining characteristic of the transformation era was the “rise of the professoriate” (Taylor & Machado, 2008). During this era, faculty transformed from tutors to professors with expertise in specific discipline areas. As the respect for the profession increased, so did the pay, responsibility and status of the professor. The development of departments centered on specific disciplines and the formation of professional organizations for faculty began to build the framework for a collegial power structure (Lerner, 2008). The advancements made during this period eventually led to academic freedom, tenure, and the participation of faculty in institutional governance. Faculty senates emerged giving professors the opportunity to vote on educational policy, a voice in curriculum decisions and faculty
appointments. Today faculty still enjoy the expansion of their role in institutional governance that initially began in the transformational era; however the current trend of hiring adjunct or non-tenure track faculty may erode the gains made by faculty during the transformation era (Lerner, 2008). Tenured faculty members have the larger roles in institutional governance and committee work. According to Lerner (2008), fewer tenured faculty members mean less power and influence on academic policies for professors.

**Use of Adjunct Professors**

In colonial era, each college had church connection and most faculty members were tutors, typically recent college graduates. College president and tutors taught all subjects. In a contemporary era, most college presidents do not teach. Populations of students have skyrocketed and budget cuts have been the arena issues of higher education. However, colleges and universities use adjunct faculty due to financial predicament and increase in enrolment (Cohen, 2010). Most adjunct faculty hired semester by semester cannot make their impact felt on the governance of the college. Due to constant budget cuts, the trend of hiring more adjunct faculty with low wages and no benefits continues to increase each year. Over 70% of community college faculty in 2006 held only part-time positions (Lerner, 2008). The Adjunct faculty account for about half of all faculty appointments in American higher education. The non-tenure track comprises of two major groups: those who teach part time and those who teach full time but are not on tenure-track lines. Part-time faculty now hold 38 percent of faculty appointments, and non-tenure-track, full-time faculty hold 20 percent (AAUP (2006). Unless this trend slows down, the current downturn in the economy may lead to institutional decisions that take the role of the faculty members back to the early days of the colonial period. By forming unions and negotiating groups, contingent faculty will continue to take action to keep the trend from expanding (Lerner, 2008). In California, New Jersey and Georgia adjunct faculty have won pay increases as well as conversion to full-time positions in some cases (Lerner, 2008). The struggle of faculty for a voice in institutional governance that began in the transformational era is still continuing today.

**Findings**

Higher education has been positively correlated with public and political participation Beaumont (2002) suggested that universities have been given a task to make some type of impacts on society by producing critical thinking individuals. One main mission of higher education is to educate students who have achieved, to a certain degree, some academic
knowledge and skills, and to send these individuals in society to become engaged citizens and to enhance society as a whole (Beaumont, 2002).

In order to understand the future societal implications of the role of the administration, one must first understand the foundational history. Historically, the role of the administration was to in still moral character and fortitude for its students and institutions of higher education were places where a classical curriculum was the standard and piety was the way of life.

Vance (1976) noted the role of the president can be best described as evolutionary, especially in regards to the president’s duties, pedigree, and vocational training. According to author of The American College & University, “…the old-time college president lived at the college, was not absent for long periods of time, probably taught every member of the senior class, knew most of the students by name, indeed probably made a practice of calling on them in their room” Vance (1976) further maintained that Frederick’s statement solidifies how the role of the president was seen during the colonial period. While the president did continue to have a paternal role as with President, Brewer Anderson of the University of Rochester, who stated that, “no class passes through my hand which does not contain more or less young men who are on the eve of ruin from wayward natures. These men must be watched, borne with, and if possible saved to the word and to their families…” (Rudolph, 1962, p. 169). It was not until the University revolution era that the role of the president expanded to include additional functions such as fund raising, expansion, and establishing community relations among alumni and certain “men of affairs” (Rudolph 1962).

The perception that clergymen would be the best to lead an institution still persisted and was seen as a religious calling. The president of Illinois College, Julian Sturtevant, wrote to a friend, seeking prayer for his new responsibility of leading the institution, stating, “How can I ever be sufficient for these things...? Pray for me…” (Rudolph 1962, p.171). It was certainly the case that clergymen were mainstays on several boards of trustees and boards of visitors at various institutions, with some institutional charters stating that the governing boards consist of clergymen. Vance (1976) stressed that the role of the colonial college president was heavily connected to the management of student conduct, an outgrowth of their religious background. “With few exceptions,” according to Vine (1976), colonial-era College presidents began their careers as clergymen, and saw their roles as “ministers-of-education”. The shift of clerical control and the changing role of the president held several societal impacts that still impact the current climate of American higher education. It was the College
of Philadelphia’s founding governing board which changed the membership of governing boards with its membership being the first to have no clergymen. Brown University, whose founding as one of the first institutions built upon religious influences, branched out and selected non-clergymen for its board under the presidency of Francis Wayland (Rudolph, 1962).

**Colonial Effect on Minority**

During the colonial era, blacks and women were under-represented in college and university presidential administrative roles. In the U.S., most of the college and university administrators were caucasians. They were chiefly white men who were married, in their 50s, and had risen through the academic ranks (Sullivan, 2001). The demographics of minority in higher education have not become equal. Minority disparity at the presidential level is not yet realized and women presidents were 26.4% (Lederman, 2012).

Table 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnic Group</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Caucasian</td>
<td>81.1</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>85%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African American</td>
<td>8.1</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Indian</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian American</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


A longevity Table 2 showed Minority presidents hired in colleges between 2011 and 2012 which revealed a declined in hiring minority. In 2001, 14.4 % of the minority college presidents were hired while in 2006, only 12. 9% were hired and in 2011 Minority College Presidents Hired continued to diminish. From 2001 to 2011, the total percent of minority college president hired was 38.8 percent. Studies continued and next figures will be out in 2016.

Table 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>14.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>12.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>11.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The descriptive statistics for the ethnicity of the respondents are shown in Table 2. The 2006 survey that led to ACE’s 2007 edition of The American College President has some answers. It found that, at the time, the statistics on the ethnicity indicated that each distribution of Minority Under-represented in college presidential position. Ethnicity/Race composition included Caucasian, African American, and Hispanic, American Indian, Asian American, and Other. The results indicated that there was a good representation of male in the data; although there are much more Caucasian males than females by 7.10%. The Caucasian female was 81.10% while was male was 88.00%. Both male and female represented 85%. In the African American representation, female was 8.1% to 5.3%. There was 2.8% significant difference between the African America male and female. Both male and female represented 7%. Based on the data, African American and Hispanic women were more likely to become a president than men. Cook and Young (2012) data showed that about a quarter of white college and university presidents are women, but more than a third of Hispanic presidents and African American.

**Salaries and Funding**

During the colonial era in higher education, funds were received from sponsorship church groups, subscribers or private donors and governmental bodies. The same process is being done in a contemporary era but colonial administrators were not paid substantial amount (Cohen, 2010). In another development, given the universities increasing emphasis on research and discovering new scientific knowledge, the humanities, including religion, were less evident in the curriculum but the role of higher education administration expanded. Further, colleges sought funding from multiple sources, each with their own interests. Besides pressure to research and train personnel from the government, private philanthropists and alumni also financially contributed for their own particular purposes. These multiple funding sources and interests were evident in the multiple options in the curriculum; thus, college administrators had to build relationships with each entity that was exerting the influence.

Many institutions were debt-ridden and fiscally unsound. This prompted many presidents to have “conservative men of wealth” added to governing boards in order to improve the fiscal reputation of the institution (p. 173). This practice can be seen today in the current climate of higher education. Because of the financial instability faced by many institutions, presidents are called upon to seek donations and other contributions to ease the financial burdens. As such, many presidents are avid fundraisers, thus prompting a significant shift from figurehead to one who chased after funds.
In 2013, basic market pricing report was prepared using certified compensation professionals’ analysis of survey data collected from HR departments at employers of all sizes industries and geographies. It was reported the median expected salary for a typical College President in the United States is $248,169 (Salarycom, 2013).

Despite state funding cuts and slashed campus budgets, pay for administrator of public colleges continued to increase nationwide; some presidential salaries topped $1 million. In spite of shortage of funds, many universities are facing financial predicaments. President’s salaries continue to skyrocketing. According to an analysis of nearly 200 state colleges and universities released by the Chronicle of Higher Education, Presidential compensation was up by 4.7 percent during the 2011-2012 school years (Ellis, 2013 and Heyboer, 2013).
Table 3
Highest-Paid Public College Presidents in 2011-12

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>College</th>
<th>Compensation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Graham B. Spanier*</td>
<td>Pennsylvania State University</td>
<td>$2,906,271</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jay Gogue</td>
<td>Auburn University</td>
<td>$2,542,865</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. Gordon Gee</td>
<td>Ohio State University</td>
<td>$1,899,420</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alan G. Merten</td>
<td>George Mason University</td>
<td>$1,869,369</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jo Ann M. Gora</td>
<td>Ball State University</td>
<td>$984,647</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary Sue Coleman</td>
<td>University of Michigan</td>
<td>$918,783</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charles W. Steger</td>
<td>Virginia Tech</td>
<td>$857,749</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mark G. Yudof</td>
<td>University of California</td>
<td>$847,149</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bernard J. Machen</td>
<td>University of Florida</td>
<td>$834,562</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Francisco Cigarroa</td>
<td>University of Texas</td>
<td>$815,833</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: CNN Money News 2013

From the chart, former Penn State President Graham Spanier was the nation’s highest paid public university president with a total compensation package of more than $2.9 million in 2011. Next was Auburn University President Jay Gogue ($2.5 million), Ohio State University President E. Gordon Gee ($1.9 million) and former George Mason University President Alan Merten ($1.9 million). Presidential pay at public colleges has come under increasing scrutiny in recent years as states have cut funding to colleges and universities and tuition has continued to increase (Ellis, 2013 and Heyboer, 2013).

The impact of budget cut has led to fundraising. The chase for funds led presidents to begin creating relationships with businessmen within the community as well as with prominent alumnae. In regards to the state institutions, presidents garnered support from their respective state legislators. This trend shows how presidents had to be industrious and entrepreneurial in raising funds. The societal impacts illustrate that higher education administration has moved from clergymen to businessmen and the role of the institution no longer was a branch of religious life but strictly business.

Implications for Future Roles

The colonial presidents were expected to be the fundraiser-in-chief for their institutions, a role for which they are typically underprepared while fund raising was and will
continue a component of higher education. They actively, deliberately, and systematically raise funds to support the activities and budgetary needs of their institutions.

Implications of the role of administration on American universities are characterized by the practice of shared governance (AAUP, 2006). This involves faculty, trustees, and the president combining efforts to administer the university’s business, but the president holds the responsibility for “the definition and attainment of goals, for administrative action, and for operating the communications system that links the components of the academic community” (AAUP, 2006, p. 138). This shared governance begins to describe the scope of a modern college president’s responsibility. As universities have developed into complex organization, the roles of president will extend far beyond academic goals, administrative action, and communication to real estate acquisition, state and federal policy advocacy, active fund-raising, and public service.

Some of the challenges facing and will continue to higher education administration include the market forces of globalization, increasing competition, diminishing budgets, transformative technologies, rooted traditions, use of adjunct faculty, curriculum renovation, pedagogical innovation, academic freedoms, universal access to learning (online program), evolving governance, faculty reformation, hiring freezes, tuition increases, and increase demand for student financial aid, salaries, and quality protections (Van Hook, 2004). According to Growe (2003), the roles of administrators are now as diverse as the administrators themselves. Current trends are affecting the role of administration and are changing with the times. Freedom of speech at the university will gradually erode. University will not be a quiet place to teach and perform scholarly studies. With the advent of a globalization, administration at universities roles will continue to be big, complex and demanding (Skilbeck, 2001). Administrators must “utilize transformational leadership in communications and market in order to remain present with the demands of an ever changing student population (Kritsonis, 2007).

With the rise of administrative bureaucracies, universities are starting to run as large corporations in that they function on organization and efficiency (Cohen, 2010). Administrators are now confronted with additional responsibilities that were once not required in the past and now must govern universities such as a CEO would run a business (Grove, 2003).
According to Demaris (2007), postmodernism is to play an important role in the future of education administration. Postmodernism has been defined by Jacobs (2006) as “a set of strategic practices that erase limits or norms to abide by placed upon people in society.” However, another author defined Postmodernism as a distinct shift in the way that humanistic intellectuals view the relation of their cultural work to society at large (e.g. Alvin Gouldner, 1982b). Jacobs and Kritsonis say the time is now for educators to be cognizant of rapid changes occurring in the school system. According to Gilliam et al. (2007), the postmodern perspective presents concepts, insights, and ways of viewing our current situation.

Duderstadt (2007) notes in View from the Helm: Leading the American University During an Era of Change that many duties of the president will continue. Such duties include leading the executive team of administrators; overseeing capital projects; maintaining faculty quality through recruitment, promotion, and retention; serving as a role model for students; advocating on behalf of the university externally especially with alumni, politicians, and various local, state, and federal organizations; initiating strategic-planning processes; fostering a robust yet not overly dominant athletics program; and sharing governance with appropriate internal and external constituencies. Today’s university president will continue to face a nearly-impossible span of management responsibilities and a demand for effective leadership. Presidents of public flagship institutions will continue to deal with added external situations involving the state governor, legislators, and leaders in business and industry. By contrast, Schuman (2005) writes about small colleges and concedes that “although small college presidents are hardly invisible within their campuses or communities, they rarely occupy the positions of high public visibility and political prominence of their peers at major universities,” (p. 103). In a small college, the president is expected to be involved in nearly every aspect of the institution’s operation including faculty, facilities, athletics, and student affairs as it was operated during the emergent era and transformation eras. Schuman (2005) explains that in small colleges, many presidents are expected to know each faculty member individually, interview potential staff members across departments, and attend a wide range of campus activities and events such that “a level of personal accessibility and a constancy of presence is a universal expectation” (p. 102).

CONCLUSION

Colleges and universities in the colonial days in United States existed mainly to train ministers. As such, the first college administrators were highly revered intellectual and
spiritual leaders whose chief responsibilities included teaching required classes in moral philosophy showcasing their rhetoric skills and debate. Presidents bridged the gap between collegiate studies and ministerial life after schooling. After World Wars I and II in general, there was a paradigm shift in higher education enrollment. The shift in higher education enrollment, exposure of German and England education gave birth to modern higher education administrators. It helped also transitioned away from the clerical patriarch model of the presidency in favor of a scholar whose chief responsibilities centered on academics as opposed to religion after exposure to Germany and England’s educational system. The modern president’s job has evolved from a cleric to a pure scholar to a position whose responsibilities span the vast array of functions represented in today’s contemporary universities.

The roles of modern college administrators are not only centered on decision-making in developing long-term vision and communicating vision and goals to all stakeholders. Other roles are: reinforcing institution financial base, assisting with faculty issues, preparing annual budgets and resolving problems relating to student issues. Presidents in both public and private colleges and universities are now more accountable to stakeholders, government and the board of trustees than ever.

**Recommendation**

During the colonial era, college presidents were known as creative, daring, and unrestricted and the early settlers of the presidency. Sullivan maintained that although administrators were autocratic, they exhibited a traditional leadership style within a hierarchical organizational structure, very much like their counterparts in American industry (Sullivan, 2001). Accountability is the arena of contemporary college president. College president needs to branch out into many faculties in order to increase enrolment, maintain retention and graduate students in a timely manner along with soliciting donations to keep the university running. Anticipating changes in student affairs, faculty issues, staff and developing new strategies to meet challenges posed by change requires an understating of the current themes and trends in higher education.

Contemporary college administrators should be able to establish a defensible process that is flexible enough to predict the future using the mistakes of pass issues in higher education to avert possible problems in their various colleges. Learning from the past may improve the quality, and efficacy of the relationship of stakeholders and the use of decision-making.
Following the great depression, donations from wealthy individuals shrank. Consequently, many private institutions struggled for financial survival. During the colonial era several colleges amalgamated and some closed down due to competition for students and financial constraints. Modern college will soon face similar issues due to budget cuts and global competition for students. College presidents and stakeholder should put aside ride to consolidate with other colleges and universities. Colleges and universities that are struggling could pool resources together to form a viable college. Several businesses have used this model and have been successful. In the contemporary business world, companies have consolidated to form a successful business. For example communication sector manufacturing sector, financial companies and transportation have resulted from high-profile mergers to form a booming companies. Prime examples are Warren Buffett’s Berkshire Hathaway and Richard Branson’s Virgin Group who acquired smaller businesses with strong talent pools.

**Recommendations for Future Research**

Struggling colleges and universities could merge with other institutions that are either flourishing or struggling financially to form a viable institution. Colonial presidents were dedicated to improving colleges and universities. They were not in this position to enrich themselves. Standardizing colleges and universities high college presidents’ salaries will be an interesting topic for future research.
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