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Background/Context: Although research on college and university presidents has grown in recent decades, historically Black college and university (HBCU) presidents have rarely been included in this research. We know almost nothing about the pathways to the HBCU presidency or the role that current presidents play in grooming future presidents. More literature is needed in order to deepen our understanding of the HBCU presidency.

Purpose: With this study, we sought to capture the background characteristics of HBCU leaders, to lay the ground work for future studies on HBCU presidents, and to understand the role these leaders play in grooming and mentoring the next generation of HBCU leaders.

Research Design: In order to answer our research questions, we used a combination a surveys, document analysis, and qualitative interviews.

Conclusions and Recommendations: Our conclusions and recommendations point to a recycling of presidents at HBCUs as well as the disproportionate presence of long-term presidencies. Moreover, although grooming of future presidents is taking place, it is not systematic and would benefit from deeper thought and commitment.
“If you want to know when a college is heading down a slippery slope, I can tell you that it is when you change presidents every two, three, or four years. That’s a sign that the college is going to have difficulties.”

– Haywood Strickland, 2009, President, Wiley College

Historically Black colleges and universities (HBCUs) enroll 11% of African American college students and graduate 22%; showing disproportionate success in terms of their ability to bring Black students toward degree attainment (National Center for Educational Statistics, 2011). These institutions have long been responsible for creating and supporting the Black middle class in the United States and although most African Americans now attend majority institutions, HBCUs still have a substantial impact on society. In particular, HBCUs are still largely responsible for the production of Blacks in science, technology, engineering, and math (STEM) fields (Perna et al., 2009). In order to continue to have an impact on African American society and beyond, it would be beneficial for HBCUs to have bold, effective, and visionary leadership.

According to some scholars and practitioners in higher education, there is a leadership crisis at the nation’s HBCUs (Gasman, 2011a, 2012; Schexnider & Ezell, 2010; Seymour, 2008; Wilson, 2012). In the past decade, many HBCUs have faced accreditation warnings, probations, or loss, including some of the more prominent HBCUs such as Fisk University in Tennessee and Tougaloo College in Mississippi. The Southern Association of Colleges and Schools (SACS), the accrediting agency for all but a few HBCUs, has cited fiscal mismanagement, leadership, unethical behavior, and governance issues in its critique (Duncan, 2010; Gasman, 2008; Karlin-Resnick, 2004; Walker, 2008). Some critics have pointed out the recycling of presidents that is common among HBCUs as part of the problem; others have noted the top-down leadership that occurs at some institutions as well as pointed to the short terms of some presidents (Gasman, 2011c; Hamilton, 2002; Minor, 2004; Schexnider & Ezell, 2010; Strickland, 2009). Still others have noted the lack of fundraising or fiscal management skills on the part of some Black college leaders (Gasman, 2011c; Schexnider & Ezell, 2010). Whether or not the leadership crisis is mere hyperbole, the larger question is from where will future Black college presidents come and how can the pool be strengthened to ensure better leadership and more stable HBCUs? What kind of background do these individuals need? And lastly, are current presidents grooming future presidents and how?

Unfortunately, we know almost nothing about the background of HBCU leaders. With this study, we sought to capture the background
characteristics of HBCU leaders, to lay the groundwork for future studies on HBCU presidents, and to understand the role these leaders play in grooming and mentoring the next generation of HBCU leaders. The role of grooming and mentoring is essential to the preparation of presidential leadership (Freeman, 2011). According to Washburn and Crispo (2006), grooming/mentoring is a process in which a person with power and expertise grooms a protégé for organizational success, generally a senior leader within an organization. They also found that senior leaders seeking to grow future leadership generally identify someone that they would like to groom, which he called a “mentee,” and provide them with leadership opportunities that prepares them for similar roles to the one that the senior leader occupies.

Despite being an important and vital topic, and one that is often discussed in media and policy outlets, there is very little research related to HBCU presidential leadership. We know about the lives of some individual leaders through biography and autobiography, but until recently we knew almost nothing about these individuals as a group (Henry, 2009; Herring, 2010; Mishra, 2007). In fact, HBCU presidents are often left out of larger research projects related to college and university presidents (Mbagekwe, 2006; Nichols, 2004). For example, Birnbaum and Umbach (2001) conducted a study that identified the four career paths to the college presidency and dropped the HBCU presidents from their sample because including them would skew the percentage of minorities. Though true, Birnbaum and Umbach’s decision also neglected to tell the story of HBCU presidents’ career paths.

The first purpose of our article is to gather information on the background of HBCU presidents, discovering the preparation and positions that led them to their position. The second purpose of the study is to investigate whether presidents believed they were helping to groom individuals to replace them and how. The importance of this study stems from the lack of previous research that adequately identifies whether HBCU presidents intentionally prepare and groom individuals for the presidency. As the requirements for the college and university presidency continue to become more complex it is important to understand the background characteristics of those who currently occupy those positions. The results of this study also offer information that may assist those who aspire to an HBCU presidency and give presidential search committees, presidential search consultants, boards of trustees, and policy makers information that will enhance their knowledge regarding both the desirable and undesirable characteristics of future HBCU presidents. This study provides those within the HBCU community, as well as those seeking to join the HBCU community in leadership roles and support
it financially, with comprehensive data on the HBCU presidency. Our findings will enable these groups and individuals to have a greater understanding of the professional background characteristics of current HBCU presidents, which may assist them in future decision making.

LITERATURE REVIEW

Our literature review is divided into two sections: the first section is focused on the college and university presidency overall and the second on the HBCU presidency specifically.

PRESIDENTIAL PATHWAYS

University presidents come from a variety of academic backgrounds. What is generally recognized is that graduate education, in particular, plays a vital role in developing academic leaders. P. A. Brown (2008) wrote, “Graduate school is powerful force in structuring your mind, what facts you legitimize, and how you interpret things. Academic credentialing is very important for a potential president to have” (p. 13).

Judith McLaughlin (1996) states, “There is no one generic community college, college, or university in the United States. Likewise, the training for the presidency is varied” (p. 6). Because the economy continues to fluctuate, boards of trustees will likely look for potential presidential candidates that can solve complex problems and raise substantial dollars for their institutions. Several executive higher education doctoral programs focused upon preparing individuals for executive leadership have sprouted up in established institutions during the early 2000s; among them are the University of Pennsylvania, University of Alabama, University of Georgia, and Jackson State University. Most of these programs are arranged in the cohort model and students must demonstrate that they have substantial leadership experience. These programs usually take two to three years for students to complete. Jackson State University is the only such program that offers a PhD. The other programs offer an EdD. These programs, especially the one at the University of Pennsylvania, have a fairly strong track record for producing presidents of small private and more regionally focused public institutions. Of course, these presidents approach the presidency without the typical academic background that has been considered a staple for decades among presidents at more prestigious institutions (that is, faculty to chair to dean to provost to president) (Birnbaum & Umbach, 2001).
EXPERIENCE

Stimson and Forslund (1970) said, “Despite its formidable responsibilities, the college or university presidency is not the kind of position that lends itself to self-selection” (p. 195), while Sanaghan, Godlstein, Jurow, and Rashford (2005) state that regardless of previous roles, no one is completely ready for the position. A successful presidency is based on institutional needs in conjunction with the knowledge and competency the president brings. Basically, it is a function of good fit. “No matter how accomplished one has been in other positions, the presidency is a completely different experience” suggest Sanaghan et al. (2005, p. 34).

Strengthening the pipeline of future university presidents is paramount to maintaining American global competitiveness in the higher education sector. Presidents set the tone and vision for their prospective institutions. Therefore they effect the direction of the academe. It has been suggested that institutions do not have to necessarily look outside of their institutions for future top leadership. Some scholars have suggested that institutions grow their own leadership. Moore (1998) posits that “a person enters the presidency through the inside door when he or she is an employee of the college upon selection or enters through the outside door when he or she is not employed by the college at the time of selection” (p. 55). One of the ways that institutions have developed their own talent is by sending their top leadership to programs such as the American Council on Education’s fellows program (American Council on Education, 2011) and Harvard’s Institute for Educational Management. Some institutions are also sponsoring potential leaders’ pursuit of a terminal degree. According to Patton (2007),

If you don’t protect your own leadership pool with some planning and thinking, somebody else will be there to borrow from that pool if you don’t have a plan that develops people, moves them forward, somebody else will sing that siren song to them and they’ll go in that direction. (p. 25)

If schools do not make the proper investments they leave themselves vulnerable to brain drain. Patton (2007) shares the concern that institutions of higher education must be strategic about recruiting and developing top talent for leadership. She states,

But as schools look toward the future, staffing becomes a big question mark. More and more baby boomers are exiting the workforce, which is fueling the skilled labor shortage. Some institutional leaders are concerned that they won’t be ready, that they will be unable to recruit the talent they desperately need. (p. 25)
The reluctance of many in higher education leadership to adjust some of their recruiting practices may hamper their ability to recruit top emerging leaders. Patton (2007) also alludes to the idea that the hiring process can be cumbersome. Specifically, she states, “the vetting process is very long and detailed. Selection is often conducted by broad committees, which require a great deal of documentation of academic and management success before anyone is hired” (p. 26).

CONSIDERATIONS BEFORE MOVING TO THE PRESIDENCY

There are several steps to the presidency that Moore (1998) suggests. They include: the person deciding to apply, interviewing with the prospective institution, waiting through the selection process, and, after being selected, going through a period of self- and institutional discovery. When thinking about applying for a presidency, experts suggest that potential applicants take very judicious steps, because the first presidency is the one that will set the course for the rest of their career, and it should be sought with care. Selecting a presidency is like selecting a spouse. A person cannot go in thinking that he or she can change the nature and character of an institution any more than they can change the nature and character of a mate. A person must also consider the issue of “sector crossing”—that is, if someone starts at an HBCU, can they make the transition to a historically White institution, or vice versa? This can occur, but history tells us it is rare (Career Consultants, 1998; Moore, 1998). The same issue can arise when moving from a private institution to a public institution. Therefore, where a person starts may have a definite impact on their ability to move between sectors (Career Consultants, 1998; Moore, 1998).

According to Alexander (2008), potential presidents also must consider their temperament and their strength of character. They must be clear about their underlying principles during periods of conflict and when forced to make difficult decisions. Presidents must be committed to their underlying principles under threat. If their commitment is strong, then they can proceed to act with purpose and conviction, even in the face of opposition. Even though presidents must have strong convictions, they should be able to always remain under control. Rajib Sanya, dean of Northern Michigan University’s College of Business (as cited in Lum, 2008), suggests, “A president has to appear positive in public and can’t get angry” (para. 1). It is also important to remember that to be chosen for leadership is a privilege. (Alexander, 2008) Presidential leadership is a privilege that comes with the responsibility—to protect the integrity and reputation of the institution, to produce high quality results, and to safeguard the members of the institution who depend on it for their
livelihood. “Except when one is faced with challenges to moral and ethical standards, those imperatives of leadership supersede personal agendas and biases, political beliefs and affiliations, and philosophical orientations” (Alexander, 2008, p. 30).

It is also important for persons considering a presidency to think about how they would like to compose their executive leadership team. Alexander (2008) suggests that

in building a leadership team, appoint supremely competent persons who clearly understand that their role is to implement the institutional vision and plan. Complete the requisite background reviews and face-to-face interviews to confirm that potential team members will be loyal and trustworthy. (p. 30)

Fisher and Koch (1996) note “loyalty on one’s staff is as important as competence and that to tolerate even the slightest disloyalty from an administrative subordinate is to set a shorter time limit on an effective presidency” (p. 110).

ACE: PATHWAY TO THE PRESIDENCY STUDY

The American Council on Education (ACE) (2012) recently conducted a study that has relevance to our research. The study used a 50-question instrument, *The College President’s Survey*, to gather information about these issues. The study contains data from 1,662 presidents, identifying the degree to which they perceived their university preparation as effective in preparing them for the position of the president. The study gathered data pertaining to education, career paths, and length of service, as well as personal characteristics such as age, marital status, and religious affiliation. ACE’s American college president study is the only comprehensive source of demographic data on college and university presidents from all sectors of American higher education (ACE, 2012). This survey was first administered in 1986 to describe the backgrounds, career paths, and experiences of college and university presidents (ACE, 2012). Questions have been adapted and refined throughout that 25-year period. ACE conducted the survey again and the results published as *The American College President: 2012 Edition*. Based upon the data in this study, it appears that in the next decade, there will be large numbers of individuals retiring from the university presidency. This makes it paramount to assure that those who replace them will receive a high-quality education that will prepare them for this role. Throughout the discussion section of this paper, we will use the ACE data as a point of comparison and to make sense of the data from our research on HBCU presidents.
HISTORICALLY BLACK COLLEGE AND UNIVERSITY PRESIDENCY

Higher education researchers have studied the role of the college and university presidency within the United States throughout the past hundred years (Cohen, 1998; Fisher, 1984; Mbagekwe, 2006; Nason, 1980; Nichols, 2004; Ricard & Brown, 2008; Schmidt, 1930; Wiseman, 1991). Yet there is a dearth of literature that addresses the unique role presidents of HBCUs have played within higher education (Gasman, 2011b; Mbagekwe, 2006; Nichols, 2004; Ricard & Brown, 2008). This particular set of presidents has had to endure the cruel hand of Jim Crow laws, unequal funding support, and other disadvantages while still being expected to attract, develop, and retain high-quality faculty and staff members and to sustain their institutions. They must manage the legacy of discrimination in our nation on a daily basis (Gasman, 2011b; Ricard & Brown, 2008).

According to Gasman (2006, 2011), past research that addressed the role of HBCU presidents has characterized them as power hungry, dictatorial, and incompetent. Much of this critique is based on anecdotal evidence and evaluation standards that do not take into account the unique missions, context, history, and disadvantages these presidents must operate within and under (Gasman, 2006, 2011c; Minor, 2004, 2005; Ricard & Brown, 2008). James T. Minor, Senior Program Officer and Director of Higher Education Programs at the Southern Education Foundation, suggests that “strong presidential leadership . . . is partly responsible for the survival and progress of some campuses in a national climate that has often been hostile to the values HBCUs represent” (Minor, 2005, p. 23).

There is not a monolithic path to the HBCU presidency. Many presidents have developed their professional careers through service to the academy, while other presidents have honed their skills through experiences serving in other sectors such as business and the military. One such example is Charles A. Hines, a major general with a 38-year U.S. Army career, who served as president of Prairie View A&M University from 1994–2002. He is credited with successfully rebuilding Prairie View’s infrastructure, developing academic programs, and stabilizing its finances. A more recent example of a nontraditional HBCU president selection is Julianne Malveaux, most recently at Bennett College for Women. Prior to assuming her position at Bennett, she served as a news commentator on issues related to economics and diversity (Hawkins, 2008). In the midst of varying challenges, presidents of HBCUs whose pathways to the presidency have been traditional or nontraditional have been able to maintain and grow their institutions.

There have been several HBCU presidents that have garnered particular attention for their demonstration of visionary leadership. These include Charles S. Johnson, Frederick D. Patterson, Booker T. Washington,
John Hope, William R. Harvey, Benjamin E. Mays, Willa B. Player, Albert E. Manley, Lucy Hale Tapley, Mordecai Wyatt Johnson, and Horace Mann Bond (Benjamin, 2004; L. Brown, 1998; Carter, 1998; Davis, 1998; Engs, 1999; Gilpin & Gasman, 2003; Goodson, 1991; Manley, 1995; Mays, 2003; McKinney, 1997; Robbins, 1996; Smith, 1994; Urban, 1994; Watson & Gregory, 2005). The biographies and autobiographies of these individuals tell their personal stories within the context of larger American society. On occasion, they also tell us about the presidencies of these individuals, focusing on their leadership styles, their actions (often controversial), and their legacies. However, these individual biographies tell us little about HBCU presidents in the aggregate. It is important to note prior to the 1930s the seat of the HBCU presidency was often occupied by a White man (Anderson, 1988).

Although visionary leadership has been an important component of the positive narrative associated with HBCU presidents, one must recognize that addressing uncomfortable or crisis situations has an impact on a leader’s vision. One of the primary areas of difficulty that shapes the job of the presidents is balancing budgets and retaining students. “Tightening budgets and low enrollments have forced some HBCU leaders to take drastic steps to keep their institutions vibrant or in some cases afloat” (Gasman, 2009). Crises such as the aforementioned have forced presidents to make hard administrative decisions. For example, in 2009, President Carlton Brown of Clark Atlanta University laid off seventy full-time faculty members, including some who had earned tenure—a decision that sent shock waves throughout academe and caused many to question Brown’s leadership ability and respect for the academic side of his institution (Gasman, 2009).

HBCU PRESIDENTIAL CAREER PATHS AND PROFESSIONAL CHARACTERISTICS

Hoskins (1978) conducted one of the first studies to address the role of HBCU administrators. The purpose of the study was to ascertain the differences between Black administrators at predominantly White institutions (PWI) and those serving at HBCUs. Specifically, the author compared the background characteristics, methods of recruitment and/or selection, and opinions toward and perceptions of employment. The study had a total of 457 participants. Nineteen of the participants were presidents. Eighteen presidents served at HBCUs and one served at a PWI. This study found no significant difference between educational levels of the administrators. Hoskins described this finding as important because it provided evidence that leaders of HBCUs were not academically inferior to those serving at PWIs. The study also revealed that leaders at HBCUs had more diverse recruiting and selection procedures. Most often leaders of HBCUs found
out about a position through word of mouth whereas administrators at PWIs were found through search and screening committees. One of the most important findings of that study was that leaders of HBCUs held a greater number of positions of seniority than their counterparts at PWIs.

Willie and MacLeish (1978) conducted an important study that surveyed the opinions of HBCU presidents regarding their role. The survey asked presidents about their priorities in regards to the future directions of their institutions. At that time, Willie and MacLeish found that HBCU presidents felt that curriculum reform, faculty, and graduate program development were top priorities. Additionally, financial issues such as faculty salaries, student aid, research, equipment, and library resources were seen as important. Finally the presidents shared that leaders of HBCUs needed to be able to address issues regarding recruiting (particularly non-Black students), improving class registration procedures, and public relations.

Two years later Tata (1980) used a descriptive survey to ascertain how HBCU presidents compare to their peers in mainstream society. Michael Ferrari’s (1968) theory of occupational mobility was used as a theoretical framework throughout this study. The results of the research concluded the following: (a) there was no mechanism in the African American community that limited the choice of college president to children of people with high-status occupations; (b) 75% of HBCU presidents had attended HBCUs for their undergraduate training, whereas almost all attend PWIs for their graduate education; (c) generally, presidents spent their entire careers in the field of higher education; (d) serving on the faculty was the first position that many of the presidents had in the academy; (e) presidents had 12 years administrative experience on average prior to assuming their first presidency; (f) presidents were generally male; and (g) presidents would serve for an average of 12 years.

One of the most important studies to date on the topic of the HBCU presidency was conducted by Debra Buchanan (1988). This study examined the important aspects of the HBCU presidency. In addition she reviewed the qualifications required for the position. Included in her sample were two presidents from private and two presidents from public HBCUs. She triangulated her findings by including the responses from the academic vice president and the chair of the faculty senate or a senior faculty member from each respective institution. Twelve individuals participated in all. Her goal was to solicit the perspectives from the presidents. Additionally she wanted to gain insights based on the perceptions of those impacted by these individuals. The study’s findings concluded that presidential roles considered most important were: (a) articulating a vision for the institution; (b) assembling a administrative team; (c) providing leadership during a crisis; (d) planning for future directions; (e)
managing resources; (f) providing a sense of unity to achieve common goals; (g) providing an environment conducive to leadership development; (h) securing financial support; and (i) shaping and reshaping institutional goals. Her study revealed that academic preparation, professional experience, and personal experiences were all valuable parts of qualifying for a HBCU presidency. Additionally, experience at the professorial, department chair, academic dean, or academic vice presidential level were viewed as important. Finally the data revealed that the personal qualities preferred in a HBCU president were good communication and interpersonal skills, astuteness, possession of high energy, focus on the future, and effective management skills.

Also in 1988, Lewis developed and distributed a survey to African American presidents. This survey sought information regarding the career mobility and the personal and professional background of African American presidents. Ninety-three presidents participated in the study. The study revealed that at the time the average African American president was a Black male between the ages of 50 and 59. Most of the presidents had earned their graduate degrees from PWIs but led HBCUs. Interestingly, the majority of presidents attributed their ascension to the presidency to the support they received from other higher education leaders and their own hard work.

Similar to Lewis’s (1988) study, Holmes (2004) conducted a qualitative study that included six African American presidents. The goal of the study was to develop a profile of African American presidents and discover the elements that contribute to the success or failure of a presidency. Three males and three females participated in this study. The researcher did not identify if the participants served at HBCUs or PWIs. The participants in the study described that their families had an important role in their academic and professional achievement. Mentoring from colleagues was another area that the participants identified as helping to propel them in their career development. Additionally, the presidents shared that they drew strength from their affiliations with religious leaders and organizations. They describe this affiliation as providing a great sense of comfort and encouragement.

In 2006, Riddick and Brown, conducted a secondary analysis of the 2001 edition of the ACE presidential study, with the expressed interest of clarifying and addressing myths regarding the HBCU presidency. When limiting the sample to HBCU presidents they found that HBCU presidents had particular challenges when compared to presidents in the general population. These challenges include the “absence of very wealthy alumni, inadequate endowment funds, and continuing effects of racial discrimination in the United States” (p. 95).
Recently, there has been increased and renewed interest on issues related to the challenges, career patterns, mobility, and professional characteristics of the modern HBCU president (Henry, 2009, 2011; Mishra, 2007). In Jyotsna Mishra’s (2007) book entitled *Becoming President: Patterns of Professional Mobility of African American University Presidents*, she obtained a sample size of 72 HBCU presidents to identify and examine the rate of upward professional mobility of African American presidents. Unobtrusive measures were used to collect the biographical data. Data sources included information from the National Association for Equal Opportunity (NAFEO), the United Negro College Fund (UNCF), and the Who’s Who Among African Americans. In this study, Mishra defined upward mobility as “the rate of career progression in the administrative career of the African American presidents” (p. 32). This study used Verdi’s (1980) model of career mobility and Althauser’s (1989) internal labor market theory as conceptual/theoretical frameworks. Important findings from her research include: (a) that the rate of mobility of HBCU presidents does not depend upon academic discipline; (b) additional training such as the Harvard Institute for Educational Management seems to have an impact on the administrative career mobility of HBCU presidents; (c) the mobility rate is higher between the ages 40 and 49 as compared to other age groups; (d) a president’s position of entry in his or her professional career is a determining factor in upward mobility (most start out as faculty); and (e) age was found to be an important factor in the selection of a president.

Another study conducted by Henry (2009), reviewed the personal and professional characteristics of HBCU presidents. His study used several theories to inform his data analysis they included transformational leadership (Burns, 2003), transactional leadership (Fisher & Koch, 1996), contingency theory of leadership (Fiedler, 1967), path-goal theory of effectiveness (Northouse, 2001), vertical dyad linkage theory (Yukl, 1994), and leadership–member exchange theory (Winkler, 2009). The study also used the Fisher/Tack Effective Leadership Inventory to collect data regarding the personal and professional characteristics of HBCU presidents. Fifty-five presidents participated in the survey. Significant findings from the study included: (a) the majority of HBCU presidents earned a PhD as their terminal degree; (b) the mean salary of the HBCU presidents was $145,509. The lowest salary of the HBCU presidents was $65,000. The highest salary of the HBCU presidents was $260,000; (c) the majority of presidents began their first presidency in their fifties; and (d) The overwhelming majority of HBCU presidents serve four years or less in their position as HBCU president.

Most recently, Paquita Herring (2010) conducted a study that examined
the personal and professional challenges, career paths, and leadership characteristics of HBCU presidents. She used Bolman and Deal’s (2003) “Four Frames of Leadership” as a theoretical framework for this study. Twenty-two HBCU presidents participated in this mixed-methods study. Among the important results from her study were: (a) HBCU presidents were sensitive to the assumptions, values, and cultures that reflect their institutions; (b) the majority of the presidents had at least one mentor; (c) all of the presidents recognized that they had not reached their level of success by virtue of their efforts alone; (d) challenges to their personal life were time management and issues of balance; (e) professional challenges identified by HBCU presidents were finances, recruitment and retention of students, time management, constituent relationships, campus morale, and change; and (f) most gained strength based on the support of a spouse.

THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

Clark (2004) developed a leadership development model that is akin to the pathway of the college president. According to Clark, leadership is the result of (a) personal attributes; (b) competencies; and (c) performer outcome. Personal attributes include: general cognitive ability (linked to internal knowledge), crystallized cognitive knowledge (linked to learned experiences), motivation, and personality. Competencies include problem solving ability, social judgment skills, accumulated knowledge, and professional skills. And, performer outcome is the degree to which a leader has performed their duties (Clark, 2004). In this study, two aspects of Clark’s model guided us: personal attributes and competencies. Both of these aspects can be captured in part by a president’s background and preparation for the role of presidency; however, it was not possible to capture these attributes and competencies in full. Moreover, we were not able to access performer outcome. We sought to understand presidents’ preparation for and pathways to the presidency. We were also able to capture aspects of the motivation and the personality of those presidents that we interviewed in the study. Clark’s (2004) model advocates for leaders with appropriate competencies and personality traits for specific positions and environments and advises those selecting leaders to hire with these concepts in mind. We posit that these competencies are acquired as a leader moves through the academic pipeline but can also be gained outside of academe in similar environments. Clark also notes that leadership traits and competencies can be passed to future leaders through mentoring if done in a conscientious manner.
METHODS

Conducting research related to HBCUs is particularly difficult because researchers have exploited these institutions and their leaders in the past. The classic example is that of Harvard sociologists Christopher Jencks and David Reisman. These men conducted research or as they called it “slow journalism” on HBCUs and with little investigation and no empirical research, they labeled HBCUs “academic disaster areas,” noting only a few exceptions (Gasman, 2006). National media outlets carried Jencks and Reisman’s words, including Newsweek and Time. This publicity scarred the reputation of HBCUs and limited funding opportunities for decades (Gasman, 2006). As a result of the national coverage of the Jencks and Reisman study, the very existence of Black colleges, as well as continued financial support, were called into question. Furthermore, Black college leaders felt duped—as if they had provided a well-rounded portrayal of their institutions to the researchers, but all that was represented in the article were the problems and the mistakes. Because of the lingering mistrust that stems from this and other incidents, many Black college administrators do not complete surveys nor participate in research projects pertaining to their institutions (Gasman, 2008; Gasman, Wagner, Ransom, & Bowman, 2010). Despite the fact that we both have extensive relationships with HBCUs and their leaders and the fact that one of us attended and is currently employed at an HBCU, it was still difficult to gain participation on the part of HBCU leaders for this study. We will now discuss the procedures we undertook to conduct our survey and bolster the survey data we received.

First, we designed a survey based on The College Presidency survey distributed (and mentioned earlier) by the American Council on Education (see the appendix). We used a very similar design to the ACE survey so that we could offer a level of comparison to our HBCU presidential data. However, we did omit questions that were not relevant to our research questions. We emailed the survey to all 105 HBCU presidents (all two- and four-year, public and private HBCU presidents), using their email addresses and those of their assistants. Eleven of the emails were found to be inactive email addresses and could not be replaced due to presidential vacancies, despite numerous attempts to acquire accurate emails.¹ We eventually distributed the survey to 94 HBCU presidents and had a response rate of 23% despite three attempts to collect the data. Although a response rate of 23% is limiting, it is actually substantive for Internet surveys, which average response rates between 5%-10% (Sills & Song, 2002; Van Horn, Green, & Martinmussen, 2009). However, the response rate was unacceptable for capturing the information that we wanted to on
the characteristics of HBCU presidents as well as information on grooming of future leaders. Of note, those presidents who responded to our survey all chose to self-identify on the surveys (which was optional). As such, we were able to determine who had completed and who had not completed the surveys. In order to bolster the survey data, we collected the current vitas of all remaining presidents through Internet searches and contact with the presidents’ assistants. These documents helped us to answer the questions on our survey for all 105 HBCU presidents, providing us with a strong data set (with the exception of the grooming and mentoring questions) (Moss, 1994; Scherpenzeel & Saris, 1997). There were two questions that we could not answer using CVs and, as such, we eliminated these questions and did not report the limited results in this paper. We answered survey questions regarding the presidents’ races using our knowledge of and person networks with individual HBCU presidents; between the two researchers, we know all 105 HBCU presidents. In order to gather information on presidential salaries, we used a combination of state data on salaries as well as salary data published in the Chronicle of Higher Education’s “What Presidents Make” report.

According to Jaeger (1998), the purpose of survey research is “to describe specific characteristics of a group of persons, objects, or institutions” (p. 449). Thus, we used this method because it allowed us to gather valuable data on the presidents of multiple institutions. We also used an open-ended survey because we wanted to draw rich responses from the participants in addition to collecting demographic data. To analyze the data, we first created a database to organize the information we collected. The database included the answers to all of the survey questions. Based on this information, we summarized the demographic data. Although we asked two survey questions related to the grooming of future HBCU presidents, the answers were limited in depth and scope.

To enhance the data on grooming and mentoring, we secured interviews with 10 of the HBCU presidents who had been surveyed. Four of these presidents were female and six were male. Half of the presidents lead public research-oriented universities and the other half lead small, private, liberal arts colleges. Of the 10, 4 were under the age of 50 and all were African American. We asked them to participate in a 30-min interview related to the grooming and mentoring of future HBCU presidents. The interviews consisted of several open-ended questions. These interviews were transcribed and we developed a preliminary list of themes using our knowledge of the scholarly literature and prior research while also allowing additional themes to emerge. Desimone and Carlson Le Floch (2004) argue that interviews can be used as a method for enhancing survey research. Likewise, Ouimet, Bunnage, Carini, Kuh, and Kennedy
(2004) suggest bolstering survey responses and lower return rates with interviews and document analysis in order to increase validity. More specifically, they argue, “When triangulation is employed to validate a survey, researchers obtain an array of data points that can be used to cross reference areas needing improvement” (p. 248). In our case, interviews helped us bolster the survey data on grooming and mentoring of future presidents. Although we had to regroup and retool during the midst of this study, we are confident in our data sources. According to Stake (1995), researchers should remain open to new insights, opportunities, and discoveries throughout the research process to allow for unplanned or unexpected ideas to emerge.

LIMITATIONS

As noted above, we only secured a 23% return rate on our survey, which initially limited our ability to assess HBCU presidents. To counter this problem, we secured the vitas of all the HBCU presidents and completed all survey questions for each president, with the exception of those related to grooming future presidents. In addition, we conducted interviews with 10 of the presidents in order to better understand their approaches to and perspectives on grooming and mentoring.

In addition, because we designed the survey to correspond with the American Council on Education survey, we were limited in the types of survey questions we asked. However, because the questions are similar, we can make some comparisons between HBCU leaders and colleges and universities presidents overall. These comparisons are helpful to those studying HBCU leadership and college presidential leadership in general. In addition, these comparisons can inform the work of the American Council on Education.

Lastly, we did not interview boards of trustees for this study. Although these interviews would have offered insight into what HBCU leadership desires in presidents, we focused on the presidents’ perspectives for this study. We are currently working on a study that takes into account the perspectives of board chairs, trustees, and search firms.

FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

BACKGROUND CHARACTERISTICS

Our survey and culling of the presidents’ vitas resulted in interesting data on the characteristics of HBCU presidents. We wanted to uncover the personal attributes that influenced the leadership development of these presidents (Clark, 2004). First, all but two of the HBCU presidents
were either African American or Black in terms of their racial identity; two were White. Specifically, the Black presidents were of either African American, Caribbean (Black), or African descent (Black). All of the presidents were U.S. citizens. In terms of gender, the presidents were 70% male and 30% female. This finding is similar to that of Tata (1980) and Lewis (1988), showing that there has been minimal progress for women over the past 30 years. However, the percentage of female HBCU leaders is higher than the percentage of female leaders at colleges and universities overall (26%) (American Council on Education, 2012). This finding is particularly surprising as HBCUs have not historically been supportive to females in terms of their rise to higher level leadership positions (Gasman, 2007; Tata, 1980). That said, there is ample evidence that women have been overlooked and bypassed for presidential and other leadership positions in colleges and universities overall (Farrington, 2008; June, 2008). This calls into question whether female leaders have been provided with the opportunities to gain the experiences and skills necessary to be competitive in presidential searches (Clark, 2004).

In terms of age, 53% of the presidents were between 60 and 70 years old; 24% of the presidents were between 50 and 59 years old; and 23% of the presidents were between 40 and 49 years old. Compared to previous studies (Lewis, 1988), HBCU presidents are older in 2012. In comparison, the average age of presidents overall was 60 (American Council on Education, 2012). Black college presidents are slightly older than presidents overall. Many HBCU presidents are nearing the age of retirement, which poses a problem. Higher education researchers predict a surge of openings for university presidencies across the country. In the past 10 years, many HBCU searches turned to sitting college presidents as the primary pool of applicants. That pool may not be as convenient an option in the future (Farrington, 2008).

Across the nation, college and university presidents serve in their positions for an average of 8.5 years. In contrast, of HBCU presidents, 16% of the presidents held their position for 10–25 years. Forty-two percent of the presidents held their position for 5–9 years; and another 42% of the presidents held their positions for 1–4 years. By comparison, HBCU presidents were serving 12 years on average 30 years ago (Tata, 1980). Interestingly, there is a substantial percentage of HBCU presidents serving for extended periods of time. The problem of the long-term presidency has one major consequence that is often overlooked. When presidents are at an institution too long, they become the institution and staff and faculty members begin to rely on them in unhealthy ways (Birnbaum & Umbach, 2001). In addition, the ethos of a campus becomes too set in its ways, hindering new ideas and progress (Birnbaum & Umbach, 2001). At the same time, there
is an even larger group of people who have served a minimal amount of time. Compared to college and university presidents overall, HBCU presidents average tenure is somewhat shorter.

Of interest to those considering the HBCU presidency in their future is the position held just prior to securing the presidency. For our HBCU sample, 46% of the presidents were presidents prior to holding their current presidency; 33% of the presidents were either provost or Vice President of Academic Affairs, ensuring traditional academic competencies; 15% of the presidents had held administrative positions in the K–12 setting; 3% of the presidents had held positions in business or industry; and 3% hailed from some other background. This is important to note, as crystallized cognitive knowledge is linked to learned experiences. Many of those experiences are learned on the job. And in this case those who have served in administrative capacities within the higher education context have a distinct advantage (Clark, 2004).

In comparison, presidents of colleges and universities overall were slightly more likely to have served in the presidency prior to serving in their current position. The American Council on Education (2012) survey showed that 54% had presidential experience. Of course, HBCUs make up less than 3% of colleges and universities, and there is a tendency for these leaders to stay within the HBCU setting upon securing a leadership role. Of note, in these results is the recycling of HBCU presidents that is taking place, especially in comparison to colleges and universities in general. Similar to our HBCU sample, 31% of the presidents in the national pool had served as provosts or Vice Presidents of Academic Affairs prior to securing the presidency.

With regard to the educational background of HBCU presidents, 58% of them hold PhDs, 25% hold EdDs, 3% hold MDs, and the remaining 14% hold JDS. Of note, the majority, a full 75% of HBCU presidents, hold degrees in education. This is substantially higher than the general population of college and university presidents, of which less than 50% have either earned doctoral degrees in education or higher education (American Council on Education, 2012). The discipline of education and specifically the field of higher education is the dominant doctoral degree area choice of college and university presidents, but it is much more prevalent among HBCU leaders. The competencies developed in these terminal degree programs enhance the knowledge base and professional skills of their graduates (Clark, 2004).

The second most prevalent degree area was the social sciences (15%), with small percentages of presidents holding degrees in the arts (1%), law (2%), physical/nature sciences (4%), and theology (3%). A telling finding, and perhaps indicative of the growing popularity of executive
doctoral programs in higher education is that of the education degrees, 15% were in higher education or higher education management. Within the HBCU context there is a growing trend of having an understanding of the entire higher education entity before taking the reigns of the institution (Schexnider & Ezell, 2010). This reinforces the notion that potential presidential candidates must have accumulated knowledge and professional skills before assuming the role of president (Clark, 2004).

Earlier in this article we talked about discussions, often taking place behind closed doors, about the type of institution from which an HBCU president hails—both in terms of his or her graduate and undergraduate education. Our research found that 95% of the presidents earned their doctoral degree at historically White institutions whereas only 5% of the presidents earned their doctoral degree at HBCUs. This finding is consistent with the research of Lewis (1988) who found that the overwhelming majority of HBCU presidents earned their advanced degrees at historically White institutions. Of course, the low percentage of presidents earning their degrees at HBCUs is the result of the low number of PhD programs at HBCUs throughout the country. HBCUs tend to focus on undergraduate education. In terms of their bachelor’s degree, 58% of the presidents earned their bachelor’s degree at an HBCU, whereas 42% of the HBCUs presidents earned their bachelor’s degree at a historically White institution. This figure is consistent with both anecdotal evidence as well as empirical research, which purports that those who earn their undergraduate degrees at HBCUs are more likely to return to the HBCU environment after obtaining a PhD even if that PhD is secured at a historically White institution (Perna, 2001). According to our research, the majority of HBCU presidents obtained their faculty and administrative experience post-PhD at an HBCU indicating that they returned to the HBCU environment. Of note, our findings show that a lower percentage of HBCU presidents are securing their undergraduate degrees (58%) at HBCUs than 30 years ago. According to Tata (1980), 30 years ago, 75% of HBCU presidents earned their undergraduate degree at HBCUs. This change is due to the increased access and opportunities available to Blacks at historically White institutions and also has an impact on a president’s competencies. Being groomed within the HBCU environment offers unique insight into the culture of an HBCU, which can be advantageous to a president.

Another interesting result of our research is the growing number of HBCU presidents without higher education experience. A full 23% of presidents have less than five years of experience in higher education, indicating that presidents are being recruited from outside of academe. In comparison, in 1980, according to Tata, HBCU presidents had on average 12 years of higher education experience before assuming the presidency.
Also of note, 34% of the presidents have been in higher education between 25 and 50 years, which offers some perspective on the aging field of presidents.

With regard to salary, which is often considered to be lower within the HBCU setting, 17% of the presidents made $350,000 or above while the majority (47%) made between $150,000 and $249,000. The remaining 36% of the presidents earned between $50,000 and $149,000. In 2009, according to Henry (2009), the mean salary of the HBCU presidents was $145,509. There seems to have been significant progress in terms of salary among the HBCU president population. In comparison, the median total compensation for college and university presidents nationally in 2009–2010 was $375,442 (Stripling & Fuller, 2011), demonstrating that HBCU presidents make significantly less than presidents at historically White institutions.

GROOMING THE NEXT GENERATION OF PRESIDENTS

According to our survey of HBCU presidents, three quarters of the responding presidents are in the process of grooming someone for a future HBCU presidency. Our interviews with 10 HBCU presidents shine light on their perspectives on leadership and HBCUs. These presidents see it as “their responsibility to groom future leaders” and to ensure the “proper and effective leadership of HBCUs” in the future. They hold strong feelings about who should lead and how leadership should be enacted. In the words of one president, “We can’t let someone who knows nothing about HBCU culture and the challenges we have run one of our institutions.” On the other hand, one of the presidents we interviewed noted, “We just need the best leaders. It doesn’t matter where they come from. What matters is that they understand how an organization works and the uniqueness of the educational environment in which we work.” This idea addresses Clark’s (2004) notions of both personal attributes and competence. It is very important for leaders to have personalities that enable them to work effectively with others within their institution. It is just as important that they be competent to lead their particular institution.

There is much variation in perspectives on leadership on the part of the presidents. Older presidents, both those who answered our survey and those that participated in an interview, tend to operate with a more top-down approach, having had to defend their institution from outside forces over the course of their presidency (Minor, 2004, 2005). According to one older female president, “There is a constant fight to keep my institution afloat. I have to be vigilant and there are many critics that don’t want it to survive let alone thrive.” In contrast, several younger presidents, both those who answered our survey and those that participated in an
interview, advocate for a more egalitarian approach to leadership within the HBCU context. They think that the world has changed significantly and that there is no longer a need to be as protective of HBCUs in terms of outsider forces. According to one younger president, “HBCU presidents must hire good people and let them do their jobs. There is no longer a need to micromanage the employees or the institution’s actions.” Some of these younger presidents, including Walter Kimbrough, the past president of Philander Smith College and new president of Dillard University, are empowering faculty members to have more of a voice and more decision-making opportunities. In particular, while president of Philander Smith, Kimbrough worked with faculty to set up a chapter of the American Association of University Professors on his campus (Gasman, 2009). Younger presidents tend to be more focused on accountability as they were reared in this environment while in their graduate programs. In the words, of one younger president, “We have to show results. We can’t continue to ask for funding and support from alumni or foundations or corporations and not give them something in return. We are educating our youth and we must prove—using data—that we are doing the best job.” As such, there is much that more seasoned presidents can learn from these younger presidents in terms of use of data to demonstrate institutional and student success (Kiley, 2011; Kimbrough, 2011).

All 10 of the presidents told us that they are grooming young people for the job of president. Interestingly, the male HBCU presidents tended to groom males and the females tended to groom females for the job. Those individuals being groomed were in their late 30s and early 40s and had held several academic positions by that point. According to one of the older male presidents, “Future presidents need to be mentored beginning when they are department chairs and throughout their academic trajectories.” This president was insistent that presidents be groomed in traditional ways and that they follow a traditional route to the presidency. He was convinced that the competencies needed to be a president were garnered through traditional academic positions. In contrast, those presidents that did not take traditional routes to the presidency were encouraging more nontraditional candidates to pursue presidencies, convincing them that “skills are transferable” and competencies could be learned in a variety of settings. Most of the presidents were grooming between two and three people at a time, feeling a “sense of obligation to HBCUs and their continued existence.” Grooming and mentoring activities included professional introductions, job shadowing, problem-solving sessions, fundraising shadowing, and personal and professional advice (McGhee, 2011; Washburn & Crispo, 2006). All of the presidents with whom we talked felt that leaders have to have specific attributes, including confidence, the ability to
take risks, organization, the ability to inspire, and strong negotiating skills. Although these presidents acknowledged that these attributes cannot always be learned, they did feel that the competencies needed to be a successful president could be gleaned from experiences and grooming.

With regard to the professional track from which the next generation of presidents will hail, most of the presidents we surveyed think that new presidents will come from higher education, while some believe the next generation of presidents will come from business and industry. These perspectives mirror the current make-up of HBCU presidents, demonstrating a belief that the number of presidents from outside of academe will keep growing.

CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Our research found that there is indeed a recycling of presidents taking place within the HBCU context. Although it is important to have presidents with experience, some scholars and practitioners are calling for presidents to retire or cycle out of academe (Gasman, 2011a, 2012; Wilson, 2012). It would be beneficial for Black colleges to reconsider decisions to reinstate ineffective leaders in the position of president. It would also be advantageous for HBCUs, as well as colleges and universities in general, to evaluate their presidential choices. What are the trade-offs when an HBCU hires a nonacademic to lead their institution? What happens to shared governance and academic freedom on the campus? Does fundraising success increase with a leader who is more prepared in terms of management and fiscal priorities? Does the institution lose prestige by hiring a nonacademic to lead it? Regardless of their background—academic or not—presidents of HBCUs must have substantial competencies in management and leadership in order to be prepared to lead and to manage the outside forces that shape HBCUs.

It may be of interest for individuals aspiring to serve in an HBCU presidency to consider participation in presidential leadership preparation programs such as the American Council on Education’s Fellows Program. That program allows aspiring presidents time to spend at another institution working with the president. Another program that potential presidential candidates may take advantage of is the American Association of State Colleges and Universities’ Millennium Leaders Institute, which provides its participants with opportunities to experience both theoretical learning as well as practical hands-on training through media interviews, visits with representatives on Capitol Hill, and close interactions with presidents and chancellors. In addition, there are leadership development opportunities offered through such organizations as the United Negro College Fund’s
Institute for Capacity Building, which directly prepare an individual to address the unique challenges of the private member colleges that it serves. Specifically, these programs offer opportunities to enhance the executive leadership and governance skills of participants. Hampton University also offers presidential leadership development opportunities through their Executive Leadership Summit.

HBCU leaders would benefit from capturing the passion and excitement among young people who are interested in becoming presidents. These young men and women should be groomed and given opportunities to shadow presidents to learn the inner workings of an institution. Unfortunately, these young people often have lots of enthusiasm, but they are not aware of the work involved in becoming a president and leading an institution. The work of presidents and the pathways to the presidency should be shared with young people in order to make sure they are prepared and that HBCUs benefit from their presence.

**IMPLICATIONS FOR FUTURE RESEARCH**

With this research, we attempted to capture the landscape of the HBCU presidency so that others could build upon this foundational information. We recommend interviews with younger HBCU presidents to ascertain how they have been mentored (if that is the case) for the presidency. We also recommend additional interviews with presidents to understand the unique environment in which they are leading their institution—an environment that, in many people’s eyes, should no longer exist.

Of note, although only 30% of HBCU presidents are female, this percentage is higher than that at historically White institutions. Therefore, it is important that the stories and experiences of these women be captured. In recent years, the female presidents of HBCUs have been particularly vocal in the national media. Presidents such as Beverly Daniel Tatum, Julianne Malveaux, and Johnnetta Cole have spoken out on national issues, including race, poverty, and HBCUs. These individuals, much like their female counterparts at historically White institutions, are operating in male-dominated environments and they have significant stories to share (Gasman, 2007).

We want to reiterate that research related to the inner workings of HBCUs will remain difficult to conduct and our knowledge will be limited until HBCUs become more comfortable with outside researchers. As scholars, we have to work hand in hand with scholars and leaders at HBCUs to build trust and relationships that will lead to more transparency. Through these relationships, more research that is jointly supported and jointly sponsored will transpire and perhaps, as a result, HBCUs and their processes for selecting leadership will be strengthened.
CONCLUDING THOUGHT

There are those who believe that Black college presidents should be reared within the Black college environment. Interestingly, some of the newest Black college presidents did not attend these institutions for their undergraduate or graduate degrees and/or have not worked extensively or at all in the Black college environment. Of course, there are many Black college presidents who are wonderfully successful and have achieved this success in part because of their experiences at Black colleges. But perhaps Black college boards and the Black college community in general would benefit from being more open minded in their understanding of what makes a successful Black college president. There are some terrific leadership prospects on the horizon, but if they are not groomed and given opportunities, they may be missed.

Notes

1. During the midst of our research, there were 16 HBCU presidential vacancies.
   2. Although there is not literature that speaks to this notion, within private circles and closed meetings there is ample discussion about the inappropriateness of leaders from the outside (meaning majority institutions).
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APPENDIX

HBCU Presidents Survey

1. Name: ________________________________________

2. Position title:
   (1) _____President
   (2) _____Chancellor
   (3) _____Other: ________________________________

3. Phone:  _______________________________________
   a. Fax:  ________________________________________
   b. E-mail: ______________________________________

Your Current Position

4. As President, to whom do you report?
   (1) _____System head
   (2) _____Governing board
   (3) _____State commissioner/superintendent/church official/other

5. Date appointed to current President position (mm/yy): __________

6. Is the position an interim appointment?
   (1) _____Yes (2) _____No

7. Do you hold a tenured faculty position at this time?
   (1) _____Yes (2) _____No

8. What is your current salary?
   (1) _____$50–$149,000
   (2) _____$150,000–$249,000
   (3) _____$250,000–$349,000
   (4) _____$350,000 and above

Prior Positions

9. How many college or university CEO positions have you held prior to your current position? ____

10. Position held immediately prior to assuming current CEO assignment:
    (1) _____President/CEO/chancellor
    (2) _____Chief academic officer or provost
    (3) _____Other senior executive in Academic Affairs (including deans)
    (4) _____Senior executive in Development
    (5) _____Senior executive in External Affairs (e.g., government relations)
<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Senior executive in Student Affairs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Senior executive in Finance and/or Administration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Chair/faculty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>K–12 administrator/educator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Business/industry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Religious counselor/member of religious order</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Elected or appointed government official</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Legal professional</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Military personnel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Medical professional (e.g., doctor or hospital administrator)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Nonprofit sector (e.g., foundation, museum, or association)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Other: ________________________________</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Institution of position held immediately prior to assuming current CEO assignment:

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Same institution as current job</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Different institution from current job</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Not applicable (e.g., worked in business, government)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

b. For how many years did you hold that position? _____

c. Did you have tenured faculty status at that time?

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Not applicable</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

11. Position held prior to the position described in Item 9:

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>President/CEO/chancellor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Chief academic officer or provost</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Other senior executive in Academic Affairs (including deans)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Senior executive in Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Senior executive in External Affairs (e.g., government relations)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Senior executive in Student Affairs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Senior executive in Finance, and/or Administration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Chair/faculty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>K–12 administrator/educator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Business/industry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Religious counselor/member of religious order</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Elected or appointed government official</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Legal professional</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Military personnel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Medical professional (e.g., doctor or hospital administrator)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Nonprofit sector (e.g., foundation, museum, or association)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Other: ________________________________</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Institution of position held prior to the position described in Item 9:

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Same institution as current job</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Same institution as prior job described in item 9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
(3) _____Different institution from both current and prior job described in item 9
(4) _____Not applicable (e.g., previously not employed in higher education)

b. For how many years did you hold that position? _____
c. Did you have tenured faculty status at that time?
   (1) _____Yes (2) _____No (3) _____Not applicable

Career History

12. What are the total years you have served in higher education administration? ______

13. What are the total years you have served outside higher education administration? ______

14. Number of books published? ______

15. Age at first HBCU presidency? ______

16. Years in current HBCU presidency? ______

17. Over the course of your professional career, how many years were you employed full time outside higher education? ______

18. How many years have you served as a full-time faculty member at a college or university? _____

Your Education

19. Please check all the degrees you have earned:
   (1) _____Associate
   (2) _____Bachelor’s
   (3) _____Master’s
   (4) _____PhD
   (5) _____EdD
   (6) _____MD
   (7) _____Other health degree (e.g., DDS, DVM)
   (8) _____Law (e.g., JD, LLB, LLD, JSD)
   (9) _____Other (e.g., theology, doctor of ministry, master of divinity).
   Please specify: ______________________________

20. Indicate major field of study for your highest earned degree:
   (1) _____Agriculture/natural resources
   (2) _____Biological sciences
   (3) _____Business
   (4) _____Education or higher education
   (5) _____Engineering
32. Type of master’s degree
   (1) _____Agriculture/natural resources
   (2) _____Biological sciences
   (3) _____Business
   (4) _____Education or higher education
   (5) _____Engineering
   (6) _____Health professions
   (7) _____Humanities/fine arts
   (8) _____Law
   (9) _____Mathematics
   (10) _____Medicine
   (11) _____Physical/natural sciences
   (12) _____Religion/theology
   (13) _____Social sciences
   Institution where master’s degree was earned ________________________

24. Type of university where master’s degree was earned
   _____HBCU (2) _____PWI (predominantly White institution)

25. Type of baccalaureate degree
   _____HBCU (2) _____PWI (predominantly White institution)

26. Institution(s) where baccalaureate degree was earned
   ________________________________________________________________

27. Type of university where baccalaureate degree was earned
   (1) _____HBCU (2) _____PWI (predominantly White institution)

Your Background

28. Gender:
   (1) _____Male   _____Female
29. Year of birth: 19____

30. Are you Hispanic or Latino(a)?
   (1) _____Yes (2) _____No

31. What is your race/ethnicity? (Check all that apply).
   (1) _____White
   (2) _____African American
   (3) _____Asian/Pacific Islander
   (4) _____American Indian/Alaskan Native
   (5) _____Other (please specify): ________________________________

32. Are you a citizen of the United States of America?
   (1) _____Yes, born in the United States
   (2) _____Yes, born in Puerto Rico, Guam, the U.S. Virgin Islands, or Northern Marianas
   (3) _____Yes, born abroad of American parent or parents
   (4) _____Yes, a U.S. citizen by naturalization
   _____No, not a citizen of the United States

33. In which of the following areas did you feel insufficiently prepared for your first presidency? (Check all that apply.)
   (1) _____Academic issues (e.g., curriculum changes)
   (2) _____Accountability/assessment of student learning
   (3) _____Athletics
   (4) _____Budget/financial management
   (5) _____Capital improvement projects
   (6) _____Community relations
   (7) _____Crisis management
   (8) _____Enrollment management
   (9) _____Entrepreneurial ventures
   (10) _____Faculty issues
   (11) _____Fund raising
   (12) _____Governing board relations
   (13) _____Government relations
   (14) _____Media/public relations
   (15) _____Personnel issues (excluding faculty)
   (16) _____Risk management/legal issues
   (17) _____Strategic planning

34. Are you grooming anyone for a HBCU presidency?
   (1) _____Yes (2) _____No
   Please describe your process for grooming.
35. Where do you think the majority of the next generation of HBCU Presidents will come from?

(1) _____Business/industry
(2) _____Religious counselor/member of religious order
(3) _____Elected or appointed government official
(4) _____Legal professional
(5) _____Military personnel
(6) _____Medical professional (e.g., doctor or hospital administrator)
(7) _____Nonprofit sector (e.g., foundation, museum, or association)
(8) _____Higher Education professional
(9) _____Other: ________________________________

SYDNEY FREEMAN JR. is a director of a teaching and learning center at Tuskegee University (HBCU) and is a graduate of Oakwood University (HBCU), both in Alabama. He is a former National Holmes Scholar, a Certified Faculty Developer (CFD) through the Learning Resources Network (LERN), and affiliate of the University of Pennsylvania’s Center for Minority Serving Institutions.

MARYBETH GASMAN is a professor of higher education and the director of the Center for Minority Serving Institutions at the University of Pennsylvania. Her areas of expertise include Minority Serving Institutions and philanthropy and fundraising in communities of color.