

**Academic Business:
Professionalization and the University Business Officer**

by

Lynn Price McWhorter

A dissertation submitted to the Graduate Faculty of
Auburn University
in partial fulfillment of the
requirements for the Degree of
Doctor of Philosophy

Auburn, Alabama
December 13, 2014

Keywords: higher education, business officer,
professionalization, history, SACUBO

Copyright 2014 by Lynn Price McWhorter

Approved by

Charles A. Israel, Chair, Associate Professor of History
Jennifer E. Brooks, Associate Professor of History
David C. Carter, Associate Professor of History
Daniel J. Svyantek, Professor of Psychology

ABSTRACT

This dissertation examines the place of the college and university business officer in institutions of higher education across the U.S. South. In 1927, George Howell Mew, newly minted business officer at Emory University, was the driving force behind the creation of the Southern Association of College and University Business Officers [SACUBO]. Over the next fifty years members of SACUBO succeeded in creating an institution which transformed the business officer from a functionary who reported bookkeeping numbers to the board of trustees into an administrator and vice-president of the university. In the process, business officers helped transformed the college and university from an individual institution working with hundreds of students into campuses enrolling tens of thousands students and managing billions of dollars. A number of forces pushed college and university business officers into a position of responding to external pressures: philanthropy in the 1920s, research grants in the 1930s and 1940s, the need to train military personnel for wars from World War I into the 1980s and the accompanying regulations, the alliance of research universities with industry, and social pressures such as race relations and student protests. Though sometimes better than others, SACUBO helped college and university business officers navigate the complexities of the modern university.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Please hear how important the following people have been to me in general and to my academic success at Auburn University in particular. My dissertation committee pushed me through to the end and for that I will always be grateful. Charles A. Israel gave his time, his energy, and more importantly the love of his craft. Though he inhabits the halls of administration at the moment, he is and always will be a historian first. I hope I can pass on his love of history to my students. Jennifer E. Brooks pushed me to earn my degree by giving it the attention it deserved, not easily done given how much I wanted to spend time with my four year old and nine year old. And I will not forget how in the minutes prior to my dissertation defense while Dr. Brooks and I made idle chat and before others entered the room she said, "I think this is going to go well." It did and I thank her for her support. David C. Carter and I have been together for a long time, too long to say here. He has been a sustaining presence since his days as a non-tenured professor, then as Graduate Program Officer, and now committee member. All three shared their interpretations, asked important questions, and helped me write a better dissertation. My outside reader, Daniel J. Svyantek entered the room with good questions, challenging questions, and alternate interpretations. I look forward to learning more from him.

The people in the following list of names also contributed to my success and also know how important they are to me. I have said it many times and I will say it again. They range from archivists, to professors, to friends. I include their names because I

hope you will cross their paths and will get to know them. They have enriched my life and helped me write a good dissertation: Heather Armbruster, Joe Barber, Morris Bian, Donna Bohanan, Ann Case, Patience Essah, Wayne Flynt, Ralph Kingston, Ken Noe, Wilma Philips, William Trimble, and Mark Wilson. C. Joseph Carter deserves special citation for his help as a SACUBO member, leader and editor of their newsletter. He graciously provided editorial comments as well as factual information about SACUBO. Vera Mew Hiller, George Mew's daughter, welcomed me into her home and shared stories and boxes of early papers, a boon for a budding researcher. Jessica Busler inhabited the office across from mine in the basement of Thach Hall. I am grateful to her for sharing her technical expertise and for her enlivening presence on those dreadfully quiet weekends.

My family, God bless them, endured all varieties of moods from me: exhilaration when progress was good, despair when I sailed past another deadline, irritation when I failed to juggle my responsibilities. They have loved me throughout. Theirs may be the closest I ever get to unconditional love. I have said in another context that Patsy has been my salvation. I still believe it to be true and continue to remind her of it. And I am grateful for the two children she gave us, children born during my tenure at Auburn University: Price Townes McWhorter and EmilyGwyn McWhorter. Donna Bohanan said it right when she greeted me after my successful dissertation defense, "You have a family and a Ph.D.!" Yes.

Table of Contents

Abstract	ii
Acknowledgements	iii
List of Abbreviations	vi
Introduction	1
Chapter 1 – The Creation of the Southern Association of College and University Business Officers: “Standard Forms for Financial Reports”	22
Chapter 2 – World War II and the Transformation of the College and University Business Office: “The business office is a necessary and important unit in the university.”	63
Chapter 3 – From Regional Concerns to a National Association, 1950-1968: “The larger problems in education are national in scope.”	95
Chapter 4 – African-American and White Business Officers Negotiate a Merger in the Civil Rights Era: “The Time is Now.”	126
Chapter 5 – Reinventing SACUBO: “Today there are types of business decisions that didn’t exist before.” ..	160
Conclusion	192
Bibliography	197

Abbreviations

AUSCA—Auburn University Special Collections and Archives

American Association—American Association of College and University Business
Officers

SACUBO—Southern Association of College and University Business Officers

NACUBO—National Association of College and University Business Officers

TUASC—Tulane University Archives Special Collections

Introduction

When Isaac Hill arrived for duty as Treasurer at the newly created East Alabama Male College (later Alabama Polytechnic Institute and finally Auburn University) in 1856, his charge was simple: “It shall be the treasurer’s duty to receive all moneys due to the board and pass receipts for the same. He shall pay out moneys only by order of the board, signed by the president and the secretary, and said order so signed shall alone be his voucher.” And finally, “The treasurer’s books shall always be open to the inspection of the auditors.”¹ In what appears to be a personalized version of mixed Spencerian and Copperplate handwriting—a style popular in the late nineteenth century—Hill recorded the required information in a ledger containing ten columns: Number, Date, Drawer, Favor Of, Account Of, Time, Year Payable, Month, Amount, Remarks. Reading the entries, it is easy to conjure a mental image of Mr. Hill seated at his desk, fulfilling the charge given him by the Board of Trustees. But there were many issues not addressed in Hill’s carefully written entries or in the instructions from the Board. There is no mention of a form for reporting expenditures. There is no mention of a form to request travel expenses. There is no mention of any kind of standardization of reports. There is no mention of how to collect nonpayment of student tuition. There is no description of Hill as an academician, an educator, or a businessman. Hill handled each transaction as it came to his desk under the direction of the Board of Trustees. The only thing clearly enunciated was the treasurer’s place in the hierarchy of the institution, a tool of the Board of Trustees.

¹ Vice President for Business Finance. “Officer of Treasurer” Vertical File, Auburn University Special Collections and Archives.

Seventy-one years later George Mew sat at his desk at Emory University business office with a more difficult task; how to manage a much more complex business office. The end result was the Southern Association of College and University Business Officers [SACUBO]. This dissertation considers the significance of the SACUBO to southern higher education. In 1927, George Howell Mew, twenty-eight years of age and in his second year as Treasurer of Emory University, was learning how much there was to know about the business office and how much help he needed. As a result, he emerged as the driving force behind the creation of the Southern Educational Buyers and Business Officers Association (later Southern Association of College and University Business Officers [SACUBO]). It was an association to address the problems encountered by treasurers and accountants at colleges and universities.²

A close historical examination of the development of (SACUBO) reveals its importance to the transformation of southern higher education into the mammoth institution it became in the late twentieth century. Strong willed presidents and boards of trustees were important but the skilled business officer made possible those visions and dreams of a new college and university. Understanding SACUBO's place in southern higher education will also make it possible to understand better some of the key transformations in higher education as an institution. SACUBO members put in place the mechanisms to standardize financial records as well as report them. SACUBO members created an institution making it possible for business officers to work with other college

² "I wish to direct briefly your attention to the history and growth of this Association during the first twenty-five years of its existence. To the fecund and farsighted judgment of Mr. George H. Mew of Emory University we owe our very existence." Gladys Barger, SACUBO President and Treasurer of Lenoir-Rhyne College in the Proceedings of Southern Association of College and University Business Officers Twenty-Fourth Annual Meeting, Clemson, S. C., April 3, 4 and 5, 1952, 24.

and university business officers across the South and in the process creating a larger pool of expertise. And SACUBO members were a driving force in the creation of the National Association of College and University Business Officers [NACUBO]. The three elements were instrumental in the creation of the modern university.

College and university business offices across the South share a history with Auburn University and Emory University. Augustus B. Longstreet served as president of Emory College (later Emory University) from 1839 to 1848. He knew coming into office Emory College lacked the necessary funds to persist. Prior to being elevated to president he had served as chairman of a “committee to borrow \$5,000 to meet a note of the College treasurer falling due on December 24, 1839.” Unable to accomplish his goal, the financial agent Samuel J. Bryan traveled to Athens, Georgia, through stormy weather borrow \$5,000 for twenty three days. This race for money continued into 1840 when Bryan in announced his waning faith in this Emory College enterprise: “During the first three years of your Agent’s connection with you, he had no doubt of the success of the enterprise. Since that time he has had serious apprehension that there may be an entire failure.”³ Maybe the business office contains the source of his waning faith. Alexander Means, treasurer during the 1840s, recorded the “pathetic story” in his records, or lack thereof, as treasurer of Emory College. Read his entries:

“pd. A. H. Mitchell in part of his Sal. \$100,” and “pd. A.B.L.--\$50.”

December 8th 1840. This day on settlement with G. W. Lane the whole amt. due him (principle & Int.) as Prof. of Language up to Oct. 1st. 1840 was pd. by Note given for Thirteen Hundred & 30-100 Dollars signed by the Treasr. His receipt held as voucher.

³ Henry Morton Bullock, *A History of Emory University* (Atlanta: Cherokee Publishing Company, 1972), 83-84.

In his history of Emory University, Henry Morton Bullock records it was not until January of 1841 that the records indicate that there was an awareness of the situation by the Board.⁴ In fact, rather than assess the situation, President Longstreet contributed the needed funds. Longstreet's zeal for Emory's continued existence included the offer to cover \$4800 in debt even after he left the institution.⁵ It was 1851 before the minutes of the trustees included a report from the college business officer on the endowment.⁶ College and university business practices would have to change before the American university could begin its transformation into its modern incarnation.

In the 1860s and 1870s prominent leaders with majestic visions of a new university assumed the leadership of colleges and universities across America. Laurence R. Veysey in *The Emergence of the American University* cites Noah Porter's inaugural address at Yale University in 1871 naming 1870 as the "almost the Anno Domini of educational history" and that American higher education was "convulsed by a revolution." "My theme Higher Education," President Porter continued, "cannot be avoided at the present time, when the entire theory of Higher Education is so generally and so actively discussed."⁷ What has been lost in this discussion of the transformation of higher education is the place of the college and university business officer, the pragmatists who worked behind the scenes doing everything from managing meal delivery to students, housing military personnel, and accounting for the influx of billions

⁴ Bullock, *A History of Emory University*, 85.

⁵ Bullock, *A History of Emory University*, 86.

⁶ Bullock, *A History of Emory University*, 92.

⁷ Laurence R. Veysey, *The Emergence of the American University* (The University of Chicago Press, 1965), 1. Noah Porter, "Inaugural Address," in *Addresses at the Inauguration of Professor Noah Porter, D.D., LL.D. as President of Yale College, Wednesday, October 11, 1871* (New York, 1871), p. 27.

of dollars from the Federal government. They are the people generating the numbers used in historical arguments about the place of higher education in society. And they are the people working at the center of everything and yet outside the view of most university chroniclers doing what has to be done for higher education to work. The history of the business officer has not been told. Historians chronicled the changes over time and the major transformation of higher education but they have left out of their histories the business office and officers. Unlike college and university presidents, provosts, and academic deans, their tenure is more enduring, lending a stabilizing force from the business office. But presidents cannot be ignored.

In March of 1869, Charles W. Eliot of Harvard published a two-part essay in the *Atlantic Monthly* entitled “The New Education: Its Organization.”⁸ He called for an end to “the narrowness, sectarianism, and the unremitting traditionalism of contemporary instruction.” He called for an end to pedagogy dominated by “the teacher’s reading from faded and yellowing lecture notes and the students memorizing.” He called for an end to the single course of study prescribed for all students because it “disregarded individual differences in capacity, interest, and aim.” Instead, Eliot called for an American university offering liberal arts, practical subjects, and postgraduate professional schools. Eliot promoted the elective system providing full choice for Harvard seniors in 1872 with electives trickling down to freshman by 1885. Then Eliot tied those issues together with these three concerns: “the admission of students regardless of their previous education (the professional schools did not require a college degree), the rigor of the schools, and the quality of teaching.” By the late 1890s Eliot achieved most of his goals for

⁸ <http://www.theatlantic.com/magazine/archive/1869/02/the-new-education/309049/>

reorganizing the curriculum at Harvard.⁹ Professors taught, students learned and occasionally rebelled, but who tracked finances? Who accounted for the changes made?

William Rainey Harper, the first president of the University of Chicago and advocate for the modernization of the American university added “new features such as a two-year junior college and an extensive summer school.” He generated funding for new laboratories, an observatory, a university press, multiple Ph.D. programs, and a library. Though Charles Eliot at Harvard avoided college athletics, Harper called for “inter-collegiate football with a magnificent stadium geared to a large spectator audience.” Harper welcomed coeducation of men and women. And Harper used the skills of an entrepreneur: “advertising, billboards, and mass mailings, public relations and fund raising.” What he did not specify, however, was how the university business officer would fit into this new nexus.¹⁰

In his dissertation “*Instruments of National Purpose*”: *World War II and Southern Higher Education: Four Universities as a Case Study*, Matthew Tyler Penney says that in the 1910s and 1920s, American universities, including those in the South, marked the beginning of another era in higher education, a shift toward specialization. Specialization was another way of describing the federal government’s increasing influence: the recognition of national accreditation standards, the creation of departments based on academic disciplines, and an emphasis on research. “As the federal government become even more active in promoting public infrastructure—developing transportation, issuing business regulation, and enhancing the military, and facilitating civil

⁹ Charles H. Russell, “Charles W. Eliot and Education,” *The Journal of Higher Education*, Vol. 28, No. 8, (Nov. 1957),433-438.

¹⁰ <http://education.stateuniversity.com/pages/2029/Harper-William-Rainey-1856-1906.html>

administration—expenditures on education in the form of land-grant legislation to endow colleges and the various extension services and experiment stations brought the federal government into a more routine relationship with state higher education systems.”¹¹

Historians of higher education have written about college and university presidents, about boards of trustees with their power to hire and fire presidents, and about the distressing lack of funds to build and maintain colleges and universities; the three ingredients indicating who controlled the university. The critical and missing ingredient—and the one essential to the survival of the modern institution of higher education—is the college and university business officer. David Sansing in *Making Haste Slowly: The Troubled History of Higher Education in Mississippi* talked about the first three and then said, “It is not an exaggeration to say that, **next to income**, the college president and his reputation were the most important resources of the old-time college and that the president was often its most important booster [emphasis added].”¹² Big thinkers are important, but money and money management perhaps matter even more. Then Sansing talked about the boards. The trustees populating the governing boards for Mississippi’s colleges and university were laymen with full authority over their institutions. Sansing gives the example of Jefferson College in Washington, Mississippi: “the authority of the Board of Trustees is supreme.” In another example, the charter of Grenada College “authorized the board of trustees to appoint a president and professors and ‘supersede them at pleasure.’” These governing boards executed decisions through a

¹¹ Matthew Tyler Penney, “Instruments of National Purpose” World War II and Southern Higher Education: Four Texas Universities as a Case Study (Ph.D. dissertation, Rice University, 2007), 98.

¹² David G. Sansing, *Making Haste Slowly: The Troubled History of Higher Education in Mississippi* (Jackson: University Press of Mississippi, 1990) 26.

figurehead president.¹³ The board's exercise of full power did not mean they had the requisite understanding of accounting to manage their institution. While board members or committees might perform an inspection of the university books, they and the university president rarely if ever noted the essential role of the business officer. This absence of any discussion of the place of the college and university business officers continues into college and university histories. The sheer size of the business office in the modern university demands attention. Isaac Hill's bureaucratic descendent is Marcie C. Smith of Auburn University, Associate Vice President for Business and Finance at Auburn University. In 2012, Smith was responsible for a department that includes Budget Services, Cash Management, Contracts and Grants Accounting, Controller/Financial Reporting, Information Systems Support, Payroll and Employee Benefits, Procurement and Payment Services, and Student Financial Services. The revenue total for fiscal year 2011-2012 at Auburn University was \$779,731,625.00.

But before the business officer achieved the kind of influence practiced by Marci Smith, the business office evolved. Laurence R. Veysey grouped the treasurer and accountant with the college and university president, faculty, and trustees, all being of one and the same mind.¹⁴ But the treasurer was not formally a member of the administrative group making decisions about the college. Then Andrew Carnegie inserted himself into the management of higher education when he established a pension foundation for faculty. The Carnegie plan required gaining access to university financial data; rewriting it in a way it could be compared across institutions. In that way, Carnegie

¹³Sansing, *Making Haste Slowly*, 25.

¹⁴ Laurence R. Veysey, *The Emergence of the American University* (The University of Chicago Press, 1965), 57.

hoped to improve college and university business practices.¹⁵ Much of the burden of proof that fell on universities was born by the business officer. Over the course of the next eighty years, the responsibilities of Isaac Hill's accounting descendants grew as the complexity of discharging assignments and reporting transactions multiplied.

In 1922, Trevor Arnett published *College and University Finance*, which was described by contemporaries as “the first publication of any importance in the field of college finance....”¹⁶ He identified eight duties:

1. Receiving of receipts
2. Disbursement of funds
3. Management of endowment funds
4. Management of the physical plant
5. Maintenance of an accounting system
6. Budgeting
7. Financial reporting
8. Purchasing¹⁷

In 1935, James Franklin Webb wrote *A Study of the Business Administration of Teachers Colleges*. Webb added to Arnett's list:

1. To supervise the financial affairs of auxiliary activities
2. To delegate the duties assigned assistants
3. To assist in the employment of assistants
4. To assist in supervising student loan funds
5. To make internal audits¹⁸

In 1948, J. C. Littlejohn, business manager of Clemson College, took another approach to identifying the duties of the business office. He asked his staff to write a

¹⁵ “Carnegie Millions for College Pension Fund.” *New York Times*, April 28, 1905.

¹⁶ Trevor Arnett, *College and University Finance*, (New York: General Education Board, 1922), 212.

¹⁷ Arnett, *College and University Finance*, 212.

¹⁸ James Franklin Webb, *A Study of the Business Administration of Teachers Colleges* (Chicago: The University of Chicago Libraries, 1935), p.151. Edward V. Miles, “Responsibilities of Business Management in a State Teachers College,” *University Administration Quarterly*, I (Spring, 1942), 238-248.

report entitled “What Goes on in the Business Manager’s Office.” More interesting than the list of duties—a list which matched the preceding lists—was the general comments by his staff. Though a long quotation, Littlejohn’s staff had something to say:

General—It is natural to assume that a constant flow of people would be in this office in view of its many activities. These visitors and conferences require a great deal of time, demand courteous but firm attention of those in the office.

The student activities such as the business management of the Taps, The Tiger, Athletic Department, The Central Dance Association, The Concert Series, The Y.M.C.A, and other small functions go daily. In justice to the many fine young men who undertake the work of these activities, time, help, and a sympathetic understanding should be extended to them by the staff of this office.

The Business Manager is also called upon to make provisions for the housing and feeding of numerous groups who practically overrun the campus during the summer months. This requires much time and patience.

The personnel of this office must be conscious of the true meaning of the word “Business Manager.” This brings the realization that all of us must keep abreast of the times. We must study rules and regulations governing the everyday conduct of government affairs as they apply to Clemson College such as Federal Admission taxes, Federal Excise taxes, gasoline taxes, etc. Every day a certain amount of time must be spent reading current newspaper and periodicals to gather information about what is going on and how it affects Clemson College.¹⁹

The college and university business officer was a pragmatist charged with the responsibility for dealing with that long list of responsibilities. The plethora of on-campus administrators did not come until later. In these early years, business officers managed purchasing, building maintenance, personnel issues, gifts to the college, travel expenses, payrolls, and more. SACUBO emerged to give these officers a forum and a physical place to meet annually to address these issues. S. J. T. Price of Auburn University serves as an example of an early member who benefitted from the relationships fostered by SACUBO. He would present his experience and knowledge to his colleagues while also seeking their guidance in addressing the many and complex

¹⁹ Hamilton Hill, K. R. Helton, and Virginia Poole, “What Goes On in the Business Manager’s Office,” (Unpublished Report, Clemson College, 1948), 1-5.

problems of the office. In 1929 and 1930, S. J. T. Price, accounting descendant of Isaac Hill at Auburn University, delivered two speeches to that newly formed association describing difficulties they encountered. Price said, “Too often we make up a form in a few minutes. These ‘hurry up’ forms are generally worth nothing and sometimes not that much. By this I mean they are a liability.”²⁰ In 1930, Price delivered a speech entitled “Business Office Forms.” He outlined it as follows: “Budget—what is it?” “Why a budget?” “Procedure” “How to treat estimations on income”²¹ Price was describing a lack of standardization requiring him and his colleagues to fabricate forms and accounting techniques, basically making things up as they go. He seems also to have been describing a business office that was understaffed and overworked.

When George Mew arrived at Emory University in 1923 as treasurer, he walked into that kind of business office. And though he recognized he alone was responsible for completion of his assignments, he also recognized he was not alone in his lack of specialized training for the position. Mew was not alone, and this was not a new situation. As J. K. Davis of Wofford College recalled at the first annual meeting of the Southern Educational Buyers and Business Officers Association in 1928, “One of our professors was treasurer for over twenty years. He had never been audited.” Then he said most higher education business was conducted by those coming “out of the academic world where they have different phases of the university.” “This is a day of awaiting on business problems in institutions. Two decades ago the head of the department would

²⁰ Minutes of the Second Annual Convention of the Southern Educational Buyers and Business Officers Association, April 19-20, 1929, p. 63-66.

²¹ Minutes of the Third Annual Meeting of the Southern Educational Buyers and Business Officers Association, April 24-26, 1930, 41.

make his own purchases. . . .”²² Mew recognized the need for training and he noticed how little was available. Recalling formative influences, J. R. Miles, Bursar for the George Peabody College for Teachers, said, “it was necessary for me to learn the management of a college business office from the ‘ground up,’ and it was the biggest learning assignment I had ever attempted. All previous learning experiences were child’s play compared to this.”²³ At the 1948 annual meeting, Miles asked how many of the attending business officers were trained “specifically for your present jobs?” Only two hands were lifted.²⁴ This urge toward training and standardization led to what Roger L. Geiger described this way:

A generation of standardizing activities gave much greater definition to the American system of higher education, even if it left the system of higher education, even if it left the system still highly diverse and decentralized. By World War I, American colleges and universities by and large conformed to a single pattern in terms of admissions, credit hours, offerings, majors and so on.²⁵

When Emory University’s President H. W. Cox delivered the welcoming address to the foundational meeting of SACUBO in 1928, he said, “We are glad to have you here, to have you study our Purchasing Problems, [and] to have you discuss some of our Business Problems. The Business Side of the Institution is one of the main questions.”²⁶

²² Minutes of the First Annual Convention of the Southern Educational Buyers and Business Officers Association, 1928, p. 6.

²³ Proceedings, Southern Association, 1948, 20-21.

²⁴ Proceedings, Southern Association, 1948, 21. (Though the records do not indicate how many business officers were in attendance, the records do say forty members were present at the annual meeting.)

²⁵ Roger L. Geiger, “The Ten Generations of American Higher Education,” in *American Higher Education in the Twenty-First Century: Social, Political, and Economic Challenges* edited by Philip G. Albach, Robert O. Berdahl, and Patricia J. Gumpert (Baltimore, Maryland: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 2011) 55.

²⁶ “Minutes,” Southern Educational Buyers and Business Officers Association, First Annual Meeting, April 20-21, 1928, 1.

Mew and Cox and others distinguished the business side of higher education from academics. In “The Duties and Functions of the College Business Officer,” Richard Setzer says the administration of institutions of higher education can be divided into two categories, the education and the financial. Both categories fell under the jurisdiction of the college president.²⁷

The need for a fully trained college and university business officer ratcheted up with the arrival of World War II and the increased the federal role in of higher education. World War II introduced a multitude of variables, each requiring consistency, efficiency and accountability: money for GIs, training programs, and the accompanying room and board. Readers of higher education histories will have to look hard, closely, and with a large magnifying glass to find mention of the college and university business officer, the one standardizing those reports and the one accountable for the funds.²⁸ They were the pragmatists responding to changing times in higher education. College and university business officers were born in the Progressive Era propelled by the idea of imposing order on disorder by creating standardized forms, by working to define their work as a profession, and working with colleagues across the nation to develop ever larger and more complex educational institutions.

When Clarence Scheps arrived at Tulane University as Executive Assistant to the President in 1947, he brought with him a Ph.D. in accounting, experience in the

²⁷ Richard Woodrow Setzer, *The Duties and Functions of the College Business Officer*, George Peabody College for Teachers, Dissertation, 1951, p. 1.

²⁸ In all my reading I have encountered two references to a business officer report included in an annual report to the Board of Trustees at Rice University. Report of the office of the business manager in Texas A&M, *Annual Report for the Fiscal Year 1944-1945*, 51. Matthew Tyler Penney, “Instruments of National Purpose” *World War II and Southern Higher Education: Four Texas Universities as a Case Study* (Ph.D. dissertation, Rice University, 2007), 123 and Henry Morton Bullock, *A History of Emory University* (Atlanta: Cherokee Publishing Company, 1972), 86.

Louisiana state capital as Supervisor of Finance for the Louisiana State Department of Education, and a strong set of opinions about education and finances. Reflecting on what he had learned, and setting out his expectations for how rapidly growing post-war university had to be organized, Scheps repeatedly defined the role of the college and university business officer as educator first and business manager second. Throughout his career he argued the end purpose of the educational business administration is not finance and business but, in fact, instruction, research, and public service: “It follows from this concept that the business officer and his associates in an educational institution must qualify first as educators and only secondarily as business men. Any attempt at separating business from academic, except on the narrow basis of routines and techniques, is artificial and unrealistic and can be harmful to the institution. Thus, the business officer must be a business man and an educator all at once.” Even more bluntly Scheps said, “The university budget essentially is an academic, not a business document.” On another occasion he said, “The business officer and his associates in an educational institution, understanding as they should the educational objectives and aims of the institution, must qualify first as educators and only secondarily as businessmen.”²⁹ Clarence Scheps personified the business officer SACUBO leaders wanted to create—a business officer with professional training and an eagerness to work with other business

²⁹ Scheps addresses these themes throughout his career: Clarence Scheps, “The Challenge of Change in Accounting and Budgeting,” delivered at the 24th Meeting of the American Association of College and University Business Officers. “Principals of Business Management and Finance in the College and University,” 1948. “Outline of Address to New Orleans CPA Society”, October 26, 1954. “The Business Office as it Affects the Climate of the College” Delivered to the Institute of Higher Education, Nashville, Tennessee, July 26, 1964. “An Open Letter to a New Business Officer,” Opening Address at Omaha Workshop, July 22, 1962.. “An Open Letter to a College Housing Officer by Dr. Clarence Scheps, published in Association of College and University Housing Officers, Ann Arbor, Michigan, August 5, 1964. Box 6, Folder Speeches, Series 1.

officers regionally and nationally. He authored *Accounting for Colleges and Universities* in 1948, a text popular enough to be revised and updated 1973 with a third edition produced in 1978. Scheps served as SACUBO president in 1960 and as secretary 1961-1965. He facilitated the merger between the American Association of College and University Business Officers and SACUBO. And he was a driving force in the creation of the National Association of College and University Business Officers.

Scheps said when he was first named business officer at Tulane University he was given the title Executive Assistant to the President because the president was unwilling to name him Chief Business Officer for fear faculty would not recognize his authority—that is to say, executive decisions should come through the office of the president, not the university business officer. Scheps said it this way: “Business officers in the early days were concerned more with bookkeeping and housekeeping than with participation in planning the objectives and goals of institution on high level.”³⁰ Isaac Hill and his peers knew exactly what Scheps was referencing. How to define the business officer and where to place him or her in the institutional chart of hierarchy continued to be debated, educational or financial.

Scheps argued vigorously that the educational and financial functions of the business office are not separate, but are one and the same: “Taking skills learned in the world of commerce into the university was common—there were no other options—but it failed to account for the differences between the two institutions. The principles and techniques are no different from those used in the commercial enterprise. In both organizations, there are the same necessities of journaling transactions, preparing and

³⁰ Scheps, speech to Catholic University, “College Business Management as a Profession”, June 6, 1969. Tulane University Archives Special Collections Box 6, Folder Speeches, Series 1.

auditing vouchers, the use of forms, such as requisitions, purchase orders, [and] checks.”³¹ The difference lies in the nature of the institution. The university is a spending institution. The university is not organized to generate a profit. Its task is to spend resources as efficiently as possible without any interest in generating a profit. In summary, “The budget is essentially an academic document.”³² He wrote later, “Business officers in the early days were concerned more with bookkeeping and housekeeping than with participation in planning the objectives and goals of institution on high level. An increasing number of business officers have become presidents of institutions.”³³

SACUBO members were tested in their abilities by the many internal and external pressures on the university: from philanthropists like the Carnegie Foundation to growing student populations delivered by the Serviceman’s Readjustment Act of 1944 and the National Defense Education of 1958, and the many new opportunities and challenges presented by twentieth century educational developments. Most business officers were not visionaries with grand designs for the university, but practitioners of an emerging profession that sought to do their jobs better. In making these changes and in organizing SACUBO they aided in the modernization of the American university. They helped

³¹ Clarence Scheps, “The Challenge of Change in Accounting and Budgeting,” delivered at the 24th Meeting of the American Association of College and University Business Officers. “Principals of Business Management and Finance in the College and University,” 1948. Tulane University Archives Special Collections Box 6, Folder Speeches, Series 1.

³² Scheps, “The Role of the Business Officer in the Institution of Higher Education, a speech at Georgetown University, July 15, 1968. Tulane University Archives Special Collections. Box 6, Folder Speeches, Series 1.

³³ Scheps, speech to Catholic University, “College Business Management as a Profession”, June 6, 1969. Tulane University Archives Special Collections Box 6, Folder Speeches, Series 1.

transform the university into the financial giants they became in the second half of the 20th century. And in figuring out how to accept and account for federal aid they contributed to the entanglements indicative of the modern university.

In chapter one, southern colleges responded to Andrew Carnegie's vision for the modern university, which included the creation of a pension fund to encourage the retirement of senior faculty and to entice new scholars into academia. The pension fund, though, required the ability to compare universities with each other in order to fairly distribute the money. In other words, standardization of financial reporting became essential. SACUBO's story began in 1925 with George Mew's visit to the Association of Business Officers of the Universities and Colleges of the Eastern States. George Mew used his visit to set in motion the creation of southern association of college and university business officers in 1927. During the first decade of its existence the Southern Association of College and University Business Officers [SACUBO] created a community of business officers collaborating on cooperative purchasing, standardizing accounting and reporting practices, and helping each other fulfill their specific institutional duties. At the organizational meeting of May 14, 1927, Mew used notes gleaned from his brief interactions with the Eastern Association to determine the topics for discussion and within the first decade, the association was on sound footing and beginning to hint at changes to come: the growing need for professional training, standardization of accounting and reporting, and the desire for greater cooperation amongst business officer associations. Hugh Hawkins talked about this urge to "band together" this way, "Much of the ferment loosely categorized as 'Progressivism' was in fact the effort of these groups to reshape government policy. No ivory towers, American

academic institutions had to pursue their goals in this confusing, rapidly changing ambience, and some leaders concluded that the creation of national organizations could help.”³⁴

The one topic George Mew missed in SACUBO’s first meeting—demand for increased education—was addressed with vigor in SACUBO’s second decade, and is the topic for chapter two. With its federal troops, money, and regulations, World War II transformed the college and university business office. Though land grant schools had worked with the federal government before, and the New Deal had provided a new money-stream for colleges and universities, business officers could not have known the extent and speed of changes lying in wait with World War II and its aftermath. To cope with the blossoming budgetary issues—particularly the need for bookkeeping skills and standardized reporting—SACUBO launched a series of training institutes that proved popular and important to the development of professional business officers. Attendees who appreciated the benefits of the training programs encouraged their continuation; indeed some of these programs continue into the twenty-first century. These training programs provided the tools for college and university business officers to help create the modern university.

Chapter three explores how business officers experienced and shaped the homogenization of higher education through the growing influence of the federal government and the many changes in American politics and society ushered in after the Second World War. The business problems faced by colleges and universities in the South were the same problems faced by those in other parts of the country; federal money

³⁴ Hugh Hawkins, *Banding Together: The Rise of National Associations in American Higher Education, 1887-1950* (Baltimore, Maryland: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 1992) 2.

and student populations expanding exponentially and the Cold War fueling the growing research university. SACUBO members realized regional problems and national problems were one and the same. With SACUBO leaders as the driving force, the regional associations created a national association, the National Association of College and University Business Officers in 1962.

The times also forced SACUBO members to address the racial divide in the South between their all-white organization and a similar association of African-American business officers in the South. Business officers from traditionally black colleges and universities created their own business officer group in 1939: the American Association of College and University Business Officers [American Association]. The association, commonly referred to as the American Association and never as AACUBO, formed because black members were not welcomed into SACUBO. Though the black business officers might join the other regional associations, the bulk of traditionally black schools resided in the South and the hardships of distance, education, and access were even more acute for black schools and their business officers. Merging two years after the enactment of major national civil rights legislation in 1964 and 1965, SACUBO and AACUBO members provides another opportunity to look at the Civil Rights Movement. Harold Logan and Burnett Little of the American Association worked with Luther Callahan, Clarence Scheps, and William Haywood of SACUBO to merge the associations. Does the merging of two professional organizations differ from integration? Who gained and lost from the merger? Who was reluctant and who pushed? No matter how these questions are answered, the merging of the two institutions created more

opportunities for cross fertilization of ideas, created an institution more representative of society, and helped create the modern university.

Clark Kerr described the years between 1960 and 1980 as “the second great transformation . . . [where] once again higher education entered a new stage of history.”³⁵ This transformation heightened SACUBO’s difficulty of addressing the needs of its members. The gap between smaller schools with a need for a business officer with generalized skills and larger institutions whose business officers increasingly became specialized with many responsibilities shifted to other administrators pushed SACUBO leaders to call for institutional reassessment. How would SACUBO function from the 1970s forward? Would it be a regional association in service of a national association or should it disband as did the American Association? Should it focus on general needs of college business officers or attempt to also address the various specialties emerging in that increasingly complex work? To answer those questions, SACUBO president Harold Read called for a self-study: “a comprehensive study of the Association’s role and structure in a time of expanding professional activity and of the directions that might appear most suitable for the Association’s future growth.”³⁶ The results of the study and the changes SACUBO implemented in the late 20th Century form the central interest of the fifth chapter. That SACUBO leaders felt the need to respond is evidence of the transformation referenced by Kerr and that SACUBO responded with increased opportunities for education is evidence of its continued influence in the creation of the modern university.

³⁵ Clark Kerr, *The Great Transformation in Higher Education, 1960-1980*. (Albany: State University of New York, 1991), xii.

³⁶ Self-Study Report of the Southern Association of College and University Business Officers, 1974. Original in SACUBO Archives.

By the late twentieth century, SACUBO had grown in size, importance, and complexity, much like the educational institutions to which its members belonged. In all the histories of the Carnegie Foundation, the histories of progressivism, the histories of colleges and universities, no one tells the history of the college and university business officer. This is the history of a group of higher education administrators who were masters of pragmatism and who in the process of transforming their business office helped transform institutions of higher learning in the South and the nation. To begin this story, we first turn back to George Mew in 1925.

CHAPTER ONE:

The Creation of the Southern Association of College and University Business Officers “Standard Forms for Financial Reports”¹

In the transformative years of the 1910s and 1920s and before George H. Mew and several of his fellow business officers birthed the Southern Educational Buyers and Business Officers Association in 1927, five significant forces shaped southern colleges and universities: World War I, Andrew Carnegie, the Great Depression, the federal government’s promotion of public infrastructure, and the death of the idea of institutional self-determination and campus autonomy. Combined with the increase in the size and complexity of the institutions generally, these forces made the need for highly trained college and university business officer become even more apparent.

Historians differ on the effects of war upon higher education in the South. In an argument for continuity, Clarence Mohr argues that World War I did not fundamentally change higher education in the South though it did pull the South “into the modern world.” The army needed the training only a college or university could provide—“physicians, chemists, engineers, and even Ph.D.s in psychology to devise and administer the standardized group tests”—but these offerings “were usually rendered in uniform after enlistment had removed them from an academic setting.”² Using Georgia Tech as his example, Robert C. McMath argues for change, giving example after example of how the needs of the military fundamentally changed Georgia Tech. The first example, a “national preparedness campaign called for training 50,000 military officers” even before

¹ Jessica M. Shedd, “The History of the Student Credit Hour” *New Directions for Higher Education* (Number 122, Summer 2003) 8.

² Clarence L. Mohr, “World War II and the Transformation of Higher Education” in Neil McMillen *Remaking Dixie: The Impact of World War II on the American South* (Jackson: University Press of Mississippi, 1997) 34.

the US entered the war in Europe. A second example, “Congress passed the National Defense Act in June 1916, establishing the Reserve Officers’ Training Corps on the campuses of institutions that could qualify.”³ Georgia Tech also “conducted a ground school for cadet advisors and supply officers, trained several hundred enlisted men as army technicians, and began a reserve officers training program that was later expanded and made a permanent feature of the institution. The federal government also asked Tech to run a motor transport school for disabled soldiers. A geology department was also established at federal request and expense in 1919.”⁴ Matthew Penney supported McMath’s argument for change by observing the South benefited from specialized programs because warmer weather permitted year-round training. Southern politicians eager for federal money capitalized on the South’s positive milieu which resulted in new training facilities and military bases.⁵ Though they may disagree, Mohr and McMath agree World War I changed some institutions but did not alter all higher education across the South. The college and university business office, however, changed. Processing those cadets and their money fell to the business office.

In his dissertation “*Instruments of National Purpose*”: *World War II and Southern Higher Education: Four Universities as a Case Study*, Matthew Tyler Penney says that in the 1910s and 1920s, American universities, including those in the South, shifted toward specialization. Specialization was another way of describing the federal government’s increasing influence: “the recognition of national accreditation standards,

³ Robert C. McMath, Jr. *Engineering the New South: Georgia Tech, 1885-1985* (Athens: University of Georgia Press, 1985) 144.

⁴ McMath, *Engineering the New South*, 125

⁵ Matthew Penney, “*Instruments of National Purpose*” *World War II and Southern Higher Education: Four Texas Universities as a Case Study* (Ph.D. dissertation, Rice University, 2007), 103.

the creation of departments based on academic disciplines, and an emphasis on research. As the federal government became even more active in promoting public infrastructure—developing transportation, issuing business regulation, and enhancing the military, and facilitating civil administration—expenditures on education in the form of land-grant legislation to endow colleges and the various extension services and experiment stations brought the federal government into a more routine relationship with state higher education systems.”⁶ But the intellectual and physical expansion of higher education in the 1920s was slowed by the Great Depression with some colleges in the South suspending operations, especially small classical institutions claiming to be colleges. Nevertheless, during the Depression, federal programs provided financial support and another precedent of government involvement in higher education. Georgia Tech’s ability to survive the Depression depended upon the largess of the federal government. The federal government provided money for “building program,” and in the in the 1933-34 annual report to the board of trustees, the writers noted that the federal government spent more money in one year at their institution than the several previous years combined: “The Civil Works Administration (CWA) repaired the athletic fields, painted the Chemistry, Library, and Physics buildings, and constructed a chemistry lab for research and a Naval Armory building.” Before it was over, Georgia Tech benefited from “30,000 hours of labor and \$3,997.48.” “And that was just the beginning,” McMath said.⁷ The New Deal at colleges and universities took the form of grants from programs such as the Works Progress Administration (WPA), the Federal Works Agency (FWA),

⁶ Penney, “Instruments of National Purpose,” p.98.

⁷ McMath, *Engineering the New South*, 182-3.

and the National Youth Administration (NYA). Penney noted that Federal largess also extended to students, “The NYA had the most direct effect on students, for its main function was to provide government checks to students for on-campus jobs.”⁸

Even before the influx of government money during the New Deal, there was Andrew Carnegie’s wealth and creative disruption of American education. After Carnegie mastered the world of business and amassed a fortune, he invented a style of philanthropy that sought not to just give money but to use that money to reshape institutions. Andrew Carnegie and his soon to be appointed head of the Carnegie Foundation Henry Pritchett believed that the fundamental problem with American higher education was that colleges were operating haphazardly as “unguided and inefficient” providers of education.⁹ Carnegie selected Henry Pritchett to lead his newly created Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching and in 1906 set aside \$10 million as a pension fund for “aged university and technical school teachers.”¹⁰ In order to fairly distribute the pension funds, Pritchett wanted some way to define a college, a university, a professor, public versus private, and denominational versus independent institutions. The foundation proposed that a college would be eligible for retirement allowances “if it (1) had at least six professors giving their entire time to college and university work, (2) had a course of four full years in liberal arts and sciences, and (3) required for admission not less than the usual 4 years of academic or high school preparation, in addition to the

⁸ Penney, “Instruments of National Purpose,” p. 99.

⁹ Morris L. Cooke, “Academic and Industrial Efficiency: A Report to the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching” (New York City: Bulletin Number Five, 1910),

¹⁰ “Carnegie Millions for College Pension Fund,” The New York Times, April 28, 1905.

pre-academic or high school preparation, in addition to the pre-academic or grammar school studies”¹¹

In 1910 the Carnegie Foundation issued a report written by Morris L. Cooke on “Academic and Industrial Efficiency.” The Carnegie Foundation enlisted the services of Cooke because he was “one of a group of engineers who specialized in the organization and management of industrial establishments and the installation in them of improved methods based on a scientific study of the results desired.”¹² Cooke’s report called for detailed “accounting and time-use” information that could be compared across time and between institutions with the ultimate goal of subjecting higher education to “competitive market pressures akin to those in private industry.” Cooke wanted to develop a formula to estimate the cost and output of both teaching and research “to measure the efficiency and productivity of educational institutions in a manner similar to that of industrial factories.”¹³ Cooke also developed a measuring tool, the student hour: “one hour of lectures, of lab work, or recitation room work, for a single pupil.”¹⁴ With the student hour defined, Cooke and others could measure “relative faculty workloads, the cost of instruction per student hour, and ultimately, the rate of educational efficiency for individual professors, fields, departments, and universities.” The Carnegie Foundation

¹¹ Shedd, “The History of the Student Credit Hour” 7. Shedd, “In a memorable academic put-down, Professor Carey Thomas of Bryn Mawr asked incredulously: if college credit is given for ladder exercises in gym classes, why not give students credit for walking up stairs; or if credit is given for swimming, why not give partial credit for one’s morning bath.”

¹² Cooke, “Academic and Industrial Efficiency” iv.

¹³ Shedd, “The History of the Student Credit Hour” 8.

¹⁴ C. W. Barrow, *Universities and the Capitalist State: Corporate Liberalism and the Reconstruction of American Higher Education, 1894-1928* (Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1990) 67.

followed Cooke's report with a "Standard Forms for Financial Reports." All colleges applying for the Carnegie Foundation pension would be required to use the calculus developed by Cooke and Carnegie. With the promise of funding to support the colleges and their faculties, the Carnegie foundation promoted "the idea of a single, standardized, and comprehensive system of education." Whether motivated by the offer of pension money or by the usefulness of the student hour as a unit of measure, record keeping shifted from local institutions to a national standard "by the end of the 1920s."¹⁵ "The 'scientific' definition of *college* and *university* developed for the pension system provided a starting point" for standardization of terms that was soon expanded, reforming education at many levels which encouraged further investigation into the organization and operation of higher educational institutions.¹⁶ Nestled in all of this talk about standardization and business practices, Cook wrote "The college is partly a business, and partly something very different from a business."¹⁷

Into this mix stepped H. W. Cox, president of Emory University, and George Howell Mew, treasurer of Emory University. Cox arrived on the steps of Emory University from the University of Florida. An Emory trustee nominated Cox based on his personal knowledge of Cox as a loyal church member but also as a "proficient executive and teacher in the University of Florida." Though the trustee did not define what he meant by proficient, Cox demonstrated his definition during his tenure as president 1920-1942. In his history of Emory University Bullock layered on the praise,

¹⁵ Shedd, "The History of the Student Credit Hour," 8.

¹⁶ Shedd, "The History of the Student Credit Hour," 8.

¹⁷ Morris Llewellyn Cooke, *Academic and Industrial Efficiency: A Report to the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching* (New York City: Bulletin Number Five, 1910) vi.

“With the coming of President Cox, the University emerged from a period of changing leadership unparalleled in the history of the institution, and entered one marked by unified leadership and well-planned progress. . . .”¹⁸ Bullock correctly observed how Cox tackled Emory’s problems and even noticed Cox so efficiently ran the university that the Chancellor position was dropped when Chancellor Warren Akin Candler retired. Then Bullock also correctly observed that the success of the University included “deans and others who by reason of position, or strategic leadership in some phase of the administration, have assisted in shaping its growth.” And though Bullock does not discuss his contributions, it is at this point George Howell Mew left Western Electric and began working at Emory University, 1923. In 1924, George H. Mew was elected Treasurer of the University.¹⁹

Cox and Mew needed all their skills to earn Bullock’s praise. With finances in bad order and the university operating at a deficit, even supporter and future benefactor Asa Candler declared he would no longer support the university. Cox and Mew created a budget, held the divisions and departments to it, and restored the confidence of Emory’s chief benefactor, Candler. Using money made from investments and Coca-Cola, Candler gave the budding university \$1,000,000 in the 1923-24 academic year.²⁰

Cox and Mew embraced the modernization pushed by Carnegie, and sought to work with their counterparts throughout the region to comply with the foundation directives and improve the business side of higher educational institutions; their work

¹⁸Henry Morton Bullock, *A History of Emory University* (Atlanta: Cherokee Publishing Company, 1936) 298.

¹⁹Thomas H. English, *Emory University 1915-1965: A Semicentennial History* (Atlanta: Emory University, 1966) 30.

²⁰Bullock, *A History of Emory University*, 300.

resulted in the creation of the Southern Association of College and University Business Officers. SACUBO and similar organizations in other regions are noticeably absent from the standard accounts of the modernization of the American university, yet understanding their development provides a window on both the modernization of higher education and the development of a new professional identity for the university business officer.

Responding to the request of Dr. H. W. Cox, President of Emory University, George Howell Mew, twenty-eight years of age and in his second year as Treasurer, attended the sixth annual meeting of the Association of Business Officers of the Universities and Colleges of the Eastern States in Pinehurst, North Carolina, on December 4 and 5, 1925. The Eastern Association had formed in November of 1920 and expanded in 1924 to include the Association of Business Officers of New England Educational Institutions.²¹ At the 1925 meeting, when business officers talked of further expansion and invited suggestions from those in attendance, one participant identified a pool of potential new members residing in the institutions of the southern United States. Many of the business officers at the meeting subscribed to Henry Louis Mencken's view of the South as the "Sahara of the Bozart" and could hardly imagine that real collegiate education occurred in the region.²² Mew recalled one speaker stood to discourage the recruitment of southern schools: "There are only a few institutions in the South and only one, Duke, will amount to anything."²³ Early correspondence and early organizational

²¹ Mary M. Lai, *Eastern Association of College and University Business Officers: Seventy-Five Years in Review*, 1994, 8-9.

²² H. L. Mencken, *A Mencken Chrestomathy: Edited and Annotated by the Author* (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1956), 184-195, original in *New York Evening Mail*, November 13, 1917.

²³ Vera Mew Hiller, Interview by author. 8 February 1999 and 20 February 1999. Notes in author's files.

minutes suggests this experience ignited the initiative of the young Emory treasurer and inspired the formation of an association for the southern states. Returning home by train, Mew and R. B. Cunningham of Agnes Scott College discussed the advantages of a regional organization.²⁴ Though others shared similar thoughts, Mew clearly was the driving force behind the creation of the Southern Association of College and University Business Officers.

Mew brought a wide range of gifts and skills to his role as creator of SACUBO. George Howell Mew began his life on October 29, 1895, in Barnwell County, South Carolina and began his professional career at Emory University in 1923. After attending school in South Carolina he moved further south, working as an assistant foreman on a crew building the Ocean Highway bridges to Key West for the Flagler System of the Florida East Coast Railway Company. In 1917, Mew served the American Expeditionary Forces in the Army Engineering Corps, fighting in Somme, Montdidier-Noyon, Aisne-Marne, Ypres-Lys, St. Mihiel, and Meuse-Argonne. Following his Honorable Discharge from military service, Mew attended the Georgia School of Technology (now Georgia Institute of Technology) from 1919-1921 and graduated from New York University in 1922 with a Bachelor of Science in Commerce. Mew would also complete some legal studies in 1925 while working at Emory University.²⁵ Mew learned his craft and established his career at Emory, serving as its treasurer from 1923 to 1958. A memorial tribute to Mew described his work in heroic terms: "It was Mr. Mew's firm hand that

²⁴ George H. Mew to J. G. Kellum, 2 May 1927. Original in files of Vera Mew Hiller, Atlanta, Georgia.

²⁵ "A Memorial Tribute to George H. Mew: 1895-1985" (Adopted by the Executive Committee of the Board of Trustees of Emory University on August 22, 1985), 1.

enabled President Cox and the trustees to keep the university's income and expenditures flowing in reasonable proportion during the crisis years of the Great Depression and World War II. 'See Mr. Mew' was an expression heard everywhere on campus: he knew where to buy and how to buy anything and everything, a vital skill in those days"²⁶ George H. Mew also served as Deputy Sheriff of DeKalb County and functioned as the only law enforcement on Emory's campus for several years. Mew served ten years as an assistant professor of business law and generated a formidable reputation for his work in the classroom. One student recalled how dorm room conversations soon labeled Mew's class as labor intensive and should be taken only by those interested in hard work. At Mew's retirement a student—one of several—reported Mew's influence altered his plans for the future. Though idealized, these reports at Mew's retirement suggest Mew demonstrated himself a people builder as well as an institution builder.²⁷

Legends also grew with Mew's reputation. In an early meeting with Asa Candler, Candler called Mew and advised him of a \$100,000 contribution to Emory University. Candler instructed Mew to shift the Bearer Bonds from Candler's safety deposit box to Emory's. Mew arrived at the bank, asked the keeper of the safety deposit box room to watch as he counted the bonds. Three times Mew counted one thousand dollars more than Candler promised. Mew called Candler to the room. After listening in his characteristic pose—hands clasping his lapels and elbows akimbo—Candler smiled, pocketed the extra \$1,000 and left.²⁸ Henry L. Bowden, chairman of Emory's Board of

²⁶ A Memorial Tribute, 1.

²⁷ Judson C. Ward, Jr. to George H. Mew, 5 February 1958 and Morgan S. Cantey to George H. Mew, 3 February 1958. Originals in files of Vera Mew Hiller.

²⁸ Vera Mew Hiller, Interview by author. 8 February 1999 and 20 February 1999. Notes in author's files.

Trustees, remembered Mew also served as manager of the University's real estate. Because a tenant failed to pay the rent, a warehouse was closed and Mew confiscated the contents—automobile suspension springs. Wanting to make good use of university assets, Mew suggested installing the springs as markers in a university parking lot, clearly a good example of Mew's innovative thinking. However, when faculty and staff bumped those automobile springs with their cars the spring often "slapped" under the bumper. Bowden dryly said: "If you have ever tried to get an automobile off an automobile spring—it was a real problem."²⁹

The energy Mew focused on his career, his students, and his university, he also turned toward the creation of the Southern Association of College and University Business Officers [SACUBO]. A good raconteur, Mew enjoyed telling the story of his trip to Pinehurst and how those uppity easterners failed to appreciate institutions of higher education in the South. Nevertheless, SACUBO can be considered to be the progeny of the Eastern Association and the Central Association. On his notes for the organizational meeting of May 14, 1927, Mew scribbled the topics discussed at the 1925 and 1926 meetings of the Eastern Association. Under the heading "1925 Pinehurst, North Carolina, meeting," he wrote: student loans, insurance, auditing, student activities, college store, and investments. Under the heading "1926 Princeton, New Jersey, meeting," Mew made this list: demand for increased education, fire insurance, group

²⁹ Proceedings, Southern Association of College and University Business Officers, Forty-Second Meeting, April 5-7, 1970, 88. Vera Mew Hiller recalled a visit by her parents when she lived in southern California. On one visit she and her parents visited San Juan Capistrano to witness the annual return of the cliff swallows in the spring. Hampered by health problems, the elderly Mew elected to sit on a bench while Vera and her mother toured the site. While seated on the bench, Mew began to calculate the profit made by the selling of a few kernels of corn for ten cents to feed the swallows. After calculating the rows of corn, the number of kernels in the row and how much was earned for an ear of corn, Mew announced if Emory could reap the same kinds of profits the university's financial future could be secured.

insurance, student loans, and dining hall operations.” Within the first three annual meetings of the new Southern Association all but one topic—demand for increased education—had been discussed. The Southern Association built upon what other associations had done.³⁰

The connection between offspring and parent grew clearer as the foundation for the Southern Association grew firmer. Immediately following the fateful trip to Pinehurst, Mew requested a copy of its Constitution and By-Laws and then requested minutes of the Central Association’s meeting held in Chicago, 1923-24. The secretary-treasurer of the Eastern Association sent the requested items but said the genesis of the Eastern Association could be summed up in one paragraph. Citing the selection of key officers, the selection of a name, and an agreement to meet at regular intervals, he unhelpfully added, “That is the whole story!”³¹ With the initial information in hand, Mew increased his correspondence with other business officers across the South, generating interest and soliciting information. Mew’s correspondence inspired S. J. T. Price of Alabama Polytechnic Institute (now Auburn University) to forward Mew’s initial questionnaire to several other colleges. With positive responses in hand from institutions including Birmingham-Southern and the University of Alabama, Price wrote to Mew: “Since a large majority of the colleges have indicated their interest I am inclined to think the time is ripe for an organization.”³² Within two months, Mew received letters from K. H. Graham of the University of Florida and Thomas C. Amick of Elon College, both

³⁰ Handwritten note in files of Vera Mew Hiller.

³¹ H. S. Ford to George H. Mew, 31 January 1927. Original in files of Vera Mew Hiller.

³² S. J. T. Price to George H. Mew, 8 April 1927. Original in files of Vera Mew Hiller.

eager to aid in the creation of an organization working to help business officers in the South.³³

In the beginning, Mew favored dual functions for these gatherings of college and university business officers, combining the idea of purchasing agreements along with the need for professional contact. Mew was already a member of the Educational Buyers Association (a national organization) whose headquarters were in Chicago. At the 1926 meeting, the Educational Buyers Association divided the United States into five regions with a regional chairman for each. Mew was selected chairman of the Southern Region.³⁴ Not content for the South to be an extension of a national organization, Mew argued for forming a southern educational buyers association. Prior to the organizational meeting in 1927 Mew had already given the idea of a southern buyers association serious thought. In August of 1926 Mew wrote to John C. Dinsmore, purchasing agent for the University of Chicago, and requested “a copy of the paper which you read at the joint meeting of the Association of University and College Business Officers, held at Ohio State University, Columbus, Ohio, on May 21, 1926. This paper was entitled “Possibilities of Pool Buying.”³⁵ After a year of further contemplation, Mew wrote S. J. T. Price on May 2, 1927, and suggested, “Perhaps the two organizations could be included in one. At our annual meetings, we could discuss our college and business

³³ K. H. Graham to George H. Mew, 24 March 1927 and Thomas C. Amick to George H. Mew, 9 May 1927. Original in files of Vera Mew Hiller.

³⁴ George H. Mew to T. D. Morris, 5 September 1927. Original in files of Vera Mew Hiller. Morris was treasurer of The University of Tennessee. In 1944 George H. Mew was elevated to president of the National Association of Educational Buyers.

³⁵ George H. Mew to John C. Dinsmore, 25 August 1926. Original in files of Vera Mew Hiller.

problems which would, I think, be an ideal method of meeting together.”³⁶ Price agreed, concluding that it “is beyond a doubt the wise course to pursue at this time.”³⁷ With his thoughts jelled and the promise of support, Mew combined the two functions. Writing in his first presidential report—1928—to the executive committee, Mew stated the “objects of the association are two-fold, the first of which has to do with solving our purchasing problems and the second with our business administration procedures. Both of which are of equal importance in our southern institutions and are closely related because of the fact that in the large majority of institutions the treasurer and business manager . . . is intrusted [sic] with the successful administration of both activities.” He further proposed the two purposes could be combined in one annual meeting to minimize travel expenses.³⁸

By April, 1928, Price was fully persuaded of the benefits of pool purchasing, extolling the virtues of group purchasing in a presentation entitled “Association Dues as an Investment.” He likened the emphasis on group purchasing to the “reformation brought about by” equipping colleges with purchasing departments.³⁹ Mew followed Price the next year with an address entitled “Advantages of Association Membership.”⁴⁰ Many of the advantages, he said, were self-evident. To highlight the benefits of group action over individual action, he used a metaphor, the manufacturer and the chain store.

³⁶ George H. Mew to S. J. T. Price, 2 May 1927. Original in files of Vera Mew Hiller.

³⁷ S. J. T. Price to George H. Mew, 3 May 1927. Original in files of Vera Mew Hiller.

³⁸ “Report of the President,” Southern Educational Buyers and Business Officers Association. Original in files of Vera Mew Hiller.

³⁹ “Minutes,” 1928, 31.

⁴⁰ “Minutes,” 1929, Table of Contents.

Chain stores, Mew argued, “are the out-growth of a disorganized system of distribution in the retail selling field.” The chain stores evolved when manufacturers were willing to give large discounts to those who could purchase in large quantities. The parallels are obvious. Southern colleges and universities were the disorganized system which needed to join together so they could command a reduction in costs, not unlike the chain stores.⁴¹ Though not all members possessed the confidence and zeal of Mew and Price, sufficient numbers agreed to try it. J. G. Kellum’s response was illustrative: “If we can save money in this way of course I am for it. Just how far we could do our buying through that association I do not know. That would be something for us to try out and see how it works.”⁴² The local nature of this project facilitated its success. Mew reminded his listeners, “on account of Atlanta being the Southern distributing center of all large companies, the freight rate from Atlanta to Southern Colleges being so much less than freight would be from the same houses located in Northern cities, the Southern Educational Buyers and Business Officers Association was organized to function here in the South.”⁴³ He boasted in a letter to the treasurer of the University of Tennessee, “We have saved a great deal for the members of the Association by purchasing through *local* firms on *local* contract, and I feel sure that should you see fit to join the Association, we could save a little for you [emphasis added].”⁴⁴ K. H. Graham of the University of Florida agreed: “I intended to join the national organization but after reading your letter

⁴¹ “Minutes,” 1928, 35-40.

⁴² J. G. Kellum to George H. Mew, 4 May 1927. Original in files of Vera Mew Hiller.

⁴³ “Minutes,” 1928, 35-40. Original in files of Vera Mew Hiller.

⁴⁴ George H. Mew to T. D. Morris, 5 September 1927. Original in files of Vera Mew Hiller.

and copy received from Mr. Price of Alabama Polytechnic Institute I am inclined to favor the southern organization.”⁴⁵

Mew shamelessly used success stories enticing others to join: “I am handing you herewith a copy of a letter which I have just received from Mr. S. J. T. Price . . . in which he informs me that he has saved for his institution \$549.64 since . . . May of this year. The membership dues for his institution were less than \$20.00 for the year. You can, therefore, readily see that the small investment has paid tremendous dividends.”⁴⁶ That letter from Price appears and reappears in Mew’s collection of correspondence. Of course those who experienced savings were delighted to share their success stories, creating a success-breeds-success promotion. Rupert Cooke of Louisiana State Normal College wrote, “It is with pleasure that I tell you we saved \$1.25 per thousand, or a sum of \$62.50 on this purchase.”⁴⁷ That letter was shared with others. “I enjoyed very much,” replied G. E. McCaskey, “reading the copy of the letter sent to you by our good friend Rupert H. Cooke, Purchasing Agent for Louisiana State Normal College at Natchitoches, Louisiana. For your information, and his, I can assure you that I have beaten his record so far, as I have just estimated that we have saved \$116.00 on an order for one year’s supply of letterhead.”⁴⁸

Though the correspondence and early minutes of this new business organization surely reflected an emphasis on group purchasing, it quickly grew to include other

⁴⁵ K. H. Graham to George H. Mew, 6 September 1927. Original in files of Vera Mew Hiller.

⁴⁶ George H. Mew to M. W. Haggard, 30 August 1927. Original in files of Vera Mew Hiller.

⁴⁷ Rupert H. Cooke to George H. Mew, 3 June 1929. Original in files of Vera Mew Hiller.

⁴⁸ G. E. McCaskey to George H. Mew, 7 August 1929. Original in files of Vera Mew Hiller. McCaskey was Business Manager of Gulf Park Junior College for Women, Gulfport, Mississippi.

reasons for gathering. The writer of “Notes” to the second annual convention said it this way: “Our purpose is not to have a Buyer’s Association, but also a Business Officer Association. This organization should be organized by the business officers of the colleges and universities who in most cases, do the buying.”⁴⁹ Buying, then, was simply one function of the multi-faceted calling of the business officer. Price, in all his zeal for pool purchasing, recognized the business officer’s primary vocation was not buying, but managing: “We must not take ourselves too seriously; we do not have much time to study the subject of buying. You cannot buy and carry on your work too very properly.”⁵⁰ It is worth recalling Mew’s May 2, 1927, letter to S. J. T. Price wherein he said: “At our annual meetings, we could discuss our college and business problems which would, I think, be an ideal method of meeting together.”⁵¹

These gatherings also introduced another element into the relationship between the business of higher education and the business world. After the 1930 meeting, a resolution was passed thanking the hosts of the third annual meeting: “Be it further resolved: -That the secretary be requested to express by letter our thanks and appreciation to Foote and Davies, General Foods Co., Georgia Power Co., and Libby, McNeill, and Libby for their gracious hospitality and entertainment.”⁵² With this resolution, business officers introduced into their meetings a new way of working with suppliers and providers of service to higher education. By force of generosity, suppliers gained access to potential customers, certainly generated positive will and maybe altered business

⁴⁹ “Minutes,” 1929, 69.

⁵⁰ “Minutes,” 1928, 31-32.

⁵¹ Mew to Price, 2 May 1927. Original in files of Vera Mew Hiller.

⁵² Proceedings, 1930. 84.

transactions between the two. The ease with which these two forces—suppliers and business officers—interacted generated the need for more attention from business officers in the years to come.

Whatever the motivation for gathering, there were good reasons for forming an association: other associations are not recruiting them, the members comprised a community of interest even if they were not officially associated, and meetings of the other similar organizations were often too far and expensive to attend regularly.⁵³ The Eastern Association did not recruit them, and business officers from southern institutions made little effort to join the Eastern Association. Mew said: “So few of the business officers of the southern colleges and universities attend the meetings of the Association of Colleges and Business Officers of the Eastern States, I think an association among southern colleges . . . would be a great advantage. . . .”⁵⁴ J. G. Kellum described regional differences this way: “The problems of the business officers of the eastern states are in some degree different from ours . . . since the colleges and universities in the northeastern states are much older and their policies much more established than here in the south. It might be that we could have met here in the south and discussed the questions before us and have gotten more out of it as they would have come nearer the problems before us.”⁵⁵ Like Mew, other business officers were aware that the South, by definition, was isolated by distance. Price said, “The objection to uniting with the organizations . . . now existing is the distance we would generally have to travel to attend meetings.”⁵⁶ Then there was

⁵³ George H. Mew to J. G. Kellum, 2 May 1927. Original in files of Vera Mew Hiller.

⁵⁴ George H. Mew to J. G. Kellum, 2 May 1927. Original in files of Vera Mew Hiller.

⁵⁵ J. G. Kellum to George H. Mew, 4 May 1927. Original in files of Vera Mew Hiller.

⁵⁶ S. J. T. Price to George H. Mew, 10 December 1926. Original in files of Vera Mew Hiller.

the issue of travel's primitive nature. G. E. McCaskey, business manager for Gulf Park Junior College, Gulfport, Mississippi, reported a "twenty-eight hour delay [from Atlanta!] because of washouts on the L & N Railroad and other lines."⁵⁷

Mew laid the foundation on May 14, 1927, but others contributed. One name that emerges often in Mew's correspondence is S. J. T. Price, accountant for Alabama Polytechnic Institute. Price offered consultation, gave encouragement, and solicited members. Clearly the enthusiasm of each inspired the other. In December of 1926, Price wrote, "What do you think of the advisability of an organization of college business officers for the South-eastern section of the United States?"⁵⁸ In that same letter, Price said a southern association "seems to me a step forward, especially if we can interest all, or practically all, of the colleges, say East of the Mississippi River, and South of Virginia and Kentucky. This would make the organization strong enough to make it . . . *impressive*" [emphasis added]. Four days later Mew replied: "I have talked this matter over . . . with a number of university officials in the vicinity of Atlanta, and all of them are very much in favor of such an organization."⁵⁹ Then he wrote:

I am planning on sending out a letter, during the first of the year, under the name of our President, to each of the university Presidents in the Southern states, suggesting such an organization and asking them for their opinion to the advisability of organizing⁶⁰

⁵⁷ G. E. McCaskey to George H. Mew, 24 April 1928. Original in files of Vera Mew Hiller.

⁵⁸ S. J. T. Price to George H. Mew, 10 December 1926. Original in files of Vera Mew Hiller.

⁵⁹ George H. Mew to S. J. T. Price, 14 December 1926. Original in files of Vera Mew Hiller.

⁶⁰ George H. Mew to S. J. T. Price, 14 December 1926. Original in files of Vera Mew Hiller.

Price encouraged Mew to move with speed, “wondering if it would be well to get as far along with an organization as would be ethical before the Business Meeting [of the Eastern Association] at the University of Virginia next spring.”⁶¹ Price continued:

I can see where you might feel a little delicacy in withdrawing from the Eastern Association, but if a sufficient number of those who are not members of this association would become interested enough to go to the meeting at the University of Virginia, it could probably be handled with less embarrassment to you, or any other institution now a member of the Eastern Association.⁶²

“I am very glad,” Mew effused, “to learn that enthusiasm for such an organization is growing more and more each day.”⁶³ A letter from the president of the Eastern Association refusing to make a meeting in the South a priority seemed to relieve Mew and his colleagues of further attempts to ally with the Eastern Association:

On behalf of our Association I thank you for the invitation to hold our meeting there in 1927. Of course the question where to meet will be decided by the Executive Committee taking office at the close of this year’s meeting so I cannot predict what their decision will be.⁶⁴

In February, Mew and Price expanded their discussions. Price volunteered to evangelize potential members, reporting that he had contacted eight schools already. Always encouraging, Price suggested Mew communicate with the schools in the vicinity of Atlanta. Mew concluded in his response that if Price could bring some business

⁶¹ S. J. T. Price to George H. Mew, 19 January 1927. Original in files of Vera Mew Hiller.

⁶² S. J. T. Price to George H. Mew, 19 January 1927. Original in files of Vera Mew Hiller.

⁶³ George H. Mew to S. J. T. Price, 21 February 1927. Original in files of Vera Mew Hiller.

⁶⁴ Frederick B. Johnson to George H. Mew, 12 October 1926. Original in files of Vera Mew Hiller. The Eastern Association elected to meet in Charlottesville, Virginia, in 1927.

officers to Atlanta, he could bring two or three, “I think it would be sufficient number to get the organization going and to appoint an executive committee.”⁶⁵

On March 2, 1927, Mew typed a circular letter inviting business officers from several institutions to Emory University to inaugurate a business association for those working in higher education in the South. The responses included: “. . . circular letter of March 2nd reached me some days ago, but have been delayed in replying;” “Kindly keep me posted, I am anxious to know what response you have had on your circular letter of the 2nd;” “I am interested in the matter about which you write.”⁶⁶ Price agreed but suggested all of the colleges in the Southeast be invited, eliminating the possibility some would “get the impression that a few of us intended to use the ‘steam roller’ process.”⁶⁷ After months of discussion Price announced, “right now is an ideal time to invite an assembly of representatives from every college in the Southeast.”⁶⁸ Mew responded in kind and set the “date for Saturday, May the fourteenth, if it is convenient with you.”⁶⁹ Mew mailed a second circular letter May 5, 1927. Miss Banks Armand from Wesleyan College responded, “I have your letter of the 5th instant . . . if nothing prevents, Miss Mary Lou Barton, Bookkeeper for Wesleyan, and myself will attend the meeting.”⁷⁰ One

⁶⁵ George H. Mew to S. J. T. Price, 21 February 1927. Original in files of Vera Mew Hiller.

⁶⁶ K. H. Graham to George H. Mew 4 March 1927; S. J. T. Price to George H. Mew, 8 March 1927; R. C. Brownlee to George H. Mew, 14 March 1927. Original in files of Vera Mew Hiller.

⁶⁷ S. J. T. Price to George H. Mew, 27 April 1927. Original in files of Vera Mew Hiller.

⁶⁸ S. J. T. Price to George H. Mew, 27 April 1927. Original in files of Vera Mew Hiller.

⁶⁹ George H. Mew to S. J. T. Price, 2 May 1927. Original in files of Vera Mew Hiller.

⁷⁰ Banks Armand to George H. Mew, 7 May 1927. Original in files of Vera Mew Hiller.

response came from as far away as Georgetown, Texas: “I thank you for your invitation of May 5th to attend the meeting of Business Officers at Emory Saturday May 14th.”⁷¹

On the spring morning of May 14, 1927, eight business officers representing seven institutions of higher learning gathered at 9:30 a.m. in the faculty club room in the library building of Emory University, Atlanta, Georgia.⁷² At this inaugural meeting the following business officers represented seven universities and colleges and became charter members of the Southern Association of College and University Business Officers:

Mercer University	Mr. S. W. Garrett, Bursar
Wesleyan College	Miss Banks Armand, Bursar
Wesleyan College	Miss Mary Lou Barton, Assistant Bursar
Agnes Scott College	Mr. R. B. Cunningham, Business Manager
Wofford College	Mr. J. K. Davis, Treasurer
Birmingham Southern College	Mr. N. M. Yielding, Bursar
Alabama Polytechnic Institute	Mr. S. J. T. Price, Business
Emory University	Mr. G. H. Mew, Treasurer

In his report to President Cox, Mew included a prediction of future membership: “A number of other Universities and Colleges expressed keen interest in the association and intend joining immediately.”⁷³ Mew hardly could have predicted that by December 23 of the same year enrollment would expand to nineteen members.⁷⁴

These eight business officers—men and women—set the course for their new association, an association in existence for eighty-plus years. They named themselves “The Southern Educational Buyers and Business Officers Association,” combining two

⁷¹ R. W. Tinsley to George H. Mew, 10 May 1927. Original in files of Vera Mew Hiller. Tinsley was assistant to the president of Southwestern University.

⁷² “Minutes,” 14 May 1927, 1.

⁷³ George H. Mew to H. W. Cox, 17 May 1927. Original in the files of Vera Mew Hiller.

⁷⁴ “Minutes,” 14 May 1927, a list of members dated December 23, 1927, included in the minutes.

elements—a purchasing pool and business officer association.⁷⁵ Cunningham suggested Mew for temporary chairman and N. M. Yielding as temporary secretary. With those recommendations confirmed, Mew selected members for the Committee of Constitution and By-Laws—Price, Davis, Cunningham, Mew—and a finance Committee—Garrett, Armand, and Yielding.⁷⁶ As evidence of the intensive planning for this inaugural meeting, they presented and adopted the following report. Notice the level of detail, evidence of the organizing influence of progressivism:

Rules and Regulations
of the
Southern Educational Buyers & Business Officers Association

Membership: The membership of the above organization shall be comprised of the purchasing agents or other officers for the following institutions:

List of Institutions

Mercer University	Wofford College
Wesleyan College	Birmingham Southern College
Agnes Scott College	Alabama Polytechnic Institute
Emory University	

Additional members may be admitted at any time.

Membership in this organization shall be purely voluntary, and any member reserves the right to withdraw from the organization at any time, except that all contracts made in good faith by any member shall be fulfilled before withdrawal.

In voting upon any action of the contract each institution represented shall be entitled to one vote, no action to be taken on any matter with the mutual consent of all.

Object: The object of the organization shall be to bring about a better understanding among the members of their mutual purchasing and supply problems and requirements; to standardize wherever possible; to investigate the various methods open to reduce the cost of supplies and equipment; to conduct a thorough study of the general stores problem, and

⁷⁵ George H. Mew to H. W. Cox, 17 May 1927. Original in the files of Vera Mew Hiller.

⁷⁶ “Minutes,” 14 May 1927, 1.

where it appears to be the interest of the various institutions to act jointly in getting bids and preparing and entering into contracts for supplies and equipment commonly used by all; and to meet periodically for the purpose of discussing business problems.

Officers: 1st A President whose duty it shall be to preside at all meetings of the association as a whole and to perform such other duties as are usually connected with said office or shall be from time to time determined by this organization.

2nd A Vice-President, whose duty it shall be to preside at all meetings of the association as a whole in the absence of the President.

3rd A Secretary-Treasurer, whose duty it shall be to keep a true and correct record of all meetings, and to perform such other duties as are usually connected with said office or shall be from time to time determined by the organization.

4th As Executive Committee, consisting of the officers and two other members appointed by the President, whose duty shall be to enter into and handle all contractual relations with vendors and to perform such other duties as are usually connected with such committee or shall be from time to time determined by the organization.

Meetings: Regular meetings shall be held at the various institutions comprising the membership of this organization; the time and place to be determined at the preceding meeting.

Special meetings may be called by the President upon due notice to the members.

A majority of the members shall constitute a quorum, but no member shall be bound by any action or contract entered into at such meeting without his consent or ratification.

General: It is the avowed intention of the organization to avoid interfering with existing arrangements where it is evident that harm will be done to some member and no common good will accrue.

No member shall be requested to forsake any contract wherein more is gained than if participating in the general contract.

Each member institution shall defray all expenses incidental to his membership in the organization, except that general expenses of the organization shall be met by the organization as a whole, each member

being assessed annually \$1.00 per 100 students or fraction thereof, registering in the regular session.

These rules may be amended at any time at a regular meeting by a majority of members present.⁷⁷

As secretary/pro tem, Yielding recorded the results of their work:

After this report was adopted Mr. G. H. Mew was elected President of the organization, Mr. Garrett Vice-President, and Mr. Cunningham Secretary-Treasurer. Mr. Mew then appointed Mr. Price and Mr. Davis as members of the Executive Committee.

It was regularly moved, and seconded that the time and place of the next meeting was to be left to the Executive Committee.

Upon the motion of Mr. Davis, Mr. Mew was extended a vote of thanks for his work in connection with the organization of this body and the courtesies shown at the convention, after which the meeting was adjourned.⁷⁸

This vote of thanks was not the only one tendered. Garrett, echoing the sentiments of his colleagues, wrote, "I congratulate you on what you have already accomplished, and I am confident we are laying the foundation for big things in the future. I want to express my appreciation personally for the many courtesies shown us last Saturday."⁷⁹

Mew immediately looked to the next year, writing to S. W. Garrett with several inquiries about the next meeting. Perhaps his excitement fueled the barrage of questions to Garrett:

Have you given the subject any thought? If so, what do you think about it? As a member of the executive committee where and when do you think we should have the meeting? What about the program? Will you outline a tentative program showing the subjects which you think should be discussed at the meeting? If you will, I think we can definitely work out a program of interest and benefit to all of us.⁸⁰

⁷⁷ "Minutes," 14 May 1927, 2-3.

⁷⁸ "Minutes," 14 May 1927, 4.

⁷⁹ S. W. Garrett to George H. Mew, 21 May 1927. Original in files of Vera Mew Hiller.

⁸⁰ George H. Mew to S. W. Garrett, 27 February 1928. Original in files of Vera Mew Hiller.

Mew continued, suggesting that he expected “each member of the executive committee as well as others at the meeting to read a paper covering some phase of the business administration of Colleges and Universities. Choose your subject as soon as possible.”⁸¹

Clearly excited by the possibilities, Mew concluded:

I am planning to write a letter to each member of the Association requesting them to send a list of the subjects which they would like to hear discussed. Then to assign these subjects to various ones beforehand in order that the assignee may have time to prepare the subject for discussion. What do you think of that idea? If you think well of it, can you send in a list of subjects that are bothering you? In handling our problems in this manner, I think we can be of mutual benefit to each other. Any suggestion or comment which you wish to make will be appreciated I assure you.⁸²

George Howell Mew’s willingness to listen to his colleagues, to write and read correspondence, and to invest the planning time required to start a new professional organization was rewarded. Business officers from across the South built on the April 1927 organizational meeting, with an even larger gathering the following year.⁸³ At 9:00 a.m. Friday, April 20, 1928, the Southern Educational Buyers and Business Officials Association gathered at the Henry Grady Hotel in Atlanta, Georgia, for its First Annual Convention. The delegates began the task of sharing information with and among business officers. Alliances were forged which created an expanding circle of contacts which allowed conventioners a glimpse into the methods of other officers and other schools. In 1929, the assembly of business officers welcomed officials from junior colleges and listened as women business officers delivered presentations; a model that

⁸¹ George H. Mew to S. W. Garrett, 27 February 1928. Original in files of Vera Mew Hiller.

⁸² George H. Mew to S. W. Garrett, 27 February 1928. Original in files of Vera Mew Hiller

⁸³ Garret to Mew, 21 May 1927.

has endured. Miss Banks Armand said, “I believe the only way we can help each other is by telling how we manage our own and let other institutions profit by anything new we think would be advisable, for adoption.”⁸⁴ Then and now women participants have been a part of the annual proceedings, although the first woman elected to president was not until 1951, Gladys Barger of Lenoir Rhyne College.

The officers at those first meetings laid the foundation and provided leadership for twenty years. Of the original eight members, five served as president—George H. Mew of Emory, S. W. Garrett of Mercer, J. K. Davis of Wofford, N. M. Yielding of Birmingham Southern, R. B. Cunningham of Agnes Scott—and two served as secretary-treasurer—Cunningham and Mew. Mew served as temporary chairman of the 1927 organizational meeting and president from then until 1929—the two foundational years. Mew was elected permanent secretary-treasurer in 1929 and served until 1937.⁸⁵ His physical and spiritual presence permeated the annual proceedings until his death in 1985. Alone, Mew provided nine years of leadership in the critical days of this new organization. Charter Member R. B. Cunningham served as secretary-treasurer the first two years. Indeed, at the organizational meeting; it was Cunningham’s recommendation that Mew serve as temporary chairman. Cunningham was elevated to president in 1940 and served as a strong and enduring presence, providing critical support during the early phase of this organization. S. J. T. Price epitomized the depth of talent available for leadership. He did not serve as president or secretary-treasurer in those early years but was critical to the organization’s success. Mew wrote Price, “Without your cooperation

⁸⁴ “Minutes,” Southern Educational Buyers and Business Officers Association, Second Annual Convention, April 19-20, 1929, 23.

⁸⁵ “Minutes,” Southern Educational Buyers and Business Officers Association, Second Annual Convention, April 19-20, 1929, 70.

and assistance in the Association I do not know what will be the ultimate outcome of it. For you know Emory and Auburn are the Institutions that put the thing over.”⁸⁶

Those officers at the first annual convention at the Henry Grady Hotel participated in an ambitious two-day itinerary. Eighteen presentations were scheduled, including an after-lunch address by the Honorable L. G. Hardman, Governor of Georgia. The calendar was filled from 9:00 Friday morning until late Saturday afternoon.⁸⁷ Dr. H. W. Cox, president of Emory University and friend of George H. Mew, gave the welcoming address. With seven sentences delivered in less than forty-five seconds, Cox sketched the next several years of this emerging organization: “We are glad to have you here, to have you study our Purchasing Problems, [and] to have you discuss some of our Business Problems. The Business Side of the Institution is one of the main questions.” Cox’s short welcoming address revealed the organization’s goals: cooperation, standardization, and professionalization: “This Business Association has benefited us not only as a purchasing agency but has helped us to make friends with other schools to cooperate with other schools.”⁸⁸ Cox so clearly identified the issues facing this group of business officers one can only wonder if Mew provided consultation on the address. Whoever crafted it, Cox described the reasons for which this foundation had been laid: a buyers’ association, a business association, the emerging field of cooperation and standardization, and the position of business officer a profession.

⁸⁶ George H. Mew to S. J. T. Price, 1 December 1927.

⁸⁷ “Program,” First Annual Meeting of the Southern Educational Buyers and Business Officials Association. Original in files of Vera Mew Hiller.

⁸⁸ “Minutes,” Southern Educational Buyers and Business Officials Association, First Annual Meeting, April 20-21, 1928, 1.

Cox's first three words—we are glad—suggests a honeymoon period in this budding organization and reflected the eagerness of those present. In spite of taking twenty-eight hours longer than usual to return home, G. E. McCaskey, business manager of Gulf Park Junior College for Women in Gulfport, Mississippi, sent his compliments by letter and volunteered for future service: “I am counting upon your calling upon me if I may be of any assistance to you from now until the end of May, 1929.”⁸⁹ Whatever happened at that first gathering clearly impressed McCaskey: “[My wife and I] will continue to remember with utmost pleasure the wonderful trip given by the association under your direction and with the assistance of Mr. Cunningham to the delegates of the convention.”⁹⁰ Without as much vigor, Banks Armand echoed the sentiments of McCaskey when she wrote: “I cannot tell you how much Miss Barton and myself enjoyed the meeting, and we both feel that it was well worthwhile to attend. I am writing to thank you for your many courtesies to us.”⁹¹

If some expressed their enjoyment of the organizational meeting, others spread the news of a new business officer association. Eight business managers representing seven institutions met at the organizational meeting in April 1927. By September 5, 1927, Mew reported eleven member institutions and by the end of the same month twenty-one. Mew and others continued to proselytize. Thirty-one registered for the first annual convention in 1928. By 1938, the Southern Association of College and University Business Officers counted fifty-eight member institutions from eleven southern states.

⁸⁹ G. E. McCaskey to George H. Mew, Gulfport, Mississippi, 24 April 1928. Original in files of Vera Mew Hiller.

⁹⁰ G. E. McCaskey to George H. Mew, Gulfport, Mississippi, 24 April 1928. Original in files of Vera Mew Hiller.

⁹¹ Banks Arman to George H. Mew, 25 April 1928. Original in files of Vera Mew Hiller.

The growth came largely through the efforts of the organization and members to promote their positive experiences at the meetings and what they learned there. A 1937 resolution committee repeated for the tenth time since SACUBO's inception a strong invitation to members to promote the association to fellow business officers and membership continued to grow.

The growth in numbers resulted, in part, from the location of the meetings; that is, the southern region of the United States. F. L. Jackson, treasurer of Davidson College said, "My sympathies, of course, are with the southern institutions."⁹² J. G. Kellum wondered aloud to Mew, "Would we get more out of a separate association or by working with them [Eastern Association]." He answered his own question when he said he had "never attended but two of their [Eastern Association's] meetings."⁹³ It means something that Kellum's name is the first on the registration list of the Southern Association's first annual convention, that he served on the executive committee that first year, and that he was elected president in 1937; location mattered.

The meeting locations also contributed to the name of the new organization. The present name—The Southern Association of College and University Business Officers [SACUBO]—evolved during the first decade. Several names appeared in the correspondence: Southern Educational Buyers Union,⁹⁴ Southern Educational Buyers

⁹² F. L. Jackson to George H. Mew, 9 August 1927. Original in files of Vera Mew Hiller.

⁹³ J. G. Kellum to George H. Mew, 4 May 1927. Original in files of Vera Mew Hiller.

⁹⁴ K. H. Graham to George H. Mew, 24 March 1927. Original in files of Vera Mew Hiller. T. C. Amick to George H. Mew, 9 May 1927. Original in files of Vera Mew Hiller. Amick was business manager of Elon College in North Carolina.

Association,⁹⁵ University Buyers Association for the Colleges and Universities of the Southern States,⁹⁶ and University Purchasing Association for the Southern States.⁹⁷ The minutes of the 1927 organizational meeting recorded the name as the Southern Educational Buyers and Business Officers Association while the program for the first and second annual conventions reported the name as the Southern Educational Buyers and Business Officials Association.⁹⁸ President Thurmond Sensing settled the issue at the eighth annual meeting in 1936 by proposing a new name, “Southern Association of College and University Business Officers.”⁹⁹

The progression from foundation building to a fully erected edifice was not smooth or without struggles. And because these business officers were attempting to “pool purchase” and address business problems, the potential for friction multiplied: fear of losing local support, dealing with companies beyond local reach, and the continuing lack of coordinated purchasing among southern colleges and universities. One recurring theme for business officers was the fear of losing the support of businesses in their

⁹⁵ R. B. Cunningham to A. W. Rees, 28 July 1927. Original in files of Vera Mew Hiller. Rees was treasurer of Emory University Academy.

⁹⁶ George H. Mew to S. J. T. Price, 14 December 1926. Original in files of Vera Mew Hiller.

⁹⁷ George H. Mew to S. J. T. Price, 21 February 1927. Original in files of Vera Mew Hiller.

⁹⁸ “Minutes,” 14 May 1927. Original in files of Vera Mew Hiller. “Program,” First Annual Convention of the Southern Educational Buyers and Business Officials Association. “Program,” Second Annual Convention of the Southern Educational Buyers and Business Officials Association.

⁹⁹ “Minutes,” Southern Educational Buyers and Business Officers Association, Eighth Annual Meeting, 10-11 April 1936, 6. The new name, SACUBO, was a precursor to the multitude of “ACUBOs” to come. Business officers in the Middle West organized the first association in 1912, the Association of Business Officers of the State Universities and Colleges of the Middle West. The members later changed its name to the Association of University and College Business Officers. Only in 1946 did its name evolve into the Central Association of College and University Business Officers (CACUBO). Business officers in the East organized the second association, the Association of University and College Business Officers of the Eastern States. Its members changed the name in 1939 to the Eastern Association of College and University Business Officers (EACUBO). By the 1960s there was WACUBO for the Western Association, AACUBO for the American Association (African Americans), and NACUBO for the National Association.

community. J. B. Franklin, Superintendent of Georgia Baptist Hospital and Training School for Nurses, wrote Mew describing how he was almost persuaded: “Several times I have given some thought to your Association. I have also made some investigations. Thus far I have not been able to see wherein we would benefit especially by cooperating with you, but I do see the possibility of losing some influence we may count upon.”¹⁰⁰ R. W. Tinsley, assistant to the president of Southwestern University in Georgetown, Texas, was less diplomatic: “I am much interested in this proposition but must move slowly on account of local conditions. Our town has a population of about 4,000 and just two years ago we raised subscription here to some \$65,000 to rebuild our dormitory by fire.” He identified the problem: “If you have lived in a small college town you will appreciate my position.”¹⁰¹ McCaskey from Gulfport, Mississippi, framed the problem in ethical terms: “We are morally obligated to some of our local concerns.” Negative experiences with pool purchasing also emerged as a barrier to joining. F. L. Jackson, treasurer of Davidson College in North Carolina, hesitated because “I have already taken membership in other organizations and have not profited a great deal. Typewriter ribbons and other things purchased through the Chicago organization [Educational Buyers Association] proved particularly worthless.”¹⁰² Louisiana State University business manager R. L. Himes just said, “Our experience is that it takes considerable time to work out the routine involved in buying through an association, and we will not join more associations at this time for that reason.”¹⁰³

¹⁰⁰ J. B. Franklin to George H. Mew, 6 April 1928. Original in files of Vera Mew Hiller.

¹⁰¹ R. W. Tinsley to George H. Mew, 10 May 1927. Original in files of Vera Mew Hiller.

¹⁰² F. L. Jackson to George H. Mew, 9 August 1927. Original in files of Vera Mew Hiller.

¹⁰³ R. L. Hines to SEB&BOA. 2 September 1927. Original in files of Vera Mew Hiller.

Some rejections to Mew's invitations were rather dramatic. J. H. Kirkland of Vanderbilt University said, "I am somewhat alarmed at the increasing number of special conventions held every year for college officers. I think there is an organization for ever such officer except the President." Kirkland piled the sarcasm on, "An earnest appeal has come to me from some of our assistants and secretaries that an organization be gotten up that will furnish them opportunities of excursions and social engagement."¹⁰⁴ Mew refused to personalize Kirkland's response and attempted again to engage him, "There are, however, groups and associations which I believe justify their existence and, as I am founder and sponsor of this Association, I believe I can convince you that of all associations now represented that this one is justifiable."¹⁰⁵ Kirkland's final letter revealed his problem and curiously one of the reasons Mew and others created the new association of business officers. Kirkland said, "I do not see my way clear to make the changes necessary for a well organized purchasing department for the whole University."¹⁰⁶

Sales representatives who lost profits presented a more insidious problem. One interaction between Mew and Banks Armand, both charter members, provides a glimpse of how easily new members could be misled by the words of an unhappy salesman. "I have just learned," Mew wrote, "through a salesman who called on you that the cooperation which you have been getting from the Southern Educational Buyers and Business Officers Association this year has not been satisfactory. I shall appreciate it if

¹⁰⁴ J. H. Kirkland to George H. Mew, 26 March 1929. Original in files of Vera Mew Hiller.

¹⁰⁵ George H. Mew to J. J. Kirkland, 12 April 1929. Original in files of Vera Mew Hiller.

¹⁰⁶ J. J. Kirkland to George H. Mew, 13 April 1929. Original in files of Vera Mew Hiller.

you will write me full details with reference to the service you have not been able to get.”¹⁰⁷ Armand immediately replied: “I have your letter of the 19th instant and am indeed hurt to think that you would for a moment believe that I had said anything derogatory about you or the . . . Association. Whoever told you so said something that is not true.”¹⁰⁸ Mew needed little time for reflection on the detailed explanation provided by Armand; he responded the next day: “It looks like the supply are trying to do all they possibly can to create some discord among the members of the Association because of the fact that they are probably a lot of them losing business, or not getting any profit which they have been able to get in the past.” Mew concluded his letter by suggesting that “this fellow from the Puritan Chemical Company has been doing all he could do to discourage the members of the Association from buying on contract.”¹⁰⁹

The ability to address and rectify problems demonstrated and enhanced the strength of the alliance amongst these business officers. The value of this growing relationship was reflected in setting the membership fee. As the Association grew, the fee increased and members willingly paid it, perhaps indicating their belief the fee was a good investment. The “Rules and Regulations” drawn up and accepted at the 1927 organizational meeting established that “each member institution shall defray all expenses incidental to his membership in the organization as a whole, each member being assessed annually \$1.00 per 100 students or fraction thereof, registering in the regular

¹⁰⁷ George H. Mew to Banks Armand, 19 July 1929. Original in files of Vera Mew Hiller.

¹⁰⁸ Banks Armand to George H. Mew, 23 July 1929. Original in files of Vera Mew Hiller.

¹⁰⁹ George H. Mew to Banks Armand, 24 July 1929. Original in files of Vera Mew Hiller.

session.”¹¹⁰ Just one year later, Mew wrote to Frank C. Gentry, business manager of the University of Louisville, reporting the dues to be on a graduated scale with a minimum of \$5.00 to a maximum of \$25.00.¹¹¹

As they met, the commonality of problems revealed itself, perhaps again revealing why schools willingly paid their dues. When Joe Barber—SACUBO president in 1984-1985 and SACUBO archivist in 1990—examined the 1928 Minutes, he noticed two themes that resonated many decades later, the “familiar old tune of fee collection duties” and “the administration of loan funds.” Barber especially appreciated the anecdote recalled by Joe L. Davis of Wofford College wherein a boy “withdrew from school owing us about \$55. The student planned to transfer to Tulane, but Mr. Davis told him they would not issue a transcript until the \$55 was paid. He said, ‘Within a few days we received a cashier’s check for the amount’.”¹¹² In 1929, the theme of student fees continued. F. L. Jackson of Davidson College recalled: “I had one student to ask that his ‘bill’ be sent to his father. When it was explained that this was contrary to our policy he remarked that his father said it was handled that way when he was in college and he was sure an alumnus would thus be accommodated. The boy was not told that the father had not yet paid his own account.” Jackson recalled a second anecdote, one that “served as a stimulant to stiffen my backbone: A boy said he could not pay his fees because his father had so much income tax to pay.”¹¹³ By 1933 the depression was in full force,

¹¹⁰ Rules and Regulations, “Minutes,” Southern Educational Buyers and Business Officers Association. Original in files of Vera Mew Hiller.

¹¹¹ George H. Mew to Frank C. Gentry, 21 July 1928. Original in files of Vera Mew Hiller.

¹¹² Joe H. Barber, Jr., “Report from the Archivist,” *SACUBO LEDGER*, Fall 1990, 9.

¹¹³ Joe H. Barber, Jr., “Report from the Archivist,” *SACUBO LEDGER*, Fall 1990, 9.

highlighting or magnifying financial problems in higher education. Again, the collection of student fees was an issue. A two-hour round table discussion was led by Miss Banks Armand at the 1933 meeting. The recorder of the minutes said: “Due to the depressed economic conditions which have invaded every southern institution, this discussion was most interesting and beneficial to the entire membership.”¹¹⁴

The depression also inhibited the ability of some colleges and universities to pay the annual membership dues causing several institutions to withdraw their membership. As treasurer of the Southern Educational Buyers and Business Officers Association, George Mew suggested a treasury surplus of \$800 be used to cover dues of established members who were unable to pay. Though there certainly is the issue of institutional survival, these members knew the importance of working together and learning from each other.¹¹⁵

W. C. Trotter, financial secretary for the University of Mississippi, recalled when he began his work there in 1930, “the depression had just begun. We were having hard times finding money to operate the school. Among the things we did was to reduce salaries and wages paid everyone.”¹¹⁶ The impact of the depression on the South was highlighted by Emory Q. Hawk of Birmingham-Southern College: “In the sixteen Southern states there are only eight institutions of higher learning which may be considered as adequately endowed. Of the one hundred five colleges in the United States

¹¹⁴ “Minutes,” Southern Educational Buyers and Business Officers Association, Fifth Annual Meeting, April 15, 1933, 1.

¹¹⁵ “Minutes,” 1933, 15.

¹¹⁶ Proceedings, Southern Association of College and University Business Officers, Nineteenth Annual Meeting, April 18-19, 1947, 27.

with an endowment of two million dollars or over, the South has only fifteen.”¹¹⁷ If sharing information helped during the depression, some minutes possessed an escapist entertainment element. S. W. Garrett, business manager of Mercer University, described some of their evening meals: “Where you have a large group of boys coming from all types of homes, some with high ideals and some with no ideals at all, it is impossible to serve meals day after day, that will please them. And if they are not pleased they soon begin to vent their feelings on the matron or whoever is in charge. The throwing of biscuits, wasting of food, boisterousness, and general bedlam prevails.”¹¹⁸ Two years later K. H. Graham, business manager of the University of Florida, offered this remedy: “The latest innovation was to secure one of our student orchestras to play during the dinner and supper periods. This has been successful in eliminating, to some extent, a few of the points just mentioned.”¹¹⁹

While the depression years created daunting difficulties for college and university business officers and pushed their creativity to its limits, some revolutionary changes began during this period. In his 1928 welcoming address to the first annual convention, Cox expressed excitement about this business association helping “us to make friends with other schools and to cooperate with other schools,” identifying the two themes critical to this decade—creating allies cooperating.¹²⁰ One problem highlighted by the attempts to cooperate was the considerable variance among institutions in the titles and duties assigned to business officers. In 1934, Thurmond Sensing surveyed 124 teachers’

¹¹⁷ “Minutes,” 1933, 31.

¹¹⁸ “Minutes,” 1928, 26.

¹¹⁹ “Minutes,” Southern Educational Buyers and Business Officers Association, Third Annual Convention, April 24-26, 1930, 31.

¹²⁰ “Minutes,” 1928, 1.

colleges. In the survey he asked for the titles of seven main administrative offices:
 president, librarian, registrar, dean of women, dean of men, dean, and business officer.

He discovered the lack of uniformity in titles for business officers:

Business Officer	
Accountant	5
Accounting Clerk	2
Auditor	1
Bursar	19
Business Administrator	1
Business Agent	3
Business Manager	29
Business Manager and Treasurer	1
Business Secretary	3
Controller	1
Executive Clerk	1
Financial Agent	1
Financial Clerk	2
Financial Secretary	24
Office Manager and Accountant	1
Secretary	1
Secretary-Accountant	1
Secretary-Treasurer	5
Treasurer	7
Registrar and Clerk	2
Registrar and Disbursing Officer	1
Registrar and Financial Secretary	1
Registrar and Purchasing Agent	1
Registrar and Secretary-Treasurer	1
Registrar and Treasurer	1
TOTAL	117 [sic 116]

The titles “president” and “librarian” occurred 124 of 124 times. The title “registrar” occurs 121 times. The title “dean of women” occurs 114 times. The title “dean of men” occurs eighty-seven times. And the title “dean” occurs seventy-three times. He

concluded by suggesting that it is “regrettable that the same uniformity is not found in the title assigned to the business officer as in the case of the other six officials tabulated.”¹²¹

The absence of a standard title and role for the business officer perhaps contributed to another problem, lack of consistency in financial reports. Mew cited a report completed by the Student Loan Information Bureau and the Harmon Foundation describing a lack of uniformity in the administration of student loans. He concluded: “Each institution seems to have a procedure peculiarly its own. Nor has it been possible to discover any two institutions which are guided by the same set of principles in the administration of loans to students. Mew tackled the lack of uniformity by communicating with the United States Office of Education and requesting a representative be sent to the 1929 annual convention “to discuss with us the problems of university and college accounting.”¹²² Dr. Arthur J. Klein, Chief of the Division of Higher Education, United States Office of Education, presented a paper to the Southern Association and repeated it to the Central and Eastern Associations.¹²³ Klein described the dilemma of university business officers this way: “Nothing contributes to the latter unhappy distortion of sweet dispositions more than constant dealing with facts that are not fact—the repeated discovery that an egg is an omelet.”¹²⁴ He presented the problem anecdotally, quoting from the reports his department had collected from almost twelve

¹²¹ “Minutes,” Southern Educational Buyers and Business Officers Association, Seventh Annual Convention, April 13-14, 1934, 18-19.

¹²² This invitation “resulted in the organization of the National Committee on Standard Reports.” *Financial Reports for Colleges and Universities*, compiled by The National Committee on Standard Reports for Institutions of Higher Education (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1935), vii.

¹²³ “Minutes,” 1929, 41; Proceedings, Southern Association of College and University Business Officers, April 16-17, 1937, 15.

¹²⁴ “Minutes,” 1929, 41.

hundred colleges and universities. One school listed seventy-three major divisions of expenditures; two caught Klein's attention: "One is called 'Promotion' and the question pops into the undisciplined mind as to whether this refers to student promotion, student recruiting, plain publicity or a real estate development." Klein was intrigued by one classification known as "Economic Poison." He wondered if it referred to "the single tax or [if] communistic propaganda has enjoyed the patronage of a respected institution." Or, he said, maybe it refers to "expenditures for rat and gopher poison, it may have been intended for the undoing of the insect pests or the cultivation of poisonous plants."¹²⁵ In the course of Klein's 1929 presentation entitled "Cooperation Between the Bureau and the Colleges with Reference to Statistical Reports," he identified "why financial records are so curious." They are so for the very important reason that "the training and experience of many educational finance officers has been that of accountants or bookkeepers in the business world. They bring to the task of educational accounting very little conception of how their activities may throw light upon educational policy and educational purposes."¹²⁶ Even at this early date, 1929, Mew and other business officers identified important themes enduring for the length of SACUBO's existence; standardization and the connections between universities, SACUBO, and the Federal government.

When S. W. Garrett wrote to George Mew in 1927, he said "I congratulate you on what you have already accomplished, and I am confident we are laying the foundation for

¹²⁵ "Minutes," 1929, 45-46.

¹²⁶ "Minutes," 1929, 50.

big things in the future.”¹²⁷ Indeed, they laid a foundation for the modernization of their institutions and higher education generally. Mew, Garrett, and their colleagues through what would become the Southern Association of Colleges and University Business Officers introduced better business practices into their institutions of higher education. They constructed the ground floor by creating a purchasing co-operative, by updating accounting skills, and welcoming business sponsorship of meetings. What remained to be seen was the shape of the structure to come.

¹²⁷ S. W. Garrett to George H. Mew, 21 May 1927. Original in files of Vera Mew Hiller.

CHAPTER TWO:

World War II and the Transformation of the College and University Business Office: “The business office is a necessary and important unit in the university”¹

The Southern Educational Buyers & Business Officers Association adopted a new name in 1936—Southern Association of College and University Business Officers—and marked the start of its second decade of existence by holding its annual meeting in Atlanta, site of its organizational meeting and its first convention a year later. The following decade would be a challenging one for the business officers as U.S. entry into the Second World War set in motion numerous changes in society and education. Though SACUBO members were poorly prepared for the scope of the crisis, they survived the crisis and set in place programs to prepare themselves and their universities for the future.² They launched a training institute on behalf of the Association in cooperation with the Georgia School of Technology and created the College Business Management Institute at the University of Kentucky. Within two decades they had successfully launched a tradition of offering training programs for their members.

Internal motivations drove George Mew and colleagues to excel at their jobs and to achieve the best results they could for their institutions of higher learning. From the beginning in 1927, they gathered to share solutions members devised and to propagate

¹ The first line is adapted from Clarence L. Mohr’s essay title, “World War II and the Transformation of Higher Education.” in Neil R. McMillen, ed, *Remaking Dixie: The Impact of World War II on the American South* (Jackson: University Press of Mississippi, 1997) 33-55. The second line comes from Proceedings, Southern Association of College and University Business Officers, Twentieth Annual Meeting, April 23-24, 1948, 56.

²“Very early in the years of World War II the University’s slogan became ‘Get Ready for the Unexpected.’ That radical change was in store for colleges and universities was keenly realized, and it was taken without delay to assess Emory’s resources that might contribute to the national effort when and if the United States was drawn into the conflict. In the summer of 1940 a University Council Committee on National Defense was appointed with Dean Purks as Chairman, “to facilitate the cooperation of the University with the government in all matters relating to the defense program.” Thomas H. English, *Emory University 1915-1965: A Semicentennial History* (Atlanta: Emory University, 1966) 58.

the latest accounting techniques. In 1937 SACUBO members accepted an invitation by the Central Association—drawing members in the area from Kansas to Ohio and Missouri to Minnesota—to explore the prospect of “standardization for business organization and administration of colleges and universities.”³ In this task SACUBO leaders worked with J. C. Christensen from the University of Michigan, J. Harvey Cain of the Financial Advisory Service of the American Council on Education, and Henry G. Badger of the Office of Education of the United States Department of the Interior. The result of this work was an October, 1938 bulletin entitled, “College and University Business Organization.” “These writings,” [SACUBO treasurer and business officer from Auburn University] W. T. Ingram said, “set forth in much detail the principal duties and responsibilities of the business office under the direction of the chief business officer.” He marveled at the list’s comprehensiveness and detail on eighteen different duties and responsibilities.⁴ Twenty-six years later, the documents produced by that Joint Committee continued in use as evidence of their lasting power and the importance of standardization. The desire to improve business practices at their schools motivated many university employees to join SACUBO and provided the organization with active members primed to work on solutions to common problems.

Sometimes, though, external forces unexpectedly work to achieve internally longed-for goals; in SACUBO’s case, World War II accelerated the pace of changes in higher education. In the introduction to *Remaking Dixie: The Impact of World War II on the American South*, Morton Sosa wrote, “Although World War II did not diminish the

³ Proceedings, Southern Association of College and University Business Officers, 1938, 11-14.

⁴ Proceedings, Southern Association of College and University Business Officers, 1938, 11-14.

South's mythological status—indeed it enhanced it—the social changes it brought to the region were vast and far reaching. The accelerated urbanization and industrialization wrought by a massive modern war, which greatly affected the entire United States, would have a particular dramatic impact on the South. In effect, the South after World II would be different from what it had been in 1940.”⁵ In his essay, “World War II and the Transformation of Higher Education,” Clarence Mohr talked about the “historic pattern of incompatibility between war and higher learning in America.” Pearl Harbor ended it.

After Pearl Harbor the needs of the federal government and the needs of higher education blurred into one. University of California Chancellor Clark Kerr famously said it best when he described the new role of colleges and universities as ‘instruments of national purpose.’⁶ Mohr gave this example, “In January 1942, officials from the Office of Education, the Army, the Navy, and 1000 college and university executive officers from forty-six states” met in Baltimore the gathering suggested that colleges and universities were solidly on board to serve the needs of the federal government at the time of national crisis. Once closely joined to federal funding and direction, few institutions of higher education would ever fully retreat or question the relationship. At the Baltimore meeting, both sides pledged their mutual interest and support: the armed forces acknowledged the importance of higher education while the colleges agreed to year-round sessions, more physical training for students, the introduction of courses and credits for military preparation, and accelerated degrees that could be completed in three

⁵ Morton Sosna, “Introduction” in Neil McMillen *Remaking Dixie: The Impact of World War II on the American South* (Jackson: University Press of Mississippi, 1997) xv.

⁶ Clarence L. Mohr, “World War II and the Transformation of Higher Education” in Neil McMillen, ed. *Remaking Dixie: The Impact of World War II on the American South* (Jackson: University Press of Mississippi, 1997) 3d.

years.⁷ While the return of peace would see colleges return to many pre-war patterns of instruction, the continued merging of national needs with higher education goals drove many more changes in higher education in the decades to come. Tulane president Rufus Carrollton Harris predicted that the university's transition from war to peace would constitute the most complex episode in the school's 112-year history. In his history of Tulane University, Clarence L. Mohr lauded President Harris's prescience, "Events of the next decade not only proved Harris correct, but established the importance of World War II as a demarcation line separating two great epochs in Tulane's development."⁸

U.S. entry into World War II forever changed the character of the American college and university. Matthew Tyler Penney latched onto Clark Kerr's phrase "instruments of national purpose" in a dissertation studying the relationship between the federal government and four Texas universities: "*Instruments of National Purpose*" *World War II and Southern Higher Education: Four Texas Universities as a Case Study*. Millions of dollars of research money for military applications and military personnel brought federal money for tuition and housing even as university based training programs were created for the Army, Navy and Air Force. The roadmap for many of these changes can be found in "Higher Education for American Democracy: A Report" which was issued in 1947. Drafted by a panel of experts commissioned by President Harry S. Truman, the report "recommended among other things a larger system of higher education broader in curricular scope, with an eye toward pragmatism, and expanding

⁷ Mohr, "World War II and the Transformation of Higher Education" in Neil McMillen *Remaking Dixie*, 35.

⁸ Clarence L. Mohr and Joseph E. Gordon, *Tulane: The Emergence of a Modern University, 1945-1980* (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 2001) 1.

vastly the traditional demographics that had attended college with respect to class and race.”⁹

Though many students quickly enlisted and depopulated class rolls, the U.S. military saved many universities from financial ruin by bringing many young men back to campus as military students. Penney notes that at Rice University “civilian enrollments decreased by more than one-half between 1940 and 1944.”¹⁰ At the University of South Carolina, the male civilian population dropped from 1,117 to 277 in four years, 1941 to 1944.¹¹ These numbers were despite the pleas of the “director of the selective service system, General Lewis B. Hershey, who encouraged college men resist ‘war hysteria’ and to continue their normal course of activities. . .”¹² The military took these students and their tuition fees away from colleges and universities, creating multiple problems for the institutions left behind but in short order the U.S. military returned students with significant sums of federal money to college campuses. In January 1942, a series of short courses on a variety of war-related subjects was offered at Emory University whose enrollment totaled 357. Two hundred and thirty five of those 357 came from outside the University.¹³ At the University of South Carolina [USC] the U.S. Navy joined three new programs to a naval ROTC. Whether from relief, excitement, or other reasons, the faculty and students at USC “responded with a standing ovation” when

⁹ Penney, “Instruments of National Purpose” 229.

¹⁰ Penney, “Instruments of National Purpose” 100.

¹¹ Henry H. Lesesne, *A History of the University of South Carolina, 1940-2000* (Columbia: University of South Carolina Press, 2001) 22.

¹² Penney, “Instruments of National Purpose” 100.

¹³ Thomas H. English, *Emory University 1915-1965: A Semicentennial History* (Atlanta: Emory University, 1966) 59.

university President McKissick announced the arrival of the navy programs.¹⁴

These wartime students quietly inaugurated a change in Southern higher education, tying higher education and the federal government together tighter and tighter. Mohr described the change as “educational democratization” and then added the change was significant from a “psychological and a political standpoint.”¹⁵ Politically the federal government made higher education a priority and provided the “means and the incentive for ordinary citizens to pursue advanced training.”¹⁶ Psychologically Mohr argued that wartime educational experience generated positive feelings with the members of the American Legion. Members of the American Legion in turn made higher education a prominent part of veteran’s benefits later enacted in “The Servicemen’s Readjustment Act of 1944, better known as the “G. I. Bill of Rights.”¹⁷ This tightening knot holding the higher education and the federal government together was pulled from both ends. While the Federal government pulled politically from one end, leaders of higher education in the South pulled from the other end. Tulane University President Rufus Carrolton Harris co-chaired President Roosevelt’s Committee on Postwar Educational Opportunities for Service Personnel and created an earlier version of the G.I. Bill. The “Osborne Committee proposed a limited veteran’s aid program,” limited because Harris and other administrators feared they would be seduced by the attraction of “open-ended federal subsidies.” These subsidies “would attract weak students” which

¹⁴ Lesesne, *A History of the University of South Carolina, 1940-2000*, 22-23. “Before the end of hostilities, some 147 Tulane professors and administrative personnel entered military service, in company with some 4,000 alumni. Mohr, *Tulane: The Emergence of a Modern University*, 1945-1980, xxv.

¹⁵ Mohr, “World War II and the Transformation of Higher Education,” 42.

¹⁶ Mohr, “World War II and the Transformation of Higher Education,” 42.

¹⁷ Mohr, “World War II and the Transformation of Higher Education,” 42.

would weaken academic standards and in theory the southern higher education edifice would crumble.¹⁸

The idea of attracting weak students and tempting colleges to lower their standards indicated a level of anxiety about administrations losing control of their institutions. Critics argued that “the G.I. Bill would eventually destroy the college; that the very concept of mass higher education was anomalous and that men were being admitted to the college who should instead be hod carriers.”¹⁹ Other critics argued that increased federal spending would “provide shelter for a few slackers who didn't want to go back to work.”²⁰ The federal government heard these concerns about “diploma mills” and began to require institutions be accredited to be eligible for GI tuition reimbursement.²¹ Others worried that government funds would make it easier to avoid the problems associated with fund raising and meeting financial obligations.²² Many college and university business officers expressed a more optimistic appraisal. S. F. Bretske, Vice-President and Comptroller of the University of Chattanooga, said, “When the financial responsibility was assumed by the government, the opportunity was seized by the veterans. There are those who will wish to interpret this as a move for comfort and security without having to work for it. We who work with the veteran-students know better; at least as far as the great majority of them is concerned. But if we welcome them

¹⁸ Mohr, “World War II and the Transformation of Higher Education,” 42.

¹⁹ Edith Efron, “Two Joes Meet: Joe College, Joe Veteran,” *The New York Times Magazine*, June 16, 1949, 21.

²⁰ Kiester, E., Jr., “The G.I. Bill May Be the Best Deal Ever made by Uncle Sam” *Smithsonian*, 1994, pp. 128-139.

²¹ Shedd, “The History of the Student Credit Hour,” 10

²² Efron, “Two Joes Meet: Joe College, Joe Veteran,” 21.

as they embark upon their educational voyage, we must also admit that they have brought with them unprecedented problems for the college business officer.”²³ Both sides recognized the “unprecedented problems” as evidenced by Emory’s response. On December 7, 1941, a University Council on the War Emergency was formed with President Cox as Chairman. The council quickly created subcommittees to anticipate every need. Schools began to operate throughout the year. Short courses were offered on war-related subjects. In 1943 Emory was listed for “basic” and pre-medical training in the Navy College Training Program (V-12), and also for medical training in both the Army and Navy. But, says Thomas H. English in his history of Emory University, and as if to deny Emory’s weakening autonomy, “Emory refused to be stampeded, but determined to continue its regular academic program until a call for special services should be made. Provision was made for a class of entering freshmen in the summer quarter.”²⁴

Fear of the growing federalization and the weakening autonomy of higher education percolated across the South. University of South Carolina’s McKissick attempted to deny both by saying “the Navy is not taking over the school, but is simply using a part of its facilities and staff.” He may have been sincere but USC “historian Daniel Hollis wrote that during the war the university was ‘from all appearances a naval base.’”²⁵ USC housed a Navy V-5 program, a flight preparatory school. USC housed a Civil Aeronautics Administration-War Training Service. Whatever USC administrators

²³ Proceedings, Southern Association, 1947, p. 13-16.

²⁴ Thomas H. English, *Emory University 1915-196*, 59.

²⁵ Lesesne, *A History of the University of South Carolina, 1940-2000*, 22-23.

said, they could not help but agree with McMath observations about Georgia Tech when he concluded that “World War II represented a major watershed” for Georgia Tech.

“During the war itself the campus became ‘militarized’ to a large extent, as scores of students enrolled in designated programs, such as the Navy V-12 and Army Specialized Training Program (ASTP), soon outnumbered the regular school population.”²⁶

Federalization grew higher education all across the South.

College and university business officers closely—and anxiously—watched these numbers and the students they represented. S. F. Bretske, Vice-President and Comptroller of the University of Chattanooga, guessed colleges would be assaulted with “more students than we can handle.” The student population would increase in size and change as servicemen returned from military service. Bretske also wondered aloud about already stressed physical plants and how they would survive the influx of students. Blake R. Van Lee, president of Georgia School of Technology [later Georgia Institute of Technology or Georgia Tech], reminded listeners of those missing teachers, missing because of a policy which refused to permit “professional and highly skilled and trained technical groups to be in any way exempt from the draft.” Scientists and those with a Ph.D. were drafted alongside those with only a grade school education.”²⁷ Writing about Tulane University, Mohr said “Before the end of hostilities, some 147 professors and administrative personnel from Tulane University entered military service, in company with some 4,000 alumni.”²⁸ Whatever happened during the war, when it ended the resulting problems demanded attention. William T. Middlebrook, vice-president of business administration

²⁶ McMath, Jr., *Engineering the New South*, 203

²⁷ Proceedings, 1946, 15.

²⁸ Mohr, *Tulane: The Emergence of a Modern University*, 1945-1980, xxv.

at the University of Minnesota, predicted worse times ahead. “When this war is over,” he said, “some of us are going to say, ‘How simple were the problems of yesteryear when our main worries were negotiation and renegotiation with the Army and Navy.’”²⁹”

On June 22, 1944, the Servicemen’s Readjustment Act—Public Law 346 or the G.I. Bill—catalyzed the democratization of higher education that had been only a hope of the pre-war world. World War II veterans swarmed college campuses, bringing their families with them, and creating a population explosion on previously quiet Arcadian landscapes. George F. Baughman, Business manager of the University of Florida, announced in 1955 that “they have today more babies in their Veterans’ Villages at Florida than they had students before World War II.”³⁰ In his article praising the success of the G.I. Bill, Edwin Kiester, Jr. marveled at that statistics: “Out of 14 million eligible, 2.2 million veterans jumped at the chance to attend college.”³¹ He cites the work of an early attempt to quantify the G.I. Bill’s success: “450,000 engineers, 240,000 accountants, 91,000 scientists, 67,000 doctors, 22,000 dentists, 17,000 writers and editors, and thousands of other professionals.”³² Writing about the G. I. Bill in the *Smithsonian* magazine, Edwin Kiester, Jr., said “The astonishing thing about this human cascade is that practically nobody saw it coming.”³³ Four billion dollars was distributed

²⁹ Proceedings, 1944, 32ff.

³⁰ Proceedings, Southern Association of College and University Business Officers, Twenty-seventh Annual Meeting, March 31-April 2, 1955, 85.

³¹ Edwin Kiester, Jr., “The G.I. Bill May Be the Best Deal Ever Made by Uncle Sam,” *Smithsonian* Volume 25, Number 8, November, 1994, 130.

³² Kiester, “The G.I. Bill May Be the Best Deal Ever Made by Uncle Sam,” 130.

³³ Kiester, “The G.I. Bill May Be the Best Deal Ever Made by Uncle Sam,” 131.

to nine million veterans. Ten million veterans made use of educational benefits.³⁴ A later chronicler of the GI Bill's influence wrote, "Ten Years after World War II, the Census Bureau found that 15.7 million veterans had returned to civilian life in the United States. Of that number, 12.4 million (78 percent) benefited directly from the GI Bill." Writing in his editor's note to *The GI Bill: A New Deal for Veterans* David Hackett Fischer listened to the testimonies of individual veterans; "75% responded to surveys by saying 'The GI Bill changed my life.'"³⁵

Business Manager George F. Baughman of the University of Florida may not have seen the human cascade coming but he knew it when it hit. Writing about the years after World War II, he said "In the short span of three and one-half years, the enrollment of the University of Florida has jumped from 1,503 male students to a student body of 10,143 full-time students, of whom 5,842 are veterans, 4,301 male non-veterans and 1,174 coeds." Prior to those years, the peak enrollment had been 3,300 persons. He cited figures released by the United States Office of Education naming only one other state-supported institution of higher learning in the nation with a higher percentage-wise enrollment increase—Rutgers University. Its enrollment increased because a number of schools were consolidated within New Jersey.³⁶ The increased enrollment generated problems related "to adequate staff, classrooms, laboratories, housing and other

³⁴ Eric Foner and John A. Garraty *The Reader's Companion to American History*. 1991 by Houghton Mifflin Harcourt Publishing Company. All rights reserved.

³⁵ Glenn C. Altschuler and Stuart M. Blumin, *The GI Bill: A New Deal for Veterans*, Pivotal Moments in American History (New York: Oxford University Press, 2009), ix.

³⁶ Proceedings, Southern Association of College and University Business Officers, Twenty-First Annual Meeting, April 28-30, 1949, 56-57.

facilities.”³⁷

The business officer faced a new kind of student, a student with a spouse and family. Business officers were pleased to have the veterans among them: “a majority of the men in our dormitories are veterans and the Dean of Men reports excellent conduct.”³⁸ But unlike the civilian student who arrived on campus alone, the veteran usually brought a spouse and children. This, of course, altered the housing needed for students. Campuses, Edenic and unadulterated by the world, were invaded by Quonset huts and surplus barracks. “Vetsvilles” were erected on some campuses, consisting of trailers, muddy yards and a shared lavatory-bathhouse.³⁹

In his history of higher education in Mississippi, David Sansing reported Mississippi institutions experiencing enrollment patterns and curriculum patterns similar to the rest of the country: “In 1900 college enrollment in Mississippi was 2,727, with 2 percent of the 18- to 21-year age group in college. By 1950 the total student population was 21,716, with 14.67 percent of the college-age group enrolled.”⁴⁰ “In the last year of the war, enrollment at Mississippi State College was 761. In the first full academic year after the war it jumped to 3,391; almost 75 percent, or 2,458, were veterans. At Ole Miss during the spring semester of 1945 enrollment was 657; in the fall semester, 1,271; a year later, 3,213. At Mississippi Southern College the fall 1944 enrollment was 264; in 1946, 1,189. At Jackson College for Negro Teachers 195 students were enrolled in 1944; 633

³⁷ Proceedings, Southern Association, 1949, 55.

³⁸ Proceedings, Southern Association of College and University Business Officers, 19th Annual Meeting, April 18-19, 1947, 36.

³⁹ Kiester, “The G.I. Bill May Be the Best Deal Ever Made by Uncle Sam,” 136.

⁴⁰David G. Sansing, *Making Haste Slowly: The Troubled History of Higher Education in Mississippi* (Jackson: University Press of Mississippi, 1990) 129.

in 1946, and over 500 veterans were turned away. President Jacob Reddix told the board of trustees that Jackson College, if it had the facilities, could enroll 1,000 students during the regular academic session and over 2,500 in the summer session. Delta State Teachers College had 205 students in 1945 and 891 three years later. Alcorn and Mississippi State College for Women experienced less dramatic gains largely because Alcorn was in a remote location and dormitory facilities at MSCW limited enrollment to approximately 1,250.”⁴¹ The numbers of students, Sansing said, “overwhelmed Mississippi colleges and universities in the postwar years. College enrollment statewide zoomed from 4,000 in 1920 to 10,000 in 1940, to 20,000 in 1950, to 35,000 in 1960, to 55,000 in 1965, and to 70,000 in 1970.”⁴²

Bretske focused on the dramatic increase in enrollment and the mass in-migration of students as both a blessing and a curse. The blessing, he said, was found in a “hitherto untapped source of students for institutions of higher education.”⁴³ The curse, he acknowledged, was that the veterans forced business officers to recognize new students “brought with them unprecedented problems. Those of us who have seen enrollments doubled or trebled by the veterans had no conception of what our task would be under the GI Bill.”⁴⁴ “We have all read and reread the law,” he said, “and listened to discussions. In the spring of 1946, none of us, whether at colleges or with the Veterans Administration, knew exactly how the procedures would be worked out, with the consequence that bills were returned for correction, deductions were made on vouchers,

⁴¹ Sansing, *Making Haste Slowly*, 129.

⁴² Sansing, *Making Haste Slowly*, 132.

⁴³ Proceedings, Southern Association, 1947, 13.

⁴⁴ Proceedings, Southern Association, 1947, 13.

and payments were greatly delayed.⁴⁵ As if to dramatize the complications, Bretske talked about how veterans were divided into two groups; some under Public Law 16 and others Bill 346. Some veterans were granted additional benefits because of service-incurred disabilities.⁴⁶ And though business officers were afforded some latitude in bookkeeping, Bretske strongly encouraged their records to be as clear and concise as possible. He even went so far as to suggest a particular kind of bookkeeping machine for record keeping.⁴⁷

Veterans and their families needed homes. SACUBO invited Ernest V. Hollis, Chief of the Veterans Educational Facilities Program, United States Office of Education, to speak to the needs of housing. He reported that “American colleges and universities have 341,550,000 square feet of building space and need an additional 265,000,000 square feet in order to accommodate enrollments anticipated by 1950. At 1948 prices, the additional space would cost approximately \$2,650,000,000.”⁴⁸ At the nineteenth annual meeting in 1947, SACUBO devoted three of seven addresses to housing needs. Perhaps most significant was Frank D. Peterson’s speech entitled “Your College or University’s Building Program: What Policy to Adopt under Present Market Conditions.”⁴⁹ He outlined and offered suggestions on five areas of concern: “reasons for not building today; reasons for building today; pressure from the backlog of public and private construction; effect of labor on the future; and the prospects for available building

⁴⁵ Proceedings, Southern Association, 1947, 13.

⁴⁶ Proceedings, Southern Association, 1947, 13-16.

⁴⁷ Proceedings, Southern Association, 1947, p. 13-16.

⁴⁸ Proceedings, Southern Association, 1948, 41.

⁴⁹ Proceedings, Southern Association, 1947, 3.

material for 1947.”⁵⁰ Scholars have focused on the democratization of education, and the huge influx of students, but only a few scholars have given attention to those administrators accounting for the money accompanying these students.

College and university business officers contended with funds large and small and their effects on their universities. On one end of the spectrum, business officers addressed the needs of the individual veteran on their campuses. On the other end, business officers addressed the fiscal management issues surrounding the big research projects funded by “the National Defense Research Committee and the Office of Scientific Research and Development: radar, napalm, the proximity fuse, biological warfare, and even the initial stages of the Manhattan Project.”⁵¹ Then there is the issue of how all this money affected the university. Clarence Mohr has urged scholars to differentiate the Second World War’s short term and long term effects on southern higher education. In the short term, veterans and their needs dominated the attention of college and university administrators. In the long term federal subsidies of higher education transformed the government-academic partnership. And Penney wrote about funding institutions for military research already mentioned, and then the U.S. Office of Education in 1940 funded the Engineering Defense Training Program with \$9 million to offer “tuition-free engineering classes to persons in the community” wholly apart from veterans, another example of the growing enmeshment of the federal government and the university. The number of government funded programs expanded further to include funded classes in chemistry, physics, and other sciences: “In 1942, 223 educational institutions offered 12,000 courses to 596 trainees.” In just two years the initial budget of

⁵⁰ Proceedings, Southern Association, 1947, 17.

⁵¹ Mohr, “World War II and the Transformation of Higher Education,” 47.

\$9 increased to \$30. Colleges and universities were becoming increasingly dependent upon the federal government for their survival.⁵²

In 1943 the majority of southern colleges and universities grew in size and in entanglement with the government by participating in federal programs. Three popular programs were the Army Specialized Training Program (ASTP), the Navy College Training Program, better known as the “V-12” Program, and the Army Air Forces College Training Program. The military paid room, board, medical, and instructional costs for these soldiers and sailors. The Navy’s V-12 program proved most compatible to the academic agenda of most colleges and as a result found a home in thirty-two Southern schools: “Smaller scale V-12 programs enrolling 200-400 students operated at a number of church-related liberal arts colleges including Mississippi College in Clinton, Mississippi, Howard College in Birmingham, Alabama, and The University of the South in Sewanee, Tennessee.”⁵³ The increased involvement of the federal government generated its own anxiety. When Duke University contracted with the Navy to instruct “1600 reservists in medicine, advanced engineering and the basic V-12 curriculum,” Duke President Robert Lee Flowers reported that the Navy did not expect “to run the place.”⁵⁴ However relieved he was to still be in charge, still the Navy and Army programs produced “changes in the academic emphasis and campus environment of the schools involved.”⁵⁵ The federalization of higher education went beyond the needs of soldiers and sailors to include the Office of Scientific Research and Development

⁵² Penney, “Instruments of National Purpose,” 110-111.

⁵³ Mohr, “World War II and the Transformation of Higher Education,” 37.

⁵⁴ Mohr, “World War II and the Transformation of Higher Education,” 37.

⁵⁵ McMillen, *Remaking Dixie*, 37.

(OSRD). The OSRD developed projects and contracted with commercial industry and universities.

Southern colleges and universities nurtured their relationship because of the financial benefits during the uncertain times. In fact, southern universities benefited greatly by “wartime training programs”:

“The income from contracts, which paid teacher salaries, administrative costs, and room and board, generally met or exceeded costs, rewarding the university with money for its general operating budget and supplanting lost income from civilian student tuition. Colonel Ralph Durkee, the director of the Army Specialized Training Program (ASTP) at Baylor, later reported that income from military trainee programs was what enabled Baylor to meet its financial obligations, given the paucity of civilian tuition dollars.⁵⁶ This financial benefit was also evident at public institutions. W. H. Holzmann, the business manager at Texas A&M, reported that the military trainee contracts were essential to the college’s meeting financial obligations during the war. He also noted that the federal funds relieved the state from having to allocate money to keep the university operating.”⁵⁷

And after the war the GI Bill generated students and cash. Because expenses in the South were lower than the national average, the national rates were set higher than Southern rates. Southern colleges and universities could maintain the swollen enrollments with the extra money.⁵⁸ Then there was the U.S. military’s releasing its “surplus war material and offering it where appropriate to colleges and universities.” Penney continued, “Baylor business manager Roy J. McKnight procured several dormant structures in Waco that had been first been used as worker housing for New Deal programs and again as housing for workers on various wartime industrial endeavors in

⁵⁶ Penney, “Instruments of National Purpose,”123.

⁵⁷ Penney, “Instruments of National Purpose,” p.123. Report of the office of the business manager in Texas A&M, Annual Report for the Fiscal Year 1944-1945, 51.

⁵⁸ Penney, “Instruments of National Purpose,” 230.

the region.”⁵⁹ Southern colleges and universities welcomed and benefited greatly from wartime and postwar federal involvement in their institutions.

Benefits came with strings attached and administrators at all levels faced new regulations required by the federal government. The key figure in many of these new obligations would be the college business officer whose job included managing the loss of students to the war, accommodating G.I.’s arriving for training, and military contracts demanding performance reports. The number of presentations at SACUBO’s annual meetings devoted to the war gives evidence of the depth of its disturbance of the usual business of universities. In April, 1942, four months after the United States entered the conflict, the SACUBO members devoted one of five presentations to war-related problems. In the next three years, 1943-1945, the Proceedings show over half of the presentations directly related to the war and its domestic effects. Samplings from the 1943 Proceedings suggest the nature of concerns: “War Department AAF Materiel Command;” “Simplify Your Wartime Procurement;” “Some Observations on Contracting for College Training Programs;” and “University Business Management and War.”⁶⁰

Many of these federal programs were being developed even as they were announced meaning the enactment of the programs evolved and further complicated the business manager’s ability to implement them. Before the war, most institutions offered traditional curricula to a traditional student population. Frank D. Peterson, comptroller at the University of Kentucky, identified one example of a clear-cut contractual relationship

⁵⁹ Penney, “Instruments of National Purpose,” 132.

⁶⁰ Proceedings, Southern Association of College and University Business Officers, Fifteenth Annual Meeting, April 16-17, 1943, 9.

between the federal government and the university. Soldiers were housed and fed in a local hotel while classroom instruction was provided by the university. The contract, he announced, was “simple to administer and equitable and therefore mutually agreeable to the University as well as to the War Department.”⁶¹ Other contracts were more complicated but still simple. Even representatives of the federal government recognized the growing number of variables affecting management of higher education. Ervin T. Brown, a consultant for the Army Air Force, remembered some programs called for action with the management issues to follow.⁶² On top of loosely defined contracts and contracts with missing management instructions, even the once simple skills for procurement required updating. Bert C. Ahrens, manager of the Educational and Institutional Cooperative Service and executive secretary of the Educational Buyers Association, spoke at SACUBO’s annual meeting and went so far as to outline a four step program for procurement⁶³ Maybe Claude L. Hough, Jr., of the War Production Board said it best, “because new forms are being issued every week, it is suggested that you check with the nearest office of the WPB when you are not certain which form to use.”⁶⁴

Administrators of higher education did exactly what the rest of the country did to get through the war, adapted as quickly and as efficiently as possible. With the war over and the relationship between higher education and the federal government fundamentally altered, SACUBO leaders now had the time to address the changes. Herbert A. Meyer of

⁶¹ Proceedings, Southern Association of College and University Business Officers, Sixteenth Annual Meeting, 1944, 27.

⁶² Proceedings, Southern Association, 1943, 37.

⁶³ Proceedings, Southern Association, 1943, 14.

⁶⁴ Proceedings, Southern Association, 1943, 33.

Centre College of Kentucky directed attention to three addresses by President Truman: the State of the Union address of 1950, his Economic Report to the Congress, and his Budget Message and the Budget.⁶⁵ In his State of the Union message the President said, “We must take immediate steps to strengthen our educational system. In many parts of our country young people are being handicapped for life because of a poor education I believe that the Congress should no longer delay in providing Federal assistance to the States so that they can maintain adequate schools.”⁶⁶ The Economic Report reiterated the Administration’s concern. The report said, “In field such as resource development, education, health, and social security, Government programs are essential elements of our economic strength. If we cut these programs below the requirements of an expanding economy, we should be weakening some of the most important factors which promote that expansion.”⁶⁷ Concerning higher education, “Primarily because of low family incomes and of the high costs involved, more than half of our young people who could benefit from a college education are now unable to attend.” “Almost 700 bills either referring entirely to education or containing sections pertaining to the subject were introduced. . . . The introduction of so many bills, however, is indicative of the lively interest in education in the 81st Congress.”⁶⁸

Increased enrollments, the federalization of higher education, and the sheer number of increased responsibilities taxed the intellectual resources of college and university business officers. Clarence Scheps, Executive Assistant to the Tulane

⁶⁵ Proceedings, Southern Association of College and University Business Officers, Twenty-Second Annual Meeting, April 13-15, 1950, 58.

⁶⁶ Proceedings, Southern Association, 1950, 58.

⁶⁷ Proceedings, Southern Association, 1950, 58.

⁶⁸ Proceedings, Southern Association, 1950, 59.

University president said in 1948 “. . . as the academic structure of the university became more complicated, business administration began to emerge as a separate and distinct function. Today there is an almost universal recognition that the business office is a necessary and important unit in the university, and it is coordinate with the highest level of academic administration.”⁶⁹ The increased complexity of the modern university, and the many new managerial tasks required by this expansion necessitated that university business officers develop new skills.

The business officer, already saddled with responsibilities for personnel, business, bookstores, dining halls, maintenance and investments, now braved a campus whose enterprises became even more complex and diverse. Business officers were acutely aware of their need to form and sustain new alliances, to embrace the evolution of changes in business management, and to welcome these new students who brought with them new and greater demands. SACUBO helped and was helped by this expansion of need and opportunity. In 1947, business officers—joined professionally as SACUBO—resolved to express the regional association’s appreciation to the Federal Government for the resources given to administer our educational programs.⁷⁰ Through SACUBO’s they expressed gratitude for new relationships important to their schools: The Federal Works Agency, American Council on Education, regional and national educational associations, Federal Disposal Agencies, and Veterans Housing Program.⁷¹ These new cooperating relationships were a microcosm of the blessing and the curse. A sample of the

⁶⁹ Proceedings, Southern Association, 1948, 56.

⁷⁰ Proceedings, Southern Association, 1947, 10.

⁷¹ Proceedings, Southern Association, 1947, 10.

presentations at the annual meetings also indicates that SACUBO was aware of the emerging needs: “Probable Effects of Post-War Taxation Trends in Our Colleges and Universities” and “Some Observations on the Business Officers’ Relation to the Veterans’ Educational Program.”⁷² E. T. Rollins, preparing an address on tax-related issues for the Eastern Association, asked colleagues to inform him of institutional tax problems. He reported being “astonished when nearly 150 letters arrived.”⁷³ Another business officer, George F. Baughman of the University of Florida, talked about having to redraw the organizational chart and rewrite the operating manual for his business officer. He argued the changes called for a physical increase of personnel, equipment and space and also called for improved methods of operation.⁷⁴

Clarence Scheps agreed with George F. Baughman: the place of the college and university business officer was evolving and required new attention. Scheps said it this way, “The business officer, as an administrative unit, is a comparatively recent development in the American university.” In fact, he continued, “In the early days . . . each dean or department head did his own buying, frequently from his ‘share’ of the institutional funds, which he kept in his own bank account.” This changed only “as enrollments began to expand, as revenues increased, as auxiliary enterprises grew in size and importance, and as the academic structure of the university became more complicated. . . .” He concluded emphatically that “today there is an almost universal recognition that the business office is a necessary and important unit in the university,

⁷² Proceedings, Southern Association, 1948, 49; Proceedings, Southern Association, 1947, 13.

⁷³ Proceedings, Southern Association, 1948, 50.

⁷⁴ Proceedings, Southern Association, 1949, 56.

and is coordinated with the highest level of academic administration.”⁷⁵ The challenge for SACUBO lay in how to adopt and train business officers to function in the highest level of academic life.

At the 1948 meeting, the business officers discussed the challenges they faced in organizing and operating the business affairs of the modern university with a workforce largely untrained for the job. J. R. Miles, Bursar for the George Peabody College for Teachers, presented a paper entitled “A Program of Training for College Business Management.” He began by offering his pedigree: “When I went to Peabody five years ago, I had no special training in the field of business management or business administration. I had taught in rural schools, served as principal of a city elementary school for thirteen years, and later as superintendent of city schools for ten years.”⁷⁶ He discovered his colleagues learned their skills exactly the same way. Only one had an earned degree, Bachelor of Science in Business Administration from Vanderbilt. Deciding the paradigm had worked for them, Miles began employing young men to reproduce business officers in the same way. They employed “a young man, a veteran, twenty-five years of age, and giving him ‘On the Job Training’ in conjunction with the Veterans Administration Program. He has been on this training program for some fifteen months and has learned the routine of the office admirably and has proven most satisfactory in every way. We hope he will stay with Peabody and work into a more responsible position.”⁷⁷

⁷⁵ Proceedings, Southern Association, 1948, 56.

⁷⁶ Proceedings, Southern Association, 1948, 19.

⁷⁷ Proceedings, Southern Association, 1948, 19.

At this point in his presentation, Miles wondered aloud about the experiences of those business officers in his audience. “May we take the time at this point to make a survey of the training and experience of business officers present in this meeting?”

Q. How many of you are trained specifically for your present jobs?

A. Two hands.

Q. How many have training in accounting?

A. A big majority.

Q. How many have a college degree in business administration or education?

A. I’d say about a third.

Q. How many worked into your present positions?

A. Two hands.

Q. How many worked up to business manager or bursar or what have you?

A. I’d say about a fourth.

Q. How many of you had a similar experience to mine, on the job training?

A. Well, I’d say about 25 per cent.⁷⁸

Miles suggested the best way to train college business officers is “through an apprenticeship or “On the Job Training Program” in the individual institutions and individual business offices.” He concluded, “Each of us should be training younger men to take our places.”⁷⁹ Miles’s presentation triggered a lively discussion over whether a more organized and centralized training approach might be warranted.

Several members tagged onto Miles’s presentation and at the conclusion of a vigorous conversation drafted a response to Miles’s injunction “to train younger men to take our places.” President Kavanaugh asked, “Are there any questions you would like to ask Mr. Miles?” Several members responded and in the process identified a core issued

⁷⁸ Proceedings, Southern Association, 1948, 21.

⁷⁹ Proceedings, Southern Association, 1948, 24 .

to be resolved and one solution. Mr. Graham said, “You know it is pretty hard for those on the job to get much superior to those who are teaching them. If you are going to teach a dog the first essential is to know more than the dog.” Graham reported attending an institute for college administrative officers at Peabody College in Nashville and wondered if a similar institute could be created by business officers to supplement on-the-job training. He suggested a college or university in the South create a teaching institute for business officers. He asked for a show of hands from those who would likely participate. Almost all present raised their hand. He asked about a fee of \$25.00. Again he requested a show of hands. A clear majority responded favorably. The discussion proceeded to refine the workings of the institute. Mr. Dewberry asked if the institute should be informal or one based on accounting theory. Members clearly wanted both. Mr. Brown concluded the discussion by suggesting the “Southern Association take a lead in this movement.”⁸⁰ He called for a week to ten day conference to begin in the summer of 1949. The 1948 annual meeting of SACUBO ended by adopting a resolution presented by the Resolution Committee—Clarence Scheps, J. H. Dewberry, C. M. Reeves, P. J. Rogers and Raymond D. Fowler. The resolution called for research into the creation of a short course to be offered in the summer of 1949.⁸¹

One year later in 1949, Clarence Scheps presented the committee’s report and generated a discussion similar to that inspired by Miles’s presentation. W. T. Ingram, Auburn University business officer and SACUBO president, asked Scheps and two colleagues to discuss and implement just such a training program. With the help of the

⁸⁰ Proceedings, Southern Association, 1948, 27

⁸¹ Proceedings, Southern Association, 1948, 12.

Extension Department of Georgia Tech, SACUBO designed a three-day training program.⁸² Scheps and the committee enthusiastically endorsed the idea of a short course “which will consist of an intensive type of classroom instruction to cover a period of about three days.” He limited social activities to a possible banquet on the second night. Otherwise, the three days would include offerings on a wide range of topics, personnel, accounting, the place of the business office in the university, and purchasing. The committee called for qualified instructors not limited to southern institutions.⁸³ Members representing approximately fifty institutions pledged to attend. SACUBO members authorized C. O. Emmerich of Emory, J. H. Dewberry of Georgia State College for Women, and J. R. Anthony of Georgia Institute of Technology, also known as the Training Institute Committee, “to conduct a training institute on behalf of the Association in cooperation with the Georgia School of Technology and to be held in the fall of 1949.”⁸⁴

By the standards of numbers attending, institutions represented, budgeting needs, and participant reports, the Training Institute Committee declared its first session a success: “Approximately 200 persons from 77 institutions of higher learning, representing 20 states, attended.” The institute was a financial success with a balance of \$928.46 left over, all funded by fee payment from participants.⁸⁵ More importantly, participants submitted positive responses. Irvine Wilson, of Purdue University and the Central Association of Colleges and University Business Officers offered these

⁸² Proceedings, Southern Association, 1949, 13.

⁸³ Proceedings, Southern Association, 1949, 13.

⁸⁴ Proceedings, Southern Association, 1949, 13.

⁸⁵ Proceedings, Southern Association, 1950, 15.

comments: “The approach which your Association has taken will undoubtedly be a guide for other groups to follow. At the moment no definite plans have been made by the Central Association, but if such a program does materialize, your Association will be mailed an invitation to come up North and tell us how it is done.”⁸⁶ The Training Institute Committee credited the first institute’s success to the “beyond the call of duty” leadership of Frank Wilson, **George Mew**, Gerald Henderson, Charlie Hayes, Dr. Blake R. Van Leer, and Dr. Goodrich C. White [Emphasis Added]. The committee followed their affirmation of the training institute with several suggestions and recommendations for future years while reminding listeners that “The training institutes began as an experiment, offering an opportunity to SACUBO members with the understanding it was provisional.” Given the larger than expected number of attendees and the positive feedback from participants the committee urged its continuance. Committee members then wondered if it would be useful to cover other fields of institutional management such as purchasing, accounting, food handling, housing, maintenance, personnel management, and all other phases of management.⁸⁷ This first successful training institute inspired others to come.

In Gladys Barger’s presidential address of 1952 she celebrates two successful training institutes: “Two highly successful Training Institutes have been sponsored, with Mr. C. O. Emmerich heading the program committee for each. These were open not only to college and university business officers, but any others who cared to attend. They afforded excellent opportunity for study, exchange of ideas, and discussion of common

⁸⁶ Proceedings, Southern Association, 1950, 15-16.

⁸⁷ Proceedings, Southern Association, 1950, 16.

problems—as well as good fellowship. It would be impossible to evaluate in words the benefits derived from these Institutes.”⁸⁸ Barger further declared her support for training institutes by calling for a revision in SACUBO’s constitution and by-laws to explicitly include business training institutes as one of the five-stated objectives of SACUBO:

(5) a. To sponsor business institutes and other educational activities as may be useful and beneficial to its members.

b. To promulgate such pertinent information to its members as will be beneficial to them.⁸⁹

Though it is unclear in SACUBO records how these first training institutes ended, they did. They were provisional and part of a steep learning curve. It is probably more accurate to suggest the first training institutes evolved into another of the same kind of training institute but different. SACUBO leader Frank Peterson, Comptroller at the University of Kentucky, initiated another workshop course called College Business Management Institute [CBMI] in 1953. While the 1955 records do not indicate his role in the birth of that institute, in 1957, Trent Root, business officer at Southern Methodist University, clearly linked the two together: “Frank Peterson organized and held the First Annual College Business Management Institute on the University of Kentucky campus.” The next two SACUBO presidents endorsed the institute, blessing it with their presence or that of a representative.⁹⁰ Peterson reported an attendance of forty-nine persons representing thirteen states at the first meeting in 1953 and an attendance of seventy-one persons representing twenty-three states at the second meeting. Peterson and SACUBO

⁸⁸ Proceedings, Southern Association of Colleges and University Business Officers, April 3-5, 1952, 25-26.

⁸⁹ Proceedings, Southern Association of Colleges and University Business Officers, April 3-5, 1952, 18.

⁹⁰ Proceedings, Southern Association, 1955, 25; Proceedings, Southern Association of College and University Business Officers, Twenty-Ninth Annual Meeting, March 14-16, 1957, 34.

had created and sealed an alliance between the association and the University of Kentucky. Presumably, the institute's success lent encouragement to the University of Kentucky to offer a master's and doctorate degrees, focusing on college business management. The offering was made available in the fall of 1955, two years after the first cooperative institute.⁹¹ With the initiative taken to provide training institutes, SACUBO had demonstrated the organization's readiness to move proactively to advance the profession and to meet member needs.

Gladys Barger's elevation to SACUBO president in 1951 invites the question of the place of women on college campuses and in the business office. From its beginning, men and women college and university business officers met to discuss the business of higher education. Women in SACUBO enjoyed a status they did not enjoy outside the organization. Mohr highlights cultural reasons for such; for example, the militarization of southern campuses underscored women's "subordinate social status and left them in the category as physically unfit men—the much maligned "4-Fers"—and draft-exempt ministerial students who received few accolades in a war atmosphere."⁹² Mohr also cited a study conducted in 1946 by Eoline Wallace Moore, a professor of education at

⁹¹ Proceedings, Southern Association, 1955, 25. CBMI endures into the present. This is pulled from their website: <http://www.ultimateconference.com/events/cbmi-2014/event-summary-ac694c7e2b9c4f15997b2a6e5e072508.aspx> "The College Business Management Institute offers an intensive course of study in business and financial management for administrators of colleges and universities. Over 500 business officers and administrators, representing hundreds of colleges and universities of every size and description, attend each year. CBMI is designed to provide participants with an overview of current issues and procedures applicable to institutions of higher education large and small, public and private. Individuals participate in 28 hours of instruction each summer for three years to earn a certificate of completion. Ranging from entry level to advance, approximately 60 courses are taught by distinguished faculty who are practicing administrators and leaders in their fields. There is no prerequisite to attend CBMI."

⁹² Mohr, "World War II and the Transformation of Higher Education," 44.

Birmingham-Southern College. In this “rare study” “she compared employment data for Alabama colleges during the war years with statistics gathered in 1926, 1931, and 1939.” Moore concluded that in spite of “a substantial increase in the number of graduate degrees awarded to women during the interwar decades, and notwithstanding an acute wartime shortage of male faculty, ‘Little significant change in the ratio of women to men teachers in Alabama colleges has resulted from war conditions’.”⁹³ Mohr followed Moore’s conclusion by suggesting the South’s “conservative religious dogma and a feminine ideal built largely around the experiences of a leisured upper class lent powerful reinforcement to the view that marriage and motherhood were the most appropriate outcome, if not the stated goal, of female college attendance.” In other words, the late 1940s marked “the beginning of a pronounced remasculinizing of higher learning which saw female influence recede as the number of women students remained relatively stable while male veteran enrollments exploded.” In a bluntly worded assessment, Mohr said “the virile world of Southern universities during the two decades after 1945, a setting replete with high spirited ‘panty raids,’ close order drill by awkward ROTC cadets, and ritualized combat in intercollegiate football, white college women encountered a range of less than subtle cues concerning their perceived status as ornamental husband seekers.”⁹⁴

From its initial organization, women business officers have always had a home in the Southern Association of College and University Business Officers as members and leaders. Two women represented Wesleyan College at the inaugural meeting in 1927: Miss Banks Armand, Bursar; and Miss Mary Lou Barton, Assistant Bursar. Not only

⁹³ Mohr, “World War II and the Transformation of Higher Education,” 44.

⁹⁴ McMillen, *Remaking Dixie*, 44-45.

were they present, they had a voice. As a member of the newly formed Finance Committee in 1929, Miss Armand suggested “The only way we can help each other is by telling how we manage our own and let other institutions profit by anything new we think would be advisable, for adoption.”⁹⁵ In 1929, the assembly of business officers welcomed officials and listened as business officers who just happened to be women delivered presentations alongside their male counterparts. In 1948, Gladys Marie Barger of Lenoir Rhyne College was elected Third Vice President of SACUBO, continuing the trend of women business officers participating in SACUBO and setting the bar higher for the following generations. In 1951 she assumed the presidency of the Southern Association while overseeing a budget increase at Lenoir Rhyne from \$100,000 to over \$3,000,000. The board of trustees at Lenoir Rhyne acknowledged Barger’s contributions to the college in a citation that echoes what women business officers did for SACUBO. Maybe Ms. Barger described the contributions of women by describing the SACUBO’s contributions, “from that small beginning has grown a fine organization, a distinct credit to educational institutions in general, and especially to those in the Southeast.”⁹⁶ Though no statistical analysis has been completed on the issue of women in SACUBO, their numbers anecdotally reflect their participation in higher education at large. It seems significant that of the original eight members two were women and women currently number seven of twenty on the 2013-2014 SACUBO governing board. The current president is a woman.

⁹⁵ “Minutes,” Southern Educational Buyers and Business Officers Association, Second Annual Convention, April 19-20, 1929, 23.

⁹⁶ Proceedings, Southern Association of Colleges and University Business Officers, April 3-5, 1952, 25.

SACUBO members began the decade in the same way they began 1927 and 1928. They focused on the needs of regional college and university business officers. They did not anticipate, though, the entrance into a world war. SACUBO members soon realized the skills needed to function on a regional level were of limited use when interacting with the Federal government over national issues related to educating and housing servicemen and veterans. All of this gradually escalated the skills needed to be a college and university business officer. SACUBO responded by creating training programs for their business officers. This pattern was further built on by SACUBO's conception, development, and maturation of the National Association of College and University Business Officers [NACUBO] as an umbrella organization uniting SACUBO and many other regional groups. In this case, SACUBO brought to fruition an idea not exclusively its own.

CHAPTER THREE:

From Regional Concerns to a National Association, 1950-1968 **“The larger problems in education are national in scope.”¹**

From the late 1940s to the late 1960s, SACUBO transformed from a regional organization focused on regional concerns into a group with national influence confronting national problems. In the process, SACUBO members played significant roles in the creation of the National Association of College and University Business Officers [NACUBO] even as they worked to ensure the continuation of their own organization. In 1961, SACUBO president Clarence Scheps, Vice President and Comptroller of Tulane University, declared that “The large problems in education today are national in scope.”² The problems confronting a small private institution in Mississippi, he continued, will be the same problems faced by a similar institution in California. Then he concluded, “It is simply not enough for a business officer at a given institution to concern himself only with matters affecting his campus. He must avail himself of every opportunity of being informed on national problems and of relating that information to problems on the campus level.”³

With the gift of hindsight, Matthew Tyler Penney and Clarence L. Mohr have described how this shift from regional focus to national focus happened and how this loss of regional autonomy resulted: World War II and the federalization of higher education. Penney says that the transformation thrust upon the South was the result of blending national problems with regional motivations. Penney concluded that the southern

¹ Clarence Scheps, Series 1, Box 6, Folder Speeches 1961-1964 “President’s Remarks” April 23-25, 1961.

² Scheps, “President’s Remarks.”

³ Scheps, “President’s Remarks.”

university's need for a national victory in World War II—a national problem—was an important catalyst—regional motivation—in moving southern higher learning away from a commitment to regional distinctiveness. It is not that the southern university leaders ignored their regional identity, but instead they worked “to re-shape the national mainstream ostensibly based on shared ideals of the majority;” that is, shaping regional identity to fit a Southerners' view of the nation. By shaping the regional mindset to fit the national mindset, the South could “cast aside an older identity and join a position of cultural supremacy represented by the nation as a whole.”⁴

Penney describes how this change to a national focus happened. In part, the southern university became a training ground for military personnel and “Americanism.”⁵ This willingness for southern university administrators to strive for consensus with national goals also resulted from higher education's focus on science, and the accompanying research money. Science dominated the attention of higher education. President Houston of Rice University said scientists would be the “new power brokers and shapers of the culture.” Not only would these scientists wield power and shape culture, but they would shape people. Houston wanted Rice University to mimic how other major universities were training their students into world-shaping scientists.⁶ To accomplish his goal “the Texas A&M course catalogues in the early 1950s echoed this sentiment in their section on industrial engineering, saying that with powerful

⁴ Penney, “Instruments of National Purpose,” 227.

⁵ Penney, “Instruments of National Purpose,” 56.

⁶ Penney, “Instruments of National Purpose,” 63. (Though he did not say so, shaping people has long been the domain of higher education but not under the umbrella of science.)

‘technological forces’ went the responsibility of ‘humane and human elements’.”⁷

However it was explained, World War II generated a view of higher education seen through the eyes of the nation and not just the South.

As southern institutions trained military personnel and imbibed a new kind of Americanism, requirements for participation in federal programs shifted from regional to national. In the postwar South attention turned to national accreditation, further blurring the lines between regional and national. The Southern Association of Colleges and Schools [SACS] had been authoritative enough for the federal government in many instances. The federal government began to sometimes use “other guidelines, such as those from professional organizations, causing universities to align their programs with nationally recognized standards.” This shift in policy pushed “many southern schools to accept national standards.” In a kind of catch-22, the more federal government relied on national accreditation bodies and the more southern institutions cooperated with the federal government then the more southern institutions became reliant and accepting of the federalization of southern schools. Penney cited the example of Texas A&M when it “learned it stood to be passed over for some military training programs because its chemical engineering program did not meet the criteria of the Engineers’ Council for Professional Development (ECPD).” Texas A&M trustees frantically applied for immediate accreditation and though ECPD’s response remains unclear, Texas A&M soon taught chemical engineering with federal assistance.⁸

⁷ Penney, “Instruments of National Purpose,” 64.

⁸ Penney, “Instruments of National Purpose,” 123-4.

No matter how the shift from regional to national concerns happened, it was becoming more difficult for southern institutions to think of life without federal subsidies. Every time southern institutions accepted federal support, federal money, and federal surplus southerners became “further desensitized to—if not more inviting of—federal subsidization.” Federal dollars for research aided national interests but national issues may have been ancillary to the enhanced careers of professors and the burnished reputations of their institutions. Some administrators and professors continued to resist the entanglements of federal dollars but they fought a losing battle.⁹ Penney said it this way, “returning veterans, cultural and economic trends, and a conscious national effort to increase the scope of higher learning all contributed to a burgeoning national system of higher education.”¹⁰ And as southern institutions grew increasingly dependent upon federal largess, the federal government grew increasingly aware of higher education’s importance. Government leaders took their new appreciation for the contributions of higher education during war and applied it to postwar education. The federal government released a statement on higher education and “recommended a greater system of post-secondary schools, including the growth of four-year colleges and universities, the expansion of junior colleges and community colleges, and increased educational opportunities for minorities.”¹¹ The blending of national problems with higher education benefited both participants.

⁹ Penney, “Instruments of National Purpose,” 135.

¹⁰ Penney, “Instruments of National Purpose,” 138.

¹¹ Penney, “Instruments of National Purpose,” 138.

Southern institutions also benefited from federal research money resulting from the Cold War. One way to measure the benefits is to notice the increased number of awarded degrees. Though the numbers here are tedious to read, each degree awarded represents a gradual movement of that individual and that institution into the national mainstream. Thirteen southern institutions awarded their first earned doctorates, and at least three other campuses revived Ph.D. programs. In the ten years between 1950 and 1960, southern institutions produced twenty-three doctorates per institution, excepting education degrees. More specifically, the University of Texas awarded 125 new Ph.D.'s per year. The University of North Carolina awarded 82. Duke University awarded 69 Ph.D.'s. The University of Florida awarded 65 Ph.D.'s. Or, to say it another way, a way that would bring a smile to George Mew's face, by the mid-to-late 1960s peer ratings placed major southern universities such as the University of Texas, North Carolina, Duke, Florida, Rice, Virginia, Vanderbilt, Tulane, Emory, and Florida State "somewhere in the middle third of the national research hierarchy."¹² The placement of southern institutions of higher learning in the middle of the national research hierarchy suggests they were moving "inexorably from the periphery toward the center of national life in the postwar decades. Beneath the rhetoric of regional pride and institutional autonomy that was still served up to southern alumni during the 1950s and '60s lay an increasingly intricate pattern of relationships with government, private enterprise and large scale philanthropy."¹³

¹² Mohr, "World War II and the Transformation of Higher Education," 49.

¹³ Mohr, "World War II and the Transformation of Higher Education," 52.

This interdependence crushed the idea that southern colleges could continue to exist as self-contained institutions.¹⁴ Federal subsidies for military training and research “favored scientific disciplines” and would gradually reshape the curriculum and focus of many southern schools. Perhaps Robert M. Hutchins, President of the University of Chicago, saw the dangers of this emerging relationship between southern higher education and the federal government best: As “the government is establishing in the public mind the doctrine of technical training is the only education for war, the public mind will eventually conclude that technical training is the only education for peace.”¹⁵ If funding for higher education grew increasingly dependent on federal sources, and if those federal programs increasingly privileged technical training, what would become of the traditional arts and humanities that formed such an important component of higher education?

Though college and university business officers did not offer grand interpretations of this growing partnership, they knew its challenges. In a speech entitled “The Challenge of Change in Accounting and Budgeting,” Scheps cited the developments since World War II as evidence of the Federal government’s growing presence in higher education. During, and just after World War II, the research projects were in agriculture and the impact of the Federal government was minimal. Within ten years the volume of research dollars reached a billion dollars a year. The increase in dollars generated more work but more importantly those dollars had to be tracked and accounted in ways that were new to college and university business officers. And, Scheps said, “Most of you are aware, I am sure, of the continuing struggle of the college and business officer to obtain

¹⁴ Mohr, “World War II and the Transformation of Higher Education,” 52.

¹⁵ Mohr, “World War II and the Transformation of Higher Education,” 53.

full reimbursement of the costs of federally sponsored research.”¹⁶ If obtaining a full reimbursement was troublesome, the Department of Defense and the National Institutes of Health also introduced a new accounting technique, “effort reporting.” Effort reporting “involves monthly or quarterly report from each faculty member engaged in federally sponsored research whose salary in part or in total is charged to that research agreement.”¹⁷ Then there is “simply more of every kind of transaction to record and report—more student loans, more construction with borrowed funds, more fringe benefits—in short—more everything.”¹⁸

Though World War II ended, the resulting Cold War created its own problems, generating anxiety at the annual meetings and offering further evidence of the growing nationalization of business officer concerns. SACUBO members regularly offered a prayer of invocation at their annual gatherings. In 1955, though, Vice-President Baughman announced after the prayer: “Now that we have recognized the Almighty, we would like to pay homage to our great country, and we would like to open our meeting for the *first time* with the pledge of allegiance to the flag [emphasis added].” Dud Giezentanner, assistant business manager at the University of Oklahoma, led the

¹⁶ Clarence Scheps, Series 1, Box 6, Folder Speeches 1961-1964 “The Challenge of Change in Accounting and Budgeting” 1962. Though Scheps does not identify his audience, he says “It is a privilege for me to participate in the 24th annual meeting of your Association, it being at least my third appearance before this group of business officers.” The 24th annual meeting coincides with the origins of the American Association of College and University Business Officers, the association representing business officers from traditionally black colleges and universities. And though she does not name the speech, Lanora F. Welzenbach in her history of the American Association says, “Various aspects of college business management were addressed in papers given at the 1960, 1961, and 1963 meetings. Clarence Scheps, then vice president and comptroller of Tulane University, spoke on the philosophy of business management.” Lanora F. Welzenbach, *American Association of College and University Business Officers: A History* (Washington, DC: National Association of College and University Business Officers, 1985) 84.

¹⁷ Scheps, “The Challenge of Change in Accounting and Budgeting.”

¹⁸ Scheps, “The Challenge of Change in Accounting and Budgeting.”

recitation.¹⁹ Though the offering of a prayer and the recitation of the pledge seem but little things to add to the much larger proceedings, they are evidence of how much attention was directed to matters unrelated to business officer needs.

The Soviet launching of Sputnik, the first artificial earth-orbiting satellite, in 1957, also raised concerns that were reflected in SACUBO meetings. SACUBO president Claude M. Reaves of Huntingdon College referenced the heightened responsibilities placed on educational institutions: “Since the launching of the Sputniks, national attention is focused on education as never before. It is more than ever incumbent upon us to carry out to the fullest possible extent the purposes and responsibilities of this Association, which we have declared.” In 1959, John W. Shirley delivered a presentation and led a discussion of “The Immediate Challenge of Soviet Education,” a topic that consumed eighteen of 126 pages in the annual Proceedings. Shirley, dean of faculty at North Carolina State, described his “experiences behind the Iron Curtain, and some of the sense of urgency with which [he] returned to this country.”²⁰ Shirley’s presentation reverberated through the rest of the meeting much as the concerns over Soviet education and scientific advancement would influence American government and society in the Cold War era.

Like the rest of the country, SACUBO members were concerned about the race into space with the Soviet Union but unlike the rest of the country business officers had to manage its effects on higher education. In 1962, SACUBO leaders invited Elmer H.

¹⁹ Proceedings, 1955, 21.

²⁰ Proceedings, Southern Association of College and University Business Officers, Thirty-First Annual Meeting, April 19-21, 1959, 34ff.

Buller, Project Mercury Representative for the Manned Spacecraft Center of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, to talk about the United States' response to the Soviet Union's launching Sputnik. "Project Mercury," he said in April, 1962, "was born not three and half years ago but about five or six years ago in the minds of some government visionaries." "It manifested itself formally in 1958," he continued, "when NASA was created, carved out of another national institution which was called NACA, the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics, which was an executive group reporting directly to the President on matters concerning aeronautical research." Again, he told his listeners that this agency dated back to 1915, pushing back even further when Americans were working on space related issues.²¹ In 1966, Willis M. Tate, president of Southern Methodist University, described the Sputnik era: "There was almost hysteria in the country when we were shocked into the realization that all the brainpower and all the research was not being done here, that we were not just automatically the leaders of everything in the world." The level of detail about activities unrelated to the business officers' primary concern seems evidence of a larger distraction. Tate went on to identify other effects of the Cold War on education: "Immediately we became frightened. Immediately education came into focus because it dawned upon people then that education was the solution for the problems that we face, that the Cold War was really being fought in the classrooms and in the laboratories of this country."²²

One of the most important educational legacies of the Cold War was Public Law

²¹ Proceedings, Southern Association of College and University Business Officers, thirty-Fourth Annual Meeting, April 11-13, 1962, 111.

²² Proceedings, Southern Association of College and University Business Officers, Thirty-Eighth Annual Meeting, April 6-9, 1966, 51.

85-864, the National Defense Education Act of 1958 [NDEA]. The law would prove to have significant implications for the work of the university business officer. After Russia launched Sputnik, lawmakers wanted to encourage the development of new technologies. NDEA may have been the most important federal bill related to higher education since the 1862 Morrill Act; President Eisenhower's signature on September 2, 1958, made possible an increase in the funding for research from five percent of the federal budget to fifteen percent. Not only did the law release research and development money, it made money available for student loans. Prospective students took advantage of the money offered.

A presentation and panel discussion led by W. C. Freeman, comptroller of Texas A & M College System, addressed NDEA's impact on business officers. He identified four areas of particular concern: loans to students, graduate fellowships, counseling and guidance training institutes, and language and development. The NDEA created complicated qualification formulas for the loans and even more convoluted repayment rules. Freeman gave a summary of some of the conditions placed on loans. A student could borrow as much as \$5,000 during his college days, but not more than \$1,000 in any fiscal year," he said. The notes at three percent interest would be repaid in ten equal annual installments. Repayment began one year after the date on which the student stops being a full-time student. If the student was a member of the Armed Forces, the interest rate did not begin to accrue until three years later. One half of the loan for a public elementary or secondary school teacher would be forgiven. And that loan was a blending of monies, nine parts Federal money and one part institutional funds.²³ And who was

²³ Proceedings, 1959, 89.

responsible for implementing these rules? As Freeman concluded, “*The Federal government does not share in the cost of administering this program* [emphasis added],” leaving college and university business officers to implement the programs at the local levels.²⁴ As Scheps said, all of this was another layer on top of current responsibilities. Business officers “were already overwhelmed” by the “ordinary responsibilities of getting the veterans in and out, and getting buildings built for the postwar bulge, and in many other problems.”²⁵

The loan programs grew quickly and required university officials to grow along with them. One business officer reported that the college student loan program catapulted colleges and universities into the “realm of big business.” “A Chicago bank,” he reported, “made a study of the NDEA loan program, and their projected estimates based on present knowledge showed that by 1970 NDEA loans will exceed the outstanding consumer loan portfolio of 97.2 per cent of all commercial banks in the United States.”²⁶ Auburn University’s business officer, Robert J. Bear, reported that his institution had initiated forty-seven loans totaling \$9,600 in 1958-59, and, by 1963-64 Auburn had 410 loans totaling \$204,000. In the very next year, they had nine hundred NDEA loans totaling \$737,000. He concluded, “We are doing all right, but before the program builds up further at Auburn and at other institutions, at this very rapid pace, we must concern ourselves with its future and we must do it now.”²⁷ The NDEA was only

²⁴ Proceedings, 1959, 89.

²⁵ Proceedings, 1964, 80.

²⁶ Proceedings, 1964, 88.

²⁷ Proceedings, 1964, 89.

the first of many new programs expanding the role of the college and university business officer. President Lyndon B. Johnson, on October 16, 1964, extended the NDEA through fiscal year 1968. He signed legislation releasing \$195 million, up from \$135 million. The maximum amount to be contributed to institutions was eliminated, enabling large universities to further expand their loan program.²⁸

The federalization of higher education extended beyond military politics and entered domestic affairs. Scheps must have smiled to himself as he listened to one speaker talk about increased birth rates and their impact on those student loans. Scheps already knew that “The large problems in education today are national in scope.”²⁹ At SACUBO’s 1960 annual convention, J. L. McCaskill, Assistant Executive Secretary for State and Federal Relationship of the National Education Association noted that increased birthrates signaled “steadily increasing enrollments in higher education,” observing that the high birth rate “which started twenty years ago is already resulting in a rapid expansion of higher education.”³⁰ This expansion “at an accelerated pace,” he said, is “staggering,” and would have “reverberating” effects.³¹

Though business officers were challenged to manage the impact of increased enrollments on traditional campuses, new institutional models also developed to help manage the influx of students, a relatively new educational institution had been created,

²⁸ Proceedings, Southern Association of College and University Business Officers, March 31-April 2, 1965, 92.

²⁹ Scheps, “President’s Remarks.”

³⁰ Proceedings, Southern Association of College and University Business Officers, April 3-5, 1960, 52.

³¹ Proceedings, 1960, 52.

“the public two-year college, junior college, [and] community college.” McCaskill also accurately predicted that community colleges would increasingly share the burden of increased enrollments. “In 1900,” he said, “there were only eight junior colleges with an enrollment of 100 students. Last year [1959] there was 677 with an enrollment of 905,062.”³² How those students would finance their education came under the heading of business officer concerns. In 1965, SACUBO added a workshop on Federal relationships to its scheduled activities. To assist business officers from smaller institutions in upgrading their skills, SACUBO conducted training conferences on student loans from mid-April through mid-May in Atlanta, Durham, Memphis, and Dallas.³³

In another attempt to help prospective students, the government funded new student employment opportunities; this money just became yet more for the business officer to track. President Lyndon Johnson was expanding the federal focus to develop a War on Poverty, signing the Economic Opportunity Act on August 20, 1964.³⁴ Part C in Title I of the Act authorized inauguration of the College Work Study Program, which was designed “to promote the part-time employment of students in institutions of higher education who are from low income families and are in need of earning from part-time employment.”³⁵ At SACUBO’s 1964 annual meeting, Hubert E. Beck, treasurer of Georgetown College, addressed the added administrative responsibilities brought by the CWS Program: “It will be necessary,” he said, “to keep separate records for this program

³² Proceedings, 1960, 52-53.

³³ Proceedings, 1965, 38-39.

³⁴ Mary Beth Norton and others, eds., *A People and A Nation: A History of the United States*, 4th ed. (Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1994), 994.

³⁵ Proceedings, 1964, 93.

for audit and control purposes. As stated in the regulations, a separate bank account must be established or other accounting controls approved by the Commission.”³⁶

Not only was there a great increase in the number of students, many of them represented new concerns for the already harried campus business officers. The social upheaval of the 1960s was in many ways fueled by the students who had in recent decades swelled the enrollment rolls of American universities. William T. Haywood, SACUBO president in 1968-1969, recalled the 1960s as “hectic times” complicated by several issues—“women’s lib, hippies, Vietnam, and sit-ins.”³⁷ Ernest Boyer, chancellor of the State University of New York, cited some of the differences in this generation of students: “This generation is three inches taller and 20 pounds heavier on the average than were their counterparts 50 years ago. They enter puberty 18 months sooner and reach full growth two years earlier than did their grandparents in 1920. Academically, on standardized tests, they perform upon admission to our colleges one year ahead of their parents just 20 years ago.”³⁸ Students also applied different problem solving skills, taxing the patience and energy of university administrators. But beyond these physiological and academic differences, these students inhabited a higher education environment of the 1960s that policed their behavior in new ways.

Protesting students pushed administrators into defensive postures on a variety of issues. For business officers, it was often a defense of endowment investments in industries disapproved of by students. SACUBO invited William C. Greenough, chief

³⁶ Proceedings, 1964, 93.

³⁷ E-mail, Haywood to McWhorter, 21 June 1999.

³⁸ Proceedings, 1968, 62-63.

executive officer of the Teachers Insurance Annuity Association and College Retirement Equities Fund [TIAA/CREF] to address how social issues impacted TIAA/CREF's investments strategies. While he avoided speaking explicitly about a pending vote on General Motors stock—an investment protested by students because of accusations of air pollution—he did describe how stocks were selected. He argued against an artificially constructed continuum “which seems to be anchored at one end by a high interest rate, high productivity, high growth situation which is therefore evil, down to a low interest rate, good social investment that subsidizes something.”³⁹ Perhaps a little defensively, though, he sang the praises of investments in companies producing “wet scrubbing of the ash that goes out of industrial smokestacks.” He also praised TIAA/CREF's willingness to take a “little less return” by participating in the “FHA mortgage loan program in the ghettos.”⁴⁰ One business officer attempted to position himself between students on the one hand and administration on the other. E. Bruce Heilman, president of the Southern Association of Colleges for Women and president of Meredith College in Raleigh, North Carolina, and a former SACUBO member, argued that business officers have been a stabilizing force. “You are neither the president,” he said, “whose office is subject to the sit-in, nor the students who radicalize the institution, nor the faculty who are free to shift from side to side.”⁴¹

Although protesting students usually chose the president's office rather than the business officer's, the latter was flooded by a growing torrent of Federal regulations.

³⁹ Proceedings, 1968, 62-63.

⁴⁰ Proceedings, 1968, 62-63.

⁴¹ Proceedings, 1968, 65.

Charles Moore, senior officer for the Higher Education Facilities Program in the United States Office of Education in Region 4, even described a “policing” function added to the business officer’s workload. “If you have students participating in campus unrest,” he advised, “and if they are found guilty and they have not been dealt with accordingly, then under this provision, we may withhold the approval of the use of funds approved under the supplemental 1969 appropriation.”⁴² Membership in SACUBO had helped business officers transition from less complicated days to a convoluted relationship with the Federal government. And yet SACUBO leaders were increasingly aware of the need for doing even more in the face of the rapid changes rippling through higher education.

The challenges of the 1950s and 1960s—the threat of Soviet dominance, rising enrollments, and a new economy—and their effects on higher education also made college business officers aware of the need for their own increased status and authority to negotiate with authorities in the Federal government and be a voice for their institution. At the 1947 SACUBO convention, Carl F. Parker, business manager of Trinity University in San Antonio, Texas, defined business officer limitations this way: “It seems to me that in too many small colleges the business manager has not been accorded a professional status and acceptance on a coordinate level with the chief academic officer which is paramount in establishing an effective administrative organization.” Looking at the problem from another angle, he said, “Business and financial functions in too many small colleges have not been centralized in a chief financial officer of major rank.” Then he chided the university president and board of trustees for failing to “recognize the need for and the advantages of making sound functional delegation of authority of the business

⁴² Proceedings, 1970, 118.

administration to the business manager.” In conclusion, Parker said, “The title exists, yes, but the functions, duties, responsibilities, and authority of the business manager have not been defined in a clear-cut statement and thus have not been delegated.”⁴³ In 1964, Gladys Barger, SACUBO president in 1951-52 and first woman president of any of the regional business officer associations, noted the distance traveled—and the distance not covered—by university business officers. “We must keep in mind,” she said, “the fact that the position of business officer was one of the last to be established in the American college. This occurred in 1906, and it was about 1912 before much was done in regard to organization of the business office. It follows that both the business officer and his office are comparatively young.”⁴⁴ The limited development of functions and staffing that characterized the business officer’s beginning continued in some institutions, revealing what it was like in its beginning. In these, she said, the bursar reported: “We have no structure. Mrs. X, my assistant, and I are IT.” With tongue-in-cheek, Barger concluded: “Their duties should never grow monotonous.”⁴⁵

Louisiana State University President John Hunter captured the “ambiguous” position in which many college business officers found themselves: “that of a prudent businessman functioning in a most unlikely environment—the field of education.” The business officer was a “tight-rope walker, treading the thin line between the natural instincts of a finance officer and the academic involvements of an institution of higher

⁴³ Proceedings, 1957, 83.

⁴⁴ Proceedings, 1964, 114.

⁴⁵ Proceedings, 1964, 116.

learning.”⁴⁶ Hunter, however, pointed to a direction that in SACUBO’s third decade began to dispel the ambiguity: “The business officer must be an educator as well. Not that he will be called upon to determine educational policy. But the unusual needs of our times, the complexities of institutions geared to and aimed toward modern-day excellence, have made it imperative that you in management be quasi-academics as well.”⁴⁷ There are some disadvantages, he proposed, to being “part business officer and part academician.” But, he deduced, “the business officer who possesses an academic orientation is the only individual who can intercede logically and effectively when such a seeming conflict of interest--and objectives--arises. Finally, he argued that “some understanding of academic life” was necessary to work effectively as a university business officer.⁴⁸

Hunter was an astute observer of his times and his predictions for the future of higher education seem almost clairvoyant. With the benefit of hindsight, William T. Haywood, SACUBO president in 1968-69, reported that in the “mid-60’s the remaining founding fathers of SACUBO were transitioning into either teaching, retirement, entrepreneurship or simply being by-passed in their own institutions.”⁴⁹ Haywood recalled a vignette he learned after his retirement. When Rufus Harris, president of Tulane, communicated with President L. O. Todd of East Central Junior College to inquire about Haywood, Todd said, “He is a real go-getter; if you don’t watch him

⁴⁶ Proceedings, Southern Association of College and University Business Officers, Thirty-Fifth Annual Meeting, April 17-19, 1963, 69.

⁴⁷ Proceedings, 1963, 69.

⁴⁸ Proceedings, 1963, 69.

⁴⁹ E-mail, William T. Haywood to Lynn Price McWhorter, June 21, 1999. In author’s files.

closely he'll be rounding third before you can get to bat." Harris replied, "That is what I want." Todd was describing a business officer unleashed from the president and able to make decisions apart from the president. Under, or perhaps better with Harris, Haywood moved from one who simply reported *to* the president to one who worked *with* the president.⁵⁰ This new version of business officer required new training and skills, as Haywood described the archetype of the new business officer:

Into a great void emerged Clarence Scheps of Tulane who had become the most prominent person in the field of university business and fiscal management. A C.P.A. and a Ph.D. in economics whose dissertation evolved into the professional bible, his "Accounting for Colleges and Universities" both revolutionized and standardized the professional field. Adopted by all of the accrediting agencies, national and regional, as the standard for accreditation in fiscal reporting, it was also recognized as the standard for CPA audits and financial reporting certification. It also dealt with general business management principles and ethics.⁵¹

The changing role of the business officer was further evidenced by their involvement in the accreditation process through participation in self-studies at their own campuses and visiting committees in other institutions. The Southern Association of Colleges and Schools (SACS) is the college and university accrediting body for eleven southern states. During Haywood's tenure as business officer at Mercer University, SACS began including business officers while assessing accreditation issues for member institutions. The benefit derived, he said, was a better understanding of business and financial conditions necessary for institutional health, discussion of good practices developed by other institutions, and an expanding network of professional contacts. George E. Fortin, comptroller of Florida State University, made the case for including the

⁵⁰ E-mail, William T. Haywood to Lynn Price McWhorter, June 21, 1999. In author's files.

⁵¹ E-mail, Haywood to McWhorter, June 21, 1999.

business officer in the self-study program. Orié Myers, SACUBO president in 1973-1974, recalled that his skills were greatly enhanced by the information he learned by visiting other universities as part of accreditation visits.⁵²

Always working to improve the skills needed to position the business officer as a professional, SACUBO continued to support education opportunities. The organization continued to nurture the College Business Management Institute [CBMI] it had initiated in 1953, staging it annually in Lexington, Kentucky. Frank Peterson, business manager for the University of Kentucky, proudly announced in 1959 that “we have had seven Institutes and in July we will open the eighth. If the business officer was to function with the kind of authority needed to interact with Federal officials continued education was essential. The CBMI carried the backing of the University of Kentucky and the accompanying prestige. The College Institute attendance fluctuated between seventy and eighty from twenty to twenty-six states each year.”⁵³ At the 1963 annual convention, SACUBO’s President Vann reported that “a week ago an announcement from the University of Kentucky indicated that the Institute was cancelled for this summer.” SACUBO’s board intervened and “prevailed upon the University of Kentucky to reconsider its decision and I am happy to announce that the Institute will go on this summer as originally planned.”⁵⁴ SACUBO members continued to provide motivation and energy toward maintenance of the alliance with the University of Kentucky and encouraged continued offering of the institute.

⁵² Proceedings, 1965, 38-39. Telephone conversation with Orié Myers, February 8, 1999.

⁵³ Proceedings, 1959, 133.

⁵⁴ Proceedings, 1963, 65.

Educational opportunities certainly aided the cause of business officers in the Southern Association of College and University Business Officers in their efforts to bridge the closing gap between regional and national problems, a problem announced by Clarence Scheps and identified by Matthew Tyler Penney and Clarence L. Mohr. National problems required a national response, more than a regional association could do and the attempt to achieve some kind of national level organization for college and university business officers has a long history. Several leading members of SACUBO had long attempted to create a national organization but failed until post-World War II. In 1929, Dr. Arthur J. Klein, Chief of the Division of Higher Education, United States Office of Education, presented a paper to the Southern Association and repeated it to the Central and Eastern Associations that would lead to a greater degree of cooperation among the regional organizations and between them and the federal government.⁵⁵ In it he proposed a “plan of cooperation between these associations and the Bureau of Education.”⁵⁶ He invited the Southern Association “to cooperate with similar selections made by the other two business organizations.”⁵⁷ The Southern Association quickly complied with Klein’s request, appointing G. H. Mew and F. L. Jackson “to work in conjunction with four men to be appointed from the two other divisions of the Business Officers Association, to cooperate with the Bureau of Education in adopting a system of definitions and classifications.”⁵⁸ The six men, two from each association, met in

⁵⁵ “Minutes,” 1929, 41; Proceedings, Southern Association of College and University Business Officers, April 16-17, 1937, 15.

⁵⁶ “Minutes,” 1929, 52.

⁵⁷ “Minutes,” 1929, 52.

⁵⁸ “Minutes,” 1929, 71.

Washington, D. C. on March 24, 1930, and appointed Lloyd Morey of the Central Association as chairman, F. L. Jackson as vice-chairman and George Mew as secretary, both of the Southern Association.⁵⁹ The committee's goal was to formulate "principles to be followed in the preparation of financial and statistical reports of universities and colleges, and of securing acceptance and adoption of those principles."⁶⁰ The committee presented its findings in a forty-eight page bulletin entitled "A Study of Financial Reports of Colleges and Universities in the United States."⁶¹ The report indicated what could be achieved by cooperation but did not lead to a permanent arrangement.

In another attempt to cooperate with other organizations, the 1930 Committee on Resolutions resolved that "we continue to encourage other educational institutions in the South to join us and so enlarge the scope of the helpfulness of the organization." In 1931, then, the Southern Association sponsored a joint meeting with the Educational Buyers Association. Though the records do not indicate it, Mew recalled thirty years later that "it was felt that it would be a very good idea to invite the other Associations to meet with us and invitations were sent to the Eastern and Central Associations and to the Educational Buyers Association." "Unfortunately," he recalled, "the Eastern Association and the Central Association did not think well of the scheme; however, the Educational Buyers Association (National Association of Educational Buyers) did meet with us.

⁵⁹ George H. Mew to E. S. Evenden, 8 May 1939. Original in files of Vera Mew Hiller. Evenden was from Teacher's College, Columbia University.

⁶⁰ "It was then found that the Association of American Colleges and the council of Church Boards of Education had inaugurated a similar study and had created a joint committee for this purpose. The representatives of all these bodies decided to consolidate their efforts and a joint committee of the entire group, accordingly, was organized." *Financial Reports for Colleges and Universities*, vii.

⁶¹ "Minutes," Executive Committee Meeting of the National Committee on Standard Reports for Institutions of Higher Education. Original in files of Vera Mew Hiller.

Again in 1945 the NAEB met with us in Atlanta but invitations to the Eastern and Central Associations were again declined.”⁶²

Another two succinct, unexplained, and intriguing paragraphs reflecting zeal for cooperation were included in the 1934 Proceedings. George Mew delivered a speech entitled “Consolidation of Business Officers’ Associations.” After his presentation he led a discussion “relative to consolidating or merging this Association with other similar Associations under the management of a full-time secretary.” The issue was referred to the officers and to the Executive Committee, but there is no indication that it re-emerged. The Committee on Resolutions made no mention of Mew’s suggestion in that year or any of the following. It is also intriguing that two years later, in 1936, Sensing proposed the change in name of the Southern Association to SACUBO. After Sensing proposed the change in name, he announced: “I do believe that as time goes by we should work towards a national organization.”⁶³

The creation of a national association, an idea that had been toyed with since 1929, became a pressing concern for some in SACUBO and a mission for others with the onset of World War II. In 1941, SACUBO resolved to “approve an appropriation of its share of a budget of \$2,000 (not to exceed \$3000) in support of a central office.” SACUBO wanted a central office to represent all the regional associations. SACUBO also approved “sending delegates to the meeting of representatives from the various

⁶² “Minutes,” 1930, 84; “Minutes,” Joint Convention of Southern Educational Buyers and Business Officers Association and The Educational Buyers Association, 23-25 April 1931; Proceedings, Southern Association of College and University Business Officers, Thirty-Second Annual Meeting, April 3-5, 1960 114; George H. Mew to Bert C. Ahrens, 18 September 1956. Original in files of Vera Mew Hiller.

⁶³ “Minutes,” 1934, 36; “Minutes,” 1936, 5-6.

associations to be held at the University of Chicago in July, 1941.”⁶⁴ The next year, 1942, SACUBO Secretary-Treasurer Thurman Sensing reported: “the idea of a central office representing all the business officers associations must be shelved for the time being at least.” “We were advised,” Sensing said, “that inasmuch as no satisfactory arrangement had been worked out for the financing of a central office, it had been decided not to call the Chicago meeting.”⁶⁵ George R. Kavanaugh, SACUBO president in 1948, announced at the April meeting that the Executive Committee met on December 6, 1947, in Birmingham, Alabama, and “discussed rather fully” the idea of forming an alliance with the other three regional business manager associations. Kavanaugh credits Gerald Henderson, SACUBO secretary and treasurer, with the idea of a “federation” of all the associations, commenting that “we do not speak nationally as a group.”⁶⁶ He concluded “that our association should give attention to and stimulate the other associations that join us in finding some common basis of making business management heard in the field of education.”⁶⁷ But, receptivity to forming a national association was not universal. In April, 1948, the Resolutions Committee recommended that SACUBO “express itself to be in favor of a national association.”⁶⁸ The resolution was rejected. W. T. Ingram, incoming SACUBO president, spoke for those who were not eager to embrace a national organization. Fearing the loss of personal relationships formed within

⁶⁴ Proceedings, 1941, 20.

⁶⁵ Proceedings, Southern Association of College and University Business officers, Fourteenth Annual Meeting, April 9-11, 1942, 12-13.

⁶⁶ Proceedings, 1948, 18.

⁶⁷ Proceedings, 1948, 17-18.

⁶⁸ Proceedings, 1948, 14.

smaller membership and perhaps even the dissolution of the regional organizations, he called for “earnest consideration to any proposals which would materially change our organization which has done very well for these past twenty-one years.”⁶⁹ Following a long discussion of the rejection, Clarence Scheps, business manager of Tulane University, substituted the idea of a federation for an association. Each of the four regional associations would select representatives, the group would meet at least once a year and they would be the voice of all business officers on a national level. Scheps’s suggestion was embraced.⁷⁰ Gerald D. Henderson circulated the resolution to the other associations and made a “number of attempts to initiate some action which possibly would carry out the intent of the resolution.”⁷¹ The Eastern Association, in 1948 and the Central Association in 1950 passed resolutions in support of a national office but did nothing else, but a new initiative by SACUBO combined with the mounting post-War federal regulations would allow the initiative to gain traction after World War II.

In 1950, SACUBO leaders discussed the issue and decided there was strong enough support to seize the initiative for giving the regional associations a national voice. In August, 1950, Jamie R. Anthony, business manager of the Georgia Institute of Technology, corresponded with the officers of the National Association of Educational Buyers, Central, Eastern, Western, and American Associations, asking that “they meet with us as soon as possible, either in Chicago or New York, to determine the most

⁶⁹ Proceedings, 1949, 21-22.

⁷⁰ Proceedings, 1948, 14. “You asked me what I would do if I could do over again what I did in helping NACUBO get started. The only thing I would do differently would be that I would have redoubled my efforts to have achieved a strong national association years before it actually came into effect.” Scheps, Letter to Fred S. Vorsanger, Tulane University Archives Special Collections.

⁷¹ Proceedings, 1951, 26-27.

practical manner to obtain the national representation that we desired for our associations.”⁷² Anthony described himself as pleased with the “immediate, favorable and enthusiastic” responses.⁷³ Accepting the Central Association’s offer to host, representatives gathered in Chicago for their first meeting in September 1950. All who were invited attended, and they began the work of forging a national group: appointing committees, writing present and future objectives, and selecting officers. The first president of the newborn Federation of College and University Business officers was Jamie R. Anthony, business manager of the Georgia Institute of Technology and president of the Southern Association. The group was quickly acknowledged when the American Council on Education invited Federation officers to its meeting in October, 1950, barely a month after the new group’s formation.⁷⁴ A letter from the executive secretary of the Interdepartmental Committee on Federal Agencies, an agent for the contracting agencies of the Government, offered further validation of the Federation’s legitimacy and substance:

I was pleased to have received your letter of October 20, 1950, informing me of the establishment of the National Federation of College and University Business Officers Association. This is certainly a progressive step in the process of establishing better relations between the contracting agencies of the Government and the business officials of the various universities throughout the country.⁷⁵

While Anthony was acknowledged by the National Federation as the “organizer and first president,” he was careful to divert attention from himself, reminding his

⁷² Proceedings, 1951, 27.

⁷³ Proceedings, 1951, 27.

⁷⁴ Proceedings, 1952, 35.

⁷⁵ Proceedings, 1952 39.

admirers that it was not the “overnight brainstorm” of one person or of one association.⁷⁶ It was, he said, “an evolutionary development in the thinking of competent college administrators who recognized the value of unified action.”⁷⁷ He cited Lloyd Morey: “We went through, some of us, two previous wars without the benefits of unified or coordinated organization of business officers. The disadvantages were many and constant. They meant that individuals had to step in and try by personal influence and otherwise to do things that should have been done in the name of a unified organization.”⁷⁸ Anthony concluded by exhorting SACUBO to remember what had gotten them this far, to embrace the new Federation and to know that “in unity there is strength.”⁷⁹

That SACUBO was facing national problems and not regional ones is also demonstrated in the revisions to the training manual *College and University Business Management*. These books, originally published in 1935, were the direct result of the National Committee on Standard Reports for Institutions of Higher Education and they were even more relevant thirty years later. Key leaders in SACUBO and NACUBO would play an important role in the revisions. A committee was appointed, Scheps was named chairman, and a long journey began. And as evidence of the importance of the task and the commitment to the task, Scheps highlighted the intensity of the project, “from July of 1964, to the present time (1968), we have been engaged in this traumatic

⁷⁶ Proceedings, 1954, 25; Proceedings, 1951, 32.

⁷⁷ Proceedings, 1951, 32.

⁷⁸ Proceedings, 1951, 32.

⁷⁹ Proceedings, 1951, 33.

task of bringing out a new volume.”⁸⁰ “We met,” Scheps emphasized, “on Saturdays and Sundays –mind you, not during the week because we didn’t want to be away from our jobs—these six men really did the bulk, carried the load in editing the drafts of chapters which were written by business officers and others throughout the country.”⁸¹ All of this is to highlight SACUBO’s commitment to a new national approach to solving the problems of business in higher education.

Of course, SACUBO continued to support and promote the premier inter-institutional organization closest to its direct interests, the National Federation of College and University Business officers. While Frank Peterson, business officer of the University of Kentucky, resisted a national association (he thought it was too expensive), he recognized the need for a voice in Washington, D.C. “I believe,” he said in 1959, “the time has come when the business officers’ associations should have in Washington an individual looking after the national business aspects that affect all the colleges and universities in America.” “I would be opposed,” he continued, “to establishing a separate independent office in Washington at this time because of the expense but I think the Federation should have an executive secretary or an executive officer there.’ He argued that the regional associations needed the “unity” and the “voice” gained by having a national central office.⁸²

Perhaps having worked with the National Federation reassured those who feared the demise of the personal relationships nurtured by a regional association or perhaps

⁸⁰ Proceedings, 1968, 62-63.

⁸¹ Proceedings, 1968, 62-63.

⁸² Proceedings, 1959, 131.

they simply began to see the benefits of a national group. Whatever happened, the willingness to move from a federation of regional associations to creating a national association gained momentum. In 1961, Scheps announced the results of three meetings: First, in July 1960, a second annual meeting of business officers on a national level was held. Attendees adopted a resolution declaring “that an association of business officers should be created to function at the national level with the continuation of the strong and vigorous regional associations as divisions of the national group.” At that meeting, the Federation Board decided that each of the five regional associations should be asked to appoint one representative to meet to consider this question. Second, SACUBO’s executive committee agreed that a national association should be formed. The executive committee was careful, though, to emphasize that the “strong regional associations should be preserved.” Third, the meeting of the five regional representatives “subsequently took place in January, 1961 and constituted,” Scheps said, “what might be called a constitutional convention to see if the five regional associations could get together on the formation of a national association.” The participants in that meeting, Scheps announced, “unanimously approved the creation of the National Association provided it is ratified by each of the regional associations.”⁸³

The significance of a positive first step was not lost on Scheps. Because of the annual convention schedule, SACUBO was first to discuss the issue of a national association, followed by the other regions and concluding with the Eastern Association’s meeting in November.⁸⁴ Scheps presented the proposition to the convention, and a

⁸³ Proceedings, Southern Association of College and University Business Officers, Thirty-Third Annual Meeting, 1961, 55.

⁸⁴ Proceedings, 1961, 55.

lengthy question and answer period followed. At the business meeting of that convention, SACUBO's President Springfield reported that formation of a national association would entail a change in by-laws which required a mail ballot.

"Unofficially," though, "we would like to determine the feeling of this group on the question." The records indicated an "almost unanimous approval."⁸⁵

Clarence Scheps, Gene Cohen, and Trent Root served as SACUBO's first representatives to the board of the National Association of College and University Business Officers [NACUBO].⁸⁶ The other regional associations appointed representatives and in 1965, Clarence Scheps was elevated to the position of president of the National Association and served until 1968. With Scheps's nurturing hand, the national organization continued to grow until, in 1966, he reported that the National Board of Directors called for the next step on the evolutionary ladder, the "creation of a full-fledged central office in Washington." "For the first time," he said, "staff services would be provided. The poor volunteers, which I can assure you gentlemen, since I am one of them, have been worked to death in your behalf over the last decade." The office was needed; he outlined, for two reasons--a physical locus for records and communications and professional development for business officers.⁸⁷ The National Board called for the creation of a professional journal to encourage research by and for university business officers. And, of course, the office was needed to "improve further

⁸⁵ Proceedings, 1961, 103.

⁸⁶ Proceedings, 1963, 32.

⁸⁷ Proceedings, 1966, 220-221.

our relationships with the Federal government.”⁸⁸ SACUBO leaders agreed to hold a joint convention in 1967 with NACUBO.

The creation of a National Association had a long history, one going back to the origins of SACUBO. NACUBO marked a new approach for this regional association contending with the Federal government, the 800-pound gorilla in the room. The regional association began to look to NACUBO for leadership in negotiating a closer relationship to Washington, D.C. and its money. This would create a dilemma for SACUBO leaders, just what role would a regional organization have in the federalization of higher education. Those issues would resurface in the early 1970s, but first another national issue stormed cities across the United States, the issue of racism. Though buried in the SACUBO archives, the issue of racism in SACUBO began with the organization’s founding in 1927.

⁸⁸ Proceedings, 1966, 220-221.

CHAPTER FOUR:

African-American and White Business Officers Negotiate A Merger in the Civil Rights Era: “The Time is Now”¹

In 1967, leaders of SACUBO and the American Association of College and University Business Officers [commonly referred to as the American Association] merged the two associations. SACUBO’s history with social issues as represented by its merger with the American Association feels different from the rest of this project because it is different. SACUBO leaders eschewed social issues and only reluctantly addressed them when forced. This history is also about those at the bottom of the social ladder pushing for social change: black business officers Harold K. Logan and Burnett Little of the American Association. SACUBO leaders SACUBO’s Luther Callahan, Clarence Scheps, and William Haywood led change only after a long history of Civil Rights protests, judicial intervention and federal legislation. American Association leader Augustus L. “Gus” Palmer of Howard University business officer and a former member of the Tuskegee Airmen said it this way, under them [SACUBO], our “very best friends, we had received all kinds of stalling tactics when we would talk about this thing [merging].” “When invitations went out,” he said, “they seemed so embarrassed that there was still some elements, and I am told that it was the Alabama delegation, that still was not sold by people letting us come in as full-fledged members.”²

It was difficult for Palmer and his colleagues to celebrate their success because of the loss of their own association. The American Association became SACUBO. There is

¹ Proceedings, Southern Association, 1965, 137.

² “Meeting of Executive Committee, May 6, 1966,” Tuskegee University Archives and Museums, AACUBO Holdings, Box 7.

no evidence that leaders considered an alternate name somehow combining the names of the two associations. Though association leaders could have made it happen, no American Association leader was inserted into the presidency. SACUBO leaders remained in positions of leadership as former American Association leaders worked their way up from the bottom, taking several years to do it. Writing about the merging of white and black teacher associations in the South, Adam Fairclough said it this way, “If school integration proved painful for black teachers, so did the process of integrating the black and white teachers’ associations. In 1966, after two years of negotiations, the American Teachers Association voted by 172 to 3 to merge with the National Education Association.”³ SACUBO members had been slow to move while American Association members experienced the ambivalence of getting what you wish for. By becoming part of the larger white institution they garnered privileges and power experienced unavailable to them thus far but they lost a home shared by common experience available only to black business officers in traditionally black institutions. As bleak as this sounds, and it is, by merging the two associations black and white business officers improved their ability to respond to the needs of the modern university and to offer leadership in its ongoing transformation.

Southern institutions of higher education proved particularly resistant to integration, and the university business officers proved no exception to the general patterns of white southerners’ reluctance to change. As Clarence Mohr said of Tulane University, “It was segregation above all else that made Tulane a southern school, and it was the university’s inability to break swiftly and cleanly with its racist past that cast a

³ Adam Fairclough, *A Class of Their Own: Black Teachers in the Segregated South* (Cambridge: The Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 2007) 408.

shadow of impending tragedy over an otherwise promising future.”⁴ Resistance to racial integration in the South’s higher education institutions has as long history. But the prospect of veterans returning, and now with federal student aid, meant southern universities would have to face increased pressures challenging the segregation of education in the South. In 1932, the Mississippi legislature “consolidated three boards of trustees into one ten-member board with governance over all the state institutions of higher education learning.”⁵ In 1939, Calvin Wells, chairman of that board, received a letter from University of Mississippi’s Chancellor Alfred Butts. Butts advised “him that blacks were seeking admission to professional schools in other southern states and the Mississippi could soon expect some black applicants.” Chairman Wells replied bluntly, “We will litigate until the cows come home before we permit any such thing as [integration]. I sincerely trust that no effort will be made by any Negroes to enter [our] institutions. I believe they have too much sense to do so I would feel sorry about what would happen to them in 24 hours after they got there. However, we will not anticipate any trouble along that line until we meet it.”⁶

President Harris of Tulane reinforced these strongly held opinions with a set of resolutions he probably wrote that were then adopted in 1943 by “the Executive Committee of the Southern University Conference, a forty-three member group that included virtually all of the region’s major universities and stronger liberal arts colleges.” Harris and the Conference wanted college benefits dispersed to individual veterans, not to institutions. Of course these benefits would cover all costs associated with the student,

⁴ Mohr, *Tulane University*, xviii.

⁵ Sansing, *Making Haste Slowly*, 111-112.

⁶ Sansing, *Making Haste Slowly*, 141.

‘maintenance and otherwise in his school of choice.’ Other administrators quickly joined the chorus of individual reimbursement: “the National Conference of Church-Related Colleges and from the Association of American Colleges.” Individual reimbursements necessarily kept the institution out of the fiscal arrangements between the student and the federal government making it possible for schools to continue their support of segregation.⁷

A supposedly “color-blind GI Bill” helped set the stage for future changes but provided little help to black veteran would-be students at the time. Black and white southerners received the same benefits—“living expenses and full tuition”—but black college students attended typically inferior segregated institutions.⁸ Nevertheless, Mohr argued that the “Second World War must still be regarded as the catalyst for an unprecedented drive toward educational democratization.” The matriculation of Alabama veterans in the late 1940s required the “opening or expansion of University of Alabama branch campuses in Birmingham, Montgomery, Mobile, Selma, Gadsden, and Huntsville.”⁹ “Aggregate registration at these ‘extension centers,’ as they were initially called, temporarily surpassed enrollment at the main Tuscaloosa campus.”¹⁰

SACUBO leaders solidly followed the norms of the white South and its institutions of higher education. Nothing in the membership section of SACUBO’s Constitution and By-Laws prevented black business officers from joining. SACUBO members simply exercised their freedom to accept or reject applications. In 1952

⁷ Mohr, “World War II and the Transformation of Higher Education,” 42-43.

⁸ Mohr, “World War II and the Transformation of Higher Education,” 45.

⁹ Mohr, “World War II and the Transformation of Higher Education,” 46.

¹⁰ Mohr, “World War II and the Transformation of Higher Education,” 46.

SACUBO began publishing its Constitution and By-Laws in their Annual Proceedings. Section 1 on the membership portion reads as follows: “(1) all present members are bonafide members of the association; (2) Any responsible business officer of an institution of higher education may apply for membership.” The room for maneuvering comes in Section 2, Admission: “An applicant becomes a member upon acceptance on his application by the Executive Committee. . . .”¹¹ But even at this early date noises of change could be heard amongst the members of the American Association. In her account of the *American Association of College and University Business Officers, A History*, Lanora F. Welzenbach said talk about mergers and dissolutions began to be discussed in the decade of the 1950s. And though she does not identify them, she reports some American Association members became involved in SACUBO. Their presence in SACUBO along with members and leaders like Clarence Scheps kept the issue alive.¹²

In the process, and perhaps better said in the long run, SACUBO and the American Association members listened to liberal leaders, generated change, and did the hard work of merging of two professional organizations. The American Association leaders deserve credit for keeping the issue of merging on the minds of both organizations, providing an almost relentless reminder of racial inequities at every available opportunity. For example, the American Association held its 1964, at the site of its first, Howard University. On that occasion James B. Clarke, business manager for Dover State College for Colored Students in Delaware, spoke to those in attendance. He said, “Our goal has always been to help provide the best educational experiences for the

¹¹ Proceedings, Southern Association, 1952, 85.

¹² Welzenbach, *American Association*, 94.

youth under our jurisdiction through efficient management of available resources. . . .

The financial management of educational institutions has become big business that is far more complex and demanding than Negro problems per se.”¹³ If they wanted, listeners could hear the echo of Clarence Scheps’ words to the audience in 1961, “The larger problems in education are national in scope.” Though SACUBO leaders did not call for the initial meetings between the American Association and the Southern Association, SACUBO was the larger of the two institutions and had the corresponding power given members of the majority race. Hence, SACUBO leaders could have squelched continued conversation, but instead they nurtured the relationship, demanded SACUBO members address the issue, and helped inaugurate a new business officer organization.

In 1965, Clarence Scheps of Tulane University called for the merger and William T. Haywood, veteran of Mercer University race politics, strongly advocated the merger. Scheps, Haywood, and SACUBO President Luther Callahan of the University of Alabama attended a March 11, 1965, meeting at the Dallas, Texas, airport. Harold K. Logan of Tuskegee and Burnett A. Little of Southern University in Baton Rouge represented the American Association. Eagerly, but with remorse, Little and Logan advocated the dissolution of the American Association. In its place they created a new business officer association, one that welcomed African-Americans and whites, one that promoted the interests of both races, and one that pushed members of both races into leadership roles regionally and nationally. From the next year after the merger, Harold K. Logan maintained a presence in SACUBO as a member of the executive committee, leader, officer, and president from 1968 until his death in 1995. He was the first, but not the last of the American Association leaders to serve in role of importance in SACUBO.

¹³ Welzenback, *American Association*, 92-93.

The 1965 meeting carried two histories with it, the genesis of SACUBO and the American Association.¹⁴ The merger of two college and university business officer associations has a historical context, and dual beginnings. Conceived for different reasons, the American Association and SACUBO intersected in 1965. In 1927, George Mew and colleagues created what would become SACUBO. Eleven years later on Thursday, April 13, 1939, at Howard University, Luther H. Foster, Sr., proudly announced the birth of another business officer association, the Association of Business Officers in Schools for Negroes.¹⁵ Luther H. Foster, Sr., and V. D. Johnston, business officers respectively at Virginia State College and Howard University attended meetings of Central and Eastern Associations and benefited from the “opportunities for professional improvement afforded by formal associations of business officers.”¹⁶ They returned home eager to share their experiences with their colleagues. In 1939, Foster, Johnston and two more colleagues banded together and launched the Association for Business Officers in Schools for Negroes, which became the American Association of College and University Business Officers [American Association].¹⁷

The American Association began with a group of business officers from historically black colleges and universities. Its twenty-eight year journey from its birth in

¹⁴ William T. Haywood. Interview by author. 16 April 2003. Notes in author’s files. The “a” in SACUBO, like the other business officer organizations, is pronounced as a short vowel.

¹⁵ Proceedings, Association of Business Officers in Schools for Negroes [ABOSN], First Annual Meeting, April 13-15, 1939, 11; Lanora F. Welzenbach, *American Association of College and University Business Officers: A History* (National Association of College and University Business Officers, 1985), 99.

¹⁶ Proceedings, ABOSN, 1939, 8. “Johnston and Luther Foster, Sr., who were very light in color, and Robert O. Purves, who was white and was then at Hampton Institute, had been able to attend meetings of the Eastern Association. Lanora F. Welzenbach, *American Association of College and University Business Officers: A History* (Washington D.C. National Association of College and University Business Officers, 1985) 8.

¹⁷ Proceedings, ABOSN, 1939, 13.

1939 to its dissolution in 1967 is a story within two other stories. It is the story of how a traditionally excluded people became a part of those who excluded them. It is also the story of how black business officers refused to wait passively for acceptance, built their own organization and eventually worked toward its successful demise. At their twenty-fifth anniversary, Clarke said it clearly and poignantly: the story of the American Association is the “story of an organization that perhaps should never have existed, but one that was created to fill an urgent need involving the very existence of our institutions of higher education.”¹⁸ It is also the story of how SACUBO struggled to hold racial issues at arm’s length.

Although a single and clear precipitating event has not been uncovered, at least three reasons existed for the emergence of a college and university association of and for black business officers: black institutions, if they were to be represented at the regional meetings they had to send white delegates; if none were available they could not participate.¹⁹ African-Americans were not welcome as officers in most southern educational institutions or as guests in the region’s best hotels, so there were few places where a racially mixed meeting could be held. The American Association held the promise of creating opportunities for black business officers to gather for professional discussion, filling a role much as SACUBO did for their white counterparts.

¹⁸ “James Clark Address at the Banquet Session, 7 May 1964,” Tuskegee University Archives and Museums, AACUBO Holdings, Box 1.

¹⁹ Welzenbach reported that “No records could be found that document the conversations, telephone calls, or correspondence that must have preceded the first meeting of a proposed new organization of business officers in schools for Negroes.” Indeed, the author’s search of the official records housed at Tuskegee University Archives and Museums confirms the absence of records indicating a precipitating event. A note to the reader: If you fail to discern an order to the AACUBO Holdings citations, there barely is one. The author had to convince the archivist of their holdings, which she later found, which as yet have not been catalogued. Nevertheless, I was thrilled that she found them.

As hard as the American Association worked to address issues of race, Mew and other SACUBO leaders avoided them. Correspondence between SACUBO founder George Howell Mew and the executive committee revealed that even prior to SACUBO's first official meeting in May of 1928, Spelman College, a historically black school in Atlanta, requested permission to join SACUBO. On December 30, 1927, SACUBO Secretary-Treasurer R. B. Cunningham answered Mew's request for counsel regarding Spelman's wish to join. His response is consistent with the times. He wrote:

It seems to me that it will be right to admit Spelman College to our association if we can have it clearly understood that we do this because the institution is under the management of white people; and, further, that the institution will be represented only by a white person at our meetings.²⁰

With the response of the executive committee in hand, Mew wrote the purchasing agent for Spelman College:

I have communicated with the Executive Committee of the Southern Educational Buyers and Business Officers Association with reference to admitting Spellman [sic] College as a member of the Association. . . . The Executive Committee has decided to admit Spellman [sic] on the condition that they send a white representative to all meetings of the Association. If you wish to join the Association under these conditions, I assure you that we shall be glad to have you among us.²¹

Spelman College responded six days later, accepting the offer. As an institution serving African-American students, Spelman College agreed to be represented by a white purchasing agent, Edith Globe. Florence M. Read, president of Spelman College, wrote:

If it would be in order, I should like to apply on behalf of Spelman College for such membership with the understanding that a white representative would be sent to the meetings of the Association and that our membership would be discontinued if at some time in the future this should not be feasible.

²⁰ R. B. Cunningham, to George H. Mew, 30 December 1927. Original in files of Vera Mew Hiller.

²¹ George H. Mew to Edith Globe, 10 January 1928. Original in files of Vera Mew Hiller.

Miss Globe is our purchasing agent at the present time.²²

The documentation makes clear that Spelman College's relationship with SACUBO was qualified; reflecting the second reason African-American business officers formed their own organization. The records listing the names of member institutions attending the annual meetings indicate that Spelman College sent a representative for only two years--1928 and 1930. Clarence Scheps, SACUBO president in 1959-60, explained the limited interaction between SACUBO and the American Association in an address delivered in 1965: "southern institutions were not integrated to a large extent," and "technically [because of segregation] it would have been difficult to hold meetings of this Association except in one or two cities in the South."²³ Spelman College's limited participation—attending only those meetings held in Atlanta where lodging was available—seems to confirm Scheps's observation.²⁴

The same southern culture in the 1930s pushing African Americans to form their own association also created problems for young African American professionals. Some

²² Florence M. Read to George H. Mew, 16 January 1928. Original in files of Vera Mew Hiller. Though I have no idea what it means, the repeated misspelling of Spelman is curious.

²³ Proceedings, Southern Association, 1965, 136.

²⁴ Welzenbach, *American Association*, 8. In 1942, when Howard University applied for membership in the Eastern Association, a policy change limited further applicants. While protest led to a change in the policy, restrictions were still in place until 1960. Harold Sitkoff, *A New Deal for Blacks: The Emergence of Civil Rights as a National Issue*, vol. 1, "The Depression Decade" (New York: Oxford University Press, 1978), 35, reported that "over half the Negroes in the United States lived [in the South] in 1930." While other regional associations—the Central Association and the Eastern Association—were less restrictive, black business officers were keenly aware that "the great majority of such [black] colleges were in the South." Neal O. Hines and Abbot Wainwright, *A History of NACUBO: Business Officers in Higher Education*, published by NACUBO, 1994. "The record shows that the Central Association was the first to accept membership of Negro institutions. Fisk University, represented by a white business officer, was accepted in 1929. In the same year, the Eastern Association accepted membership from Hampton Institute, whose business officer was also white. But in the 1930s no association would accept Negro colleges with Negro business officers. It became evident in the late 1930s that a new organization would have to be formed with the special mission of securing the benefits of group efforts and of making a concerted attack on those problems aggravated by segregation policies." p.9.

of those problems were identified in the August 1938 issue of *In Crisis*, a publication of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People. It reported a lack of interest amongst employment interviewers from the major corporations in filling positions with African American applicants.²⁵ Luther H. Foster, Jr., son of the American Association founder, exemplified the problem. After earning a master's degree from Harvard University he was discouraged from applying to established accounting firms because of the expected refusal. An *In Crisis* article illustrated the dilemma of black college graduates, in this case a white institution in the North:

When the employing interviewers come to the campus from Standard Oil, Western Electric, General Electric, United Fruit Company, the big finance companies and the nation's premier department stores, the farthest thing from their minds is a Negro filling any of the positions their organizations.²⁶

Whatever the reasons for Foster's difficulty in finding an accounting job clearly race was an issue.

At the 1950 SACUBO annual meeting Jay F. W. Peterson from the University of Miami delivered an address entitled "Business Officers and Higher Education," exactly describing some of the problems confronted by black business officers. Given eleven years after the formation of the American Association, Peterson's speech described the problems well: "because of certain historical racial problems, the South *has always* operated under different conditions from those experienced by northern and western states [emphasis added]." The South operates "under a different set of social customs and our problems are not always understood outside the South." The ways of the South, he said, were easily learned because "the South today contains many people who were

²⁵ Welzenbach, *American Association*, 9.

²⁶ Welzenbach, *American Association*, 9.

raised and educated in other areas and yet, for the most part, these people rapidly become aware of the reasons for existing southern customs and become, in fact, Southerners.”²⁷

Of course, he means “white” southerners here.

The SACUBO leadership’s acceptance of its region’s mores is evidenced by its identification of itself as southern in its title. In 1927 it had a dual focus; hence its name, “The Southern Educational Buyers and Business Association.” By 1936 the organization had changed its name to the “Southern Association of College and University Business Officers.” Yet the organization retained the label “Southern” in both versions of their name. The regional label signaled many things, among them the South’s insularity and a history of racial and political division. Or, perhaps the label was only a pragmatic acceptance of limited geographical reach necessitated by the practical constraints of travel and communication in this era. George R. Kavanaugh, president of SACUBO in 1948, highlighted its southern emphasis: “The biggest thing that we can say about our Association is that we occupy the South. We are a southern association.”²⁸ The content of annual meetings and annual addresses further bore out that SACUBO was a creature of its time and place. The Proceedings for the years coinciding with the emergence of the American Association reveal a narrow focus on campus business issues. None of the addresses at the annual convention were devoted to social issues generally, or to racial issues in particular.

When the American Association was formed in 1939 it adopted the name “Association of Business Officers in Schools for Negroes.” By the time of its

²⁷ Proceedings, Southern Association, 1950, 81.

²⁸ Proceedings, Southern Association, 1948, 17.

dissolution, the name had become the “American Association of College and University Business Officers.” Rather than define a region, the American Association’s name identifies a group of people. That the name American Association was chosen is striking because it does not explicitly identify the group’s racial constituency and because it implicitly asserts the Americaness of that creation. William T. Haywood, SACUBO president in 1968-69, described an interesting aside to the issue of the organizational names. There were five constituent organizations: SACUBO, EACUBO, CACUBO, WACUBO, and the American Association or AACUBO. Each name, he said, sounded the initial “a” as a short vowel, as in “sack” for SACUBO. But, he said, “I don’t recall that we ever pronounced it [AACUBO], sort of like the Jews [never] pronounce the name of God.”²⁹

Speeches at the annual meeting of SACUBO and the American Association revealed different purposes. Though black business officers from the American Association surely allied to improve business practices, they also used some of their time to address political concerns of black southerners. Of fifty-six addresses between 1939 and 1968, the American Association devoted seventeen to issues specific to black higher education. In 1939, for example, the Thursday evening session was devoted to “The Financial Support of Higher Education among Negroes.”³⁰ Four distinguished guests—President Mordecai W. Johnson of Howard University, President John W. Davis of West Virginia State College, Associate Director Jackson Davis of the General Education Board, and the U. S. Office of Education’s Representative Fred J. Kelly all examined

²⁹ William T. Haywood. Interview by author. 16 April 2003. Notes in author’s files.

³⁰ Proceedings, Association of Business Officers in Schools for Negroes, 1939, 7.

concerns of historically black colleges and universities. One address, “The Employment Service at Virginia Union University,” described some problems peculiar to black students:

Now when we send girls out to prepare and serve dinner every afternoon, that is, from 3:30 or 4:00 P.M., we charge a minimum wage fee of \$3.50 and car fare. Many employers readily inform us that they can get someone all day for just seventy-five cents or a dollar more for a week, but we are polite and firm in answering that we charge more because they are getting more than just ordinary help--but that they are paying for a ‘Service.’³¹

Black business officers creatively used the occasion of their annual meetings to consider issues of concern in black higher education. In 1939, the inaugural year of their association, black business officers invited Doxey A. Wilkerson, Associate Professor of Education at Howard University. He spoke on “The Allocation of Public Funds for Higher Education Among Negroes,” describing the gross inequities between funding for white and black institutions. African-American colleges, he said, received only 5.3% of the total receipts from Federal funds for land-grant colleges in seventeen states. He also reported that the receipts from federal funds for resident instruction dipped as low as seven cents on the dollar and that total expenses per black student were forty-nine cents on the dollar.³²

Wilkerson ended his presentation by offering a remedy and suggesting a political role for the American Association. He concluded that the “basic social situation from which this unwholesome condition stems is very well known to us all. It should likewise be apparent that any correctives in the near future will come only through the *effective*

³¹ Proceedings, Association of Business Officers in Schools for Negroes, 1939, 38-39.

³² Proceedings, Association of Business Officers in Schools for Negroes, 1939, 103-109.

application of group pressure [emphasis added].³³ He went further to make clear his understanding that “many business officers in Negro schools are so circumstanced that they cannot, themselves, serve as spear-heads in any campaign for the revision of federal education laws.” “There is no need to do so,” he continued, “organizations [can] carry the brunt of the battle.” The black business officer’s role, he said, was to provide information and give moral support. He concluded with an exhortation: “Further discussion and definite planning to this end would seem to be most appropriate for the newly organized Association of Business Officers in Schools for Negroes.”³⁴

At the next annual meeting, 1940, Horace Mann Bond, president of Fort Valley State College, Fort Valley, Georgia, continued to give attention to the racial and political aspects of educational funding that were the stunting effects of the member institutions. In his address, “The Support of Public Higher Education in Alabama, 1865-1930,” Bond continued building the case for fiscal equality. He carefully detailed the inequities in funding, and described how white institutions received far more financial resources than black schools. He concluded, “I repeat, the history of these facts is not only a history of figures. It is a history of social and economic trends; perhaps the best history we can get of the progress of the races.”³⁵

Another stage in this “progress of the races” occurred in 1942. With the nation in crisis, Congress appropriated money for the vocational training of workers for defense industries. Congress specified that “no trainee shall be discriminated against because of

³³ Proceedings, Association of Business Officers in Schools for Negroes, 1939, 108.

³⁴ Proceedings, Association of Business Officers in Schools for Negroes, 1939, 110.

³⁵ Proceedings, Association of Business Officers in Schools for Negroes, March 28-30, 1940, 40-41.

sex, race or color.”³⁶ If, the law continued, separate schools were required for different population groups, “equitable provisions shall be made for facilities and training of like quality.”³⁷ W. A. Hamilton, business manager of Lincoln University of Missouri, described how some states had found legal loopholes, enabling them to evade laws providing for equal training. Some state officials, Hamilton reported, argued that there was no demand for training for blacks. Another said that there were no trained black teachers. Hamilton concluded: “Thus in the preparation for the defense of democracy, the Negro is again caught in a vicious circle.”³⁸ What is important is that the American Association repeatedly and relentlessly refused to ignore the race issue at their annual meetings.

Black business officers also followed race and legal issues. Some, in fact, were unimpressed with the legal remedies being offered to segregated and underfunded education. One business officer cited *Missouri ex rel Gaines v. Canada*. Described by some constitutional scholars as “the first crack in the wall of segregation,” the 1938 *Gaines* decision launched a movement to improve “separate-but-equal” African-American schools throughout the South. The state of Missouri offered to pay law school tuition for African-American Cy Woodson Gaines in an out-of-state school but refused his admission into a state school because of his race. The U. S. Supreme Court ruled Missouri had to admit Gaines or create another school for blacks.³⁹ Leon Ransom spoke

³⁶ Proceedings, Association of Business Officers in Schools for Negroes, May 7-9, 1942, 55.

³⁷ Proceedings, Association of Business Officers in Schools for Negroes, May 7-9, 1942, 55.

³⁸ Proceedings, Association of Business Officers in Schools for Negroes, May 7-9, 1942, 55.

³⁹ Alfred H. Kelly, Winfred A. Harbison, and Herman Belz, *The American Constitution: Its Origins and Development*, vol. 2, 7th ed. (New York: W. W. Norton & Co., Inc., 1991), 585.

to the 1944 American Association gathering and expressed his dismay by announcing that the principle in the *Gaines* case “was neither new nor revolutionary.”⁴⁰ It, Ransom said, “tried to mold accepted practices into the democratic forms.”⁴¹ *Missouri ex rel Gaines v. Canada* simply reinforced segregation. Members of the American Association had created and sustained a segregated institution, but as their critique of the shortcoming of the *Gaines* decision implied, the logical conclusion of integration for the American Association would be their own dissolution. He then described the American Association’s political purpose: “Are we Negro educators willing and courageous enough to admit that we are gradually working ourselves out of the American picture as a separate racial group and willing to sacrifice personal ambitions for group achievements?”⁴² Just five years after their first meeting, black business officers had portended their association’s dissolution. So, from at least 1944, many members of the American Association worked toward their dissolution.

While the American Association continued to address racial issues with each annual meeting, SACUBO focused its attention on business management because it had no motivation or cause to focus on the issues dividing black and white schools. From the beginning, the American Association also placed a primacy on improved business practices. So their meetings contained many sessions that paralleled the concerns of white associations, and when they opportunities allowed, American Association organizers sought the cooperation and input of the other regional associations and their

⁴⁰ Proceedings, Association of Business Officers in Schools for Negroes, June 8-9, 1944, 48.

⁴¹ Proceedings, Association of Business Officers in Schools for Negroes, June 8-9, 1944, 49.

⁴² Proceedings, Association of Business Officers in Schools for Negroes, June 8-9, 1944, 55.

members. Reflecting on the situation decades later, SACUBO's Haywood remarked: "I think they saw that they were not going to be as fulfilled as they would like to be unless they were integrated into all the other associations. They just saw that their profession, that they as professionals, were not going to succeed as well as they might otherwise."⁴³ Race divided the groups but the business of higher education united them. In the early 1960s, the American Association invited Clarence Scheps, vice-president and comptroller of Tulane University and president of SACUBO in 1959-60, to address its assembly.⁴⁴

The similar purposes yet contrasting realities of the two organizations were highlighted as they moved toward union in 1967. The merger was many years in the making and likely sought by members of the American Association well before many in SACUBO ever even considered a merger. A December 1962 meeting of the American Association's Executive Committee reveals one of several earnest attempts at dissolving their organization into a union with one or more of the other regional associations. Isaiah T. Creswell, president of the American Association reported a discussion with the "Board of the National Federation [of College and University Business Officers Association] regarding the dissolution of the American Association and the membership of the schools in the American Association being absorbed in the other regional associations."⁴⁵

In March 1965, Harold K. Logan of Tuskegee and Burnett A. Little of Southern University in Baton Rouge (representatives of the American Association) initiated contact with SACUBO concerning a proposed merger. A one-day meeting was set for

⁴³ Haywood. Interview by author. 16 April 2003. Notes in author's files.

⁴⁴ Welzenbach, *American Association*, 84.

⁴⁵ "Minutes of Executive Committee Meeting of American Association of College and University Business Officers, Atlanta, Georgia, December 8, 1962," Tuskegee University Archives and Museums, Box 2.

March 11, 1965, 9:30 a.m. until 5:15 p.m., at the Dallas, Texas, airport. Little and Logan represented the American Association while SACUBO was represented by President Luther Callahan, Clarence Scheps of Tulane University, and William T. Haywood of Mercer University. Haywood remembered that a “very frank discussion was held” and that the meeting resulted in SACUBO’s pledge to “push for their [black business officers] acceptance but could not promise them anything.” Haywood added, “They accepted that.”⁴⁶ At the March 31, April 1 & 2, 1965, meeting of the Southern Association’s annual meeting held in Durham, North Carolina, a resolution was passed “to accept all applications for membership in the Southern Association from all colleges holding membership in the regional accrediting association for their area.” The notes continued, saying “This resolution removes the exclusion of the Negro colleges and memberships.”⁴⁷ This information was to be passed on to SACUBO membership and the next annual meeting in April, 1966. But before that April 1966 annual meeting, and on July 13, 1965, Southern Association leaders and American Association leaders met again, this time in Chicago during the annual meeting of the National Association. They revisited the issue of the merger and began to outline exactly how it would look and unfold. In notes from that meeting it was made clear that Southern Association meetings would always be held in cities and hotels where full recognition of members would be extended. The above requirements for membership were defined. All members would be eligible for offices and recognition. The notes conclude that the executive committee for the Southern Association responded favorably. From its inception, the American Association seemed to be working toward its own end; nevertheless, their efforts were

⁴⁶ William T. Haywood and Lynn Price McWhorter, Telephone Conversation, 2 June 1999.

⁴⁷ Welzenbach, *American Association*, 94.

rewarded when Clarence Scheps and William Haywood emerged as leaders in SACUBO. Their vision of SACUBO included black college and university business officers.

When asked what motivated him and Scheps to work for change, Haywood recalled a turning point in Scheps's career and formative moments in his own career. Clarence Scheps described to Haywood an official visit he made to Southern University in Baton Rouge in the early 1940s. The university president and his wife invited Scheps and his spouse to dinner. Scheps was "greatly embarrassed when their hosts stood silently, and they thought properly unobtrusively, in the dining room while their guests dined." "From that day on," Haywood recalled, "Clarence was determined to bring his black educator colleagues into his own milieu."⁴⁸ Scheps's views were given added weight because of his stature amongst his professional colleagues. He earned a Ph.D. in Economics 1943, served as SACUBO president 1959-60, and was instrumental in the creation of the National Association of College and University Business.⁴⁹

When asked about the genesis of his resistance to segregation, Haywood recalled an experience from 1951, when he served as the business officer for a junior college in Newton County, Mississippi. Because the rest of the administration was absent for the summer—teaching in North Carolina, working on another academic degree, or in a National Guard camp—Haywood was left in charge. During his watch, "one Roger Bell from Conehatta registered in the high school division." Haywood remembered that at 2am that night the school's president called from Chapel Hill, North Carolina, agitated by "long distance telephone protests from some racist trustees." "What do you mean," he

⁴⁸ E-mail, Haywood to McWhorter, June 21, 1999.

⁴⁹ "Biographical Data," Tuskegee University Archives and Museums, Box 2.

demanded, “letting that Indian register in school today?” “What Indian?” Haywood replied. “Roger Bell from Conehatta,” he said. After a brief conversation Haywood said, ‘If you want Roger Bell sent home you will have to come home from North Carolina and do it yourself. And if you do, bring a business manager with you because when I see your car coming in the campus drive I will leave.’ “The matter was never mentioned again,” Haywood remembered. (Roger Bell remained in school, became a class favorite, graduated, and became vice-chief of the Choctaw Indians of Neshoba County.) Haywood credited this vignette, his reading of *Black Like Me* by John Howard Griffin, and his evolving Christianity for his willingness to resist segregation.⁵⁰

Haywood was also a veteran of race battles on other fields and in other institutions. In the early 1960s, he was hired by the Ford Foundation to work with unaccredited schools for blacks.⁵¹ Laughing throughout his recollection, he recalled how John Pond was scheduled to visit Nashville during the times of the riots. “John was a Canadian and did not understand black people at all, was afraid to go to Nashville, so I went in his place, right in the middle of the riots!”⁵² Haywood also played a prominent role in the integration of Mercer University by Sam Oni, the first black student enrolled in the college’s 130-year history, and the first black student enrolled in any southern private liberal arts college.⁵³ Haywood, secretary of the University corporation worked closely with Rufus Carrollton Harris, then president of Mercer University and veteran of

⁵⁰ E-mail, Haywood to McWhorter, June 7, 1999.

⁵¹ William T. Haywood. Interview by author. 16 April 2003.

⁵² William T. Haywood. Interview by author. 16 April 2003.

⁵³ Will D. Campbell *The Stem Of Jesse: The Costs of Community at a 1960s Southern School* (Macon, Georgia: Mercer University Press, 1995) 1.

his own race battles at Tulane University. Indeed, Harris's presence at Mercer was the result of his failed attempt to integrate Tulane University. Haywood meticulously planned for the arrival of Sam Oni: suggesting the appointment of a committee "to anticipate any nonacademic problems that might arise and to suggest ways of dealing with those problems." Haywood was selected as chairman of the committee.⁵⁴ Perhaps even more importantly, Haywood took meticulous and copious notes of all meetings.

Though Scheps and Haywood were influential leaders among SACUBO, they did not work alone. On February 20, 1964, Ori E. Myers, chairman of the host committee for the 1964-65 SACUBO annual meeting, penned a letter to the secretary of the American Association. After announcing the time and place of the annual meeting, he wrote, "It is our hope that you will be able to meet with us on this important occasion. It is our thought that representation from other associations and organizations does much to improve such a conference." He concluded his letter with the hopeful suggestion that the program would be "both enjoyable to you and profitable for you."⁵⁵ Though records include only the one letter sent by Myers and received by O.L. Brandon of the American Association, that it was sent to the Secretary of the American Association seems to suggest an open invitation to all American Association members. The meeting was held in Dinkler Plaza Hotel, Atlanta, Georgia, April, 1964.⁵⁶ In 1966, SACUBO president W.

⁵⁴ Campbell, *The Stem of Jesse*, 40 & 83,

⁵⁵ Ori E. Myers, Jr. to O. L. Brandon, 20 February 1964. Tuskegee University Archives and Museums, AACUBO Holdings, Box 6.

⁵⁶ Proceedings, Southern Association, title page. On January 27, 1964, the city of Atlanta presented Dr. Martin Luther King Jr. with a congratulatory banquet, Atlanta's first biracial dinner. It was held at the Dinkler Plaza Hotel.

C. Freeman offered E. J. Junior, Jr., of Albany State College, a historically black college in Albany, Georgia, a seat on the SACUBO News Committee. Mr. Junior accepted.⁵⁷

So, in early 1965 when Harold K. Logan and Burnett A. Little contacted SACUBO leaders, they reached a sympathetic and supportive audience, an audience no longer willing to hold racial issues at arm's length, and an audience with considerable political power in their association and profession. Haywood remembered that the first thing the American Association leaders wanted to know was "how long will it be before our first man becomes president of SACUBO?"⁵⁸ That SACUBO leaders engaged in these kinds of discussions with black business officers suggests a paradigm shift at the top of SACUBO's hierarchy. One month later in April, at the 1965 annual business meeting, held in conjunction with the annual gathering, Secretary Scheps announced that the time had come to end the racial segregation of southern business officers' professional organizations. He spoke indirectly at first, saying

For a number of years, successive Executive Committees of this Association have had before them a rather serious and difficult problem that had to do with the admission of all qualified institutions in the South to membership in this Association.⁵⁹

Scheps then described SACUBO's past resistance to uniting the two organizations. The American Association, he said, requested permission to join in the early sixties, indicating "that it wished to go out of business, stating that it was a rather

⁵⁷ W. C. Freeman to E. J. Junior, Jr., 17 May 1966, Tuskegee University Archives and Museums, AACUBO Holdings, Box 2. http://ramscholar.openrepository.com/ramscholar/bitstream/10675.1/138/1/1963_1_1-75.pdf. I pulled up a copy of the 1963 Albany State College, The Ram, and on page 18 there is a photograph of Mr. Junior, clearly African American.

⁵⁸ Haywood. Interview by author. 16 April 2003. File in author's possession.

⁵⁹ SACUBO Proceedings, 1965, 136.

anomalous regional association which came into being for historic reasons.”⁶⁰ Alluding to SACUBO’s historic pattern of avoiding racial issues, Scheps reported that the “problem [of integrating SACUBO] was inevitable, and one that could be foreseen for many years.”⁶¹ Averting the issue once more, SACUBO appealed for more time, asking the “indulgence of the American Association for this subject to be studied a little more and perhaps confronted at a more timely occasion.”⁶²

Nevertheless, at the April 1965 meeting, Scheps announced that “the time is now.” A resolution drawn up in a special meeting called in January at Atlanta was read:

The officers and Executive Committee of the Southern Association of College and University Business Officers will present at the next annual meeting of the Association to be held in Durham, North Carolina on March 31, April 1st, 2nd, 1965, a proposal for admitting all qualified institutions to membership in the Association.

He reported further that while the resolution was unanimous, it was adopted by varying “degrees of acceptance.” Some, he said, adopted it on the “basis of inevitability” and some because “we just had to do it.”⁶³

The Executive Committee’s reasoning, Scheps reported, was in part defensive, in part positive. Some recognized if SACUBO members continued to resist, change would be forced by external pressures. Some potential speakers had refused invitations, Scheps said, “because we did not have policies of open membership.”⁶⁴ Pressure also would come from “the National Association who have difficulty in understanding why the

⁶⁰ SACUBO Proceedings, 1965, 136.

⁶¹ SACUBO Proceedings, 1965, 136.

⁶² SACUBO Proceedings, 1965, 136.

⁶³ SACUBO Proceedings, 1965, 137.

⁶⁴ SACUBO Proceedings, 1965, 137.

Southern Association will not admit all qualified institutions since their own regional associations have long since admitted all qualified institutions.” Positively, he suggested, “many of us felt that let’s not wait until we are forced into doing something that we ought to do voluntarily.”⁶⁵ One person, Porter Fortune of the University of Southern Mississippi, exemplified the resistance. “I’ll tell you what,” Fortune told Haywood, “We won’t vote against it [the merger], but we won’t vote for it.” When the Mississippi vote came, “they stood up, put their hands on their bottoms, and sat down.”⁶⁶ Though with some resistance, the move toward the merger continued.

In the 1965 executive committee Scheps moved that SACUBO would “effective immediately, interpret its constitution and bylaws, to mean that any qualified institution which meets the standards of the Association should be admitted to membership in the Southern Association.” President Callahan called for a vote from those attending the annual meeting and the motion carried. Scheps concluded that “regardless of the individual motives of these men [and women], it was a *unanimous* action [emphasis added].”⁶⁷ Though unanimous, the Proceedings probably do not reflect all resistance. Haywood identified at least one group who at this meeting sat on their hands in refusal to vote. Without the no vote, the vote is unanimous. One can argue that the crumbling resistance of white business officers simply reflected SACUBO’s stated and unstated purpose: improve college and university business practices and disregard social issues.

⁶⁵ SACUBO Proceedings, 1965, 137.

⁶⁶ Haywood. Interview by author. 16 April 2003. Notes in author’s files.

⁶⁷ SACUBO Proceedings, 1965, 137.

Hence, when its survival depended on integration, SACUBO members moved toward survival.

SACUBO members were not the only ones concerned about institutional survival. The 1967 *Proceedings* of the American Association, remarking on what was their final meeting, had the feel of a memorial service. For twenty-eight years black business officers allied with each other, assisted each other through their institutional financial crises, and filled their lives with memories forged on the altar of institutional, financial, and personal racism. And, many of those business officers had been at the inaugural meeting in 1939. For them, the final meeting was good news tempered by loss or maybe loss tempered by good news. So when that final meeting came, they quietly celebrated their achievements: improving business practices for their institutions, creating an association to meet the needs of a people left out of the larger society, and, finally, the movement into the mainstream business officer associations. Some business officers, however, grieved for all the same reasons. They would no longer meet to share common problems peculiar to black colleges and universities and their culture would blend with others, making it more difficult to connect with each other. Luther Foster, Jr., son of the American Association's first president, said it eloquently: "This organization, whose aims and work were so important, in the last two and a half decades, nearly three decades, sees now the larger possibility of its membership moving fully into the mainstream of professional groups in the United States, and has decided to disband--perhaps that is a word we have to be careful about. Sometimes it is merger. Sometimes it is

amalgamation. Sometimes it is disband. Sometimes it is liquidation. . . . it is the story of survival.”⁶⁸

The energy used to survive as an independent organization, and then to work toward dissolution and merger with SACUBO, enervated many black business leaders. The light at the end of the tunnel—the dissolution of the American Association and the movement of black business officers into SACUBO and other regional associations,—remained in sight long enough to inspire fatigue and mixed emotions. White business officers resistant to the merger complicated their grief and loss. Haywood remembered some black business officers also resisting integration.⁶⁹ R. B. Welch of the American Association wrote a letter to Scheps. He knew the ambivalence: “Favorable action towards the dissolution of the American Association as a formal organization . . . is a step that called for serious thinking. The membership’s concern was as expected, very great, but in keeping with the times the thinking was positive. Several points in reference to the steps toward dissolution will be discussed with you personally within the near future.”⁷⁰ Indeed, they needed encouragement as well. Whatever their personal feelings, by April 30, 1966, twenty-two member institutions filed for membership in the Southern Association.⁷¹

⁶⁸ “Proceedings of the Twenty-Eighth Annual Meeting of The American Association of College Business Officers, May 11-13, 1967,” Tuskegee University Archives and Museums, AACUBO Holdings, Box 7, 19.

⁶⁹ Haywood. Interview by author. 16 April 2003. Notes in author’s files.

⁷⁰ R. B. Welch to Clarence Scheps, 16 May 1966.

⁷¹ “Transcript of the Twenty-Seventh Annual Meeting of the American Association of College and University Business Officers,” Tuskegee University Archives and Museums, AACUBO Holdings, Box 7.

Evidence of strong feelings runs throughout the American Association's penultimate meeting in 1966. Frederick Douglass Patterson was one of those expressing strong feelings. Patterson, founder of the United Negro College Fund, president of Tuskegee Institute, and recipient of the Presidential Medal of Freedom in 1988, said "I'm glad for one thing and that is there seems now an abatement of the "magic wand" concept--the assumption that the Supreme Court Decision of May 17, 1954, wipes out segregation and immediately there would be a flood of equal opportunity available in the land. We now know, of course, that hasn't happened after all these years." As he spoke, he described how slow the process had been and argued that energies must be renewed. Then with the force of a minister, he said, "the question is, are we perpetuating segregation?"⁷²

The minutes of the executive session of the American Association in May 1966 reveal some members as less confident of the next move and grieving the loss of a community of black business officers. Would the American Association disband completely, or would it now exist functionally under the umbrella of SACUBO?⁷³ Others at the executive meeting spoke more directly to the issue. Harold K. Logan: "Well, I indicated, Gus, that I felt when we possibly become members of the Southern Association . . . that maybe at these meetings we could get together in an informal way with the discussion of some of the problems Doctor Patterson mentioned in his talk that may be in some way peculiar to our institutions." He was hesitant to fully commit to the

⁷² "Transcript of the Twenty-Seventh Annual Meeting of the American Association of College and University Business Officers," Tuskegee University Archives and Museums, AACUBO Holdings, Box 7.

⁷³ "Meeting of Executive Committee, May 6, 1966," Tuskegee University Archives and Museums, AACUBO Holdings, Box 7.

idea, though, “because in a way, we would be then perpetuating the things we are really fighting against.”⁷⁴ As if to convince himself, Logan detailed the problems with maintaining a segregated association. “We cannot expect the National Association of College and University Business Officers to continue to recognize us as a regional organization when we are a segregated group.” “We cannot expect to get speakers from the Federal government as a segregated group.”⁷⁵ One can almost hear Logan reminding himself of the benefits, even as he attempted to manage his losses.

Augustus L. “Gus” Palmer, Howard University business officer and a former member of the Tuskegee Airmen, was angry. He recalled the long relationship between American Association leaders and SACUBO leaders. Under them, our “very best friends, we had received all kinds of stalling tactics when we would talk about this thing.” “When invitations went out,” he said, “they seemed so embarrassed that there was still some elements, and I am told that it was the Alabama delegation, that still was not sold by people letting us come in as full-fledged members.”⁷⁶ Palmer recalled for his executive committee his participation in SACUBO’s 1966 annual meeting. “Certainly most of the people were more than anxious, in appearance anyway, to have the fellows meet their wives and things like this, in a social situation.” One can only wonder how he felt when on the next evening “even one of my former auditors on the next night at the banquet made a special effort to bring his wife over to introduce her to me.” He gave a

⁷⁴ “Meeting of Executive Committee, May 6, 1966,” Tuskegee University Archives and Museums, AACUBO Holdings, Box 7.

⁷⁵ “Meeting of Executive Committee, May 6, 1966,” Tuskegee University Archives and Museums, AACUBO Holdings, Box 7.

⁷⁶ “Meeting of Executive Committee, May 6, 1966,” Tuskegee University Archives and Museums, AACUBO Holdings, Box 7.

partial answer, “Why the concept which is common to the Southern part of the country, anyway, not that we are interested at all in their women, but seem to be more afraid of them in this kind of situation than we are.”⁷⁷

Even as the black business officers forged their way into SACUBO, work continued on the official resolution of dissolution. That work had begun as early as 1962. The resolution began by recalling that “the existing regional associations of college and university business officers would not receive into membership business officers serving Negro colleges unless the officers were of the white race.”⁷⁸ The resolution described the American Association’s growth and concluded that it had “carried out admirably the purposes for which it was formed.”⁷⁹ Finally, and perhaps most importantly, the next clause stated both fact and hope: “The bars to membership of Negroes heretofore existing in the regional association of college and university business officers have largely disappeared. The goal—‘a resolution recommending to the members of the Association that the organization be dissolved’—has been accomplished.”⁸⁰

By 1969 the number of members in SACUBO representing historically black colleges continued to grow, indicating at least some level of success in making the transition. Welzenbach concluded that the integration of SACUBO was “highly

⁷⁷ “Meeting of Executive Committee, May 6, 1966,” Tuskegee University Archives and Museums, AACUBO Holdings, Box 7.

⁷⁸ Proceedings of the Twenty-Eighth Annual Meeting of the American Association of College Business Officers, May 11-13, 1967, pp. 120-123. Tuskegee University Archives and Museums. AACUBO Holdings. Box 7.

⁷⁹ Proceedings of the Twenty-Eighth Annual Meeting of the American Association of College Business Officers, May 11-13, 1967, pp. 120-123. Tuskegee University Archives and Museums. AACUBO Holdings. Box 7.

⁸⁰ Proceedings of the Twenty-Eighth Annual Meeting of the American Association of College Business Officers, May 11-13, 1967, pp. 120-123. Tuskegee University Archives and Museums. AACUBO Holdings. Box 7.

successful,” reporting that “blacks participated fully in SACUBO activities.”⁸¹ Nevertheless, resistance lingered: Joe Barber, SACUBO archivist and former SACUBO president, recalled hearing a business officer at the 1968 annual convention saying because of integration he “was never coming back again to a SACUBO meeting.” “I really don’t think he ever did,” Barber remembered.⁸² In 1968, SACUBO members selected Harold K. Logan, an African American and the business officer of Tuskegee Institute, as one of their representatives to the National Association. Logan’s entry into the executive committee culminated with his elevation to president in 1975. Meanwhile, in 1972, Charles C. Teamer, business officer of Dillard University, was selected as a representative to the National Association. Nine years later Teamer rose through the ranks, serving as president in 1980. Other black business officers followed Logan and Teamer, maintaining a presence on the executive committee from the inaugural year in 1968 through the present. Robert D. Flanigan, Jr. of Spelman College rose through the ranks to president in 1990. In 1995, SACUBO members elected a black female, Marie V. McDemmond, business officer of Florida Atlantic University, to be president.

The merger must have been both frustrating and gratifying for African-American business officers. The twenty-eight years of applying group pressure was not rewarded until the balance of acceptance in southern culture tilted, making it difficult to discern if the merger was a moral victory or a pragmatic move to maintain the “delicate balance of the races.” The negotiations did mark, though, a pioneering alliance by two professional organizations as opposed to the integration of African-American students into a school

⁸¹ Welzenbach, *American Association*, 119.

⁸² Dictation of Joe H. Barber, Jr., to SACUBO President Marie V. McDemmond, January 22, 1996.

staffed by a white administration and faculty. The decision to dissolve the American Association was contingent upon acceptance of the agreement to merge by both organizations. The American Association requested that “no later than October 1, 1967, the Executive Committee advise all National and Regional professional organizations . . . as to the dissolution of the American Association of College and University Business Officers.”⁸³

The agreement of SACUBO and the American Association to merge reflected cooperation between the two executive committees. Motives and principles were mixed on both sides. On the practical side, SACUBO rid itself of an untenable and intolerable policy of racial exclusion. The American Association was able to participate in the larger community of college business officers. While SACUBO participated in the segregated culture of its day, its executive committee, and presumably some of its membership included business officers who willingly resisted popular opinion. Two of those officers—Haywood and Scheps—were present at the one-day meeting held in Dallas, Texas. And though not alone, they exercised considerable effect on the social and professional culture of college and university business officers. White and black business officers created change through persistence, persuasion, and protest. No, black business officers did not protest in the streets, but they did create a community of protest, worked toward a better day in the world of college business practices, and grieved their losses even as they celebrated their achievements.

Even as both groups moved toward a better version of themselves, they influenced others. If the national movement toward racial equality pulled SACUBO and

⁸³ Welzenbach, *American Association*, 120.

the American Association in its wake, then their merger pulled others along. Perhaps defensively, Haywood remembered, “Well, the business officers integrated their meetings before the presidents and deans, the presidents and deans meeting in the South being the annual meeting of the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools.”⁸⁴ Groups make a difference, but the enlightened or brave few, those leaders who push against the tide, can leaven a group and make it into something it was not. So on a Sunday in 1965, five men quietly made a difference.

At the final meeting of the American Association in 1967, Don Davis, a charter member, swelled with pride as he reflected on the difference his association had made:

I was with the Association when they had only a dozen members--what a pleasure to see how it has grown. What a beautiful job they have done preparing business officers for many of the colleges. Now that their work as an association is finished, I could not resist your invitation to be here at the end. What a pleasure it has been meeting with so many of my boys--all of them have grown and developed. It is difficult for me to tell you how proud I am. . . . I was with you at the beginning and voted to organize. Grant me the pleasure of casting my vote for your liquidation.⁸⁵

In the year 1984, seventeen years after Davis’s vote for liquidation, and nineteen years after that fateful Dallas meeting, the National Association of College and University Business Officers [NACUBO] named Burnett A. Little and Clarence Scheps as co-recipients of the NACUBO Distinguished Business Officer Award. Indeed, theirs was the inauguration of that particular award.⁸⁶ Though both surely earned it based

⁸⁴ Haywood. Interview by author. 16 April 2003. Notes in author’s files.

⁸⁵ “Proceedings of the Twenty-Eighth Annual Meeting of The American Association of College Business Officers, May 11-13, 1967,” Tuskegee University Archives and Museums, AACUBO Holdings, Box 7, p. 14.

⁸⁶ http://www.nacubo.org/institutional_effectiveness/leadership_awards/nacuo_awards

purely on their contributions to the world of college and university business, maybe their union represented a strength that exceeded their individual contributions.

B. A. Little's closing remarks at the 1967 meeting of the American Association, the last spoken words recorded in their Proceedings, sound almost like an afterthought: "It seems ironic that in our dissolving, we really become Americans, and the American Association in its dissolution really will be joining the rest of America."⁸⁷ The final written words recorded in the proceedings are: "Thus the American Association of College Business Officers brought to an end its transitional mission--bridging the gap between the hopes of an old era and the promise of a new."⁸⁸ With the merger complete SACUBO moved to the next stage in the modernization of the university by addressing "the great transformation of higher education."⁸⁹

⁸⁷ AACUBO Proceedings, May 11-13, 1967," Tuskegee University Archives and Museums, AACUBO Holdings, Box 7, 84.

⁸⁸ AACUBO Proceedings, May 11-13, 1967," Tuskegee University Archives and Museums, AACUBO Holdings, Box 7, 123.

⁸⁹ Clark Kerr, *The Great Transformation in Higher Education, 1960-1980* (Albany: State University of New York Press, 1991), xii.

Chapter Five

Reinventing SACUBO:

“Today there are types of business decisions that didn’t exist before.”

Clark Kerr collected several of his essays and speeches in *The Great Transformation in Higher Education, 1960 -1980*. In one essay, Kerr categorized the four major changes American universities faced: growth, shifting academic emphases, involvement in the life of society, and responding to the new federal government, what he called “the second great transformation higher education”⁹⁰ While higher education transformed itself in response to those four changes, SACUBO as an organization did what it had learned to do: band together with business officers across the country to help each other, continue the professionalization of their skills, and cooperate in the remaking of higher education as a business. Business officers aided in this second great transformation but in the process discovered they had in place the necessary practices to meet the challenges of the 1960s and 1970s. Instead of a great transformation, SACUBO entered a period of self-evaluation and self-reflection. With a national institution (NACUBO) solidly in place, leaders realized they needed to reexamine SACUBO’s reason for existence, how it served its members and how it related to other higher education organizations.⁹¹

Colleges and universities were changing. Kerr said it this way, “this will be the most unprecedented period of campus development in American history, or indeed in the

⁹⁰ Clark Kerr, *The Great Transformation in Higher Education, 1960-1980* (Albany: State University of New York Press, 1991), xii.

⁹¹ Proceedings, Southern Association of College and University Business Officers, April 26-27, 1971, 151.

history of the entire world.”⁹² Historians of colleges and universities put a finer point on the numbers. Henry H. Lesesne’s *A History of the University of South Carolina, 1940-2000* argues that World War II “unleashed” forces of change after 1960 and concluded that the 1960s “revolutionized the nation’s conception of what a university was.” One of most powerful agents of change in higher education in the period was the surge of baby boomers hitting college campuses. A student population of 3.5 million in 1960 ballooned to 12 million by 1980. And when old-timers visited their alma maters they scarcely recognized them.⁹³ Lesesne pointed to the swell of population on his campus as perfect example of the growth changes Kerr described: South Carolina passed “the 10,000-student threshold in 1966, and within six years the University’s enrollment doubled. A 1970 enrollment of 14,484 grew to 25,908 by 1979. . . . The University’s budget grew from \$37,063,556 (\$130,121,838) in 1970 to \$123,071,544 (\$203,536,594) in 1980, a nearly 56 percent increase in constant dollars.”⁹⁴ Using skills acquired during the massive influx of students during the post-World War II years, business officers managed the surge without major difficulties.

Not only did student populations explode geometrically, the reason for their entry into the university changed. In response to new social pressures for more scientists, engineers, and physicians, college and university students shifted their focus from liberal arts to science. The shift in academic concentration and society’s call for more scientists was so strong that the university became the “chief port of entry for these professions.”⁹⁵

⁹² Kerr, *The Great Transformation in Higher Education*, 114.

⁹³ Lesesne, *A History of the University of South Carolina*, 135.

⁹⁴ Lesesne, *A History of the University of South Carolina*, 211.

⁹⁵ Clark Kerr, *The Great Transformation in Higher Education*, 118.

This further blurred the lines between the university and society at large leading Kerr to suggest that “The university and segments of industry are becoming more alike.”⁹⁶ The professor ceased to exist in isolation but became an entrepreneur, a business person generating cash flow from outside the institution and tying his institution to industry. It fell to the business officer to manage these streams of money. And though Kerr doesn’t say it, the corollary is the heightened awareness of students to their university’s involvement with industry and government, some of which students did not like. And when students did not like it, they oftentimes protested. In an attempt to maintain order on campus, the federal government linked student aid to restraining student protest. Those protesting risked losing financial aid and it fell to the business officer to monitor the allocation of the aid given.

Though college and university business officers ably managed all these challenges, the fourth of Kerr’s identified threats required more attention: the role of federal government and its support of scientific research, or the federalization of higher education. If the growth in student population was geometric, the growth of federal funding was even more so. In 1960 the federal government awarded about \$1.5 billion to higher education, “a one hundredfold increase in twenty years.” One-third of the money went to “university affiliated research centers,” home to those new professor-entrepreneurs. One-third of the money went to “research within the university.” And the final one-third went to managing the ever expanding student population: “residence hall loans, scholarships, and teaching programs.”⁹⁷ When the proportion of federal funds

⁹⁶ Clark Kerr, *The Great Transformation in Higher Education*, 120.

⁹⁷ Clark Kerr, *The Great Transformation in Higher Education*, 123.

towered over tuition and local money, the university's control over its own destiny effectively shifted to the federal government. University budget-making practices dictated how tuition and fees, gifts and endowments, and state sources would be used. As federal research funds passed through other channels, anywhere from 20 to 50 to 80 percent of a university's expenditures might pass through someone else's hands before arriving in the business office. Sometimes these funds committed university money; for example, research funds" influenced the assignment of space; they determined the distribution of time between teaching and research; to a large extent they established the areas in which the university grew the fastest." Kerr correctly concludes, "Almost imperceptibly, the university is changed."⁹⁸ Universities needed funding, and college and university business officers were eager to accept the new funds. In the process, however, they aided the transition of the university's business and perhaps its mission too.

Universities celebrated the introduction of this funding. Tulane University "President Rufus Harris informed his Board of Administrators that Tulane University 'would be in a bad way' without the research funding provided by the Office of Naval Research, the Public Health Service, and the Veteran's Administration." Harris continued, "The way that most of the federal grants aid us was by allowing some of the funds to go for overhead and by allowing the investigators to spend a substantial portion of their time teaching." Clarence Scheps agreed: "He advised the Board that the university's operation was dependent 'to a very large degree' upon grants from the federal government and private foundations."⁹⁹ Scheps also calculated the portion of

⁹⁸ Clark Kerr, *The Great Transformation in Higher Education*, 123.

⁹⁹ Mohr, *Tulane: The Emergence of a Modern University, 1945-1980*, 12.

Tulane's budget derived from sponsored research in 1960 was twice as large as that provided by endowment income. Federal money went beyond research and made possible a construction program that by 1960 would result in the expenditure of some \$8,296,000 for seven new student residence halls. In his history of Tulane University, Clarence Mohr acknowledged the importance of the "low-interest federal loans," and concluded "the new dormitories were a visible sign of the university's shift from state and local to regional and national patterns of undergraduate recruiting."¹⁰⁰ Mohr also highlighted the increasing significance of fellowships for graduate study and low-interest undergraduate loans: "by the spring of 1960 the university had received \$276,000 in federal loan funds, matched by a 10 percent institutional contribution. To put the matter somewhat differently, the total value of student loans at Tulane was nearly 47 times larger in 1960 than it had been in 1956."¹⁰¹

While college administrators celebrated the gift of funding and institutional survival, business officers dealt with the attached strings to federal money. David Sansing in *Making Haste Slowly: The Troubled History of Higher Education in Mississippi*, gives the example of some of the conditions imposed on colleges by the 1964 Civil Rights Act. "While the board of trustees and university officials were schooling themselves in management . . . , they were also formulating a compliance plan to satisfy the desegregation requirements of the 1964 Civil Rights Act."¹⁰² Not only were institutions expected to desegregate the student body, but new rules also linked federal

¹⁰⁰ Mohr, *Tulane: The Emergence of a Modern University, 1945-1980*, 30.

¹⁰¹ Mohr, *Tulane: The Emergence of a Modern University, 1945-1980*, 32.

¹⁰² Sansing, *Making Haste Slowly*, 217.

money to universities adopting fair employment practices. And if those things were not complicated enough, the federal government required university administrators to police student behavior. These expectations—and the associated reporting requirements—directly affected the life of the business officer. In any one of these examples, federal money could be withheld if the university failed to comply with desegregation, fair employment practices, and policing student behavior were beyond the realm of the business officer’s control. Nevertheless, SACUBO sought to understand, manage, and train member institutions in how to adapt to the new conditions. The 1970 meeting of the organization featured a presentation by Charles Moore, senior officer for the Higher Education Facilities Program in the United States Office of Education, who described the “policing” function added to the business officer’s workload: “If you have students participating in campus unrest and if they are found guilty and they have not been dealt with accordingly, then under this provision, we may withhold the approval of the use of funds approved under the supplemental 1969 appropriation.”¹⁰³ SACUBO also invited Hugh Brimm, chief of the Contract Compliance Branch of the United States Department of Health, Education and Welfare, to the 1970 annual convention to discuss recently strengthened federal requirements to provide equal employment opportunities and to practice affirmative action in hiring in response to the growing enmeshment of the SACUBO member institutions with federal funding. After giving a brief history of Executive Order 11246, Brimm recalled its genesis under President Roosevelt and how the order grew as each succeeding president attempted to deal with “fair employment” until on September 28, 1965, President Lyndon Johnson signed it. Section 202 of the

¹⁰³ Proceedings, 1970, 118.

Executive Order states: “All Government contracting agencies shall include in every Government contract hereafter entered into the following provisions: (1) The contractor will not discriminate against any employee or applicant because of race, color, or national origin.” Brimm concluded that the “essence of Executive Order 11246 is that in your employment practices, and this includes access to employment, treatment during upgrading, downgrading, and dismissal from employment, termination, by whatever method, that a person may not be treated on the basis of his race, his religion, his color, his national origin or his sex.”¹⁰⁴ The last provision--the avoidance of sex discrimination--became “our area of responsibility in 1968 by a separate Executive Order.”¹⁰⁵ Brimm added that until then the matter of nondiscrimination had been of a passive nature: “one simply agreed not to discriminate.”¹⁰⁶ The definition expanded with this executive order, moving from a simple prohibition to assuming the responsibility for taking “affirmative action,” assuring that employees were not discriminated against, and that “they were treated in all of their relationships as employees on the basis of their ability and without regard to race and the other criteria.”¹⁰⁷

Whatever the impact of the growing list of regulations and the need for accurate reporting on the business officer, colleges and universities grew increasingly dependent on Federal money. In their 1969 annual meeting—coincidentally held in Washington, D. C. that year—SACUBO leaders responded to a reduction in funding of Federal student

¹⁰⁴ Proceedings, 1970, 102ff.

¹⁰⁵ Proceedings, 1970, 103.

¹⁰⁶ Proceedings, 1970, 103.

¹⁰⁷ Proceedings, 1970, 103.

aid programs by encouraging Congress to consider maintaining current levels of funding for financial aid to needy and deserving students. They even called for increased funding “to more nearly approximate the amounts requested.”¹⁰⁸ Richard T. Sonnergren, representative of President Nixon’s administration and member of the Bureau of Higher Education, said some of the “programs of the 1960s seem to have accomplished the task for which they were intended; others have been identified as not being particularly effective.”¹⁰⁹ Even with an adjustment in the Federal role, he suggested more money was available to students and that for the “first time no qualified student seeking post-secondary education would be barred from attaining it by lack of funds.”¹¹⁰ No matter how much money made its way to their institutions, Hugh Brimm, Richard T. Sonnergren, and others reminded SACUBO members that their institutions had full responsibility for administering the growing number of college-based Federal student aid programs--National Defense, College Work Study, and Educational Opportunity Grants. SACUBO did not just work to train member institutions on the new requirements that came with Federal funds; they also cooperated with other regional associations to provide representation at the national level lobbying for universities. Even as the SACUBO annual proceedings began to include more references to nationwide problems and Federal government solutions, SACUBO joined with other regional associations to create the Committee on Governmental Relations.

¹⁰⁸ Proceedings, Southern Association of College and University Business Officers, Forty-First Annual Meeting, April 13-15, 1969, 146.

¹⁰⁹ Proceedings, Southern Association of College and University Business Officers, Forty-Fifth Annual Meeting, April 29-May 1, 1973, 92.

¹¹⁰ Proceedings, Southern Association, 92.

All of these changes identified by Kerr—growth in the student populations, a shift in academic focus to science and its corollary links to society and industry, the federalization of higher education with its accompanying strings attached—led to the growth of the business office as well as a period of reflection, reevaluation and reassessment for the place of the business office in general and the role of the business officer in particular. In the 1960s, Robert Wert, president of Mills College in Oakland, California, asked Clarence Scheps about the role and responsibilities of the college and university business officer: “Where do business officers come from?” The question was prompted by his realization that “today there are types of business decisions that didn’t exist before. Clarence, do you see a new breed of business manager, who comes not from a local bank, but who is formally trained for the specific job of college and university business officer?” Some forty years after creation of SACUBO, Clarence Scheps had a chance to assess the evolution of the position and make some predictions on its future. The question, Scheps said, is akin to “Where does a college president come from?” He continued, “You don’t train college presidents by giving them a four-year course in being a college president.” College presidents and college business officers generally emerge from the world of academics and have experience in some phase of university life. Apart from a familiarity with campus life these administrators usually possess the personality characteristics required for a good administrator. Scheps continued, college and university business officers oftentimes major in business administration with the occasional “topflight men who were English majors and taught English in college.” And though there are formal courses in how to be a business officer, “I don’t think we are ever going to train many people specifically to become college

business officers.”¹¹¹ Though Scheps did not foresee four-year college programs to train people specifically to become college business officers, he remained adamant about the importance of professional development. Scheps addressed the issue in a 1961 speech, “Then what are we going to do to solve the educational problems of today and tomorrow? There are many things which the educational institutions themselves can and should do. They must manage their funds more efficiently than they did in the past.”¹¹² Scheps understood that business officers in the 1960s faced “business decisions that didn’t exist before” and thus the means of training them also needed to evolve.

The educational needs of the business officer changed as the gap grew between the generalist on one end—the business officer of the smaller and usually more traditional college—and the specialist on the other end—the business officer at the new and larger research university. The generalist continued to address issues from housing to meal delivery to federal money while the growth in business responsibilities of larger universities led to growth in staffing and administration costs. Larger universities divided the responsibilities between a vice-president for finance and a vice-president for administration and shifted responsibility for campus planning from the business officer to specialists in institutional research and facilities planners who were not organizationally part of the business officer’s domain. These planners formally united as the Society for

¹¹¹ Harvey T. Stephens, Robert J. Wert, Clarence Scheps, and John J. Wittich, “Conversations” Series 114, Box 9, Real Estate-Scheps, SACUBO-General, 1972-74. Though there is no date assigned to this “conversation” between Harvey T. Stephens, President, ARA-Slater School and College Services; Robert Werts, President of Mills College in Oakland, CA; John J. Wittich executive director of the College Student Personnel Institute in Claremont, CA; and Clarence Scheps, Executive Vice President of Tulane University seems to date in the late 1960s and early 1970s when Stephens and Scheps were heavily involved in academic life.

¹¹² Clarence Scheps, Tulane University, University Archives Special Collections Howard-Tilton Memorial Library, 1961, Box 6, Folder Speeches 36-56, 1961-1964, Series 1 Clarence Scheps .

College and University Planning. Other auxiliary enterprises were detached from the business office. Oftentimes, the dean of students assumed “housing operations, food service operations, bookstore operations and other types of auxiliary enterprise units.” As the specialists assumed responsibilities for their narrow field, they created separate associations to focus on their particular needs.¹¹³ These variations presented a problem to SACUBO leaders as they worked to address the needs of business officers in large and small universities.

The needs of the generalist were obvious to the business officers in the Committee on Governmental Relations: “The business officer of a relatively small college with only a few staff members must become quite frustrated for having direct responsibility for personnel, physical plant, housing, food service, bookstore, et cetera.”¹¹⁴ Performing well as a generalist meant keeping abreast of current trends and practices in what were rapidly becoming many fields. To do that, the business officer would be required to join and attend several separate professional associations. Business officers on the committee recognized the impossibility of a business officer participating in all of the needed associations. So the business officers on the committee proposed that higher education business-related officials report to NACUBO and regional meetings of the business officers on the fragmentation of responsibilities on one hand and the concerns of the small college business officer on the other hand. The report, they hoped, would function as a monitoring tool, gauging the further loss of authority.¹¹⁵ The

¹¹³ Proceedings, 1969, 148.

¹¹⁴ Proceedings, 1969, 149.

¹¹⁵ Proceedings, 1969, 149.

committee concluded: “if we as an Association do not develop comprehensive principles of accounting, et cetera, we may expect to lose the privilege to various regulatory bodies.”¹¹⁶

The transforming trends in higher education, Scheps’s reflections on the role of the business officer, and the reevaluation of the place on campus of the business officer all prompted SACUBO’s First Vice-President Jesse Morgan to suggest a self-study at SACUBO’s 1970 meeting.¹¹⁷ Believing there have been too many workshops, he wanted to review SACUBO objectives with the hopes of eliminating overlapping services between the Southern and National Association. He also wanted to study the effect of NACUBO’s annual meeting on the role of SACUBO’s annual meeting. .”¹¹⁸ So the next year, 1971, SACUBO president Harold Read presented a resolution reflecting the views of Morgan and the executive committee, a call to reassess SACUBO’s reason for existence, how it serves its members and how it relates to other higher education organizations.¹¹⁹ At SACUBO’s forty-third annual meeting in Austin, Texas, President Read initiated a self-study process for SACUBO. His arguments for conducting the inventory acknowledged the impact of change and recognized that the role of the National Association redefined the role of the Southern Association. Read outlined five specific areas for evaluation in the study: the need for a regional identity; SACUBO’s organizational structure in relation to its activities; the timing and content of the annual

¹¹⁶ Proceedings, 1969, 150.

¹¹⁷ “Minutes,” SACUBO Executive Committee, 30 August 1970. Original in SACUBO Archives.

¹¹⁸ “Minutes,” SACUBO Executive Committee, 10 January 1971. Original in SACUBO Archives.

¹¹⁹ Proceedings, Southern Association of College and University Business Officers, April 26-27, 1971, 151.

convention and workshops; dues, finances and budget; and communication methodologies and techniques.¹²⁰ Read also expressed a basic tenet of the self-study: “It is further proposed in no sense is it to be inferred that SACUBO be abandoned.”¹²¹ He continued, calling for a review of SACUBO’s functions and activities so that its efforts would supplement and not duplicate those of the National in its service to our members. In conclusion, Read observed this “is the most important thing that our Executive Committee has done to date.”¹²²

Read’s nurturing of Morgan’s suggestion launched an eighteen-month study, including some twenty meetings of five subcommittees and consisting of forty business officers from SACUBO member institutions. An inter-committee structure was created to facilitate communication, enabling the leaders to monitor progress. At the 1972 annual convention, an interim report was presented, with the subcommittee chairs soliciting questions and facilitating discussion. In November, 1972, the final report was constructed and prepared for presentation at the 1973 annual convention.¹²³ Heeding Read’s suggestion, the report followed the organization of SACUBO’s basic charter and the findings of the sub-committee that considered each of its five components: goals and objectives; officers and committees; meetings, programs, and workshops; finances, dues, and budget; and communications with members.¹²⁴ Clarence Scheps from Tulane

¹²⁰ Proceedings, April 26-27, 1971, 151.

¹²¹ Proceedings, April 26-27, 1971, 151-152.

¹²² Proceedings, April 26-27, 1971, 151-152.

¹²³ Proceedings, 1973, 154.

¹²⁴ *Self-Study Report of the Southern Association of College and University Business Officers*, presented at the Business Meeting of the 1973 Annual Convention, May 1-2, 1973, 4.

University and Russell E. White of the University of Tennessee at Chattanooga co-chaired the “Objectives of SACUBO” subcommittee. Representing the committee, Scheps and White encouraged the membership to “recognize unequivocally the new role of the regionals in the light of the emergence of a strong, active National Association.” Calling for reciprocity in the relationship, the committee reported that “it is imperative for the National Association also to recognize the realities of the situation.”¹²⁵

Scheps and White elaborated on the changes by remembering the recent birth of NACUBO. Prior to 1960, when the National Association was formed, the regional association clearly held “paramount role in the development of the profession” because it was the only professional association available.¹²⁶ The advent of a strong national association, however, brought into question the on-going role of the regional associations. Scheps and White concluded that “it is to the National Association that the business officers look for leadership in communication, publication, institutes, workshops, and professional development.”¹²⁷ Making the point even clearer, they called for a subordinate and complementary role for the regional associations, giving prominence to the National Association.”¹²⁸ Reflecting on his strong desire for a national association, Scheps acknowledged some did not want it: “I was a crusader for a long time. I started speaking out for a national association when I got into the business in the 1940s. There

¹²⁵ *Self-Study Report of the Southern Association*, 6-7.

¹²⁶ *Self-Study Report of the Southern Association*, 7

¹²⁷ *Self-Study Report of the Southern Association*, 7.

¹²⁸ *Self-Study Report of the Southern Association*, 7.

was an unsympathetic response.”¹²⁹ Nevertheless, Scheps wrote to Fred Vorsanger years later to say, “You asked me what I would do if I could do it over again what I did in helping NACUBO get started. The only thing I would do differently would be that I would have redoubled my efforts to have achieved a strong national association years before it actually came into effect.”¹³⁰ But Scheps never intended the obsolescence of the regional associations. The subcommittee declared them valuable for providing a vehicle by which business officers in a limited geographical area could meet and build collegial relationship that could be drawn upon for advice and assistance.¹³¹ Further explaining this changed status for the regional associations, Scheps and White observed, “The problems of higher education are not regional but are national in scope.” Thus the capacities of the regional associations were maximized in strengthening, supporting, and serving as a “complementary association to NACUBO.”¹³² The sub-committee’s report concluded by proposing three amendments to SACUBO’s goals and objectives:

1. To provide a mechanism for the interchange of ideas, systems, and fellowship between the colleges and universities located in the southern region.
2. To provide support and strength to the programs and objectives of NACUBO.
3. To assist in obtaining manpower and participants for sponsored programs of interest and benefit to its members.¹³³

¹²⁹ “NACUBO 25th Anniversary: June 23, 1962—An Association is Born.” Box 7, Folder SACUBO General, Series 114.

¹³⁰ Clarence Scheps to Fred Vorsanger, August 29, 1983, Box 7, Folder SACUBO General, Series 114.

¹³¹ *Self-Study Report of the Southern Association*, 7.

¹³² *Self-Study Report of the Southern Association*, 7.

¹³³ *Self-Study Report of the Southern Association of College and University Business Officers*, presented at the Business Meeting of the 1973 Annual Convention, May 1-2, 1973, 9.

The changes were incorporated into the constitution of the organization in 1974.¹³⁴

The formation of a closer relationship with the National Association potentially changed SACUBO membership requirements and questions about membership eligibility appeared in the deliberations of all of the subcommittees. The subcommittee on “Officers and Committees” answered “no” to the question, “Should the Southern Association require membership in NACUBO as a condition of membership in SACUBO?”¹³⁵ It urged all SACUBO members to join NACUBO, however, in order to receive the benefits that are available only from the national organization. The subcommittee on “Finances, Dues, and Budget,” agreed, but supported those who would join only SACUBO without belonging to NACUBO. The steering committee also agreed and noticed that the other regions differed in their approaches (the Eastern and Western associations required membership and the Central Association did not).¹³⁶ No changes were adopted.

Lee A. Barclay from the University of Montevallo chaired the “Finances, Dues, and Budget” subcommittee. The dues level was considered adequate and no change was recommended. How dues were to be collected, however, was amended. The subcommittee recommended the National Association collect all SACUBO dues and deliver them to SACUBO’s treasurer. To facilitate this process, it was recommended that SACUBO’s fiscal year coincide with NACUBO’s. Shifting dues collection to the National Association illustrated the difference of capacities between a volunteer-staffed

¹³⁴ Proceedings, Southern Association of College and University Business Officers, April 21-23, 1974, 165.

¹³⁵ *Self-Study Report*, 10.

¹³⁶ *Self-Study Report*, 10.

regional association and the professionally staffed national association. “The transfer of dues collection,” they reported, “simply is a matter of shifting to the paid National staff the mechanical functions of maintaining membership and mailing lists.”¹³⁷ The Southern Association was not alone in handing off dues collection to the National Association. The Eastern Association granted NACUBO the power to collect dues in 1970. SACUBO leaders initially rejected an “offer on behalf of NACUBO to handle billings for memberships” in 1971, but assented to it as a result of the self-study.

James Frye of the University of Maryland chaired the “Officers and Committees” subcommittee. With NACUBO assuming responsibility for dues collection, the subcommittee considered merging the positions of secretary and treasurer. However, no change was recommended because, it was reasoned, lowering the number of officers would decrease the vitality of the organization. Indeed, the subcommittee recommended increasing the number of executive committee members by two, four, or even six additional members to facilitate balancing representation among all institutions.¹³⁸

Paul Nestor of the University of Kentucky chaired the subcommittee on “Meetings, Programs, and Workshops.” He suggested “a single annual SACUBO meeting to be held between November 1 and February 1.” Nestor also recommended that “the first vice president assume responsibility for the program of the annual meeting and the third vice president assume responsibility for “meetings that are related specifically to regional interests.” Continued support was also encouraged for the College Business

¹³⁷ *Self-Study Report*, 12.

¹³⁸ *Self-Study Report*, 14-15.

Management Institute at the University of Kentucky.¹³⁹

J. W. Wood of Millsaps College chaired the subcommittee on communication with members which recommended publication of the annual proceedings and a newsletter and urged support of NACUBO's publications. The sub-committee concluded that the "recommendations flowing from such explorations returned to the opportunities for coordination between SACUBO and NACUBO."¹⁴⁰

Although the bulk of the self-study recommendations were adopted, some became controversial and short-lived. Moving the annual meeting into the winter months was unpopular and unsuccessful. The vote of support for continued publication of the annual Proceedings crumbled under the weight of stenography and publication costs.

Assignment of responsibility for the regional workshops was subsequently modified by Joe H. Barber, Jr., SACUBO secretary in 1980-1981. He suggested that the third vice-president have a year to prepare for the role, and then assume responsibility for the regional workshops as second vice president. This worked well, he reported, for several years.¹⁴¹

The self-study and the actions following it were of critical importance in assuring the continuation of SACUBO and shaping a new conception of its role vis-à-vis a growing and successful National Association. The results affirmed the words of the report's writers, that is, the study was "an act of strength by an organization that was sound financially, that was growing in membership, and that was showing in every way

¹³⁹ *Self-Study Report*, 18-20.

¹⁴⁰ *Self-Study Report*, 23.

¹⁴¹ Joe H. Barber, Jr., Dictation, January 22, 1996.

its health and vitality.”¹⁴² The 1973 self-study reflected these influences and led to further expansion of SACUBO’s purpose, a supportive role NACUBO and to be “a mechanism for the interchange of ideas and systems between colleges and universities located in the southern region.”¹⁴³ In many ways the self-study led SACUBO back to where it began, “to meet periodically for the purpose of discussing business problems.” But just as SACUBO evolved from their first beginning in 1928, forty-plus years later SACUBO would evolve again. With the National Association solidly in place by 1973, SACUBO slowly but surely began to develop the infrastructure for professional development. In approximately ten years SACUBO leaders ratcheted up the number of professional development opportunities, placing them at the center of their new beginning. First, SACUBO leaders emphasized existing offerings: the Fall workshop in Memphis, the annual meeting, the Kentucky Institute, and the College Business Management Institute [CBMI].¹⁴⁴ Wayne Powers of Jackson State Community College was pleased with the number of offerings and was particularly pleased that programs addressed the needs of two-year colleges. After all, he said, “they are now playing a role in decision making matters.”¹⁴⁵

In 1983, Smith introduced the idea for workshops across the regions. He suggested SACUBO members identify college and university campuses located in “hub”

¹⁴² *Self-Study Report*, 2.

¹⁴³ Proceedings, 1974, 165.

¹⁴⁴ Executive Committee Minutes, 19 February 1980. Original in SACUBO Archives.

¹⁴⁵ Wayne R. Power to Philip Goree, 22 April 1983. Original in SACUBO Archives.

cities to house “on the road” workshops.¹⁴⁶ These “on the road” workshops would make professional development accessible and affordable for all business officers in the southern region. Smith suggested beginning with basic fund-accounting and identifying other areas of focus later.¹⁴⁷ Smith’s approach to professional development attracted the attention of NACUBO officers. They selected Smith as chairman of NACUBO’s Professional Development Committee and the NACUBO Board of Directors’ committee responsible for professional development and publications.¹⁴⁸

Joe Barber, SACUBO president in 1984-1985, supported the expanded offerings by suggesting the professional development committee assume overall responsibility for planning workshops, institutes, the annual convention program, and coordinate its activities with the professional development committee in the National Association.¹⁴⁹ In October 1984 C. Joseph Carter of Western Carolina University and Barber refined the changes, further highlighting the growing prominence of professional development and asserting that professional development merited “number one priority” among the organization’s goals.¹⁵⁰ SACUBO’s bylaws were amended, incorporating their suggestions and highlighting the role of professional development as the “central theme for workshops and meetings.”¹⁵¹

¹⁴⁶ Executive Committee Minutes, 30 October 1983. Original in SACUBO Archives.

¹⁴⁷ C. Joseph Carter, ed., *SACUBO Ledger*, December 1983, 3.

¹⁴⁸ C. Joseph Carter, ed., *SACUBO Ledger*, June 1985, 1.

¹⁴⁹ Joe H. Barber, Jr. to Members of the Executive Committee, 28 June 1984. Original in SACUBO Archives.

¹⁵⁰ Executive Committee Minutes, 28 October 1984.

¹⁵¹ C. Joseph Carter, ed., *SACUBO Ledger*, December 1984, 4.

Flush with the support of SACUBO members and their leaders, the Professional Development Committee developed and coordinated “a network of cluster colleges in the fourteen state southern regions.”¹⁵² Its label of “Cluster Workshop” referred to the professional development programs held on member campuses for the cluster of colleges and universities located in the same area.¹⁵³ They proposed activities for those colleges and universities unable to participate in other SACUBO multiday events. Again, SACUBO hoped that the result of these workshops would strengthen ties between two-year and four-year colleges.¹⁵⁴ The December, 1985, issue of the *SACUBO Ledger* announced the successful launching of the new program. In October of that same year, SACUBO’s Executive Committee had approved the establishment of thirty-one cluster locations. The chairman of the two-year college committee, Jeff Marsee, stated that the response “to the concept has been extremely positive.”¹⁵⁵ He predicted that these “grass root” programs will strengthen the “region-wide professional development efforts of the Association,” confirming SACUBO’s hopes.¹⁵⁶ Just three months later, the March, 1986 *SACUBO Ledger* announced that the cluster workshops had “taken off.”¹⁵⁷

The “Cluster 18 Workshop” held in Jacksonville, Florida, illustrated the success of the new program. Eighty-four business officers attended the workshop, gave

¹⁵² Report of the SACUBO Professional Development Committee’s Subcommittee on Cluster Workshops, 3 March 1985. Original in SACUBO Archives.

¹⁵³ C. Joseph Carter, ed., *SACUBO Ledger*, December 1985, 3.

¹⁵⁴ Report of the SACUBO Professional Development Committee’s Subcommittee on Cluster Workshops, 3 March 1985. Original in SACUBO Archives.

¹⁵⁵ C. Joseph Carter, ed., *SACUBO Ledger*, December 1985, 3.

¹⁵⁶ C. Joseph Carter, ed., *SACUBO Ledger*, December 1985, 3.

¹⁵⁷ C. Joseph Carter, ed., *SACUBO Ledger*, March 1986, 3.

encouraging reviews and prompted the planning of another one for the following year.¹⁵⁸ In 1988, SACUBO President Wayne Powers articulated the Association's evolving purpose: "Professional development is the key. As we move into the latter years of the decade of the eighties, I think that each of us should have professional development as part of our objectives."¹⁵⁹ Indeed, he continued, the success of professional development activities resulted because of an "attitude developing among our membership that accepts the fact that only through professional growth will our profession succeed in staying at the forefront of higher education management."¹⁶⁰

Meanwhile, existing training institutions flourished. In 1985, SACUBO past President George Ruschell reported an attendance of 574 at the most recent College Business Management Institute which stretched the capacity of available classrooms.¹⁶¹ In 1997, the Institute housed 763 participants from 289 colleges and universities, forty-six states and two countries.¹⁶² The next year the Institute included business officers from 320 institutions, thirty-seven states, the District of Columbia, and two from South Africa.¹⁶³ Joe Barber, serving as SACUBO archivist and historian looked at attendance reports for another of SACUBO's training programs, the Memphis Workshop. He counted a fifty percent plus increase in attendance in just fifteen years, 1977 to 1992.¹⁶⁴

¹⁵⁸ Lauren J. Brisky, ed., *SACUBO Ledger*, Fall 1987, 6.

¹⁵⁹ *SACUBO Ledger*, Summer 1988, 2.

¹⁶⁰ *SACUBO Ledger*, Summer 1988, 2.

¹⁶¹ Executive Committee Minutes, 21 April 1985. Original in SACUBO Archives.

¹⁶² Charles M. Peccolo, ed., *SACUBO Ledger*, Fall 1997, 4.

¹⁶³ Charles M. Peccolo, ed., *SACUBO Ledger*, Fall 1998, 18.

¹⁶⁴ Calvin G. Lyons, ed., *SACUBO Ledger*, Winter 1992, 17.

With the growth of the programs and the increasing enrollments, the need for funds to support offerings grew. Some members suggested accepting the support of vendor companies, offering them a chance to contribute financially to the annual convention. Though this idea met with favor among the larger membership, at least two members vigorously protested. William T. Haywood wrote:

I feel constrained to express my deep felt reservations about what I believe to be the developing commercialization of annual meeting program events. I refer specifically to scheduled program events like the Sunday evening social hour sponsored by ARA Services, and the annual banquet, wine courtesy of the Energy Resource Management Company. No business officer should be naïve enough to think that the entire cost of annual meeting programs could not be arranged through vendor competition. My own points of view include serious debates in the 50's and 60's of whether to require host hotel commitments to exclude vendors from even being housed in the hotel during the annual convention. I have serious ethical problems with recent developments along these lines and I request that you and the Board and the Program Chairman for next year seriously reconsider this question. I might say that Clarence Scheps shares my concerns.¹⁶⁵

Other SACUBO voices viewed alliances with vendor representatives as offering both financial and professional development benefits for SACUBO. Reporting for the Professional Development Committee, Gene Smith strongly recommended that “SACUBO adopt vendor exhibits as part of future annual meetings.”¹⁶⁶ Others joined in the work of facilitating this new arrangement, developing contacts, establishing a three-member committee to work with participating vendors, suggesting that vendors be invited to seek affiliate membership, and giving the Vendor Committee the authority to accept or

¹⁶⁵ William T. Haywood to George J. Ruschell, 21 April 1983. Original in SACUBO Archives. Curiously, I began this chapter with an excerpt from *Conversations*, a glossy presentation published by ARA-Slater School & College Services which would become ARAMARK in 1994. The budget for the 2009 meeting was \$380,056 which was declared a bit down due to decline in registrations and exhibits. The proposed 2010 budget was \$406,215.

¹⁶⁶ Executive Committee Minutes, 30 October 1983. Original in SACUBO Archives.

reject applicants.¹⁶⁷ Joe Barber, program chairman for the 1984 annual convention, received unanimous approval of the Executive Committee to include vendors at the annual meeting.¹⁶⁸

The March, 1984, *SACUBO Ledger* announced that “vendor exhibits will be a new feature of the SACUBO annual meeting when the Association convenes in Atlanta next month.”¹⁶⁹ Acting for the executive committee, Third Vice President Bill Prather of Amarillo College arranged for up to twelve vendors to exhibit at the Atlanta meeting. He described the first-time effort as a pilot venture that might lead to further vendor representation at future annual meetings.¹⁷⁰ Barber wrote to Robert Goudie, second vice president of the Eastern Association, giving a report of SACUBO’s first experience with vendor support. Financially SACUBO’s cost versus expenses were about even, he said, depending on the method of calculation. Though it required an enormous amount of effort, SACUBO agreed to continue the relationship. Prather accepted the invitation to manage the details, hoping to learn from experience.¹⁷¹

In January, 1996, Barber reflected on his participation in the introduction of vendors to the annual meetings. “It may be debatable,” he said, “as to whether it has lowered the status or not, but it definitely changed the annual meeting.”¹⁷² He observed

¹⁶⁷ C. Joseph Carter, ed., *SACUBO Ledger*, March 1984, 3.

¹⁶⁸ Professional Development Committee Minutes, 30 October 1983. Original in SACUBO Archives.

¹⁶⁹ *SACUBO Ledger*, March 1984, 3.

¹⁷⁰ *Ibid.*

¹⁷¹ Joe H. Barber, Jr. to Robert L. Goudie, 16 August 1984. Original in SACUBO Archives.

¹⁷² Dictation by Joe H. Barber, Jr. to Marie V. McDemmond, 22 January 1996. Original in

that income generated by vendor companies expanded the annual program, increased fee money available for speakers, and created a budget wherein more guests could be invited to social occasions. He recalled an example, “when we had the executive committee we called it, dinner on Saturday night prior to the Biloxi meeting in which I was president, I was a little cautious to invite some three or four personal guests . . . for fear that the budget would not accommodate it. Now, it’s funded by one of our sponsors and involves about 100 people every year.”¹⁷³ SACUBO certainly commercialized their annual meetings, transforming them from intimate gatherings to celebrations with live celebrity bands, free telephone service, open bars, and banquets with seemingly endless buffets. Though participation levels were high, the evolution from a few business officers meeting “to discuss our college and business problems” into a meeting with thousands entertained by live bands commanding fees of over twenty thousand dollars seems as large as the gap between the Pleistocene to the present.

From its beginning SACUBO also strived to reach those unable to attend the annual meetings. The annual meetings and teaching institutes were key bricks in SACUBO’s education efforts but SACUBO leaders also published reports of all the workshops presented at their annual meetings and sent them to all member institutions. From 1928 through 1936, SACUBO published the *Minutes*, the verbatim reports of the annual convention. Beginning in 1937 and continuing through 1974, the verbatim reports of the annual convention were published as the *Proceedings*. In 1973, the executive committee minutes reported the continued publishing of the verbatim reports of the

SACUBO Archives.

¹⁷³ *Ibid.*

annual meetings, awarding the contract to the lowest bidder with one copy mailed to each member institution.¹⁷⁴ In 1974, however, the minutes recorded a rapid increase in publication costs, \$4,000 for printing, \$1,500 for a steno-typist, with added mailing costs.¹⁷⁵ Seven months later SACUBO Secretary Fred S. Vorsanger of the University of Arkansas reported that publication costs had become “unmanageable and suggested that speeches at the annual meeting be duplicated and sent to the membership immediately following the meeting and that a roster or association yearbook be published instead” of the verbatim proceedings.¹⁷⁶ Instead of compiling a paperback book of the annual meeting, a book which included the entire slate of events, individual papers would be mailed to members. The Executive Committee endorsed his suggestion. The issue of publication costs arose again in the next year, October, 1975. Vorsanger reported that the cost of duplicating of presentations equaled the cost of publishing the Proceedings and also reported that the task of mailing these presentations had become a “horrendous job.”¹⁷⁷ Executive Committee members decided to reproduce the speeches and papers for the 1976 annual meeting on demand only, advising the incoming secretary to mention this in a newsletter so that members wanting copies of speeches would know to ask.¹⁷⁸ Assuming the position of secretary in 1976, Barber assembled the second issue of the SACUBO Yearbook and announced that a “newsletter will also be published in

¹⁷⁴ Executive Committee Minutes, 23 September 1973. Original in SACUBO Archives.

¹⁷⁵ Executive Committee Minutes, 8 September 1974. Original in SACUBO Archives.

¹⁷⁶ Executive Committee Minutes, 6 April 1975. Original in SACUBO Archives.

¹⁷⁷ Executive Committee Minutes, 26 October 1975. Original in SACUBO Archives.

¹⁷⁸ Executive Committee Minutes, 15 February 1976. Original in SACUBO Archives.

August.”¹⁷⁹

With the demise of the verbatim reports of the annual meetings, the prospect of a newsletter achieved greater significance. In 1952, Gladys Barger praised George Baughman’s attempt at a newsletter and described it as “one of the major projects of the Association for several years.”¹⁸⁰ In 1966, Clarence Scheps recalled that earlier attempts by the Southern Association to produce a professional publication failed. “It didn’t get off the ground,” he said, “and it can’t be accomplished on a regional basis.”¹⁸¹ As secretary from 1976 through 1981, Joe Barber produced several newsletters, discovering along the way that he had a special ability for this task. Fred Vorsanger, for example, explained that he contacted only the chairman of the various committees and depended on the newsletter to communicate information to the others.¹⁸² By October, 1979, Barber reported a circulation of 3,300. The newsletter included reports from the president, the program chairman, the workshops, and “any other newsworthy items.”¹⁸³

In June 1983, President George Ruschell and C. Joseph Carter launched the *SACUBO Ledger*, a high quality, glossy newsletter published in a uniform size at regular intervals.¹⁸⁴ Carter, the *Ledger*’s first editor, began with a budget of \$5,000 and a mailing list of 4,300 names.¹⁸⁵ Carter described the newsletter as a “new medium of

¹⁷⁹ Executive Committee Minutes, 26 June 1978. Original in SACUBO Archives.

¹⁸⁰ Proceedings, 1952, 24.

¹⁸¹ Proceedings, 1966, 221.

¹⁸² Executive Committee Minutes, 24 June 1979. Original in SACUBO Archives.

¹⁸³ Executive Committee Minutes, 28 October 1979. Original in SACUBO Archives.

¹⁸⁴ C. Joseph Carter, ed., *SACUBO Ledger*, June 1983, 1.

¹⁸⁵ Executive Committee Minutes, 30 October 1983. Original in SACUBO Archives.

communication among its membership” whose purpose was to advance the goals of SACUBO, that is “*the professional activities of business officer in the Southern region* [emphasis added].”¹⁸⁶ Gene Smith suggested that the stated purpose of the *SACUBO Ledger* was achieved, crediting the new publication with increasing registration in a 1983 workshop.¹⁸⁷ Building on its success, Ruschell appointed three business officers in each of the association’s fifteen states to serve as correspondents.¹⁸⁸ In 1995, 65,000 copies of the *SACUBO Ledger* were mailed and in 1997, 68,000 copies were mailed.¹⁸⁹ Again, its design focused on the advancement of professional development, previewing activities and other events. The newsletter featured the annual convention, the College Business Management Institute, and the fall and local workshops.¹⁹⁰

As the organization entered its fifties, members began to reflect on SACUBO’s genesis; where did we come from? In 1979, SACUBO President Fred S. Vorsanger announced, “I have been concerned that as SACUBO grows older and some of our founding and longtime members phase out of their respective jobs we might lose the continuity and historical significance of our Association.”¹⁹¹ Maybe the self-study put SACUBO’s genesis story in mind of the new generation of leaders. Or perhaps the evolving relationship with the National Association called forth a retelling of SACUBO’s

¹⁸⁶ *SACUBO Ledger*, June 1983, 1.

¹⁸⁷ Executive Committee Minutes, 12 June 1983. Original in SACUBO Archives.

¹⁸⁸ *SACUBO Ledger*, September 1983, 3.

¹⁸⁹ Arthur P. Foley, ed., *SACUBO Ledger*, Winter 1995, 7; Charles M. Peccolo, ed., *SACUBO Ledger*, Summer 1997, 5.

¹⁹⁰ *SACUBO Ledger*, Summer 1997, 9.

¹⁹¹ Joe H. Barber, Jr., ed., *SACUBO NEWSLETTER*, July 1979.

history. Whatever the reason, this was not the first attempt at remembering SACUBO's history. In 1952, Gladys Barger used her presidential address to outline SACUBO's genesis and honor its founder, George Howell Mew. Just three years later, Mew attempted to build on that recollection. He gathered materials to write SACUBO's history, but was unable to find the necessary time. After Mew's aborted attempt, the idea did not resurface until twenty-four years later. He appointed a committee to be chaired by Clarence Scheps, selected six more members, and invited suggestions for naming three additional business officers. He selected former SACUBO presidents whose time of service covered almost thirty years. All were worthy of SACUBO pantheon status: William T. Haywood, Harold Read, Harold Logan, Ori E. Myers, Jr., Travis Ingram, and W. C. Freeman.¹⁹² Scheps accepted the appointment, but advised that he would be distracted by his administrative duties until retirement.

In 1980, Scheps reduced his employment to part-time status, freeing time for the history project. Meanwhile, President Charles Teamer of Dillard University wrote Joe Barber, asking him to join the committee to write SACUBO's history. Scheps requested travel money and scheduled a meeting for February 25, 1981. Attendant correspondence revealed one committee member, Ori Myers, to be an energetic participant in the project. He quickly wrote Scheps, offered his assistance and agreed to communicate with George Mew, searching for quotes and information.¹⁹³ Myers also reported that the NACUBO library held a copy of the proceedings for every year, beginning with 1928.¹⁹⁴

¹⁹² Joe H. Barber, Jr., ed., *SACUBO NEWSLETTER*, July 1979.

¹⁹³ Ori E. Myers, Jr. to Clarence Scheps, 8 October 1980; Ori Myers, to Clarence Scheps, 6 March 1981. Originals in SACUBO Archives.

¹⁹⁴ Ori E. Myers, Jr. to Clarence Scheps, 7 April 1981. Original in files of Joe H. Barber, Jr.,

Other committee members began exchanging information about resources, and identifying missing materials. At the initial meetings, members discussed the advisability of hiring “a graduate assistant to do the actual writing.”¹⁹⁵ In February, 1982, Haywood reported to SACUBO President John Temple, advising him that “I have discussed with and received the assent of Mr. Rex Roberts, an employee of Vanderbilt University to assist in this project and to serve as the chief researcher and writer of a SACUBO history.”¹⁹⁶ Haywood included a proposal with the letter. Less than a week later and distressed by the proposed cost of the project, Temple wrote Orie Myers requesting consultation on the offer.¹⁹⁷ Myers left no doubt about his thoughts. After expressing some surprise at the proposed cost, he said:

Be that as it may, my thoughts revolve around two central points. First, it seems to me that it is very important for us to write such a history at this point in time. Many of the persons who are knowledgeable about the association over the past thirty to forty years soon will not be in a position to provide information, and we shall lose access to that data. I think that such a loss would be unfortunate. Secondly, I do believe that it is very important that the history be prepared in a professional manner.¹⁹⁸

He concluded his letter by endorsing Haywood’s offer. At this point in the project the focus shifted from finding a writer to securing a home for the growing collection of documents and letters. Myers communicated with the Special Collections Department of

Clinton, Mississippi.

¹⁹⁵ Joe H. Barber, Jr. to John Temple, 8 February 1982. Original in files of Joe H. Barber, Jr.

¹⁹⁶ William T. Haywood to John L. Temple, 17 February 1982. Original in files of Joe H. Barber, Jr.

¹⁹⁷ John Temple to Orie Myers, Charles Teamer, Fred Vorsanger, 26 February 1982. Original in files of Joe H. Barber, Jr.

¹⁹⁸ Orie E. Myers, Jr. to John Temple, 3 March 1982. Original in files of Joe H. Barber, Jr.

Emory University Library. The library agreed to assume responsibility of the records.¹⁹⁹ Time passed. Myers continued to pursue missing documents, making an unofficial collection of SACUBO materials.

On August 2, 1985, Fred Vorsanger's fears were realized: George Mew died, taking with him a vast reservoir of information about the early years of SACUBO. Mew's death seemed to signal a slowing down of the history project. In 1989, Myers wrote Barber advising him that the gathered materials would be mailed to him. "My thought is," Myers said, "that you are the only remaining person in SACUBO I know with special interest in this material. I realize that this is my unburdening of an unfinished project into your hands, but I think that is better than letting the material get subsequently lost or destroyed here at Emory."²⁰⁰ Barber was officially named SACUBO's archivist/historian by the executive committee the next year.²⁰¹ As archivist/historian, Barber periodically reported his findings, recalling SACUBO's history to inform the present. He noticed that some problems are perennial. He also charted SACUBO's successes and documented significant changes—the introduction of vendors to the annual meetings is an example—offering them for reflection and providing a resource for future decisions. In 1991, Barber concluded with some resignation a report regarding documentation of the Association's past: "Only time will tell whether it is even used to write a history of SACUBO."²⁰²

¹⁹⁹ Ori E. Myers, Jr. to Louis W. Moelchert, Jr. 2 June 1982. Original in files of Joe H. Barber, Jr.

²⁰⁰ Ori E. Myers, Jr. to Joe H. Barber, Jr. 29 June 1989. Original in files of Joe H. Barber, Jr.

²⁰¹ Robert D. Flanigan, Jr. to Joe H. Barber, Jr. 31 July 1990. Original in files of Joe H. Barber, Jr.

²⁰² Report of the Archivist/Historian, April 21-23, 1991.

The late 1960s and early 1970s were a kind of mid-life crisis for SACUBO. The organization achieved its original goals, put institutions in place to train college and university business officers for years to come but found themselves wondering what happens next. Given the increased membership, SACUBO needed more ways to communicate and given its age, SACUBO needed to remember where they came from.

Conclusion

In 1856 Isaac Hill recorded financial information about the college in Auburn by hand into a single ledger. One hundred and fifty years later this task would be impossible because of the sheer number of transactions, the amounts of money involved and the scope of operations of the modern university. The tuition for 1869-70 was \$30 to \$40 dollars with an incidental fee of \$2.50. Isaac Hill's bureaucratic descendent, Marcie C. Smith of Auburn University, demonstrates just how much the requirements of the business officer have changed. As Associate Vice President for Business and Finance at Auburn University in 2012, Smith was responsible for a department that includes Budget Services, Cash Management, Contracts and Grants Accounting, Controller/Financial Reporting, Information Systems Support, Payroll and Employee Benefits, Procurement and Payment Services, and Student Financial Services. The revenue total for fiscal year 2011-2012 at Auburn University was \$779,731,625.00. For good or ill, SACUBO helped transition East Alabama Male College with 113 students to Auburn University with 24,469 students.¹

When George Howell Mew arrived on campus at Emory University in 1923 as their business officer he brought with them the requisite accounting skills from his tenure at Western Electric. What he did not bring was the skills required of a college and university business officer. Beginning in 1925 he and others birthed the Southern Association of College and University Business Officers. George Mew and colleagues numbered eight at the 1925 inaugural meeting of what would become the Southern Association of College and University Business Officers. Those eight business officers

¹ Dwayne Cox and Rodney J. Steward, Auburn History: The Old South, Civil War, and Reconstruction, <http://diglib.auburn.edu/auburnhistory/oldsouth.htm>; The information about Marci Smith was provided in an email by her office staff.

represented seven institutions of higher education. In 2011-2012 SACUBO claimed 852 members. Of that number, 757 are institutions of higher education. Member institutions joined together to lower expenses and build better business practices. SACUBO began offering training institutes annually in the 1930s; the organization now sponsors training institutes year round. SACUBO leaders were the driving force behind the creation of institutions for cooperation between regional associations and the Federal government. SACUBO leaders responded to the Carnegie foundation, the government agencies, and industry by creating the necessary skills to record, report, and track monies on campus. In the process, they helped grow their educational institutions and helped create an academic-industrial-governmental complex beyond the wildest imaginations of Isaac Hill, George Mew, and maybe even Clarence Scheps. They and others created SACUBO to address the concerns that grew up with the 20th century university and in the process defined and improved the profession of the business officer.

A cursory reading of the table of contents in SACUBO's annual minutes throughout the years reveals how SACUBO helped business officers acquire the needed skills to better manage the business of higher education. In 1928, Miss Banks Armand of Wesleyan College presented techniques for better managing the college book store. Those 1928 minutes also covered the following issues: managing the college book store, different kinds of cafeteria systems, administering loan funds, managing dormitories, and management of labor.² In 1929, Armand addressed the issue of student loans and was one of several presentations: "Investment of Endowment Funds in Common Stocks," "Cafeteria versus Dining Room," "The Control of State Budget Commissions over

² Minutes, First Annual Convention of the Southern Educational Buyers & Business Officers Association, 1928, Index.

University Budgets and Expenditures,” “Co-operation Between the Bureau and the Colleges with Reference to Statistical Reports,” “Collection of Tuition and Fees,” and “Budget Systems.”³ So as early as 1928 and 1929 SACUBO members are doing the hard work learning how to manage their institution’s money, shaping the infrastructure to work with government agencies and industry. The number of presentations grew. The number of annual meetings grew. SACUBO created weekend long training sessions, week long training sessions, a two-year training program, and a wide variety of offerings to help college and university business officers. The skills learned and the skills presented helped create the modern university, the university over which the likes of Marci Smith presides.

SACUBO, and later NACUBO too, annual gatherings introduced another element into the relationship between the business of higher education and the business world, a relationship blurring the lines between big business and higher education. After SACUBO’s 1930 annual meeting, a resolution was passed thanking the hosts of the third annual meeting: “Be it further resolved: -That the secretary be requested to express by letter our thanks and appreciation to Foote and Davies, General Foods Co., Georgia Power Co., and Libby, McNeill, and Libby for their gracious hospitality and entertainment.”⁴ In subsequent minutes there is no acknowledgement of annual meeting subsidies. With the growth of SACUBO programs and annual meetings, though, the need for funds to support offerings grew. Some members suggested accepting the support of vendor companies, offering vendors a chance to contribute financially to the annual

³ Minutes, Second Annual Convention of the Southern Educational Buyers & Business Officers Association, April 19-20, 1929, Index.

⁴ Proceedings, 1930, recorded with the resolutions.

convention. Though this idea met with favor among the larger membership, at least two members vigorously protested. William T. Haywood expressed deep reservations, fearing for the “commercialization” of annual meeting programs. He forcefully concluded his reservations stating, “I have serious ethical problems with recent developments along these lines.”⁵ The voices of Haywood and Scheps did not overcome the majority, and the role of vendors at the annual meeting continued to grow. In the decades that followed, the annual gathering became not just a training ground and meeting space for business officers to discuss common concerns, it also became a trade show at which vendors would vie for attention and favor of the university officials who they saw as potential customers of the many products they offered. On the website announcing SACUBO’s 2013 annual meeting, SACUBO solicited vendor support this way:

Extend your company’s presence and participation at SACUBO events year round, not just at the Annual Meeting! Join the EXECUTIVE CLUB and enjoy exclusive opportunities and recognition at the SACUBO Annual Meeting, the SACUBO Fall Workshop and access to SACUBO members throughout 2013. The EXECUTIVE CLUB is designed to reward your level of support and partnership with SACUBO and includes significant networking, marketing and presentation opportunities that are only available through participation in this program. The Executive Offers two levels of participation: Associate's Level at \$7,500, Director's Level at \$15,000, Read below for a complete outline of each level.⁶

Haywood is cringing while Scheps rolls over in his grave.

⁵ William T. Haywood to George J. Ruschell, 21 April 1983. Original in SACUBO Archives. Curiously, I began this chapter with an excerpt from *Conversations*, a glossy presentation published by ARA-Slater School & College Services which would become ARAMARK in 1994.

⁶ <http://www.ultimateconference.com/events/sacubo-2013-annual-meeting/custom-35-fac777bbc0f545f1b25e8ba24c4a7197.aspx>

When Haywood talked about the “commercialization of annual meeting program events” he could just as easily been talking about the growing concern over the commercialization of higher education. SACUBO certainly commercialized their annual meetings, transforming them from intimate gatherings to celebrations with live celebrity bands. Again, for good or ill, SACUBO has helped transform higher education into serious business.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Interviews, Correspondence and Primary Sources

- Barber, Jr., Joe H. Personal Correspondence. SACUBO Archives.
- Barber, Jr., Joe H. Personal Conversation with Author, July 15, 1999.
- Bentley, Elizabeth E. to D. Francis Finn, January 31, 1986, SACUBO Archives.
- Cunningham, R. B. to A. W. Rees, July 28, 1927, original in files of Vera Mew Hiller, Atlanta, Georgia.
- Haywood, William T. Personal Correspondence. SACUBO Archives.
- Haywood, William T. to Lynn Price McWhorter, E-Mail, Author's files.
- Mew, George Howell. Personal Correspondence. Vera Mew Hiller, Atlanta, Georgia.
- A Memorial Tribute to George H. Mew: 1895-1985. Adopted by the Executive Committee of the Board of Trustees of Emory University on August 22, 1985. SACUBO Archives.
- Minutes of the Annual Meetings, Southern Educational Buyers and Business Officers Association, 1928-1936. SACUBO Archives.
- Minutes of Committee Meetings, Southern Association of College and University Business Officers, 1937-1999, SACUBO Archives.
- Minutes of Committee Meetings, Southern Educational Buyers and Business Officers Association, 1927-1936.
- Myers, Ori E. Personal Correspondence. SACUBO Archives.
- _____. Telephone conversation with author, February 8, 1999. Notes in Author's files.
- Proceedings of the Annual Meetings, Southern Association of College and University Business Officers, 1937-1974. SACUBO Archives.
- Program for the First Annual Meeting of the Southern Educational Buyers and Business Officers Association, 1928. Original in files of Vera Mew Hiller, Atlanta, Georgia.

Program for the Second Annual Convention of the Southern Educational Buyers and Business Officers Association, 1929. Original in files of Vera Mew Hiller, Atlanta, Georgia.

Powers, Wayne R., to Philip Goree, April 22, 1983. Original in SACUBO Archives.

Report of the President, Southern Educational Buyers and Business Officers Association. Original in files of Vera Mew Hiller, Atlanta, Georgia.

SACUBO Ledger, 1983-1999. SACUBO Archives.

Self-Study Report of the Southern Association of College and University Business Officers. Presented at the Business Meeting of the Annual Convention, May 1-2, 1973.

Associational Histories

Hines, Neal and Abbott Wainwright. *A History of NACUBO: Business Officers in Higher Education*. 2nd Edition Washington, D. C.: National Association of College and University Business Officers, 1994.

Lai, May M. *Eastern Association of College and University Business Officers: Seventy-Five Years in Review*. 1974.

Unger, Jr., William E. *Wholly in the Spirit of Service: A History of the Central Association of College and University Business Officers: 1900-1997*. 2nd Edition United States of America: The Central Association of College and University Business Officers, 1997.

Welzenbach, Lanora F. *American Association of College and University Business Officers: A History*. Washington, D. C.: National Association of College and University Business Officers, 1985.

Secondary Sources

_____. *College and University Business Administration*. Compiled by The National Committee on the Preparation of a Manual on College and University Business Administration, Vol. II, Washington, D. C.: American Council on Education, 1955,

_____. *The Control of the Campus: A Report on the Governance of Higher Education*. The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching. Washington, D. C.: 1982.

- Allen, Frederick. *Secret Formula: How Brilliant Marketing and Relentless Salesmanship Made Coca-Cola the Best-Known Product in the World*. New York: HarperCollins Publishers, 1994.
- Altschuler, Glenn C. and Stuart M. Blumin. *The GI Bill: A New Deal for Veterans*. New York: Oxford University Press, Inc., 2009.
- Bailyn, Bernard. *Education in the Forming of American Society*. Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, 1960.
- Bender, Thomas and Carl E. Schorske. *American Academic Culture in Transformation: Fifty Years, Four Disciplines*. New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 1998. Originally published in the Winter 1997 Issue of *Daedalus: Journal of the American Academy of Arts and Sciences* (Vol. 126, No. 1).
- _____. *Intellect and Public Life: Essays on the Social History of Academic Intellectuals in the United States*. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 1993.
- Blevins, Brooks. *Lyon College 1872-2002: The Perseverance and Promise of an Arkansas College*. Fayetteville, Arkansas: The University of Arkansas Press, 2003.
- Bennett, Michael. *When Dreams Came True: The G. I. Bill and the Making of Modern America*. London: Brassey's Inc., 1996
- Bledstein, Burton J. *The Culture of Professionalism: The Middle Class and the Development of Higher Education in America*. New York: W. W. Norton & Company, Inc., 1976.
- Bok, Derek. *Universities in the Marketplace: The Commercialization of Higher Education*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2003.
- Bowen, Boone M. *The Candler School of Theology—Sixty Years of Service*. Atlanta: Emory University, 1974
- Boyer, Ernest L. *Scholarship Reconsidered: Priorities of the Professorate*. The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers, 1990.
- Brittain, M. L. *The Story of Georgia Tech*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1948.
- Bullock, Henry Morton. *A History of Emory University, 1836-1936*. Nashville: Parthenon Press, 1936.

- Clark, William. *Academic Charisma and the Origins of the Research University*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 2006.
- Cohen, Robert and David J. Snyder. *Rebellion in Black and White: Southern Student Activism in the 1960s*. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 2013.
- Conkin, Paul K. Assisted by Henry Lee Swint and Patricia S. Miletich. *Gone with the Ivy: A Biography of Vanderbilt University*. Knoxville: University of Tennessee Press, 1985.
- Durden, Robert F. *The Launching of Duke University, 1924-1949*. Durham: Duke University Press, 1993.
- Dyer, John P. *Ivory Towers in the Market Place: The Evening College in American Education*. New York: The Bobbs-Merrill Company, Inc., 1956.
- Dyer, John P. *Tulane: The Biography of a University*. New York: Harper & Row, Publishers, 1966.
- Dyer, Thomas G. *The University of Georgia: A Bicentennial History, 1785-1985*. Athens: University of Georgia Press, 1985.
- English, Thomas H. *Emory University, 1915-1965: A Semicentennial History*. Atlanta: Emory University, 1966.
- Flynt, Sean. *160 Years of Samford University For God, For Learning, Forever*. Charleston, South Carolina: Arcadia Publishing, 2001.
- Freeland, Richard M. *Academia's Golden Age: Universities in Massachusetts, 1945-1970*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1992.
- Galbraith, John Kennedy. *The Affluent Society*. 2nd Edition Revised. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1969.
- Geiger, Roger L. *To Advance Knowledge: The Growth of American Research Universities, 1900-1940*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1986.
- Geiger, Roger L. *Research and Relevant Knowledge: American Research Universities Since World War II*. New York: Oxford University Press, Inc., 1993.
- Hawkins, Hugh. *Banding Together: The Rise of National Associations in American Higher Education, 1887-1950*. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 1992.
- Holden, Charles J. *The New Southern University: Academic Freedom and Liberalism at UNC*. Lexington: The University Press of Kentucky, 2012.

- Israel, Charles A. *Before Scopes: Evangelicalism, Education, and Evolution in Tennessee, 1870-1925*.
- Kean, Melissa. *Desegregating Private Higher Education in the South: Duke, Emory, Rice, Tulane, and Vanderbilt*. Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 2008.
- Kelly, Alfred H., Winfred A Harbison, and Herman Belz. *The American Constitution: Its Origins and Development*. Vol. 2, 7th Edition. New York: W. W. Norton & Co., Inc., 1991,
- Kerr, Clark. *The Great Transformation in Higher Education, 1960-1980*. Albany, New York: State University of New York Press, 1991.
- Kerr, Clark. *The Uses of the University*. 5th Ed. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2001.
- Lagemann, Ellen Condliffe. *Private Power for the Public Good: A History of the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching*. Wesleyan University Press, 1983.
- Lazerson, Marvin, ed. *American Education in the Twentieth Century: A Documentary History*. New York: Teachers College Press, 1987.
- Lesesne, Henry H. *A History of the University of South Carolina*. Columbia, South Carolina: University of South Carolina Press, 2001.
- Leslie, Stuart W. *The Cold War and American Science: The Military-Industrial-Academic Complex at MIT and Stanford*. New York: Columbia University Press, 1993.
- Levine, David O. *The American College and the Culture of Aspiration, 1915-1940*. Ithaca, New York: Cornell University Press, 1986.
- Mayhew, Lewis B. Foreward by Clark Kerr. *The Carnegie Commission on Higher Education*. San Francisco: Josey-Bass Publishers, 1974.
- McDougal, Walter A. *The Heavens and the Earth: A Political History of the Space Age*. New York: Basic Books, Inc., 1985.
- McLemore, Richard Aubrey and Nannie Pitts McLemore. *The History of Mississippi College*. Jackson, Mississippi: Hederman Brothers, 1979.
- McMath, Jr. Robert C. , Ronald H. Bayor, James E. Brittain, Lawrence Foster, August W. Giebelhaus, Germaine M. Reed. *Engineering the New South: Georgia Tech. 1885-1985*. Athens: The University of Georgia Press, 1985.

- Meiners, Fredericka. *A History of Rice University: The Institute Years, 1907-1963*. Houston: Rice University Press, 1982.
- Mims, Edwin. *History of Vanderbilt University*. Nashville: Vanderbilt University Press, 1946.
- Mohr, Clarence L. and Joseph E. Gordon. *Tulane: The Emergence of a Modern University, 1945-1980*. Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 2000.
- Montgomery, James Riley. Stanley J. Folmsbee. Lee Sefert Greene. *To Foster Knowledge: A History of The University of Tennessee, 1794-1970*. Knoxville: The University of Tennessee Press, 1984.
- Nelson, Cary. *Manifesto of a Tenured Radical*. New York: New York University Press, 1997.
- Olson, Keith W. *The G. I. Bill, the Veterans and the Colleges*. Lexington, Kentucky: University of Kentucky Press, 1974.
- Plank, David N. and Rick Ginsberg, ed. *Southern Cities, Southern Schools: Public Education in the Urban South*. New York: Greenwood Press, 1990.
- Potter, David M. *People of Plenty: Economic Abundance and the American Character*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1954.
- Presley, Delma Eugene. *The Southern Century: Georgia Southern University, 1906-2006*. Statesboro, Georgia: Georgia Southern University, 2006.
- Rudolph, Frederick. *The American College and University: A History*. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1962.
- _____. *Mark Hopkins and the Log: Williams College, 1836-1872*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1956.
- Russell, John Dale. *The Finance of Higher Education*. Rev. Ed. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1954.
- Sansing, David. G. *Making Haste Slowly: The Troubled History of Higher Education in Mississippi*. Jackson: University Press of Mississippi, 1990.
- Salsi, Lynn and Burke Salsi Jr. *North Carolina State University*. The Campus History Series. Charleston, South Carolina: Arcadia Publishing, 2005.
- Scheps, Clarence and E. E. Davidson. *Accounting for Colleges and Universities*. 3rd Edition Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1978.

- Schrecker, Ellen. *No Ivory Tower: McCarthyism and the Universities*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1986.
- Severa, Richard and Lewis Milford. *The Wages of War: When Americans Came Home--From Valley Forge to Vietnam*. New York: Simon and Schuster, 1989.
- Sitkoff, Harold. *A New Deal for Blacks: The Emergence of Civil Rights as a National Issue*. Vol. 1 The Depression Decade. New York: Oxford University Press, 1978.
- Sulzby, James F. Jr. *Toward a History of Samford University: Volume 1*. Birmingham, Alabama: Samford University Press, 1986.
- Snider, William D. *Light on the Hill: A History of the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill*. Chapel Hill: The University of Chapel Hill Press, 1992.
- Theelin, John. *A History of Higher Education*. 2nd Ed. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 2011.
- Trilling, Diana. *Claremont Essays*. New York: Harcourt, Brace & World, Inc., 1964.
- Veblin, Thorstein. *The Higher Learning in America: A Memorandum on the Conduct of Universities by Business Men*. New York: B. W. Huebsch, 1918.
- Veysey, Laurence R. *The Emergence of the American University*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1965.
- Zunz, Oliver. *Why the American Century?* Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1998.

Journals

- Best, John Hardin. "The Revolution of Markets and Management: Toward a History of American Higher Education Since 1945." *History of Education Quarterly* 28 (Summer 1988): 177-189.
- Bonner, Thomas N. "The Unintended Revolution in America's Colleges Since 1940." *Change* 18 (September/October 1986): 44-51.
- Efron, Edith. "The Two Joes Meet—Joe College, Joe Veteran." *The New York Times Magazine* (June 16, 1946): 21 & 55.
- Hook, Janet. "Bureaucratic Tie-Ups Delay Student Aid." *The Chronicle of Higher Education*. XXIV (March 24, 1982): 1 & 13.
- Keister, Jr., Edwin. "The G. I. Bill May Be the Best Deal Made by Uncle Sam." *Smithsonian* 25 (November 1994): 128-129.

Sensing, Thurman. *College Business Management: The Story of the Development of a Profession*. *The Journal of Higher Education* Vol. 11, No. 2 (February 1940): 63-69.

Shedd, Jessica M., "The History of the Student Credit Hour" *New Directions for Higher Education* (Number 122, Summer 2003) 8.

Veysey, Laurence R. "Toward A New Direction in Educational History: Prospect and Retrospect." *History of Education Quarterly IX* (Fall 1969): 343-359.

Unpublished Theses

Johnson, Bethany Leigh. "Regionalism, Race, and the Meaning of the Southern Past: Professional History in the American South, 1896-1961." Ph.D. diss., Rice University, 2001.

Kean, Melissa Fitzsimons. "'At a Most Uncomfortable Speed': The Desegregation of the South's Private Universities, 1945-1964." Ph.D. diss., Rice University, 2000.

Olliff, III Martin T. "From Craft to Profession: The American Culinary Federation and the Occupational Identity of Twentieth-Century Chefs." Ph.D. diss., Auburn University, 1998.

Penney, Matthew Tyler. "'Instruments of National Purpose' World War II and Southern Higher Education: Four Texas Universities as a Case Study." Ph.D. diss., Rice University, 2007.