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THE DELICATE RELATIONSHIP
WITH THE BOARD

by Vera Olson

o relationship is more critical for the university president than that
with the institution's governing board. The president can survive
difficulties with the faculty, with students, with alumni and with
almost any other group associated with the university so long as he retains the
support of the board, but if he loses the support of the board he cannot long
survive, no matter how popular he may be with other groups.*

The president usually begins with the support of all, or nearly all, of the
members of the board—and indeed one should think twice about accepting an
offer which is not unanimous, or nearly so. The pressures of the presidency,
however, are so great, and the conflicting demands are so intense, that
differences of opinion between board and president are bound to arise, and
probably with some frequency. Differences are best worked out if there is an
easy, friendly relationship between president and board, and they can be
exacerbated if the relationship is strained. The spouse, in addition to providing
support in many areas, is critical to the establishment and maintenance of
friendly relations. Indeed, how well the spouse succeeds in this will have an
important bearing on the president's success or failure. The spouse will succeed
or fail largely on the basis of her commitment, her personality, and her ability to
relate to people, but it is important that board, spouse, and president have an
understanding of the role of the spouse in the presidential partnership, and that
there be some generally agreed upon set of expectations.

There are certain factors that board, spouse, and president must all recog-
nize. As is true for the presidency itself, there is no precise, all-encompassing
job description for the presidential spouse. Indeed, only 12 percent of the
spouses who participated in the 1983 NASULGC survey received any explana-
tion of the expectations of the role. It is not a career in the usual sense of the

*For simplicity I am going to use the term "president" to designate the chief executive officer who, I
realize, often is called "chancellor." Again for the sake of simplicity I am going to refer to the
president as "he" and the spouse as "she" even though this is not always the case.
word, nor can it be an end in itself. The role is one of support for the presidency, and it does not need to remove the possibility of a separate career for the spouse. It is a volunteer support role which, like the presidency, carries greater demands than the full time and energies that any one person can sustain. Obviously, this results in freedom for the spouse to determine her own pattern for the role, within certain general guidelines. Board, president and spouse all help to establish the guidelines and determine the role. This can be an ongoing process, but the period of candidacy provides an ideal time for all concerned to think together about what is expected. While only half of the spouses who participated in the 1983 NASULGC survey were included in the presidential search interview process conducted by the governing board, it is significant that 84 percent of the spouses in the survey felt they should have been a part of that process.

Accepting the importance of this inclusion can be extremely useful for the spouse, along with the presidential candidate, in making some thoughtful preparation for that first encounter with the board. There are questions which the candidate and spouse should have resolved between themselves. For example, what kind of support does this president consider most important from his spouse? Is it enough that she look after their children's demands and standard matters of running a household? Does he expect her to be a tennis partner available at the convenience of his demanding schedule? Does he want her to be a companion on his frequent travels, to serve as sounding board, diversion, and sometimes driver as he works or rests? Does he prefer to be accompanied by his spouse frequently when attending the multitude of university functions? Does he feel it is better to have some of the heavy social correspondence handled more personally at home than by the office staff? Does he expect his spouse to attend university and community events by herself, sometimes representing him, sometimes speaking for him? Does he expect his spouse to maintain and manage a heavy official entertainment schedule in the home they occupy?

Questions such as these must be resolved on the basis, first and foremost, of the personal abilities and interests of the spouse. Does her self-realization depend upon having her own career or professional activity? Does she prefer to spend most of her time with private concerns of home and family? Does she have a strong interest or avocation that requires much of her time? Does she loathe or love making speeches? Does she enjoy frequent contact, often in the limelight, with large and assorted groups of people? Can she happily spend many hours a week at her desk on correspondence, records, and guest lists? Does she enjoy frequently entertaining many people in her home?
The amount and extent of university budget, facilities, and staff available to the spouse is the other important factor for the candidate and spouse to determine as they consider the support role together. It is helpful if this information can be obtained from a faculty committee, the predecessor spouse, or some other source previous to an interview with the board.

Generally speaking, the members of the board of a public university are people of some substance. Whether they have been appointed by the governor or voted into office by the electorate, they are probably community, and sometimes statewide leaders. They usually represent a broad spectrum of the state's population, both occupationally and geographically. In Missouri, for example, the board has included bankers, business executives, housewives, lawyers, doctors and farmers, who have come from both the urban centers and the rural areas of the state. Most board members are public spirited citizens who understand and recognize the importance of volunteerism in America. The bond they share is a strong enough commitment to the educational institution they serve, that they are willing to devote large amounts of their time and energies to its welfare. From whatever walk of life they come, each of these individuals must be generally in control of his or her own time schedule, by virtue of the demands placed on them with their board membership. Whatever differences there may be among them in their approach to issues, they share a common goal of furthering the interests of the institution. Although most new board members have special interests in particular parts of the university, most of them soon develop an interest in, and a concern for, the total university, all matters related to all of its divisions, all of its campuses, as opposed to concern for a specific program, department, school, or campus.

It can be expected, then, that this group of leading citizens of the state who dedicate their volunteer efforts to the good of the university, may have considerable understanding of, and appreciation for, the support role of the presidential spouse of the institution they serve. For both of them, volunteerism is generally the basis for the expenditure of their time and energies. For both of them, that which is good for the institution they serve is the major justification for their efforts. The difference is that the spouse's first commitment is probably to the president and to helping him serve the university well. Given this situation, the spouse can only assume that members of the board stand ready to help her in whatever ways they can.

The other arm of the delicate balance is the spouse herself. What kind of person can the board expect to find as presidential partner? The answer, of course, is that presidential spouses are as varied in their interests, personalities, and abilities as are members of the board. There are, however, certain assump-
tions that the board might make, depending upon the age and experience of the
president.

It is probably safe to assume that the presidential spouse is a college graduate
who enjoys at least a basic familiarity with college life. Generally speaking,
university presidents tend to be of a mature age and probably not at the
beginning of their married lives. Frequently the president has served as de­
partment chair and dean or vice-president in an academic institution. Con­
sequently the spouse probably has served in other academic support roles. This
provides a valuable basis for experience, as well as for observation of the role of
the presidential spouse. Many of us have had role models in our early years.
Some academic spouses have concluded early that they never would, or could,
fill the support role of presidential spouse. Obviously that posture either
negates any presidential ambitions in a family or necessitates a change in the
marital union.

Generally speaking, by the time of a presidential appointment, the spouse
has developed something of a personal life style. Perhaps she devotes most of
her time happily to home and family. Perhaps she is an avid volunteer in her
community. Very possibly she has established a career or profession. Very
probably the life style of every spouse combines some of these elements. In
these times of so many options, it is important that by the time of a presidential
appointment, the spouse has achieved enough self-knowledge to understand
the elements necessary in this marriage for self-realization, satisfactions, even
happiness for both adults involved.

The interview with the board can well provide an excellent opportunity—
too frequently neglected—to establish common understandings and the basis
for a sound relationship between spouse and board members if there has been
some good, preliminary, thoughtful preparation given to this important occa­
sion.

It is well to bear in mind that the board members have probably had no
previous experience in hiring a university president. It usually tends to happen
only once—if at all—in the terms of most board members. At the same time,
this is, in all probability, the first experience for the spouse candidate to meet
with a university board. It is of vital importance that both spouse and board
approach this meeting with an attitude of positive goodwill, which will insure a
frank, open exchange between them, and a comparison of their perceptions of
the role of the spouse.

It can be expected, if board relations with the spouse of the preceding
president have been congenial, that not a lot of attention has been centered on
this support role by board members. Also to be expected is the board's assump-
tion that the role will function much as it has in the past, provided it has been an acceptable situation. Therefore, it is easy to understand why it is so vital at this time for the spouse to learn as much as possible about the board's perception of the role, whatever its basis may be. This is the right time to hear "how things have been done in the past," what has gone before.

This is also the necessary time for the spouse to represent as clearly as possible her perception of the role, in order that any basic differences in these perceptions can be discussed in an open, friendly manner in order to avoid future problems.

If the spouse, for example, intends to pursue her own career, this is the time that both board and spouse need to ascertain whether there will be adequate staff available to the spouse to make this possible. If both board and spouse agree on the importance of extensive official entertaining in the president's home, this is the time for everyone to make sure there are adequate facilities, equipment and household help to do this, or that they can be made available. If there are to be children living in the official residence with their parents, now is the time to make sure that the house will accommodate the family's personal needs and desires in regard to privacy, convenience, comfort, and household help. If board and spouse expect that the spouse will accompany the president to many events both within the community and afar, is there provision for live-in students or other help to "sit with" children and/or house in their absence? Will extra official correspondence and desk work requirements in connection with the presidency, such as invitations, responses, and records, be handled by clerical help at the house or in the president's office? Who is responsible for grounds and flowers for the house? What is the budget arrangement for household maintenance and help?

There are so many questions that the spouse should have an opportunity to discuss with some members of the board in an early interview in order to avoid future criticism and misunderstanding. It is important for the spouse to remember through their discussions, however, that these volunteer board members with their basic commitment to the educational institution they serve, have every reason to want to help the spouse to perform her volunteer support role as easily and well as possible. Rather than adversaries, they are allies in an exciting enterprise.

The prestige that members of the board enjoy with their appointment can hardly balance the criticism and blame they share with the president for everything that happens at the university which alumni, students, parents, or politicians do not like. To counteract this, and to furnish some reward for the hours of volunteer effort, members of the university administration usually try
to offer what they can to board members in the way of special consideration, such as invitations to special events, social occasions for board members and spouses in connection with their meetings, and any other available advantages to recognize their services to the institution.

These public and social occasions furnish the basic, direct involvement of the spouse with members of the board. Together the president and spouse must have reached agreement on what kinds of activity and effort in this direction will contribute most to good and useful working relationships between administration and board. For, after all, that is the basic purpose for the relationship between the spouse and board. Social contacts among people can very often improve working relationships. A word should be said about the importance of flexibility on the part of the spouse. As board membership and attitudes change, so may the spouse need to adjust her efforts and activities to best accommodate the immediate situation.

In the normal course of events, contact between board members and spouse can become fairly frequent and close. They are, in a sense, all members of a larger "university family." It is to be expected that the spouse may well come to feel closer to some board members and their spouses, than to others, based on common interests, backgrounds, education, or personalities that jibe. Board members and spouses may want to share with the presidential family personal special occasions such as weddings, funerals, alas, and sometimes parties or excursions.

These relationships can be close and supportive without the family of a board member or family of the president being too closely involved or concerned with the really private problems and concerns of either family. They are based, after all, on an employer-employee relationship which will probably be healthier and more enduring if, for example, the individuals involved are not caught up in working out each others' personal problems. This relationship then, is inevitably a delicate one.

It is not surprising that in the past, expectations have been assumed rather than stated. Generally, board members receive their impressions of how the spouse performs the support role from others throughout the community, area, or state. That appears to satisfy the need. For example, only two percent of the spouses polled in the survey have ever been asked to give a report to the board. On the other hand, almost 20 percent expressed an interest in doing so. Although this is a minority view, it may reflect a growing concern on the part of spouses that the board understand their roles. As we all know, what could be taken for granted in an earlier day cannot be today. Marian Oldham, a member of the board of the University of Missouri and of the Association of Governing
Boards, put it well when she told the Committee of Presidents’ and Chancellors’ Spouses at their St. Louis meeting in 1982: “Trustees need educating and hints as to how to cooperate with presidents’ spouses.” She suggested that annually boards “listen to spouses of our presidents and chancellors, review expectations, budgets, etc. in a more formal setting.” She added, “We must, as trustees, recognize the great resources we have in our partner-spouses.”

The relationship between the presidential spouse and members of the board can and should be a congenial, social one. It will help if the spouse has made some thoughtful preparation for the role including some consideration of the board members’ attitudes and positions, as well as her own feelings and expectations of the demands of the role, along with its privileges and pleasures. It will also be useful for her to maintain some perspective on the support nature of the role, rather than try to treat it as an end in itself. The best basis for continuing, congenial relationships between board and spouse is that of a mutual good faith and trust and that both board and spouse feel positive about the institution they serve and their volunteer efforts on its behalf.

Two presidential spouses, Adele McComas of Mississippi State University and Mary Eleanor Jennings of Ohio State University, (formerly at the University of Wyoming), expressed the same general view in summarizing their board relationships in presentations to a NASULGC spouses panel in St. Louis in the fall of 1982. McComas referred to “the supportive disposition of the board members and their spouses.” Jennings stated, “To sum up, my relationship with our two boards started on a positive note and thus far has continued on a positive, rewarding basis.”

It seems logical to assume that this delicate relationship can be handled effectively among fair and reasonable people.
Judy Ikenberry graduated from Purdue in 1957 and went on to receive her Masters Degree from Michigan State University in 1959. Stanley Ikenberry was at Michigan State pursuing graduate studies at the same time and the two were married in 1958. Judy has served on the faculty at Michigan State and at Penn State. The Ikenberrys have three sons and came to Illinois in 1979. The University of Illinois has two campuses—one in Champaign-Urbana and a second major campus in Chicago. Judy works with her partner, the President, and with the wives of the two Chancellors to help the University communicate more effectively with the several constituencies it serves.
ime was, in the not too distant past of academia, that the university president's wife stepped into an unwritten but real role as social leader of campus and community. She was expected to lead the entertainment, and serve the tea. She was watched to set a high moral and dress tone. She was expected to manage effortlessly the official residence. Virtually every campus of moderate age abounds with legends of first ladies who met the tests. Even better stories, unfortunately, are the legends of first ladies who missed the mark of the communities' expectations.

Recent history has added another complicating dimension to this already difficult role. To cope with the problems of growth and expanded enrollment and to educate larger numbers of students, many institutions established new campuses to handle expanded enrollment; in other instances states combined formerly independent institutions and campuses into "systems." Both the new system and the campus have chief executives. Thus, there can be two first ladies, or at least, two "first spouses." But who should fill the role of "first lady?" Who gives the parties, welcomes the faculty, meets foreign dignitaries and manages the official residence?

The community and the institution may have moderated their expectations of the chief executive's wife in line with the changes in societal expectations for women, but how can even this amended image accommodate more than one first lady? One need only listen to the difficult times masters of ceremonies have in introducing the two to detect the problem.

Perhaps even more important is the challenge facing the women in these positions and how they deal with their respective roles and each other.

Although tensions have obviously occurred between the campus head spouse and the system head spouse, there has been no documentation to help understand and possibly reduce areas of friction; the NASULGC study asked spouses
of system and campus chief executives to respond to areas of concern, such as:

1. Who attends national conferences? (21 percent reported some problem)
2. Who is responsible for entertaining the board, legislators, alums, donors? (16 percent reported some problem)
3. Who does the international travel? (16 percent reported some problem)
4. Who lives in the public house? (11 percent reported some problem)
5. Who entertains in relation to athletic events? (13 percent reported some problem)

These answers suggest that problems between system head and campus head spouses do exist in some instances. One wonders if campus and system respondents were willing to openly admit the extent and reality of role conflicts, expectations and tensions.

When responses to these questions about problems are divided between system head spouses and campus head spouses, differences are evident.

1. Who attends national conferences? (5 percent of the system head spouses reported problems, but 30 percent of campus head spouses reported problems)
2. Who is responsible for entertaining the board, legislators, alums, and donors? (10 percent of the system head spouses reported problems while 23 percent of the campus head spouses reported problems)
3. Who does the international travel? (5 percent of the system head spouses reported problems while 23 percent of the campus head spouses reported problems)
4. Who lives in the house? (No system head spouses reported problems but 17 percent of the campus head spouses reported problems)
5. Who hosts in relation to athletic events? (6 percent of the system head spouses reported problems while 17 percent of the campus head spouses reported problems)

The key point suggested by the data is that spouses of campus heads feel and report more strain in all five areas polled than do the system head spouses.

Other responses in the NASULGC study were analyzed for differences between system head spouses and campus head spouses. Only six questions suggested significant differences between the two groups. Four questions about accepting responsibilities of the role and enjoyment of these responsibilities brought a significantly different response from the two groups.

1. Enjoy being a public speaker? 47 percent system head spouses responded yes, while 10 percent campus head spouses did so.
2. Accept responsibility as evaluator of university candidates? 28 percent
system head spouses responded positively, but only 7 percent campus head spouses did so.

3. Enjoy being evaluator of university candidates? 31 percent system head spouses said yes, while only 3 percent of the campus head spouses responded.

4. Enjoy being editor of husband's speeches? 31 percent system head spouses reported yes, while 7 percent of the campus head spouses responded.

Another three unrelated questions brought significantly different responses with these answers showing the same trend.

1. Were you a part of the interview process when the governing board considered your spouse? 69 percent system head spouses indicated they were, while only 37 percent campus head spouses so indicated.

2. Do you participate in volunteer work in the community beyond the role of spouse to the President/Chancellor? 90 percent system head spouses said yes, while 53 percent campus head spouses responded affirmatively.

3. How many people do you entertain each year in your home? 57 percent system head spouses reported more than 2,000 while 28 percent campus head spouses reported more than 2,000.

Of the large number of questions on the NASULGC questionnaire, it is interesting the small number of questions on which there is a significant difference in the two groups of spouses. However, even though the number of questions is not large, the range of issues is broad.

More interesting, and of importance to the understanding of the system head spouse and the campus head spouse roles and problems, is the general trend of every answer in which there was a significant difference. In all questions where problems were identified, campus head spouses responded in larger percentages. In all questions about involvement and satisfaction with the role, the system head spouses answered positively much more than did the campus head spouses. In comparing the lives of the two groups of spouses, the campus head spouse seems to feel the problems and frustrations much more and seems to get less enjoyment from the role than does the system head spouse.

Another way to assess the relationship of system head spouses and campus head spouses is to talk to them individually. This has not been done by a study, but from several informal discussions with wives and among friends. It is apparent that each situation is different. Some are difficult and some quite comfortable. Some system/campus wives report functioning easily with their counterparts. Others report detailed procedures to avoid interactions which are troublesome.

"I never go on that campus without a formal invitation."
"We don't go to each others' homes or parties."

These statements and the fervor with which they are uttered indicate problems. While a problem may be caused by the differences between two personalities, the problem more likely is the result of the structure, the friction of two people trying to do their jobs but caught in a system with a tradition of only one.

Personal statements about these problems are made privately and not in large groups. The problems can be painful but the spouses are discreet. When they feel tension, they find their own ways to accommodate because they do not want to bring it to the attention of the public.

"The public does not want to hear our problems."

If spouses were to speak publicly of their own dissatisfaction it might be considered a negative factor in their husbands' job performances.

No one factor can account for all tensions between the system head spouse and the campus head spouse. Several considerations can have bearing on the tension. The history of the development of a specific system and campus is an important factor. The system may be new, while the campus may have been long established. The system wife may have to create her role, and adaptation may be required of the campus head wife. Both must re-educate the public, the alumni, the faculty and student body, and how the spouses feel may be conditioned by how others react. Awareness of the system head spouse may come at the expense of some of the homage, support, and awe formerly given to the campus executive's spouse.

Still another problem emerges if the campus constituencies did not want the system established in the first place. The system itself then becomes the real source of friction which is reflected in the tense relationship of the two spouses. If the relationship between the system and campus administrators is strong and healthy it may pave the way for an easier sharing of the spouses' roles and responsibilities.

There is also the matter of the degree and nature of control exercised by the system and its administration over the campus. This is especially true if the degree of control is perceived to be changing. If controls are seen as strengthened, this typically will be resented or opposed. Relations between spouses can reflect the tensions. Whatever the cause, it is a pretty sure bet that if relations are strained between the administrators, their wives will not have an easy, comfortable relationship.

Another factor in the stress relationship may be the physical location of the two couples. Are they in the same town? When paths cross on a daily basis in
the presence of the same audiences—campuses, faculty, students, community, etc., tension is more likely to evolve. Spouses may also find problems in sharing physical facilities on campus for events they must hold. Things as small as reading about one another in the same small town newspaper can result in unnecessary tension.

Even when not living in the same city or town, the spouses may become actively involved in "campus turf disputes," especially if the city or town plays a key role in the life of the state. For example, the campus may be located in the state capital or in the large metropolitan area. Overtures by the system head spouse there may be threatening to the campus spouse, especially if she is not included. She may well resent the invasion of what she considers "her" territory and may feel such activities as a threat to her role or an implied criticism. There is also the matter of confusion of the public as to who is who.

Another cause of friction can be the title of the husband. There is no national or regional uniformity of titles and little understanding of implied roles. The public may or may not understand what the title of chancellor or president means. "President" may be the system head or the campus executive, as may be the "chancellor." Confusion in the public and campus minds as to the roles of chancellor and president spells problems for the spouse as she has to define her husband's job before she can define her own. These two titles are the most frequently used but there are others in use, such as vice president and director, and they provide confusion for the public also.

An obvious source of friction may be the house. If the housing provisions are, or seem, unequal, there can be jealousy. Identical facilities cannot be provided, but some degree of fairness and equity in housing is important to eliminate tension between the two spouses. Apart from a sense of "fairness" is the question of function. Does the campus or system house provide the setting for the spouse to play the role as she sees it and as it has been defined?

Another problem can be covering the costs of entertaining. Both spouses, when entertaining to support the institution, need reimbursement. It is too much to expect that it be done from the personal pocketbook. More tension arises when provisions are made for one spouse but not the other.

A change of either of the executives is a factor in the stress between the spouses. It goes without saying that there should be a clear understanding of the roles of each executive and their relationship to each other. The spouses should have an understanding of these relationships. However, relationships frequently change as the people and circumstances change. New appointees have different ways of interpreting roles.

Beyond the changes in the person of the system executive and the campus
executive there are also changes in the governing boards and shifts in policies which can cause conflict. Once decentralized systems may find governing boards pushing for stronger central controls, or vice versa. This then changes the ground rules for both couples and may lead to friction. This says again that tensions between the executives may spill over into tensions between spouses.

The sometimes isolated roles of the executives at the end of the chain of command contribute also. When problems develop spouses have only their husbands to whom they can talk—no co-workers, intermediate "supervisors" or friends. Broadening the circle of discussion would likely increase, not resolve, the problem. And, too often, the president or chancellor lacks the time and understanding to help his spouse. In short, few safety valves for release of tension exist.

Some things can be done, however, to ease tensions and strains between the spouses. Communication is at the forefront of this list. The more the spouses and the two couples talk and work together, the closer and more understanding the relationship between them can become. Deliberate discussions of matters not job related help build strong human relationships and identify areas of common interest.

Who should take the initiative to improve communication? As in any human relationship, it may not be easy to make the first move, but the responsibility rests with both. If there has been a change in personnel, then a welcome to the new spouse by the spouse of longer tenure is a good first step. Lunch, a party, a concert, travel, or shopping together can strengthen mutual understanding. The purpose should be not to talk business or to talk about the tensions, although this can come too, but to build understanding and help eliminate unnecessary, irrational friction. A good human relationship between the spouses will not solve all the problems; it is merely a good beginning. The president, chancellor and "the system" need to help.

Spouses need time to prepare adequately for the functions in which they will be expected to play a leadership role. In many instances they will want to be a part of the early planning if their names are to be used. When planning for events is rushed, spouses may be the last to know the important details, building resentment and frustration.

As to which couple should entertain which groups, such questions need to be addressed openly by the chancellor, president and their spouses. They can decide on which of the various functions each will carry out, recognizing that the job is never really done and there is more than enough for both to do. If there is a policy or pattern of how functions will be carried out within the institution, decisions as to who does what can follow naturally. In cases where
there is joint responsibility, planning needs to be done cooperatively. Cooperation has to be the rule of the day and give and take a part of the process. There is simply no room for small, insecure egos or fragile feelings.

One key to eliminating tension is to avoid viewing roles as competitive, whether between campus and system or between the two executive couples. Cooperation for the good of the University, not competition, must be the aim or tension is inevitable. Governing boards have an important role in making this pattern evident for the total university and system so that the spouses' attitudes reflect a more basic system attitude.

In this context, the key criterion is: “Is it good for the university?”

What the spouse is trying to do is help her campus, university or system, and help her husband. How well a spouse works with the other “first lady” bears directly on these goals.

It can be said that relationships between the spouses can be tender because of the many chances for friction and the very close nature of the setting, but the most fundamental question is whether the situation is structured to foster cooperation not competition. If there is competition it can be compounded with the problem of conflicting personalities. Many actions should be taken to minimize conflict.

It is a tribute to the “first ladies” working in the educational systems of today that the frictions are not greater and the numbers of listed problems are so small. In their own quiet ways, system head and campus head spouses have found ways to contribute effectively as they support the institutions they serve.
Beatrice Chaikind Ross Winkler, better known as “Bea,” is the wife and partner of Dr. Henry R. Winkler, President of the University of Cincinnati. “Bea” is a chronic volunteer and sits on the boards of most of the arts organizations and a fair percentage of the activist organizations in her community. Dr. & Mrs. Winkler are the parents of five children—three hers, two his by previous marriages—and they are the proud grandparents of five wonderful grandchildren. After seven years in the presidency the couple will begin their sabbatical year in July 1984, when Dr. Winkler retires from the presidency. The Winklers expect to stay in Cincinnati.
When we married in 1973, after both of our spouses died, my new husband was the executive vice president of Rutgers University. I had been a physician's wife for 25 years and knew almost nothing about how a university functioned.

When the president of Rutgers became ill, my husband became the acting president and I suddenly found myself in the public position of partnering a president of an urban institution.

Not knowing what the rules might be, or indeed, if there were any, I adapted my 35 year history of volunteer work in fund raising and working with community groups in fulfilling my new role.

By the time the president was well enough to return to his job, my husband had received an offer to serve the University of Cincinnati as executive vice president. Since this would mean going home for him, he asked me if I could face such a move. This question deserved consideration only because I had never lived more than 38 minutes from mid-town Manhattan and my mother and my children were in the East.

We decided that this move would be good for both of us. From my point of view, it would be a great adventure for me to try and live in another part of the United States. For my husband, he would be returning to his alma mater.

Though my husband was interviewed a number of times, I was only invited to join him for the final interview. At that time the board looked us over as a couple, but they never once indicated that they expected anything from me.

Within months of arriving in Cincinnati, my husband was again in the position of acting president while a search was held for a new president. Finally, my husband was named the 19th president of the University of Cincinnati in December, 1977.

Now I faced a new city, a new job, and new flurry of interest in me by the local Cincinnati newspapers. For the first time in my life, some reporter expressed a desire to interview me! What and who was I to be in this interview?
I found the interview rather pleasant and non-threatening. I was able to express my ideas and to get the idea across to the reporter that I felt partnering a president would be both stimulating and pleasurable.

In reading through the NASULGC survey results, I find that I was not alone in having the community suddenly take a complete interest in everything I did. It seems that partnering a president of an institution such as the one we represent, means a public scrutiny of our clothing, our sense of style, our hostessing ability, our decorating ability, as well as our public availability.

It was most interesting to me to learn that I was expected to be at—and presumably to enjoy—many of the athletic events, as well as most of the social and academic functions at the university.

I was expected by our board and our community to become a recognized leader in the community and still remain in the background as a decorative first lady. I could have opinions, but they had to be expressed in such a way as not to cause the institution or the president any embarrassment. Of course, we both were expected to set a high moral and ethical tone in all of our behavior, both in the university, our synagogue and in the community.

I could do as much volunteer work as my schedule would allow, but no matter what my commitments, I was to drop everything if my husband or the university needed me elsewhere.

As a college president's wife, at least at the University of Cincinnati, I've discovered, I am assumed to have no life of my own, and certainly no conflicting obligations. I am supposed to know how to keep busy when I am not needed. I am at the beck and call of every event, whether of interest to me or not, and live with the introduction: "AND HIS CHARMING AND GRACIOUS . . . ."

In fact, "AND HIS CHARMING AND GRACIOUS . . . ." began to grate so on my sensibilities that when our student honor society invited me to be their guest speaker I used that title for my speech. By keeping my sense of humor, and my sense of the ridiculous intact, I have been able to keep my sense of self.

Because I have commitments to my own conscience, I have served on many community organizational committees. One that I chair at present is The Soviet Jewry Committee for the Jewish Community Relations Council. I have been a guest columnist in our local paper on this issue and signed my own name to the article.

I served for five years on the Planning Board of the Community Chest, which reviews the organizations and agencies that will receive money from the United Fund drive.
Even before my present experience, it had been very easy to become committed to women's issues once I was widowed and discovered that, as such, I was virtually an adult non-person in the world in which I lived. Thus, while this was therefore not a new commitment for me, it did lead to my becoming more actively involved in the women's movement in my community.

On our University campus, I discovered that we had a need for an Infant Day Care Center. This was a need that was not being filled by the traditional community centers nor those on our campus. Most day care centers begin at age two. Meeting a young professor, who was soon to need this type of care for her infant, and being asked for my help, I invited all the grandparents and great aunts and uncles that I had met in Cincinnati to an Infant Day Care Shower in the president's garden. We had our professional staff make up a list of needs—diapers, furniture, cash, etc. This list was sent with the invitations and it gave people a chance to decide how much they wanted to spend, and what they might want to donate.

We had a pediatrician, an early childhood specialist, people representing our School of Education, (they have a day care school on campus, and there is a university-sponsored center off campus for older children), a prospective male parent, and ME—the grandmother, speaking to the issue.

I explained my interest in terms of my own "grandmother day care syndrome," when I worried that my grandchildren were to be abandoned almost at birth. I watched my daughter-in-law organize and build the kind of cooperative day care center needed on her campus so that she could continue teaching while our son completed his Ph.D. I watched a baby become a socialized, sharing human being at a much earlier age than my home-raised children. I realized that Daddy was called Mommy by the day care children and I was won over.

Now with three working daughters-in-law, one working daughter, all with job, husband, children and home, functioning in their own careers while sharing the household work loads and nurturing of their children with their husbands, I at least no longer worry about "who is watching the children?"

The outgrowth of this social-civic event was a well stocked day care center, ready to open for the new quarter. The center is accessible for either parent to drop in and give cooperative time. The center board was organized from the original group that came to my shower and I have had many pleasant visits watching the center in action.

In continuing my own campus activities, I became active in our Faculty Wives Club. It has been my pleasure to help the membership understand that it is necessary for all of us actively to pursue library funds, enlarge our circles of
interest to include volunteering for the various service agencies both on and off campus, and to help our foreign-born with their English. I am now trying to convince our group that we should show an interest in cleaning up our campus and in beautifying it with more trees.

With my commitment to women's issues, I became an active participant in our "Friends of Women's Studies" group. When the director of our program approached me for help in interesting the outside community in our Women's Studies seminars, workshops and courses, I suggested a tea or a strawberry festival at the president's house.

The women who were invited represented all the women's organizations in our community—ethnic and religious, blue collar, suited professionals and housewives.

We explained that our program, with their help, would be geared to enriching the lives of all women and that the programs would attack social action topics, intellectual topics, as well as public policy as it relates to women.

Our "Friends" group has grown and flourished. We now can provide scholarship monies to non-traditional female students and we have just completed our first $100,000 campaign. We plan to use our major fund raising dollars to help bring visiting professors to our Women's Studies programs.

My Women's Studies project for the year 1983-84 involved interviewing 10 women who have been successful in areas that are considered non-traditional jobs for women in Cincinnati. I have written the text, while my friend, another grandmother who graduated from our graphics design school two years ago with her second undergraduate degree, did the graphics. Her choice of a title, A Time for Women, features a beautiful, soft yellow rose with a long leg of thorns, a simile that seems to represent so much of my thinking—soft and lovely, but with the ability to sting!

As part of my interest in the arts, I am serving on the boards of our public television station and our Cincinnati Ballet Company. I have opened our President's House to help the opera and the symphony. We will host the opening kick-off event for Ballet volunteers at our home. We have hosted seminars and lectures on all phases of music at the President's House.

It has been a source of pride to me that our College Conservatory of Music provides a home for so many of the artists who have given me pleasure over the years. One of my greatest joys in partnering my husband has been sharing our Conservatory and its artists with our community.

Because I enjoy writing stories, I have joined a writing group of some 45 women. We meet on a bi-monthly basis and we read our stories to each other.
This reading, plus luncheon, makes a most pleasant break in an otherwise hectic life.

When it comes to entertaining, I have discovered that we average about 3,400 visitors a year to our home, which is just two miles from the campus. We give graduation brunches, freshman orientation sessions at our home, athletic and cultural dinners, and the full gamut of entertaining (both on and off campus) that seems the norm for most of my peers.

The freshmen parties were an innovation of mine. Having had all of my education in a large school environment, I know how mind-boggling an institution of some 39,000 students can seem to someone from a small community school. I never even knew we had deans when I was in college, and I feel that just possibly I must have missed something.

We try to break the university down to its component parts so that it becomes a more human experience. We feel that since my husband is always available to our students, as am I, the faculty and staff should be available to our students. Any event at the President's House means open house, and a house tour. These tours have been conducted in the past, and I hope in the future, by members of SOPHOS, a student service group that hosts the orientation program for our incoming students.

One of the more demanding aspects of my job has been the active role I have played in our fund raising programs. Though I rarely ever ask anyone for money directly, my job is to host the contact parties that lead to the major gift giving. We have just about completed a five year, $43 million campaign that has taken us on flying trips all over the United States. We have kept in touch with our alumni by hosting special events in every city that we arrive in. During the past year, for example, we have been in New York, Philadelphia, Chicago, Detroit, Cleveland, Dayton, St. Louis, Memphis, Phoenix, New Orleans, Birmingham, Tuscaloosa, Miami, Tampa, Naples (Florida), Orlando, San Francisco, Los Angeles, San Diego, Portland, Oregon, Seattle, and Washington, D.C. for alumni affairs—most of them one-night stands. This, of course, in addition to the usual meetings my husband and I attend in various cities from east to west coasts.

Through this outreach, and with the help of our foundation and our alumni director, we have been able to convince our friends of the excellence of our institution. During the course of this fund-raising campaign, we have flown to Mexico to receive an endowed chair, and, though all this flying may seem jolly good fun and is pleasurable to a great extent, a good deal of it is just plain hard, tiring work. We know the inside of more airports and airport motels than we know the actual cities where we have landed.
I think that most of us in our role as partners, have found that, as we reach out and touch both those in the university family and those outside organizations that make up our communities, our lives are enriched. We are all found working in our churches and synagogues, in our schools and neighborhood organizations and on every type of community board. We, the spouses, seem to provide the anchor that keeps the goal in sight, the goal of building a better community for everyone. It is with great pride that we can view our own accomplishments and it is with even greater pride that we can see our years of volunteerism affecting every area of our communities.

I feel that I can safely say that the last six years, in Cincinnati, have been wonderful years for me. It is the first time in my life that I have felt that I've had a full scale impact on the community in which I live. My contributions have been accepted and my ideas have been expanded for the good of all of us. Before this experience, my impact was momentary, while here, I hope, we are building lasting bridges for years to come.

On the other hand, after six years, I still feel that it would be pleasant to have someone besides my husband review the job that I have done. It would be even nicer if that same "someone" would supply me with enough money to pay for the clothes that are necessary to appear at so many functions. But I think I could forego this allowance and even forgive the powers that be if, just once, I received the recognition from our board that this is a two-person job even though only one person is recognized and paid.

No one ever told me what the job of partnering a president would be. I learned by observing others and through my own experience and common sense. I believe that as a group, presidents' wives must have a strong sense of self and finely-honed sense of humor, or we could easily lose ourselves to self-pity. Without such personal resources how can anyone live always in the public eye yet always in the background?

In reading our survey results, it becomes quite obvious that the greater percentage of spouses enjoy their roles and feel that their lives have been full and rewarding. It is my opinion, and the view of many of our retiring couples, that trustees of colleges seeking new presidents will have to examine more carefully the roles they expect the spouse to assume. They should be encouraged to state clearly what they expect as standards of performance in order that they not be disappointed in the outcome. And they should be prepared properly to reward that performance. It will become harder and harder to assume that because one spouse wants the college presidency, the other spouse will automatically serve.

In recent years, wives have become decidedly assertive, independent, and
career-minded. They do not necessarily feel that they should put their careers on the shelf for a presidential spouse. Some spouses may not accept the subservient role allotted and insist that boards establish guidelines in advance in order to bring the leadership of the university more fully into the mainstream of our contemporary world.

For my part, I have always enjoyed being the other half of our partnership. But before I die, I would like to have a name other than, "AND HIS CHARMING AND GRACIOUS . . ."
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FAMILY CONSIDERATIONS
Nuestro Casa Es Su Casa

by Polly Davis

From the outside looking in, there is an aura of glamour and mystery around the "President's Mansion." (No matter how humble and weather-beaten the old bungalow or hacienda may be, it is always "the mansion.") I remember how as an undergraduate student or later as a fledgling faculty wife, save possibly a summons to the White House or the governor's manor, an invitation to the home of the university president was something special. Small matter who the incumbent or live-ins might be at the time, it was the place and the setting that provided the allure.

Now, after almost two decades, I've been on the inside looking out. Typically, while I am struggling over a menu for the dinner for the Development Foundation, chaos reigns. The dog is barking (he's chained to his doghouse for nipping a Sigma Chi fleeing from a horde of squealing Pi Phi's). The cat has been missing for the past week (a student picked it up and took him home, thinking he was lost). The telephone lines are lit up like a pinball machine (the twins learned to dial shortly after they learned to talk). The front door bell is ringing (a student is trying to find the sociology building). The back door bell is ringing (campus maintenance is here to fix the plumbing). Then, my husband's secretary arrives to tell me she couldn't get me on the phone, and, in urgent tones warns me that the president (my husband) is bringing home some visitors from Mexico and could I please whip up a few margaritas and polish my Spanish? They'll be here in 10 minutes. Sometimes, I wonder where all the mystery and glamour have gone.

Like the rookie interns in the university hospital, those who live in the "Big House" are always "on call." Not only the president who is hamming it up on TV, or telling jokes to the alumni, or diagramming plays for the football coach—but also the spouse, who often is wife, mother, writer of the checks, payer of the bills, caller of the doctors and dentists, field marshal for affairs of state, smiling hostess, bartender, pet feeder, honorary member (usually without vote) of multi-community and campus organizations, and street walker for
the March of Dimes. She is the first one to laugh at her husband's stale jokes and the last one to turn out the lights after the parade of guests has departed and the food service staff has poured the cold coffee down the drain.

And how is all this accepted? Perhaps it is best summed up by a remark one of my girls made to a school chum who had asked if her mother worked. My daughter replied proudly, "No, she doesn't work. She just gives parties."

The pace is always hectic, even under normal circumstances. But if the unexpected can happen, it will. And the supple spouse has to cope. Lively and exciting events that come to mind include:

. . . The time we were entertaining the British ambassador and wife, and the plumbing backed up.
. . . Or the two students coming to our door at 3 a.m. to borrow some of our firewood because their heat had been turned off and they were freezing.
. . . Or the student demonstration in my petunia patch when my husband was wooing the legislature in Santa Fe.
. . . Or the post-commencement reception in our back yard on the day my son decided to dump a box of Oxydol into the fountain.
. . . Or the dinner party when the wife of a dean really told off one of the regents, calling him a right wing, John Bircher stuffed shirt.

Just coping demands that you be flexible. The spouse needs to be a master juggler with more hot potatoes in the air than in the oven and more happenings than time for them to happen. Establishing a set of your own priorities can be helpful. They are always changing, but at least you have that good feeling of being semi-organized. Make things happen instead of letting them happen to you.

For one thing, the president's spouse usually can write her own job description. Boards often meet the spouse in the search and hiring process. But from anecdotal conversations with other presidents' wives and my own personal experience, governing boards seldom ask her anything about how she might view the job, what her role might be or what experience she brings to this team position. Likewise, they just as studiously avoid telling her what they expect. (I sometimes wonder if they know what to expect). No doubt, if such taboo discussions took place, affirmative action alarms would ring and sirens would howl, and the board would end up picking someone else.

And a wife is often just as reluctant to broach the subject herself, thinking that if her husband really wants the job, she won't jeopardize his chances by a lot of pushy questions. If it's a first presidency for the family, she really doesn't
know what she's in for. If she's a veteran, she knows somehow it will all work out—in five years, or ten, or . . .

In setting priorities and adapting to the life in the “mansion,” the wife constantly is balancing family needs with the demands of the job or the university. Time becomes precious.

Most presidents I have known work 70 to 80 hour weeks—and so do their wives. The eight to five routine often just measures the office hours for old prexy. Many presidents go to the office earlier and get home later just to take care of the paper avalanche. Lunch hours are business luncheons. Dinners are speeches. Learned talks and articles are written from 10 p.m. until the wee hours of the morning. Meetings with students, faculty groups, legislators, alumni, development foundations, and civic groups demand attendance and personal attention. Even the social functions take on the air of official business. The numerous activities on a campus, from football to ballet or rock to opera, fill an already busy schedule. Many of these activities are great fun, exciting, exhilarating—and are shared by the wife.

Travel, whether around the state or to national meetings or to Washington to lobby for a grant or desirable legislation, throws an added burden on the limitations of time and energy.

But I can always muster the time and energy. I have a suitcase half-packed just in case someone invites me to go and there is money to pay my way. But often, travel simply means an absentee husband. (Recently, after my husband had been gone on a series of trips around the state, he called home. One of the twins answered and yelled upstairs, “Mom, it’s your long distance husband.”)

Indeed, there are days and weeks when the wife of a president must wonder if she does have a husband or the children a father. She has to take over—often assuming as many family responsibilities as possible. Too often, she no longer can count on old dad to write the checks, or get the car to the garage or the dog to the vet. I used to kid my husband about looking around until he finally got a job where he didn’t have to mow the lawn. But I ended up being the one who sighs, “Thank God for campus maintenance.” Otherwise I’d never get the sink unplugged or the screens off and on the windows. Which brings me to my next point—help is or should be available. Get it and use it. It buys time for more important tasks—either for the university or for your family.

Since the president’s home often takes on the dimensions of a mansion, particularly when it includes not only the family living quarters but also large areas for public receptions and functions, a housekeeper is a valuable and treasured ally. Just the sheer square footage of house to maintain and keep
presentable involves systematic cleaning and polishing. When events pile up one upon the other, it often is a scramble to clean up from one function while getting ready for the next.

For one not used to having help in the home, the adjustment comes as a kind of cultural shock. When I first experienced this phenomenon, I found myself getting up at six a.m. to be sure I had the house straightened up before the housekeeper arrived to see what a mess it was. It took a long time to get into the new routine—like a week.

One thing I did feel was important, however. I thought for the children's benefit I didn't want the housekeeper to do their chores, and assigned them specific duties including the responsibility for their own rooms. This worked well with four girls. My son and my husband, however, remain both helpless and hopeless.

A big bonus for me during the seven years my husband was president of the University of New Mexico was having a cook. Not only was this a big help in official entertaining, but particularly for the evening meals for the family. Often my husband and I attended evening functions away from our home, and it was reassuring to know that someone was in charge of the meals for our young children. As with other factors, having a cook can affect the attitude of the kids. When the twins were about six, I scolded Brooke about some imperfection in her conduct, and she retorted with the usual sobs and proclaimed, "Mother doesn't love me." To which her twin, Bonnie, admonished, "Don't be silly, Brooke. Mother does too love you. She does all kinds of nice things for you, and every Saturday night she cooks you dinner."

For the really big events, I have found the university food service a tremendous asset in providing catering services. Having real pros help plan menus, set up the tables, and prepare and serve the food, not to mention policing up the premises afterwards, helps rejuvenate what otherwise might be a bedraggled hostess.

Not surprising, the president's spouse also is involved in heavy correspondence relating to the many functions and activities that come her way. Some secretarial assistance is vital, especially at peak periods—such as the numerous activities which begin and end the academic year, the holiday season, and the pre- and post-game activities surrounding big football and basketball weekends. Sometimes this help can be provided through assigning some of the tasks to one of the president's secretaries. It is a big boost to have that person working with you on a permanent basis.

Over the years, we have also had one or two students living with us, wherein we provide the board and room and the student or students help with baby
sitting both the kids and the house when we are away. We have had males, females, and even married couples sharing this arrangement. It provides a parental supplement for continuous caring—kind of an extended family concept. We were able to help some wonderful young students, and they in turn were able to help us.

All of this—living in the big house (often located in the middle of the campus), frequent guests in the evenings and overnight, legions of support troops ranging from the university plumber to the groundskeepers, and generation after generation of students who treat your youngsters like little brothers and sisters—has a profound impact on young children. Often separated from normal neighborhood relations, their friends usually are transported to and from the house—and our kids, in turn, are transported off campus. Quite often, because of the majesty of the house and the surroundings, our children are perceived as being from a rich, affluent family living in spectacular splendor. This led one of our daughters to ask, "Mother, did you marry Dad just so you could live in a big house?" Only the eldest recalls those humble residences we rented during graduate school and those early beginnings in academe. And probably only my husband and I realize how temporary this all is and the proximity of our inevitable return to the "real" world.

With the whole campus as a playground and the president's front yard the world's greatest site for a summer lemonade stand, one has to be ever vigilant in reminding the children that they are not special people to anyone but their parents. This I call avoiding the "My Dad is the President Syndrome."

In this regard, one particular episode stands out in my mind. When we first moved to the University of New Mexico, the twins, Bonnie and Brooke, were 4½ years old. They were delighted with the house in the middle of the campus with thousands of students streaming by at each change of classes. Most of all, they enjoyed climbing in the tall pine trees in front of our house. It soon developed into an exciting game. Each would climb to the top of a tree. Then, waving back and forth in the branches, they would call, "Help! Help!"

Students passing by would hear these cries and rush over to the campus security across the street. A portly campus policeman would then climb the trees and bring them down. After this happened twice, he tired of the game and lectured them sternly, "Stay out of those trees or you're going to be in big trouble."

Brooke replied, "We don't have to. Our dad's the president."

Seeing this commotion from the kitchen window, I had rushed out just in time to overhear the conversation. I grabbed the twins and hustled them into the house where I paddled them and laid down the law, "Don't you ever go
around this campus or any place else telling people your father is the president."

They got the message. Two days later at a reception for new faculty, two of
the ladies were visiting with the twins. One asked, "Is the president your
father?" Brooke looked at Bonnie and rolled her eyes. Bonnie, with a shrug of
the shoulders, replied, "We always thought he was, but Mother says he isn't."

If, however, the children of a president's family give up something by living
in a fishbowl, yea, sometimes even in the eye of the hurricane—what they lose
in invasion of privacy they gain in the warmth and friendship and vibrancy of
campus life. They learn to become a part of a great adventure. They meet
fascinating people—guests, professors, students, state and community and
even national leaders. They have entré to exciting events ranging from basket-
ball games to the finest in the performing arts. They witness first-hand the
camaraderie of dedicated people working together in a noble cause. In a state
university, they learn to walk softly and not to breathe during the legislative
session.

For all of the support services, they also develop a high degree of
independence—how to respond as a family and as individuals to uncertainty,
anxiety, and frequent and constant change in the daily routines and chal-
lenges. They learn to appreciate the quality of time together with others in the
family rather than the quantity—that people can be close and loving and
sharing even under stress and public scrutiny. They learn to be themselves in
the center of a crowd.

Albeit, most of the appreciation of all these good things comes after they
have been kicked out of the campus nest, rather than at the time of hatching
and growing.

Perhaps the overriding challenge of the president's family is how, together,
they can make a house a home. And just as they must carve out private places in
that home for their personal togetherness, they must carve out part of their lives
for one another. But they must do this with a sense of sharing the residence and
the particular frame of time with the rest of the university community.

Let me close with but one further story about the twins, whom the reader
should know well by now.

One balmy New Mexico Sunday, my husband had returned from playing
tennis. After a shower, he slipped into our bedroom for a nap. Being a hot day,
he was clad only in his shorts. Blissfully, he went to sleep.

Dreaming away, he drowsily was aware that one of the twins was prying his
eyelids open. He opened one eye cautiously, then both widely. Bonnie and
Brooke were standing there, as he suspected. But he was amazed to see them
accompanied by a young lady he quickly deduced was a university coed—what with the pack on her back, the hiking boots, cut-off jeans, midriff blouse, and sun-tanned navel.

"Pardon me, President Davis," she said demurely. "I saw these girls out front with their sign, 'Ture the Manshun, 10¢.' I've always wanted to see the President's house, so here I am!"

My husband stood up and replied in good New Mexico tradition, "Como no! Nuestra casa es su casa." (Why not! Our house is your house.)

And why not, indeed! Perhaps not under such intimate circumstances, but maybe this is what we need to convey not only to our children, but also to all students and members of the campus community by the things we say, the way we act, the way we answer the telephone or work with them in all our contacts. Make yourself at home. It's your campus. Love it, cherish it, keep it, protect it, share it with us and pass it on with all its good and proud traditions to those who will follow you.

And in this sense, for this time, our house is your house. Nuestra casa es su casa.