

Military-Affiliated Presidents

A DATA SNAPSHOT





© 2024 Association of Governing Boards of Universities and Colleges
1666 K Street, NW, Suite 1200, Washington, D.C. 20006

All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced or transmitted in any form or by any means, electronic or mechanical, including photocopying, recording, or using any information storage and retrieval system, without permission in writing from AGB.

About AGB

At the Association of Governing Boards of Universities and Colleges (AGB), we believe in the power of higher education to transform lives, strengthen inclusive democracy, and support a thriving society. We believe that strong higher education starts with great governing boards. AGB provides advocacy, leading practices, educational resources, expert support, and renowned programs that advance board excellence for 40,000 AGB members from more than 2,000 institutions and foundations. For more than 100 years, AGB has been the trusted authority for board members, chief executives, board professionals, and key administrators on higher education governance and leadership. Learn more at [AGB.org](https://www.agb.org).

Acknowledgments

AGB would like to acknowledge the American Council on Education for providing the data from the 2023 American College President Study used for this report. The American College President Study is the most comprehensive, in-depth, and frequently cited source of information about the college presidency and the higher education leadership pipeline.

Thanks also to Lesley McBain, PhD, AGB's senior director of research, for analyzing the military-affiliated presidential data and authoring this report.

Contents

Executive Summary	iv
Introduction	1
Terminology and Limitations	2
Takeaways for Board Members and Board Chairs	3
Military-Affiliated Respondents' Basic Demographics	5
Military-Specific Demographic Considerations	8
Military-Affiliated Presidents' Career Pathways	9
Military-Affiliated Presidents' Leadership Program Participation	11
Military-Affiliated Presidents' Wishes for More Training/Development in Their Current President/Chief Executive Roles	11
Military-Affiliated Presidents' Perceptions of Disclosures During Search Process	13
Military-Affiliated Presidents' Perceived Board Support ...	14
Military-Affiliated Presidents' Next Career Steps	16
References	19

Executive Summary

This AGB report is based on a limited data set drawn from the American Council on Education's publication *The American College President: 2023 Edition*, the ninth iteration of its American College President Study (ACPS, ACE, 2023). This brief is confined to that subset of the ACPS data, which ACE agreed to license to AGB for further research.

Given the growing challenges in recruiting and retaining college and university presidents, AGB provides this report as a resource for higher education boards that are considering or have chosen presidents with military backgrounds. This report provides a data snapshot to help boards better understand several aspects of this cohort of presidents: basic demographics, career paths (including areas in which they would like more training/development), pre-appointment disclosures from boards, perceived board support, and contemplated next steps (career or retirement aspirations).

A plurality of respondents described their career paths to the presidency as “faculty/academic.” They also reported undergoing more leadership training in the military prior to their first institution or system presidency than participation in training programs offered by higher education associations. Further, military-affiliated presidents wished for more training and development in a variety of subject areas related to their current roles. They also indicated less satisfaction regarding the disclosures made to them during the search process about institutions’ or systems’ challenges and finances than the overall cohort of presidents reported, but somewhat more satisfaction regarding the clarity of board and institution or system expectations. Boards should consider whether their levels of disclosure to candidates are adequate. Further qualitative research is necessary to better understand why presidents with military experience decide to pursue an academic career and then a college presidency, as well as how their previous experience translates to their civilian presidential roles.

Military-Affiliated Presidents

A DATA SNAPSHOT

Introduction

The increasingly short tenure of college presidents has been chronicled by the American Council on Education (ACE) over time in its American College President Study (ACPS) (ACE, 2006, 2011, 2016, 2022). Simultaneously, challenges facing presidents and their institutions seem to expand hourly. On top of that, an American Association of University Professors (AAUP) visualization of federal Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System (IPEDS) statistics on the academic workforce shows that full-time tenured faculty—the traditional source of future presidents—only made up 23.2 percent of the academic workforce in 2022 (AAUP, 2023).

Where, then, should boards look to find future college presidents?

Rod McDavis, former Ohio University president and AGB Search principal, commented in a AGB Search blog entry, “Broaden your perspective on the ideal candidate’s qualifications. . . . More institutions are considering candidates from administration and from outside of academia altogether” (McDavis, n.d.). Furthermore, as ACE points out in the latest ACPS, “In order to continue to diversify the presidency, search firms, boards, and search committees will need to cultivate and be open to candidates who are coming from more nontraditional paths to the presidency” (ACPS 2023, p. 31).

One such nontraditional path is a military career. College presidents with military experience are only a fraction of college presidents, mirroring military-affiliated students as a fraction of college students and the military as a fraction of the U.S. population. However, sessions at AGB’s 2022 National Conference on Trusteeship and its 2024 Foundation Leadership Forum featured military veteran presidents discussing how their military training and experiences translated to their civilian presidential roles.

After the publication of *The American College President: 2023 Edition* (ACE, 2023), which asked questions about presidents’ military experience, ACE agreed to license

limited data to AGB for related research. The full ACPS covers presidents' professional and personal lives. This brief is confined to a data snapshot of military-affiliated presidents' basic demographics, career paths (including areas in which they would like more training or professional development), pre-appointment board disclosures, perceived board support, and next steps.

A plurality of respondents in this data set described their career paths to the presidency as “faculty/academic” and reported participating more in military-related or “other” leadership training prior to their first presidency than they had in programs affiliated with higher education associations. Military-affiliated presidents also wished for more training and development to assist them in their current roles. They indicated less satisfaction regarding disclosures about institutions or systems made to them during the search process than the overall cohort of presidents ACE studied. Boards should consider whether their levels of disclosure to candidates are adequate. Further qualitative research is necessary to better understand why presidents with military experience decide to pursue an academic career and then pursue a college presidency, as well as how their previous experience translates to their civilian presidential roles.

Terminology and Limitations

- In the ACPS data provided for this analysis, presidential respondents were either retired or were currently service members. This is a snapshot, not necessarily a representative sample of all military-affiliated presidents. The data are anonymized and “military-affiliated” is used as an umbrella term to protect the confidentiality of individual responses, given the small number of respondents. There were only 50 respondents who were military-affiliated in the total ACE sample of 1,075 presidents. The descriptive tables that follow are thus illustrative rather than statistically significant.
- As per standard data-licensing procedures, ACE supplied a data file for *only* those presidents who answered that their U.S. military affiliation was “active duty,” “Reserve,” or “protected veteran” (in other words, protected by the Vietnam Era Veterans’ Readjustment Assistance Act of 1974 [VEVRAA]) on the 2022 ACPS survey. Comparisons made to the published report are thus imperfect due

to unavoidable double-counting and ACE's oversampling of particular demographic pools (explained in the ACPS report). Readers are encouraged to consult the full ACPS report for more information.

- The sample did not include leaders of institutions outside the United States and its territories, so international comparisons could not be made.

Takeaways for Board Members and Board Chairs

DEMOGRAPHICS

- This particular data sample of military-affiliated presidents was largely male and White, though that should not be extrapolated to all military-affiliated presidents. The U.S. military is predicted to grow increasingly diverse over time, along with the larger U.S. population.
- This sample's age data should be interpreted with caution and with specific attention to military-career demographics (such as average military retirement demographics). For instance, the Congressional Research Service indicated that on average, officer retirees were older than enlisted retirees.

CAREER PATHS AND TRAINING

- Many military-affiliated presidents (46 percent) chose "faculty/academic" as best describing their career path to the presidency.
- Better understanding what draws U.S. veterans to higher education careers after they leave the military will require more qualitative study.
- Both the military-affiliated sample and the presidents surveyed in the full ACPS report listed "governing board relations" as a topic presidents would like more training to assist them in their *current* presidencies.
- Military-affiliated presidents—at least in the small sample—reported participating in more military-affiliated leadership training programs prior to their *first* presidency than programs offered by higher education associations (for example, ACE).

PERCEIVED CLARITY OF DISCLOSURES DURING SEARCH PROCESS AND BOARD SUPPORT DURING PRESIDENCY

- Disclosures During Search Process
 - Military-affiliated presidents were less satisfied that the disclosures made to them during the recruitment process were full, clear, accurate, and realistic than the respondents in the full ACPS sample. Although this could be due to the small sample, boards might wish to consider their disclosure processes with both the broader ACPS results and this analysis in mind.
- Board Support During Presidency
 - Though the data should be interpreted with caution given the small sample size overall and the unavoidable double-counting, the majority of military-affiliated presidents (88 percent) considered their boards “very supportive,” 12 percentage points higher than responses in the full ACPS report.
 - The main ACPS report shows distinct differences by race and gender in terms of presidential perception of board support. For instance, 5.1 percent of women overall versus 3.8 percent of men overall considered their boards as “somewhat unsupportive.” Only 65.5 percent of women of color considered their boards “very supportive,” while 3.5 percent of them considered their boards either “somewhat unsupportive” and an additional 3.5 percent considered their boards “very unsupportive” (ACE, 2024, Table B.4, p. 57). Boards should take heed of these results if they have not already done so. The same cross-sectional analyses could not be conducted for military-affiliated presidents due to the small sample.

NEXT STEPS

- As with the full ACPS sample, the majority of military-affiliated presidents (66 percent) planned to retire without holding another position in one to five years as of 2022.

Military-Affiliated Respondents' Basic Demographics

As noted, this is a small subsample (50 of 1,075 respondents) which is not necessarily a representative sample of *all* military-affiliated higher education presidents. Readers should therefore interpret *all* data—particularly regarding demographic characteristics—with caution throughout this snapshot.

The majority of military-affiliated respondents were employed by public institutions or systems at the time of surveying (56 percent). Although the main ACPS report does not summarize respondents by institutional control, it does summarize by Carnegie Classification (ACE, 2023, pp. 2–3).

The unweighted ACE response rates for the full survey in terms of institutional Carnegie types (see ACPS p. 2 for explanation of weighting) were respectively: 34 percent unweighted for associate-level institutions and 21 percent unweighted for master's institutions. By contrast, 40 percent of military-affiliated respondents were at associate-level institutions, and 22 percent were at master's institutions. Although the small sample might be the cause, further research probing whether military-affiliated presidents gravitate toward institutions in particular sectors or Carnegie Classifications could be useful.

In terms of geographic region, the military-affiliated respondent sample is spread across IPEDS geographic regions in such a way that the numbers in each region are fewer than 10 throughout. The data are thus provided only for illustrative purposes; in general, the data mirror larger IPEDS geographic data.

**Table 1: Institution Control
(N = 50)**

Control of Institution	%
Public	56%
Private not-for-profit	44%
Total	100%

**Table 2: Institutional IPEDS Geographic Regions
(AGB Calculations) (N = 47)**

IPEDS Geographic Region	%
Far West (AK, CA, HI, NV, OR, WA)*	12.8%
Great Lakes (IL, IN, MI, OH, WI)*	12.8%
Mid East (DE, DC, MD, NJ, NY, PA)*	19.1%
New England (CT, ME, MA, NH, RI, VT)*	4.3%
Plains (IA, KS, MN, MO, NE, ND, SD)*	10.6%
Rocky Mountains (CO, ID, MT, UT, WY)*	2.1%
Southeast (AL, AR, FL, GA, KY, LA, MS, NC, SC, TN, VA, WV)*	19.1%
Southwest (AZ, NM, OK, TX)*	14.9%
U.S. Service Schools*	2.1%
Other U.S. jurisdictions (AS, FM, GU, MH, MP, PR, PW, VI)*	2.1%
Total	100.0%

*N<10

**Table 3: Institution 2021 Carnegie Basic Classification
(ACE Recoding) (N = 50)**

2021 Carnegie Classification	%
Associates	40%
Baccalaureate Institutions*	18%
Master's Institutions	22%
Doctoral Universities*	6%
Special Focus/Other*	14%
Total	100%

*N<10

**Table 4: U.S. Military Affiliation
(N = 50)**

Military Affiliation	%
Protected veteran	94%
Reserve/active duty*	6%
Total	100%

*N<10 for both categories; aggregated for confidentiality

**Table 5: Military-Affiliated Respondent Gender
(N = 50)**

Gender	%
Men	92%
Women*	8%
Total	100%

*N<10

**Table 6: Military-Affiliated Respondent Race/Ethnicity
(N = 50)**

Race/Ethnicity	%
Black/African American*	10%
Hispanic*	8%
Multiracial (excluding Hispanic)*	4%
White	76%
Race Not Listed*	2%
Total	100%

*N<10

Table 7: Military-Affiliated Respondents’ Average Age of First Aspiration, Application, and Appointment to Presidency (Ns vary)

Category	Average Age
Age first aspired to college/university presidency (N = 49)	47.6
Age first applied to college/university presidency (N = 49)	51.2
Age first appointed to college/university presidency (N = 50)	53.3

Average Age (N=35) = 62

MILITARY-SPECIFIC DEMOGRAPHIC CONSIDERATIONS

Gender. Male respondents made up 92 percent of the military-affiliated respondents compared to 61 percent of the main ACPS respondent pool (ACPS, p. 6). This should be interpreted with caution due to ACE’s deliberate oversampling of female respondents in the main study (see ACPS for explanation).

However, military demographics also play a role. In 2023, according to U.S. Department of Veterans Affairs (VA) data, only about 11 percent of total living veterans were women (VA NCVAS, VetPop 2023, calculation by author). By 2053, according to VA estimates, that will increase to roughly 19 percent (NCVAS, VetPop 2023, calculation by author). However, the *count* of women veterans is only projected to grow by roughly 7,500 over those three decades. The percentage increase, logically, will be based on a shrinking total population as older generations of veterans die.

Race/ethnicity. Race/ethnicity data for this sample should be interpreted cautiously because of the combination of the small number of respondents, ACE sampling procedures (see the main ACPS for explanation), and military demographics. Seventy-six percent of military-affiliated presidents self-identified as being White non-Hispanic, which is slightly higher than the 72.7 percent who self-identified as White non-Hispanic in the main ACPS. Previous ACE studies have shown the majority of presidents over time have been White.

Also, according to 2023 VA data, roughly 73 percent of living veterans in 2023 were White non-Hispanic (VetPop calculation by author). Thus, military demographics also

influence the race/ethnicity data of those who leave military service and move toward college presidencies. By 2053, the percentage of living veterans who are White is projected to decrease to about 61 percent as older generations of veterans die.

Age. Age-related data should also be interpreted with particular caution for multiple reasons. First, only 70 percent of the military-affiliated respondents chose to divulge their age. This applies to both demographic data and ACPS questions about presidential aspirations, applications, and appointments by age.

In the main ACPS, the average age at which all presidents first aspired to be presidents was 44.9; the average age for applying for a presidency for the first time was age 49.8; and the average age at which they were appointed to a presidency for the first time was 51.7. These ages are all younger than the average ages in the military-affiliated sample (by, respectively, 2.7 years, 1.4 years, and 1.6 years). That could be accounted for in whole or part by incomplete data on the military-affiliated respondents.

However, another element to be considered when interpreting age-related data for military-affiliated presidents is average military retirement ages. According to the Congressional Research Service, “In FY2022, the average retirement age for an active-duty, non-disability enlisted retiree was 42.1 years old and the average retirement age for an active-duty, non-disability officer retiree was 46.5” (Kamarck, June 3, 2024, p. 3). (This calculation does not include reserve retirees.) Therefore, an active-duty, non-disability officer retiring from the military to begin an academic career at the average age of 46.5 would already be older than the average age of all ACPS presidential aspirants surveyed in 2022 (age 44.9).

Military-Affiliated Presidents’ Career Pathways

As background, in the main ACPS the majority (53.8 percent) of respondents selected “faculty/academic” as the term most closely describing their career pathway, followed by “career administrative leader” (27.9 percent). Only 3.7 percent of total respondents chose “public sector/government.” Other categories included “business executive” (4.0 percent), “nonprofit executive” (4.2 percent), and “not listed” (6.3 percent) (ACPS, p. 89).

Although military-affiliated respondents followed the same general pattern as the main ACPS respondents, there were some differences. Notably, “public sector/government” responses, while having fewer than 10 respondents total, came out to 18 percent. This suggests some respondents might have included military service in this category.

**Table 8: Military-Affiliated Respondents’
Reported Career Pathways (N = 50)**

Career Path (ACPS Categories)	%
Faculty/Academic	46%
Career Administrative Leader (student affairs, auxiliary services, finance, etc.)*	18%
Public Sector/Government*	18%
Business Executive*	2%
Not Listed*	16%
Total	100%

*N<10

All military-affiliated respondents (N<10) who selected “not listed” as their primary career path mentioned the military either as a single free-response comment or as part of a longer explanation incorporating career paths in military, academia, and sometimes other positions outside academia. The implications or opportunities for boards are beyond the scope of this quantitative data snapshot.

Also, while the ACPS did not ask for branch of military service, it did ask about various international experiences. Unsurprisingly, 44 percent of military-affiliated respondents indicated “professional experience overseas (outside the field of higher education),” and 72 percent reported having been “deployed overseas as U.S. personnel (military or civilian).”

Military-Affiliated Presidents’ Leadership Program Participation

The ACPS asks whether respondents participated in a long list of higher-education-affiliated leadership-development programs prior to their *first* appointment as a campus-level or system-level president or chief executive. The majority of programs listed were, unsurprisingly, ACE-sponsored.

Fifty-two percent of military-affiliated presidents answered “None,” and 22 percent answered “other non-ACE leadership programs—please specify.” The specified programs were largely military in nature. Fewer than 10 respondents (in some cases fewer than five) had participated in ACE or other named leadership-development programs sponsored by higher education associations. It is possible that respondents’ military training and experiences served them well enough in leadership development that they did not see the need for higher-education-affiliated programs when they were first appointed as presidents. This would require qualitative confirmation.

When asked whether the program(s) in which they had participated had been helpful in *securing* their first president/chief executive role, those who had previously answered “other non-ACE leadership programs—please specify” generally considered them very helpful (45.5 percent) or helpful (27.3 percent). However, these data should be interpreted with particular caution (N = 11).

Military-Affiliated Presidents’ Wishes for More Training/Development in Their Current President/Chief Executive Roles

The ACPS also asks what topics presidents would like more training and/or development in for their *current* presidency or chief executive role. While the “governing board relations” result should be interpreted with particular caution (N<10), 14 percent of military-affiliated presidents selected it.

Boards should also note that in the main ACPS report, “governing board relations” was selected by 14.9 percent of total respondents (ACPS, p. 64), and “shared governance”

was selected by 11.4 percent of total respondents. In the military-affiliated analysis, “shared governance” was selected by 20 percent of respondents.

AGB offers many learning resources for board members and presidents alike regarding these two topics. Other topics in the table below, such as fundraising, risk management, and crisis management, are also covered in AGB resources.

**Table 9: Military-Affiliated Presidents’
Desire for More Training/Development
(Leading Topics)**

Topic	%
Fundraising	40%
Budget/financial management	38%
Capital improvement projects	36%
Entrepreneurial ventures	28%
Using institutional research (evidence) to inform decision-making	24%
Risk management/legal issues	24%
Technology planning (using technological developments to advance institutional mission)	22%
Campus internationalization (e.g., supporting international students, global curriculum)	20%
Crisis management	20%
Government relations—state	20%
Shared governance	20%
Governing board relations*	14%

*N<10

Military-Affiliated Presidents' Perceptions of Disclosures During Search Process

The ACPS asked all respondents whether they perceived the disclosures made to them during the search process as full, clear, accurate, and realistic. Per the report, “[c]ompared with 2016, fewer presidents in 2022 felt that disclosures made in the search process were clear, realistic, or accurate” (ACE, 2022, p. 11). Specifically, 67 percent of presidents overall felt the search process appropriately disclosed the institution’s financial condition versus 71 percent in 2016; 72 percent of presidents overall felt board expectations were accurately disclosed versus 79 percent in 2016 (ACE, 2022, p. 11). Boards should also take note overall of pages 28–29 discussing different (lower) perceptions by presidents of color and even lower perceptions when the data are disaggregated by gender in chapter 3.

Military-affiliated presidents, compared to the overall sample, indicated less satisfaction regarding whether the disclosures made to them during the application process regarding the challenges facing the institution/system and the institution’s or system’s financial challenges were full, clear, accurate, and realistic. However, they were more apt to agree that the search process gave them a clear understanding of the board’s and the institution’s or system’s expectations. While this could simply be due to the smaller number of respondents involved, boards might wish to consider their disclosure processes with both the broader ACPS results and this analysis in mind.

Table 10: Military-Affiliated Presidents’ Perception of Disclosures During Search Process

Disclosure Category	Yes	No
Realistic assessment of current challenges facing institution/system	60.0%	40.0%
Full and accurate disclosure of institution/system’s financial condition	60.0%	40.0%
Clear understanding of board expectations	80.0%	20.0%
Clear understanding of system expectations	77.6%	22.4%

See p. 66 of ACPS for overall data.

MILITARY-AFFILIATED PRESIDENTS' PERCEIVED BOARD SUPPORT

The ACPS asks “What is your perception of the support you have from your governing board/agency at present?”

Table 11: Perceived Board Support—Total Military-Affiliated President Sample (N = 50)

Support Rating	%
Very/somewhat supportive	94.0%
Somewhat/very unsupportive*	6.0%

* N<10

The “somewhat unsupportive” and “very unsupportive” responses to the question on the part of military-affiliated presidents were both small enough in number that they were aggregated for confidentiality. Table 11 therefore aggregates the question’s corresponding “very supportive” and “somewhat supportive” responses for parallelism. However, comparing the overall ACPS data (ACE, 2023, p. 66) to that for military-affiliated presidents yields a nuanced detail in the positive side of the ledger. Specifically, when comparing the answer choice “very supportive,” a 12-percentage-point difference appears between the military-affiliated sample and all presidents. A total of 88 percent of military-affiliated presidents chose this answer versus 76 percent of all presidents. While the difference could be explained by unequal sample sizes, it might also be useful to investigate using qualitative methods.

As the full report shows (ACE, 2023, pp. 20, 21, 30, 58), there are differences in perception of board support between men and women presidents, between presidents of color and White presidents, and between men and women presidents of color. For instance, 76.6 percent of men overall considered their boards “very supportive” versus 72.2 percent of women and 73.8 percent men of color considered their boards “very supportive” versus 65.5 percent of women of color. More women of color (3.5 percent) considered their boards “very unsupportive” than men of color (0.0 percent) (ACE, 2023, p. 58).

According to AGB data, boards are still predominantly White and male (McBain, 2021, pp. ix–x), so board members and board chairs should take particular note of the overall ACPS data.

Analyses of the responses to this question by military-affiliated presidents could not be completed given the low number of such respondents.

Related to the issue of board support, the ACPS asked a free-response question, “Briefly, what are the top three challenges you have faced during your tenure?” ACE did not publish an analysis of these qualitative data in its main report. While the military-affiliated presidents’ answers should be interpreted with caution considering the low number of respondents, some interesting—if unsurprising—initial patterns emerged.

Unsurprisingly, finance-related challenges were top of mind. Other common responses fell into the categories of COVID/pandemic-related issues, personnel issues (not only faculty-related, but also related to staff and administrative personnel), and enrollment-related issues.

However, many other issues were mentioned, ranging from deferred maintenance to data-related issues (for example, needing more/better data to make crucial decisions related to finance and enrollment), risk management, other infrastructure issues, and beyond. As with the data regarding perceived board support, this suggests areas for future qualitative exploration.

Table 12: Top Challenges for Military-Affiliated Presidents (Free Response)

Challenge 1	Challenge 2	Challenge 3
Finance-related (N = 13)	Personnel (not only faculty) (N = 11)	COVID/pandemic-related*
COVID/pandemic-related (N = 12)	Finance-related*	Personnel (not only faculty)*
Personnel (not only faculty)*	Enrollment-related*	Enrollment-related*

*N<10

Military-Affiliated Presidents' Next Career Steps

As noted in this brief's introduction (see "Takeaways for Board Members"), the overall ACPS data show that "Over half (55 percent) of presidents planned to step down from their current positions within the next five years" (ACE, 2023, p. xi). The question was asked "relative to the current academic year" (2022, when the survey was fielded). Board members and chairs are advised to take particular note of this statistic if they have not done so already.

Given the small sample size, some of the analyses done by ACE of the full ACPS data (ACE, 2023, p. 13) could not be conducted on military-affiliated presidents. However, 66 percent of the military-affiliated presidents anticipated stepping down within the next five years. Further research will be necessary.

Table 13: Military-Affiliated Presidents' Time Frame for Stepping Down

Anticipated Time Frame (N = 50)	%
Within the next year or two	44%
3–5 years from now	22%
6–9 years from now*	16%
10 or more years from now*	10%
Don't know/prefer not to answer*	8%
Total	100%

*N<10; "Don't know" and "Prefer not to answer" aggregated for confidentiality

The ACPS also asked if the COVID-19 pandemic affected the timing of respondents' decisions on when to step down from their presidencies. The majority of military-affiliated presidents (58 percent) said it had not; this is slightly higher than the main ACPS report (55 percent) (ACE, 2023, p. 14). While 18 percent of military-affiliated

presidents said the pandemic had made them plan to stay longer than previously anticipated versus 8.9 percent in the main ACPS report (ACE, 2023, p. 73), the data should be interpreted with caution due to the low number of respondents.

Table 14: COVID-19 Effect on Military-Affiliated Presidents' Time Frame for Stepping Down

COVID-19 Effect (N = 50)	%
Yes, planning to stay longer than previously anticipated*	18%
Yes, transitioning out earlier than previously anticipated*	6%
No, still planning to transition at previously anticipated time	58%
No plan for transitioning out*	18%
Total	100%

*N<10

As with the main sample, the “retire and hold no other position” was a popular response among military-affiliated presidents despite one free-response comment saying, “I will be on the job until I am physically unable to perform.” The question allowed respondents to select all responses that applied.

Table 15: Next Steps Military-Affiliated Presidents are Considering (Varied Ns)

Next Steps	%
Retire and hold no other position	44%
Move to another college, university, or system presidency	22%
Become employed outside higher education—nonprofit or philanthropic (e.g., foundation president)	16%
Move to the faculty at current or another institution	8%
Become a consultant for a search firm in higher education	8%
Move to senior-level position at campus/system (not as president)*	6%
Become a CEO of a higher-education-related (non-campus) organization, association, or state system*	4%
Become an honorific chancellor/president at current institution*	4%
Become employed outside of higher education—corporation, for-profit*	4%
Unsure*	8%

*N<10

References

- American Association of University Professors (AAUP). n.d. “Makeup of the Academic Workforce, by Appointment Type.” Accessed November 11, 2024. <https://data.aaup.org/academic-workforce/>.
- American Council on Education. *The American College President: 2023 edition*. Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education. Accessed November 11, 2024. <https://www.acenet.edu/Research-Insights/Pages/American-College-President-Study-2023.aspx>.
- Kamarck, Kristy N. *Military Retirement: Background and Recent Developments*. Updated June 3, 2024. Washington, D.C.: Congressional Research Service. Accessed November 11, 2024. <https://crsreports.congress.gov/product/pdf/RL/RL34751>.
- McBain, Lesley. *2021 Policies, Practices, and Composition of Governing Boards of Colleges, Universities, and Institutionally Related Foundations*. Washington, D.C.: AGB, 2021.
- McDavis, Rod. (n.d.). “Yes, Experienced Leaders Still Want to be College Presidents.” Washington, D.C.: AGB Search. Accessed November 11, 2024. <https://www.agbsearch.com/newsletter/yes-experienced-leaders-still-want-to-be-college-presidents>.
- U.S. Department of Veterans Affairs, National Center for Veterans Analysis and Statistics. *NCVAS Table IL: VetPop2023 Living Veterans by Age Group, Gender, 2023–2053*. Updated November 4, 2024. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Veterans Affairs. Accessed November 11, 2024. https://www.va.gov/vetdata/veteran_population.asp.
- U.S. Department of Veterans Affairs, National Center for Veterans Analysis and Statistics. *NCVAS Table 3L: VetPop2023 Living Veterans by Race/Ethnicity, Gender 2023–2053*. Updated November 4, 2024. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Veterans Affairs. Accessed November 11, 2024. https://www.va.gov/vetdata/veteran_population.asp.



AGB ASSOCIATION OF
GOVERNING BOARDS
OF UNIVERSITIES AND COLLEGES

1666 K Street, NW, Suite 1200
Washington, D.C. 20006