

A Prehistory of Corporatization: College and University Business Officers, 1909-1955

The college is partly a business, and partly something very different from a business.¹

—Henry Pritchett, 1910

On May 1, 1961, Lloyd Morey addressed the fiftieth anniversary meeting of the Central Association of College and University Business Officers (CACUBO) on the topic of the Association's history and achievements. None were more qualified than he to give the address, for Morey personified the modern university business office. Having served as Comptroller of the University of Illinois from 1916 to 1953, Morey was a veteran business officer from one of the country's largest universities. He was the first certified public accountant to become president of a major university, serving as University of Illinois' acting president in 1953-1954 and president in 1954-55. He was one of CACUBO's earliest and most prominent members, having joined in 1915, held the presidency in 1922, and remained active in the decades that followed. He had overseen the establishment of authoritative standards for financial accounting in higher educational institutions, which ranked among CACUBO's most important work. Moreover, he had served as chief consultant to the Financial Advisory Service of the American Council on Education, in the years when it was the leading national organization for research on higher educational finance and management.²

A lifetime's work made the address a personal affair, for him: of all the professional groups he had been involved with, the Association ranked as his "first love." He recalled with a sense of nostalgia and pride such topics as the standardization of financial forms and the

rationalization of business office organization, which sat rather oddly beside his more personal comments. He meditated, finally, on whether the occupation of college business officer constituted a profession. Though Morey himself concluded it did not, it said a great deal that the question was, by then, worth asking.³

Morey's retrospective, like his career, testified to a nationwide movement amongst college and university business officers towards more precise, standardized, and business-like methods of higher educational business administration. This movement paralleled the increasing administrative importance of the business office in many institutions of higher education. The business officers' movement originated, and to an extent remained, in the country's larger universities, typified by Morey's own University of Illinois, and unfolded from around 1910 to 1950. In its course, Morey noted, college and university business administration had "become a distinctive and well regarded career which command[ed] both internal and external respect."⁴ The movement's earlier phase focused on standardizing financial accounting practices and developing the capacity of the profession for comprehensive research into its problems, and proceeded unevenly from around 1909 to 1935. In a second, later phase, from around 1937 to 1955, business officers extended their concerns somewhat from purely financial tasks (accounting and investment) to more general administrative tasks, such as managing physical plant or workers, and formulated standard practices for these as well. This essay documents this movement.

The development of college and university business offices in the early twentieth century has relevance today, for it is not uncommon now to read or hear the assertion that colleges and universities in the United States are run like business corporations. Some have greeted the more

business-like administration as a positive development, even a necessity. As Constantine Papadakis, the president of Drexel University, replied in 2006 to an interviewer who objected that a nonprofit university could not run like a business: “If there's no profit motive, then you are doomed.” For Papadakis, the university could only perpetuate itself by “invest[ing its] profit back into the business to make it better.”⁵ More frequently, however, corporate methods in colleges and universities are met with criticisms, often leveled by academics themselves. In 2015, for instance, a recent graduate of Purdue University wrote in the *New York Times* against “the corporate taming of the American college,” specifically “the way universities operate, every day, more and more like corporations.”⁶ A 2014 editorial in *Time*, titled “How American Universities Turned into Corporations,” criticized “a fundamental change in higher education: universities act increasingly like big businesses that treat students as customers.”⁷

Most negative takes on higher educational corporatization, such as the two quoted above, are from liberal, progressive, or radical editorials or research pieces. Reading them, one senses a grim culture to have settled in the country’s colleges and universities, marked by a new impersonality, bureaucratic enclosure, and spiritual hollowness. Often, such writers date the corporatization of the university to the past several decades, and often they associate it with the advent of neoliberalism. The *Time* article quoted above, for instance, sees corporatization as “part of a larger cultural shift that can be traced back to the 1970s and ‘80s, when policymakers began to view higher education more as a private good...than as a public good.” Noam Chomsky, addressing an adjunct faculty union in 2014, described university corporatization as occurring “quite systematically over the last generation as part of the general neoliberal assault

on the population.”⁸ As a result of such corporatization, these voices argue, the educations that schools offer have suffered.

This discourse is limited, however, by the fact that the idea of the college as a business corporation is older than neoliberalism, not so much younger, in fact, than the large industrial corporations themselves. By the early twentieth century, even some commentators outside educational circles had noticed similarities between colleges and business corporations. In 1909, for example, an editorial in the *Wall Street Journal* observed that

American universities, especially in the larger cities, have become not only great institutions of learning, but great financial institutions entailing banking and financial skill sufficient to justify the employment of those who exercise this skill as bank officers at a high salary.⁹

While the neoliberal era doubtless has brought actually unprecedented changes to the country’s colleges and universities, many of today’s writers on corporate influence, values, and practices in higher education fail to ask whether corporatization may have taken root in an earlier period, or what preconditions for corporatization, if any, earlier periods established.

A striking corrective to this gap in the literature is provided by the writings of political scientist Clyde W. Barrow. Barrow argues that

the structure and processes of the corporate university were established from 1894–1928...[and] there have been three subsequent cycles of university corporatization from 1929–1952 and 1953–1989, and 1990 to the present [2018]. Each of these reform cycles in higher education has further advanced the corporate ideal at the expense of the

academic ideal resulting in deeper penetration and stronger regulation of the university by corporate capital and the capitalist state.¹⁰

The bedrock of Barrow's analysis is his detailed work on the 1894-1928 period. In these years, he has shown, representatives from the major blocs of corporate power in the United States joined in promoting a program of "corporate liberalism" to restructure higher education into an "ideological state apparatus" attuned to corporate needs. They frequently worked through two major clearinghouse organizations in the field of education, the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching (CFAT) and the General Education Board (GEB). These two organizations stimulated research into higher education, with the goal of scientifically reforming the system as a whole; they established a common forum for educational administrators and corporate leaders to discuss the problems of modern education; and they could pressure colleges and universities in the direction of reform by the sheer size of the resources they commanded (and hence the potential financial support they could offer).¹¹

I will not defend or extend Barrow's more general theoretical claims, such as his arguments regarding corporate liberalism. My focus is more on the practical, internal operation of colleges and universities than their structural role in society. However, this study does reinforce some of Barrow's findings on the CFAT and the GEB. Moreover, I believe that a historical approach to the problem of university corporatization is needed to properly understand its manifestation today. At the very least, the development of college and university business offices in the early twentieth century complicates the notion that university corporatization is specific to the late twentieth century. Examining the history of college and university business administration enables us to be more precise with definitions and claims about corporatization in

the present. Beyond this, I would argue that later, more striking periods of corporatization would have been impossible without the changes in college and university business offices in the early twentieth century, discussed below. The relationship between earlier and later phases of corporatization is, unfortunately, beyond the scope of this essay, which is limited to the years from 1909-1955. Nevertheless, even if we are to believe that higher educational administration has changed to navigate by narrow financial concerns over the past several decades, and no earlier, we should at least investigate the history of higher educational financial administration to understand the mechanisms by which these changes have come about. I thus intend this essay to contribute to the early history of university corporatization begun by Barrow.

Finally, I should note that it is not always precisely clear what “corporatization” entails in today’s discourse. As political scientist Henry Steck noted in 2003, “‘corporatization’ is often used in such an indiscriminate and shifting manner that it seems to say everything — or else very little.” Steck, nevertheless, provided a useful summary of the various current meanings of corporatization, based on a review of “the formal and the polemical literature.” He identified several common claims: that chief college administrators are increasingly akin to corporate executives and use corporate management practices, that academic research is increasingly compromised by commercial interests, that corporations have begun to found and operate their own universities, and that academic values are being corrupted by corporate values.¹² The reader may find Steck’s summary a useful reference point for considering the contemporary relevance of the material below.

To discuss the professionalization of higher educational financial management in the early twentieth century, I will first describe the birth and development of the major professional

organizations for college and university business officers. I then discuss the development of more precise forms of accountancy in colleges and universities, as well as the growing capacity of the profession of higher educational business administration to conduct exhaustive, quantitative research into its problems, which stand as two of the major accomplishments of business officers early in the century. I then briefly discuss the expansion of the role of the business office in many schools from the purely financial to the more generally managerial, before giving some concluding comments.

Preliminaries: the Origins of the Professional Associations

Shirley W. Smith was hired as a business officer at the University of Michigan in 1908. When he joined the university, he had been appalled by the poor standard of record-keeping the institution practiced. On his first morning on the job, Smith later recalled,

After opening my pile of letters...I asked one of the two assistants or clerks for the location of the letter file,—and found there was none. My predecessor had a file for what he currently might esteem to be *important* documents in which he placed the few letters he thought worthy of preservation,—and these were few indeed. He had always proceeded on the theory said to have been enunciated by a president of a sister university: “If one only delays long enough before answering letters, one will be surprised at how many don’t have to be answered at all.”¹³

Disorganization, non-uniformity, and an absence of administrative coordination and control characterized the university. Smith’s attempt to discover what office hours the institution kept “found each office determined these for itself, and that these hours ran from 34 to 54 weekly,

thus making for a wonderful institutional esprit de corps.” The minimal level of paperwork (hence record-keeping and bureaucracy) at the University is suggested by the fact that a single stenographer sufficed for the shorthand and typing needs of the President, the Treasurer, the Secretary, the Dean of the Law School, and the staffs of both the library and the chemical laboratory. Perhaps most astonishing to business officers of later years, “‘secretaries’ had not yet evolved.” Such a state of affairs, Smith asserted, was “typical,—not individual to Michigan” in 1908, but the problems of the work militated for change. “Old methods had been outgrown; new ones had not yet been formulated,” Smith recalled, and “The voice of work needing to be done was crying in a wilderness of perplexity and inactivity like cows bawling at the pasture gate for a farmer on an all-night drunk in town.”¹⁴

Business officers at other large state schools noticed similar problems in the years around 1908, and beyond this, realized that the same problems confronted other institutions. In 1911, for example, Kansas State Agricultural College hired J. C. Christensen from the Banking Department of the State of Kansas. Unfamiliar with his new job, he decided to tour the “leading colleges and universities in the northern and eastern parts of the United States” to survey their methods of business administration. In the course of his trip, he realized that “the problems of Kansas were the problems of every other state and that the subjects which were interesting me were engaging the attention of the business managers of every institution I visited.” Like Smith, Christensen sensed a discrepancy between the methods of the profession and the problems it confronted. “The American university,” he observed, had “outgrown its early organization,” as a result of “a remarkable growth in American educational institutions” in the previous twenty years. Annual budgets now ran to nearly two million dollars in some institutions, while leading

schools in earlier years had never exceeded three or four hundred thousand. Budgets had grown more complicated, too, with material factors of education (such as equipment or building maintenance) taking an increasing share, whereas salaries alone had been the main expenses of earlier periods. In Christensen's words,

The American university has become a large business corporation, and its business should be conducted according to the approved methods of modern corporations. There is no reason why the business of a university should not be conducted in a business-like way, and there is every reason why it should be. To place the business upon a thoroughly sound and efficient basis will not in any way interfere with the proper freedom and development of the university as an educational institution.¹⁵

To introduce the "approved methods of modern corporations," Christensen envisioned the reorganization of the business office, emphasizing "concentration" for the sake of "efficient business organization," in particular by appointing "one man with sufficient authority to enforce his demands" at the head of all business activities of the university.¹⁶ Partly through his work and his associates', many business offices across the country would later realize the changes he envisioned.

Several years earlier, Herman Knapp, of Iowa State University, had visited Carl E. Steeb, the Secretary of Ohio State University. The contact was evidently beneficial, for Steeb then toured a number of large midwestern state universities 1909, surveying the methods and problems of their business officers. He visited Smith at Michigan, and Smith himself toured large institutions soon afterwards. This traffic amongst the business officers of the midwestern state universities culminated in a meeting between six of them in Chicago on November 23, 1909. It

was the first ever such meeting between college and university business officers, and was useful enough to the participants that they agreed to sustain the meeting on an annual basis, as a formal association.¹⁷

The initial name they adopted was the “Association of State University and College Business Officers of the Middle West,” and the organization eventually grew into CACUBO. In the three decades following the founding of the central association, similar associations were formed for eastern, southern, western, and Black colleges and universities, in 1920, 1928, 1936, and 1939, respectively. The National Association of Educational Buyers was organized in 1921 for officers in charge of purchasing.¹⁸ The main role of these associations was facilitating the exchange of useful information amongst business officers. As Shirley Smith observed in 1936, “the greatest value of the [central] Association” to most of its members lay in “personal contacts” who “have taught us exactly where any information that we currently need is most likely to found” (as an example, he cited an instance in which colleagues at other institutions had helped Smith’s University of Michigan with a legal issue by sending documents from their own court cases that established precedents that favored Michigan).¹⁹ In the process, the associations promoted the movement towards more business-like methods. They were the vehicles by which the business officers’ movement spread itself, and the forums where its ideas were clarified, for the next several decades, until business officers began organizing at the national level around 1950. Thus was the movement born in the largest state universities of the country, under the logistical pressures of their recent expansion. The Central association, being the oldest and largest of the professional associations, is the focus of analysis here.

Accountancy and Research, 1909-1935

In their first few decades, the main achievements of the professional associations were in improving and standardizing financial accounting practices in institution and in developing the capacity for broad, systematic research into the problems of college and university business. Though the subject of accountancy may put off some readers, the significance of these developments should not be overlooked. To run efficiently, a university had to know its own finances, and thus required adequate accounting methods. Furthermore, detailed record-keeping systems at individual universities made cross-institution research possible, providing a more scientific method of inquiry into the field's best practices. To an extent, record systems and research were not organic developments of colleges and university business offices, but promoted by external actors such as the CFAT and the GEB. These organizations, especially the CFAT, sought to inform the practice of college and university administration with systematic, heavily quantitative research into administrative methods, exemplified by studies such as Morris L. Cooke's 1910 report to the CFAT, *Academic and Industrial Efficiency*.²⁰ Such a vision of integrated administrative knowledge and practice, with the goal of optimal efficiency, marks the development of accountancy and research in the years 1909-1935 as a definite phase of university corporatization.

Standardization of financial forms and reports was, in fact, what catalyzed the formation of the professional associations. The 1909 meeting that established the central association was a discussion of financial forms drawn up by Harvey S. Chase, a public accountant, for use by the CFAT in obtaining financial reports from colleges and universities. The forms, evidently, were inadequate: after a day spent discussing them, the business officers decided that they needed to

be “more completely developed,” and the forms were not adopted.²¹ Instead, the profession of higher educational financial management continued its process of self-organization, facilitating communication amongst college and university business officers and developing a greater capacity for organized research in its field of interest, via the formation of the professional associations. Cost accounting procedures were a continuing interest of these associations, but no authoritative consensus on standard financial forms would emerge for several decades.

A serious attempt towards establishing standards for accounting in colleges and universities was made in 1922 with the publication of *College and University Finance*, the first manual in the field of higher educational management. Written by Trevor Arnett, auditor and later business manager of the University of Chicago,²² the book covered the subjects of accounting, financial reporting, budgeting, and endowment management. Arnett’s concern for standards permeates the book, as it treats exhaustively with problems of classification and terminology — for example, how and where to count facilities costs in financial records and analysis, or the exact meaning of the term “endowment.” His sense of what was proper in his field was also expressed in his stern prescriptions against loaning endowment funds to trustees or officers, investing them in college buildings or land, or holding them in the same account as spending money.²³ While these admonitions suggest the persistence of imprecise methods in many business offices, the book also attests to the profession’s growing sense of confidence and importance in at least some institutions. Arnett believed the business officer (particularly in moderate-sized, private institutions) to be a position “of sufficient importance to warrant a respectable salary and to attract a man of ability,” even requiring subordinate staff, “a stenographer and a book-keeper for his office, both of whom may well be women.”²⁴

However influential, Arnett could not write with the authority of the entire profession. Such was only achieved with the publication of *Financial Reports for Colleges and Universities* in 1935. The manual was compiled by the National Committee on Standard Reports for Institutions of Higher Education, which was convened by the regional business officers' associations, the Association of American Colleges, the Council of Church Boards of Education, and the American Association of Collegiate Registrars. Lloyd Morey, comptroller of the University of Illinois, chaired the committee, which was mostly composed of business officers from large universities; state schools were heavily represented, but not nearly so much as in the early years of the central association. From 1930 to 1935, the committee conducted a nationwide study of financial reports and cost-accounting methods then in use by colleges and universities, before preparing "model forms of reports and standard classifications of accounts." These were revised after feedback from numerous business officers, accountants, and other "interested persons," and compiled into the final book.²⁵ These forms were the first with official, authoritative sanction, having been produced by the professional associations. Nevertheless, it should be remembered that their recommendations were only recommendations. In 1938, under 500 of the roughly 1,500 higher educational institutions in the United States had implemented the forms from *Financial Reports*,²⁶ despite the American Council on Education (ACE) forming a Financial Advisory Service (FAS) to promote their acceptance.²⁷ As always, the publications of the associations represented the leading edge, not the standard practice of the profession.

Financial Reports also demonstrated the capacity of the profession of college and university business administration as a whole, by the middle 1930s, to conduct detailed, exhaustive research in its field of interest and to deliberate and settle on standard procedures. The

professional associations had long since undertaken research projects of similarly large scope. For a number of years in the early 1920s, for example, the central association compiled a comparative list of tuition fees across its member institutions.²⁸ Additionally, the American Council on Education had organized an Educational Finance Inquiry Commission in 1921, which published a number of reports, and the Council resumed a leading research role with the creation of the FAS in 1936. According to Lloyd Morey, the FAS was to fill the void left by his committee's dissolution by "carry[ing] on studies in the field of financial management, on any subject that seems to call for further study," as well as promoting use of the standardized forms.²⁹ The committee that produced *Financial Reports* was thus not novel in being a national research effort into higher educational financial management, but rather in the thoroughness of its investigation and the degree to which it prompted and utilized cooperation amongst and participation from business officers and their organizations across the United States.

The CFAT and the GEB were particularly influential in prompting large-scale research projects, and to an extent in the production of standard financial forms. The CFAT, as we have seen, provided the impetus for CACUBO with its standardized forms, and maintained a presence within CACUBO in at least its early years.³⁰ The GEB, for its part, funded both the work of the committee that compiled *Financial Reports* and the FAS after it, and paid for the limited distribution of *Financial Reports* to a number of colleges, universities, and libraries.³¹ The GEB also promoted precise accounting methods in colleges and universities through field representatives who worked directly with institutions in implementing new methods. This system proved inadequate, for the number of institutions requesting help was too large, so in 1915 the GEB tapped Arnett to compile a manual of practices for others in his field. *College and*

University Finance was the result, and the GEB also paid for the distribution of thousands of copies of the book across the country.³²

Arnett illustrates particularly well how the foundations mediated between the worlds of business and higher education. In addition to publishing *College and University Finance*, he served as Secretary of the GEB for some years, and conducted a number of studies for the organization into the 1930s on such issues as enrollment trends, tuition fees, and salaries.³³ He was in letter correspondence with John D. Rockefeller, Jr., and was likely also in contact with John D. Rockefeller, Sr., who had endowed the GEB and was the major benefactor of the University of Chicago, where Arnett worked.³⁴ Indeed, one source has claimed that the elder Rockefeller “developed a practice of inviting the officers of the University of Chicago to discuss the university’s plans for the following year: what funds were expected, their sources, and their purposes,” though I have not found primary documents that support this.³⁵

Typically, the foundations justified their promotion of accountancy and research in colleges and universities by claiming they corrected critical weaknesses in the higher educational *status quo*. For example, when the CFAT published the forms that were presented to the 1909 business officers’ meeting in Chicago, its president Henry Pritchett explained that any institution should be motivated “both from the standpoint of its own efficiency no less than from the standpoint of its obligation to the public” to issue such forms as annual reports. Elaborating, he argued that

the absence of such a practice has been a source of much of the looseness which has characterized the financial conduct of many colleges. The college has everything to gain by opening its books to the public, and those who give to colleges will more and more

generally insist upon having a definite statement of the use which the college has made of its money. No college which refuses to do this deserves to be entrusted with money.³⁶ These might be loaded words, however, to a college administrator in 1910, for “those who give to colleges” prominently included the CFAT itself. Andrew Carnegie had liberally endowed the organization in 1905, when Pritchett had advised him on establishing a pension system for college professors, the precursor to today’s TIAA-CREF.³⁷ Barrow, in fact, has claimed that “All colleges and universities applying for admission to the CFAT pension system were required to use the standard forms,” though I was unable to substantiate this from primary sources.³⁸ Regardless, it is likely that the foundation’s apparent generosity was not without an element of pressure. Unquestionably, it was one facet of Pritchett’s program to make the CFAT what he called “one of the Great Agencies...in standardizing American education.”³⁹

For Pritchett, one purpose such standardization served was to facilitate research on higher education, with which pedagogical and managerial methods could be more scientifically refined for results and efficiency. The CFAT under Pritchett pioneered such methodological research. In 1909, Pritchett wrote to Frederick W. Taylor, the father of scientific management, on the possibility of an “economic study of education.” Taylor recommended his student, Morris L. Cooke, for the job, and the result was *Academic and Industrial Efficiency*, a report Cooke made to the CFAT in 1910 based on a study of eight schools, mostly large universities.⁴⁰ The report deserves deeper study than is possible in these pages, for it foreshadows many future developments relevant to today’s concept of university corporatization. His discussion of college professors as producers and his interest in performance metrics for different aspects of the college are particularly suggestive.⁴¹ For our purposes, however, Cooke’s report illustrates the

connection the CFAT pursued between accounting, research, and administration in higher education.

Cooke was most struck by “the entire absence of uniformity or accepted standardization” in college administration. While always too diplomatic to condemn the colleges for their idiosyncrasies, nevertheless he noted that properly established standards “produce the best that is known at any one time” in business management. Their absence in college administration prevented “the mutual help and cooperation which is given in the business world” from developing among schools. More specifically,

The colleges are not only not organized for the exchange of help and information and data, but as rule it appears that they do not care to afford it. The broad reason for this difficulty seems to be that the records of the colleges as a whole, and of the individual departments, are inadequate, and are so lacking in uniformity that any effort on the part of one college to help another is made with too much difficulty.⁴²

Such mutual aid, as noted above, was one purpose of the business officers’ professional associations. But one cannot help but notice that in addition to enabling mutual aid amongst colleges, standardizing records might facilitate research on higher education by such organizations as the CFAT. This holds particularly for heavily quantitative studies such as Cooke’s. Quantitative research could enable the scientific management and improvement of higher education; standard forms might generate its data.

Standard Practices for an Expanded Role, 1937-1955

In their earlier years, the professional associations promoted discussion amongst their members of such mutual interests as cost accounting, business office organization, and legal aspects of endowment management — frequently discussions of great detail and precision.⁴³ Such topics as these, however, are still essentially limited to college finances *per se*. They do not indicate as great an extent of administrative involvement in the general operations of the school as would develop for the business officers of later periods. The business office rarely looked beyond accountancy and investment as its areas of interest, at least for systematic study.

Arnett's *College and University Finance* reflects this balance of roles. As noted above, the manual covered the subjects of accounting, financial reporting, budgeting, and endowment management with great precision and thoroughness. Arnett's book does not, however, advise the reader in detail on the actual management of a college (e.g. regarding food service, laundry service, or security), although his section on "The Budget" notes that the "educational work of a college ought to be limited by the income at its disposal."⁴⁴ Despite the importance Arnett assigned to the business officer, his duties were still more those of accountant and investor than manager. *Financial Reports*, the major advance of the profession analyzed in the last section, is similarly confined to the problems of accountancy.

Organized efforts to formulate similarly authoritative principles of the general practice of higher educational business administration date from the late 1930s. Attempts towards such principles were not exactly new: J. C. Christensen, for example, presented a paper on "Principles of University Business Administration" to the central association in 1921.⁴⁵ A more cohesive, centralized movement towards principles for general practice, however, succeeded the work of

the Committee on Standard Reports, when in 1937 the FAS and the central association prepared a list of “Tentative Principles of College and University Business Practice.”

The duties enumerated in the “Principles” included management or oversight of central stores, physical plant, construction, residence and dining halls, print shops, and bookstores, indicating a conception of the business officer’s sphere of operations more expansive than in earlier works. That same year, Lloyd Morey, W. C. Cobb (of the University of Iowa), and H. C. Gregg (of Iowa State College) submitted a resolution to the central association to form a joint committee with the other regional associations “on standards of college and university business practice.”⁴⁶ This was the seed of the so-called “Manual Committee,” chaired by J. C. Christensen, which worked with some interruption through the 1940s and finally compiled *College and University Business Administration (CUBA)* in 1952. A second volume of the book followed in 1955.⁴⁷ The first comprehensive textbook of college business management, *CUBA* treats with the expanded roles of the business officer outlined in 1937 in full detail, and has been periodically revised by the National Association of College and University Business Officers.⁴⁸

Journal literature of the period also indicates the business officer’s serious interest in service enterprises by the year 1950. The journal *College and University Business*, in particular, founded in 1946 and authored mostly by college and university business officers, reflected this interest in its early issues. In the January 1948 issue, for example, readers could find three separate articles on food service operations, one on housecleaning, and one containing advice on “Technics for Dealing with Employees.”⁴⁹ Few articles throughout the year 1948 dealt with anything so purely financial as, for example, accounting methods. The focus of the profession

had expanded, and the business office had begun its transformation from the institution's accountant to its manager.

Conclusion: Towards a More Corporate University

On September 30, 1951, shortly before the first volume of *CUBA* was published, J. C. Christensen died. His career bookended the business officers' movement discussed above: it stretched from his address to the central association in 1912 on business-like administrative methods, to his chairmanship of the Manual Committee that produced *CUBA* in 1952. He had spent three of the previous four decades as a business officer at the University of Michigan, having moved from Kansas in 1914 and retired in 1944.⁵⁰ He remained active in the central association throughout his life,⁵¹ and played a leading role in the modernization of business office practices.

Later periods, as indicated above, would bring further changes to college and university business administration. The vast expansion of higher education following the Second World War, in particular, brought new logistical challenges that motivated further methodological imports from the corporate world into higher education. Nevertheless, the development of business offices in the early twentieth century was an indispensable precursor to such later developments. It was a new kind of business officer, exemplified by Christensen, that emerged from large state institutions early in the century, more conscious of methodological precision and efficiency than his predecessors. In many ways, Christensen's 1912 inspiration "to place the business [of a university] upon a thoroughly sound and efficient basis" had been fulfilled.⁵²

Notes

For the sake of space, minutes from the annual meeting of the central business officers' association will be abbreviated to *Minutes*, followed by the year. For example, *Minutes, 1936* will stand for *Minutes of the Twenty-Seventh Meeting of the Association of University and College Business Officers, Held at the University of Chicago, Chicago, Illinois, May 13-14, 1937*. The publishers of such minutes are always the associations themselves.

¹ Morris L. Cooke, *Academic and Industrial Efficiency* (New York: Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, 1910), vi.

² For dates in CACUBO, see *Minutes, 1961*, 172-173. On University of Illinois presidency, see University of Illinois President's Office, "Morey 1954-1955" (Urbana, IL: University of Illinois, 2018), Web, accessed February 8, 2018. For dates of University of Illinois employment, see University of Illinois Archives, Lloyd Morey papers 1908-1966, guide to papers.

³ Lloyd Morey, "The Central Association: A Backward Look — A Forward Glance," in *Minutes, 1961*, 173-189.

⁴ Morey, "The Central Association," 182.

⁵ Jennifer Robison, "Running a College Like a Business: A Q&A with Constantine Papadakis, President of Drexel University," *Gallup News*, March 9, 2006. Web. Accessed February 8, 2018.

⁶ Fredrik deBoer, "Why We Should Fear University, Inc.: Against the Corporate Taming of the American College," *New York Times*, September 9, 2015. Web. Accessed January 13, 2018.

⁷ Andrew Rossi, "How American Universities Turned into Corporations," *Time*, May 22, 2014. Web. Accessed January 13, 2018.

⁸ Noam Chomsky, "Chomsky: How America's Great University System Is Being Destroyed," Counterpunch, February 28, 2014. Web. Accessed February 8, 2018. These remarks were transcribed from an address Chomsky gave via Skype on February 4, 2014.

⁹ "Holland's Letter: Increasing Importance of the Executive Departments of the Great American Universities," *Wall Street Journal*, December 22, 1909.

¹⁰ Clyde W. Barrow, *The Entrepreneurial Intellectual in the Corporate University* (New York: Palgrave-Macmillan, 2018), 15

¹¹ Clyde W. Barrow, *Universities and the Capitalist State: Corporate Liberalism and the Reconstruction of American Higher Education, 1894-1928* (Madison, WI: University of Wisconsin Press, 1990), *passim* but especially chapters 3 and 4.

¹² Henry Steck, "Corporatization of the University: Seeking Conceptual Clarity," *Annals of the American Academy*, 585 (2003) 66-83

¹³ Shirley W. Smith, "Origins and Early History of the Association of University and College Business Officers," in *Minutes, 1936*, 36-37.

¹⁴ *Ibid.*, 35-37.

¹⁵ J. C. Christensen, "University Business Administration: A Paper Read Before a Conference of Business Officers of the State Universities and Colleges of the Middle West" (Manhattan, KS: Kansas State Agricultural College, 1912), 4.

¹⁶ *Ibid.*, 3-6.

¹⁷ Smith, 37-41

¹⁸ C. C. DeLong, *A History of the National Federation of College and University Business Officers Associations* (Publisher Unknown, 1963) 1-8.

- ¹⁹ Smith, 44.
- ²⁰ Cooke, *op. cit.*
- ²¹ *Ibid.*, 37-41.
- ²² “Guide to the Trevor Arnett Papers 1921-32,” University of Chicago Library, 2006. Web. Accessed February 8, 2018.
- ²³ Trevor Arnett, *College and University Finance* (New York: General Education Board, 1922), 6, 24-26, 42-50, 55.
- ²⁴ *Ibid.*, 175.
- ²⁵ National Committee on Standard Reports for Institutions of Higher Education, *Financial Reports for Colleges and Universities* (Chicago: University of Chicago, 1935), v-xi.
- ²⁶ Lloyd Morey, “A Central Financial Service: The Work of the Financial Advisory Service of the American Council on Education” in *Minutes, 1938*, 27.
- ²⁷ DeLong, 43; Lloyd Morey, “Financial Advisory Service” in *Minutes, 1936*, 77-78.
- ²⁸ See *Minutes* of the annual meetings of the Association of University and College Business Officers, 1921-1926.
- ²⁹ DeLong, 43; Morey, “Financial Advisory Service,” 77-78.
- ³⁰ Smith, 42.
- ³¹ DeLong, 43; Morey, “Financial Advisory Service,” 77-78; *Financial Reports*, v-xi.
- ³² Barrow, *Universities and the Capitalist State*, 77.
- ³³ University of Chicago Library, *op. cit.*. Later reports include such works as *Teachers’ Salaries in Certain Endowed Colleges and Universities in the United States* (1921), *Teachers’ Salaries in Certain Endowed and State Supported Colleges and Universities in the United States, with Special Reference to Colleges of Arts, Literature, and Science, 1926-27* (1928), *Observations on the Financial Condition of Colleges and Universities in the United States* (1937), *Trends in Enrollment in State and Endowed Colleges and Universities in the United States from 1928-29 Through 1936-37* (1938), *Trends in Tuition Fees in State and Endowed Colleges and Universities in the United States from 1928-29 through 1936-37* (1939), *Trends in Current Receipts and Expenditures and in Receipts for Capital Purposes of Endowed Universities and Colleges, and in Current Receipts of States Institutions in the United States from 1927-28 through 1936-37* (1939), and *Recent Trends in Higher Education in the United States: With Special Reference to Financial Support for Private Colleges and Universities* (1940).
- ³⁴ For the elder Rockefeller’s close relationship to the university’s early finances, see N. C. Plimpton, “Financing a University — An Historical Sketch,” *Minutes, 1937*. For correspondence between Arnett and the younger Rockefeller, see Arnett, Trevor. Papers, [Box 1, Folders 4-8], Special Collections Research Center, University of Chicago Library. The University of Chicago provides another early example of philanthropic influence on higher educational financial management. In 1897, John D. Rockefeller, Sr. loaned the school enough money to eliminate its other debts, “on the understanding that borrowing from banks was to be discontinued unless approved by him.” See Plimpton, 114.
- ³⁵ National Association of College and University Business Officers, *College and University Business Administration, Third Edition* (Washington, D.C.: National Association of College and University Business Officers, 1974), 6.
- ³⁶ Henry S. Pritchett, *Standard Forms for Financial Reports of Colleges, Universities, and Technical Schools* (New York: Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, 1910), 1-2.
- ³⁷ Ellen Condliffe Lagemann, “Pritchett, Henry Smith,” in *American National Biography* (Oxford University Press, 2018). Web. Accessed February 8, 2018.
- ³⁸ Barrow, *Universities and the Capitalist State*, 77.
- ³⁹ Quoted in Lagemann. The quote is from a 1905 letter from Pritchett to Andrew Carnegie.
- ⁴⁰ Barrow, *Universities and the Capitalist State*, 66-67. The quote is from a 1909 letter from Pritchett to Taylor. Cooke studied Columbia, Harvard, MIT, the University of Toronto, the University of Wisconsin, Haverford College, Princeton, and Williams College. See Cooke, 3.
- ⁴¹ Cooke, 19-29, 54-55.
- ⁴² *Ibid.*, 7.

⁴³ To take examples from the central association, see Lloyd Morey, "An Outline for a Statistical Cost Study" in *Minutes, 1923*, 1-2, I-IV; Christensen, "University Business Administration"; and M. E. McCaffrey, "Administration of Trust Funds and Bequests to Universities," in *Minutes, 1924*, 11-15 respectively.

⁴⁴ *Ibid.*, 67.

⁴⁵ J. C. Christensen, "Principles of University Business Administration" in *Minutes, 1921*, 47-56.

⁴⁶ From *Minutes, 1937*, see "Tentative Principles of College and University Business Practice," 38-41; Lloyd Morey, "The Problem of Developing Standards Other Than Those of Accounting in Business Practices in Colleges and Universities," 36-37; and for Cobb's and Gregg's respective institutions, see "Representatives Attending Meeting of Association of University and College Business Officers, May 13-14, 1937, Chicago, Illinois," 5.

⁴⁷ The subject was dormant for a few years in the early 1940s, following a failure to obtain supporting funds from the General Education Board. The subject of the manual was taken up again by a new committee several years later, which worked until its completion. See Lloyd Morey, "The Problem of Developing Standards Other Than Those of Accounting in Business Practices in Colleges and Universities," in *Minutes, 1937*, 36-37; "Report of the Recess Committee on the Problem of Developing Standards Other Than those of Accounting in Business Practices in Colleges and Universities," in *Minutes, 1938*, 93-97; and "Report of the Recess Committee on the Problem of Developing Standards Other Than those of Accounting in Business Practices in Colleges and Universities," in *Minutes, 1939*, 130. Reports from the "Committee on the Preparation of the Manual on University and College Business Organization and Administration," which took up the project after the hiatus, can be found in the *Minutes* of 1944-1949.

⁴⁸ National Committee on the Preparation of a Manual on College and University Business Administration, *College and University Business Administration* (Washington: American Council on Education, 1952-1955). Revisions were issued in our period of interest in 1968 and 1974 by NACUBO.

⁴⁹ From *College and University Business* 4 (1): Mabel Dorton, "Dining Hall Faces the Future," 23-24; Anna W. Janzen, "Before You Boost Food Prices," 24-25; Jean Hughes Vorhies, "Organizing a Food Service," 26-27; Frances Ronayne, "Housecleaning Is a Happier Task," 28-30; Volmer H. Sorensen, "Technics for Dealing with Employes," 14-15.

⁵⁰ "Biography," John Cornelius Christensen papers, Bentley Historical Library, University of Michigan. Web. Accessed February 8, 2018.

⁵¹ See, for instance, *Minutes* from 1921, 1923, 1926, 1928, 1929, and 1932.

⁵² Christensen, "University Business Administration," 4.