The Structure of Administrative Careers: A Prose Poem in Four Parts

Kathryn M. Moore

The Review of Higher Education, Volume 8, Number 1, Fall 1984, pp. 1-13 (Article)

Published by Johns Hopkins University Press
DOI: https://doi.org/10.1353/rhe.1984.0000

The Review of Higher Education
Fall 1984, Volume 8, No. 1
Pages 1-13

THE STRUCTURE OF ADMINISTRATIVE CAREERS: A PROSE POEM IN FOUR PARTS

Kathryn M. Moore

As you know, the Presidential Address is usually sandwiched between the annual business meeting and the ASHE Bash. This year we moved it out of the mellow glow of our evening convivality into the daylight. I have comforted myself in preparing for this morning with the thought that the move is a correct one for this hour in ASHE's history.

ASHE as an organization has stepped out of the shadow of AAHE. It has launched a full academic journal; it has attracted to its membership scholars, researchers and others of like mind for whom the study of higher education is work of high seriousness. And the membership—you and others—have indicated your willingness and commitment to sustain and support this purpose and this organization. It is good to be in the sunshine! It is with a deep sense of privilege that I have shared in that emergence.

This morning I would like share with you some thoughts and concerns that arise from my work these past three or four years on the structure of administrative careers. As many of you know, we launched the Leaders in Transition Project in 1981 in an attempt to gather benchmark data on administrators' careers in four-year colleges and universities. We just now put in the mail a second survey covering administrators in two-year colleges (subtitled "Today's Academic Leaders"). Until the new survey is returned some of my remarks as they address higher education generally may be a bit premature.

Kathryn M. Moore is in the Center for the Study of Higher Education at The Pennsylvania State University.

This article was originally "The Presidential Address" at the annual meeting of the Association for the Study of Higher Education, Chicago, March 1984.

The facts and findings from the Leaders in Transition study have been fairly widely disseminated. When someone at the Penn State Center sent me a present gift-wrapped in one of our tabloids, I realized we may have saturated the market. I am not going to repeat those findings here. Rather, I want to share some interpretations of the findings, interpretations that I consider working ideas. I invite your comments and reflections, and, in true ASHE style, I expect I'll receive them.

These interpretations fall under four main headings:

The Dan Ryan Expressway
The King of Siam
Thorstein Veblen, and
Winnie the Pooh

Now I acknowledge that for some of you the connections between my four headings and the structure of administrative careers may not spring readily to mind, so let me explain first what the Dan Ryan Expressway has got to do with careers in administration. To do this I must tell you a personal story.

Part I: The Dan Ryan Expressway

When my husband and I were preparing to go to graduate school at the University of Wisconsin at Madison from our home in Ohio we hadn't traveled very much, and certainly not in big cities like Chicago. When we hit the Dan Ryan Expressway and its maze of green and white signs we drove tensely and carefully, with traffic whizzing by on all sides. But despite our care we failed to make a necessary turn. Because of the structure of the highway and the fear of becoming more lost, we were too intimidated to correct our error until we were almost to Milwaukee. Finally we stopped and figured out where we were and how we could get to Madison.

It seems ludicrous now to remember how formidable that road was to us, how complex it seemed, how scared we were when we were navigating it, and how little we understood its purpose or design. Now, of course, we've driven it many times. We use it like the tool it is intended to be to assist us in getting into Chicago, or around it, or wherever in the vicinity we want to go.

Well, to me the Dan Ryan is a metaphor for administrative careers. The people who launch themselves into careers in administration often do not know how to maneuver. They sometimes do not know where they want to go. They may not even realize they are part of a large, interconnected network, and they often feel victimized by the very

process in which they are engaged. The entry and exist signs are not nearly as well marked as they are on freeways. And there are precious few roadcrews working to keep the usual routes in good repair. Even if you're working in the same institution where you may have been a faculty member, the administrative routes seem different and sometimes mysterious. You feel you could use a good map. But there are none. Veterans of the road can and do offer advice. Still, one usually feels oneself to be a lonesome voyager.

From the perspective of the Leaders project, which has examined over 3,000 careers involving line administrators in 1,200 four-year institutions, the array of exits and entrances, cloverleafs and secondary routes is mind-boggling. There are those who argue that the structure of administrative careers is one big super highway that begins in a fixed point and ends at a known terminus. Others are so impressed by the complexity that they believe the structure is essentially unknowable except as an individual may experience it. And still others believe their particular expressway is all there is. At times I have felt we would do well to employ a transportation analyst to assist us in the kind of work we need to do to map the career structure of administrators today.

One feature in particular of the career histories we have reviewed which sustains the expressway metaphor is the rate of job mobility. From time to time president-watchers, our academic equivalent of bird watchers, will report on the high numbers of presidential vacancies. Recently NASULGC published a report on the short tenures of college presidents (William E. Davis, NASULGC Green Sheets, Spring 1984). It is now about four and a half years. Gone are the days of the generational presidents—those who served for 15, 20, even 30 years; some of whom were even succeeded by their sons! We are now in a period of the fast turnover. Presidents are leaving before their boards have barely dismantled the search committees.

But had the president watchers compared what they considered to be an alarming trend with the data on the general population of administrators, they would leran that presidential mobility is mirrored in the larger administrative body. The Leaders data indicate that over 50 percent of all administrators in the sample had changed jobs within the previous five years, 25 percent in the last two years, 11 percent in the last year. The average tenure in any of the 55 types of line positions we examined (involving the titles of dean and up) was between five and six years. It seems likely that many an incoming president has had to pull off on the side of the road to avoid the rush of oncoming traffic *out* of his or her institution!

Movement on the highways and byways of administration is rapid,

and the traffic flow is terrific. While some may argue that it is likely to slow down in future years, I feel there are equally good reasons to think it will remain high. For one thing, research on other organizations in decline indicates that the number of managers often increases even as the production sections shrink. Second, even if the numbers of administrative positions may be reduced in future, the numbers of candidates seeking the posts is likely to increase; hence, there will be increased competition if not movement. Third, growth in higher education has always been fairly uneven; even in times of prosperity some institutions have failed. The perceived need for better management may result in simply the growth of management. And finally, as problems increase and more people are asked to manage them, the end result is likely to be more managerial solutions as opposed to other kinds of answers.

In the late 60's we began to speak of a managerial revolution. That revolution is now upon us, but I do not believe we have been thoughtful enough about its effects. What is called for its critical awareness. By that I mean the capacity to reflect not only upon the existing situation but on the ways in which the biases of managerial predispositions can be weighed against the equally strong predispositions of faculty and students. Trite as this may sound, we are in the process of creating the future for our colleges and universities. Choices must and will be made, but unless we are able to make informed choices, we stand in peril of becoming—to borrow a colleagues's phrase—like a blind man on a freeway. This brings me to the King of Siam.

Part II: The King of Siam

You will recall (most of you) the 1950's musical by Rodgers and Hammerstein called "The King and I." Most Americans considered it a charming depiction of life at the court of King Rama IV of Thailand in the 1860's. The story turns on the King's effort to modernize his kingdom and his court. This is symbolized in the play by the employment of a thoroughly English governess for the King's many children.

But despite his initiatives to modernize the King feels personally ambivalent over the changes he has wrought. He sings a song called "A Puzzlement." In the song the King laments that he feels "Confusion in conclusions he concluded long ago." "Now," he says, "Somethings are *nearly* so—and some things are *nearly* not."

Anyone who begins to examine individual careers at close range, especially careers of professionals, is struck by the ambiguities, tensions, and paradoxes of these careers. Over 30 years ago Anselm

Strauss and Howard Becker were doing some of the earliest and still most provocative work on careers in organizations and occupations. They remarked then that organizations which are "built around some particular kind of work or situation . . . tend to be characterized by recurring patterns of tensions and problems," and that "whatever the typical problems of an occupation, the pattern of associated problems will vary with one's position" (in Barney Glazer. *Careers in Organizations*. New York: McGraw Hill, 1968, p. 21).

One of the central problems in the academic occupations of this century has been to balance the tensions between meritocratic and loyalist urges. This problem is one faced by faculties in choosing between new colleagues who are "the best in the world" versus other candidates who are competent but, more importantly, who are judged to "fit in." Much as we may wish to argue that some faculty can be both, many are not so versatile. And as Neil Smelser put it, "Professional values are such that organizational loyalty is frequently viewed as being inversely proportional to professional competence" (Neil Smelser (ed.). *Sociology*. New York: Wiley & Sons, 1969).

This is nothing new. We have been well-informed about the many dilemmas of American faculty by some of our best minds. Including Wilson, Lipset, Riesman, Brown and many more. But fewer writers have dwelt upon the mirrored tensions among administrators, many of whom (fully 80 percent in the Leaders study) have at one time served as faculty. Many of these individuals were initially trained and socialized for a lifelong career as a faculty member. Most of them carry into their work as administrators the vestiges of faculty values they knew best.

As administrators these individuals are subject to similar contradictions in values. We have tended to monitor, for example, the inbrededness of faculty as one indicator of whether loyalty or professionalism was prevailing. Seldom have we looked at this notion for administrators. If we did, using the Leaders data, we would find that loyalty must be greatly prized or it wouldn't be so common. Over 65 percent of the line administrators we surveyed had held at least one previous job or had earned a degree from the institution in which they currently worked.

It seems likely that the vice of institutional loyalty in a faculty member becomes a virtue for an administrator. It seems probable that selection for a major administrative post is frequently based in large measure on the individual's association with the institution as well as proven competence to manage institutional functions at some lower level. Certainly formal training as an administrator has not been a criterion for most.

We know this and need not dwell upon it except to point out the puzzlement, the contradiction, that recruits for administration, most of whom still come from the faculty, must demonstrate a value orientation and commitment that is sharply different from their faculty-based values. And in so doing we perpetuate a central internal conflict in the governance of our institutions.

Let us add a second puzzlement. Namely, the effect of the insider/outsider notion on the corps of administrators themselves. As I mentioned, the Leaders data indicate that the majority of administrators are inbred by position, the most common connection being the position directly preceding the current one. Thus most line administrators are promoted from within, and doctoral universities are the most likely to do this.

With regard to alumni status, well over one-third (almost 40 percent for some positions) of all line administrators had earned at least one degree from the institution in which they currently worked. Once again, doctoral-granting universities were the most likely to employ their alumni (38 percent).

Without going into the possible reasons for this, let us look at the one striking exception to inbrededness: the presidency. Fewer than 20 percent of the presidents in our sample were promoted from positions within their institutions and fewer than 15 percent were alumni.

Presidents today are outsiders who preside over a largely insider administrative corps. Is it any wonder that presidential tenures are brief? Any president whose assignment is to bring about change must work first hand with a management team that is generally accustomed to the status quo. The issue lies in a dimension of administrative careers that surely bears further discussion and analysis. (See Robert Birnbaum, "Presidential Succession: An Interinstitutional Analysis." *The Educational Record,* Spring 1971, pp. 133-145.)

There is a third puzzlement apparent in the structure of administration today. It has to do with who are selected to serve as administrators. Returning to the Strauss and Becker assertion that any work organization has inherent, patterned tensions, let me add Moore's corollary:

Part A. As the organization changes and growth in functions and personnel, it tends also the acquire additional patterned tensions based on the personnel it adds.

Part B. These tensions themselves must be managed.

My point is this, when universities and colleges began to adapt to change at the turn of the century one response was to add administra-

tors where none had existed before. Universities added academic deans to manage the fragmenting disciplines and the increase in faculty. They added deans of students and the like to handle increasing enrollments and the influx of new types of students, principally women, but others also.

Subsequently colleges and universities have continued to respond to new demands for services by adding personnel. The greatet growth has been in those dealing with faculty or students, but other types of administration have grown as well; and they have grown in specific, structured, rather homogeneous ways.

In the 60's and 70's, as a result of two forces, the shift to mass education and the pressure to respond to civil rights, universities and college responded by adding persons to manage new undergraduate and adult student programs and services. And they added some new types of managers as representatives of the entering groups—principally blacks, some other minorities, and women.

Currently the initiative to increase particiption in new technological areas has been anticipated by the hiring of managers with experience or expertise in various technologies or their management.

Each time a new demand surfaces in colleges and universities an administrative as well as an academic response unually follows. The people recruited to assist in the institutional response are usually representatives of, or experts in, the demand area.

In viewing the Leaders data from this perspective it is relatively easy to find verification for these changes in the career histories of the persons in the sample. First, there is evidence of pure administrative expansion itself. Over 75 percent of the male administrators in the sample had held at least one newly created position in their career, and so had over 50 percent of minority administrators. The time span here is 20 years, approximately 1960-1980.

With regard to the character of these changes, it is clear to see that faculty academic expansion is mirrored in the careers of administrators who were drawn from the faculty and placed in charge of expanded faculty areas. Much of the expansion occurred through the creation of deanships, which relates to why doctoral universities are the greatest administrative growers.

The newly developing administrative response to civil rights and women's rights is present but to a lesser extent: First, not as much administrative responsibility has been assigned in these areas and, second, not as many women and minorities have been included in the administrative ranks as might be anticipated given the surge in enrollments from these groups, the growth of related academic studies, or indeed the legal and procedural foundation that began over a century

ago. Put simply: A 20 percent representation of women and an eight percent representation of minorities reflects neither the student nor academic response patterns that have been usual in other areas of administrative growth in this century. They represent, in fact, roughly the same percentage as three decades ago.

It seems clear that choices concerning whom to select as administrators in this context are designed to respond to external pressures, but such choices are also intended to avoid creating "uncontrolable" internal uncertainty. The norm has been to preserve and protect the current institution's leadership as much as possible through selecting persons with similar characteristics and values as much as possible. Internal promotion is the most common device; down-grading and containing more threatening (that is, sharply different) people and areas is the second. These observations, of course, bring me to Thorstein Veblen.

Part III: Thorstein Veblen

It's really rather special to be in Chicago this year and to reflect on how important this city and certain of its inhabitants have been for the development of American higher education. Thorstein Veblen traveled through the city in 1882 on his way to Baltimore to study at Johns Hopkins University. A recent graduate of Carlton College. Veblen sought at the young university the chance to engage in serious intellectual discourse of the sort he was not encouraged to pursue as an undergraduate. But the Johns Hopkins faculty failed to offer him a scholarship, and he moved on to Yale to study philosophy under Noah Porter and sociology under William Graham Summer. He received his doctorate in 1884 and once passed through Chicago on his way home to the family farm in Wisconsin—unable to secure a faculty job in philosophy because of his antagonistic and agnostic outspokenness.

One wonders if Veblen read Mark Twain's new book published in that year, *The Adventures of Huckleberry Finn*. Do you think he strolled down Michigan Avenue to gape at the construction of the first skyscrapper that was to be the new Marshall Field Department Store? It was a new kind of building and a new concept in commercial drygoods, both made possible by yet another invention, the electric elevator. Do you suppose he was intrigued with the possibility of long distance telephone calls offered by a new company called A T & T? Did he marvel at the new office machines, the typewriter and the adding machine, that were about to revolutionize the business world and academic life as well?

He surely did not need Federick Jackson Turner to tell him the frontier had closed. Nor could he help but remark upon the new waves of immigrants who, like his Norwegian parents, had come to America to seek thier fortunes in the land of opportunity.

Agrarian populism and labor unrest were in the air when Veblen walked the streets of Chicago in 1884. They were in full conflagration in 1892 when he returned, after a period of work in economics at Cornell. He had been hired as a lecturer at the new University of Chicago that was being built with Rockefeller big money and Harper's big ideas.

For 16 frustrating, exciting years Thorstein Veblen worked as a lowly subaltern at the University of Chicago. Many of his age contemporaries, like John Dewey, held professorships, but he remained, at 48, an assistant professor and sardonic outsider in that "toddlin' town" in that toddlin' university. It was the Gilded Age and, like Samuel Clemens, Thorstein Veblen was both attracted and repelled by it.

There are many striking parallels with today in the landscape of higher education a century ago. For example, in 1884 William and Mary College closed its doors for lack of students. Also in 1884 women were gaining grudging admission to the best men's colleges as well as attending institutions and seminaries specifically designed for them. In an article on coeducation written in that year it was claimed that "a diploma from Michigan University is of much more value to a lady than one from any colleges for women."

Blacks were struggling out of the disastrous reconstuction period with the double burden of white folks help and hindrance. The most popular lecturer of the day was Russell Conwell who gave his "Acres of Diamonds" speech over 6,000 times to Chautauqua audiences enthralled with his moral imperative:

> Get rich young man for money is power and power ought to be in the hands of good people . . . I say you have no right to be poor . . . Love is the grandest thing on God's earth, but fortunate is the lover who has plenty of money.

Conwell went on to found Temple University in Philadelphia and to serve as its president until 1925.

Thostein Veblen is remembered mostly for his two books, *The Theory of the Leisure Class* (1899) and the *Theory of Business Enterprise* (1904). But let us spend a few minutes with his contribution to the study of higher education, a book whose full title he had intended to be *The Higher Learning: A Study in Utter Depravity.* (The subtitle was eliminated by his publisher). Although not published until 1918, *The Higher Learning* was written mostly during his years at Chicago.

The main targets that loomed in the cross-hairs of Verlen's intellec-

tual artillery were those university presidents like Harper at Chicago who in Veblen's view prostituted pure scholarship in their drive for competitive advantage in what they viewed as an increasingly predatory academic environment. Their surest allies were entrepreneurs of both the business and academic variety who defined the main chance as the ability to secure the resources and the prestige to command the marketplace of ideas. In Veblen's own words:

> What is had in mind in this insistence on an efficient system is that these corporations of learning shall set their affairs in order after the pattern of a well-conducted business concern. In this view the University is conceived as a business house dealing in merchantable knowledge, placed under the governing hand of a captain of erudition, whose office it is to turn the means in hand to account in the largest feasible output.
>
> He will necessarily gather about him a corps of trusted advisors and agents, whose qualifications for their peculiar work is an intelligent sympathy with their chief's ideals and methods and an inreserved subservience to his aims.

This is not a flattering picture of academic administration but it is perhaps a useful tonic for those strategic planners of today who go in search of excellence among corporate board rooms. At many universities and colleges there is a rekindling desire to forge new alliances with business and industry and to attract greater corporate investment in the face of faltering governmental support. At present this iniative is largely managerial in origin, aided by a select few faculty for whom such activity is second-nature.

In another part of our campuses other managerial teams are assembled to work on "marketing" college programs to various kinds of consumers; still others are ar work "packaging" their programs and shaping their image. If they are really good these teams will succeed in cornering the market in some special areas for their institutions. (If they're clever, these folks will make a fortune consulting!)

These activities and this language would appall Veblen, of course. And there are many people who are as concerned as he would be at the direction our institutions are taking in the name of competitive advantage. Many of us view these and other actions as conforming rather too closely to the century-old social darwinist dictum: Survival goes to the fittest.

Yet it is too pat to condemn the many hardworking administrators we know as mere knowledge merchants eager to vend their schools' wares to any comer. What is needed is not Veblenesque excoriations. Rather we need some alternatives for institutional leaders to consider that both save their colleges' virtue and their general funds. But like Veblen

I am greatly dismayed to see the search for solutions leading outside to business rather than inside to our colleagues. It is an irony of ironies that the hottest selling books among administrators and many faculty is Peters' and Waterman's *In Search of Excellence*. We in academia are paying cold cash to learn about ideas we invented and gave to industries who came asking. What are quality circles if not a form of peer reviews? What is a college if not a people-centered place with a central, binding saga and a series of dynamic, charismatic leaders? I truly do not believe we need to follow corporate business models as slavishly as we appear to be doing.

These issues are reflected in the matter of administrator recruitment and administrator careers. Just where should we get our future administrators? And how and into what do we socialize them? Veblen's complaint in 1884 was that academic leaders were too businesslike in their approach to higher education. Today, once again, there is the temptation to select administrators directly from business. If the objective, however, is to maintain the university or college as a house of intellect where competing ideas can be freely debated, relatively independent of political currents, whether internal or international, one suspects it may be more difficult to convince recruits from industry to preserve and protect the academy's ideals than it will be to teach faculty recruits the nuances of a balance sheet. And indeed that is the general evidence from the Leaders data; fewer than ten percent of presidents are from non-educational organizations, fully 80 percent have faculty experience.

Point second, however, is that the faculty, who fill our traditional recruiting ponds, frequently lack more than minor accountancy skills. Driven as they inevitably are to the branches and twigs of academic specialization, it is sometimes a long and rugged road to reorient them to a wholistic view of their institutions. In times past we have let long experience and various rituals of loyalty, such as devotion to a faculty senate, serve as proxies for the administrative wisdom we dearly need. We have survived under the leadership of countless gifted amateurs, never daring to ask how much better off we might have been if we had had more postsecondarily literate people who could see their particular institution as part of a larger world and their administrative tasks as versions of a larger challenge.

With respect to administrators' careers in the turbulent 1980's that are so much like Veblen's 1880's, we need to be wary of the seductiveness of business solutions, but we also should be more impatient with a routinized reliance on local candidates largely for familiarity's sake. My own view is that we must give more thought than we have to the matter of whom we select for administrative posts below the presidency and how they are prepared. As scholars and teachers in higher

education we can be more insistent that whoever is recruited must be able to articulate the values of the academy, but they also must be able to conceptualize the essential decisions at issue in ways that encompass more than the parameters of a single institution—or they must learn how.

I do not mean to say that we have not done well under our current system. But I do believe we have not fully considered other options. And there is good reason to do so now. The Leaders data show high rates of internal selection below the presidency and tremendous turnover in administrative personnel. There are hidden costs in this structure that need examination. First, millions of dollars are being spent in nation-wide affirmative action searches for administrators. But we end up hiring our own mostly male, mostly white, colleagues. Why are well-prepared outsiders not being selected? Why do we settle for the illusion of openness? We spend millions of dollars recruiting but we spend nickles and dimes on administration education. I don't mean formal graduate programs, but rather systematic, continuous organizational development of administrative personnel. In this aspect, business has shown a different way. Investment in management development is a multimillion dollar necessity.

Unlike Veblen, I do not propose we reject out of hand the contribution business and industry can make to higher education. We are not and cannot be isolated enclaves. Neither do I believe we can afford solely home grown solutions when the tools of a larger vision are at hand. This set of propositions brings me inevitably to Winnie the Pooh.

Part IV: Winnie the Pooh

In that joyous literary work, *The House at Pooh Corner,* Chapter VIII, We read:

> Halfway between Pooh's house and Piglet's house was a thoughtful spot where they met sometimes when they had decided to go and see each other. And as it was warm and out of the wind they would sit down there for a little and wonder. . . .

I suspect what appalled Thorstein Veblen so much university life in his day was the rush to act rather than to think. Business was his literal target but also the incursion into academe of busy-ness, that urge to be active that is so endemic in American culture. Activity, doing, the Protestant ethic, Max Weber called it, is a cultural flywheel. It compelled many of Veblen's generation to Get Rich! To Go West! To Take Command! But for Veblen neither worldly wealth nor power nor travel to distant geographic frontiers were that compelling. Riches for Veblen

lay in ideas, frontiers existed in the discovery of ideas, and true authority resided in command of ideas and their careful explication.

The puzzlement, the paradox, Veblen saw and explored is that universities and colleges are unique human organizations that require largely nonmaterial things and hold basically noncommercial values, yet they are embedded in a society whose principal engagements are elsewhere and otherwise. As houses of intellect colleges engage the efforts of many minds and wills for whom the central task is learning. For a few, however, management of the house is the assignment, and for them the temptations to govern as the world governs are great. To resist those temptations, those who are selected for leadership need maps; they need models: they need perspectives that can assist them to wisely achieve balance and proportion between the external press and the internal ethos. Most of all, they need "thoughtful spots" where such questions can be discussed, where solutions can be posed.

If ever you doubted the value of your work as a scholar of higher education, now is the time. We need your skills for observation and critical awareness. Clearly scholars in other fields are not going to do it for us. If ever we doubted the value of ASHE as a locus for that necessary discussion, it is not now. ASHE is an essential thoughtful spot in the academic cosmos. It is important that we come together to struggle with the puzzlements and predicaments of higher education. There are few other organizations that can do it, will do it, indeed, who even care.

And now let me close by reiterating my four points: The Dan Ryan Expressway is a metaphor for an increasingly complex and charged administrative career structure for which few maps or models are available. I welcome fellow cartographers!

The King of Siam reminds us that puzzlements and paradoxes are endemic in our work. Indeed, they can be the substance of some of our very finest contributions. Let us encourage among us the curious and the seekers.

Thorstein Veblen stands for me as a reminder that 100 years is a very short time. We can recognize in the mirror of the past many of our own familiar features. It is healthful to glance there from time to time. Veblen also stands as a self-described "disturber of the intellectual peace." It is a calling few of us take up willingly, yet as colleagues in the pursuit of truth we ought to respect and encourage it in each other, and perhaps, most importantly, in ourselves.

Finally, Winnie the Pooh, though a bear of little brain, knew the value of a thoughtful spot and of friends to share it with. ASHE has been such a spot for me. I hope it is for you.

Thank you.