

**Dartmouth College Presidential Search Input Meeting Conducted by Al Mulley '70,  
Trustee and Chair of the Search Committee at Dartmouth Medical School.**

**WILLIAM (BILL) R. GREEN, DEAN, DARTMOUTH MEDICAL SCHOOL:**

Okay, I think we should get started. Thank you for coming. As you know, this is a special session that's really aimed at getting input for the Dartmouth College presidential search, and part of the process, the early process to achieve that.

Sue has placed our high tech audio recording device here, so I do want to point out that this is a public forum in that sense, and to the extent that there may be some reporters showing up or use of this appearing in print or websites, etc., please keep that in mind.

So I personally want to thank Al Mulley here, Chair of the Presidential Search Committee for giving faculty at DHMC a specific opportunity to ask questions and make comments about what we're looking for in a new president for Dartmouth. The purpose of this, then, is for Al to pass this on to the Board of Trustees and as they begin later this month to further shape and understand exactly what we're looking for for a successor to identify an attract to replace Jim Wright.

So, many of you know Al has had a long association with Dartmouth, but in case you haven't, let me just give you a quick update. Al's the Chief of the General Medicine Division at Massachusetts General Hospital, and he's an associate professor, both in medicine and in health policy at Harvard Medical School. Actually graduated from Dartmouth College in 1970 where he was a Choate Scholar and a Phi Beta Kappa member. He was awarded the Doctor of Medicine and Masters in Public Policy degrees from Harvard Med. and the JFK School in 1975. Before returning for his residency training in internal medicine at Mass General, he assisted on a variety of studies and research and with some particular focus in being one of the pioneers to work in the application of clinical epidemiology and decision theory to the evaluation and improvement of both medical intensive care, as well as primary care including prevention and screening. And he certainly has been a voice in many other health care service issues.

Al is a current member of the Dartmouth College Board of Trustees, he's also a current member, and has been for some ten years, of the Dartmouth Medical School Board of Overseers. He's been the liaison person between DC Trustees and the Overseers, and he's Chair of the Presidential Search Committee.

Though our group is small, I'm obligated to lay down some kind of rules of engagement here that I've been apprised of. Hopefully, you all got one of these green cards. And that's important, because although we wouldn't necessarily confine our discussion to these three questions, certainly those are three questions that have bubbled up as particularly important that we hope you'll help us address, both with your questions and comments so we can share the input here with the rest of the Board of Trustees.

So, beyond that, if when you speak you wouldn't mind introducing yourself, that would be helpful. I was supposed to say that we should keep remarks brief, and although I'll say that, I think we can be a little more liberal, given the turnout and the fact that we have the rest of the full hour. If you are a person representing a news outlet, we'd like that identification as well, and whether you're having a question or you feel like making a comment instead, even going to the point of sort of making a statement, again, try to keep that reasonably succinct.

If you don't feel comfortable with identifying yourself and making a comment verbally and being part of the audio record, what you could do is write your comment or question on the card, or a card, and we'll collect those at the end and pass them onto the Board of Trustees. And as we get near the end of the session, if we are running right up to the hour, I'll try to kind of give everybody a chance to weigh in a final time to capture those comments and so we can be reasonably complete here.

If you need to leave early, obviously you certainly may. And beyond that, I guess I'll stop and just turn the podium over to Al Mulley.

**AL MULLEY, TRUSTEE AND CHAIR OF THE PRESIDENTIAL SEARCH**

**COMMITTEE:** Thanks, Bill. It's good to be here with you. This is one of quite a few efforts on the part of the trustees to get some input early on in the search process. Ed Haldeman would be here with me today, but his daughter's graduating from law school. He and I have attended, so far, open forums for faculty and for students and for staff [and alumni] in Hanover, and we've had a couple of dinner meetings with art and sciences faculty committees, as well as meeting with the CPR that included faculty from the medical school and Tuck and Thayer. So we're trying hard to reach out and engage faculty in all aspects of Dartmouth's life, as well as other constituencies.

At this point we are really trying to develop something called a statement of leadership criteria, or leadership statement that will guide the process going forward. Just to give you a reminder of the chronology, Jim announced his plans to retire in June of '09 the first week of February. Those of us on the Board were grateful that he gave such a long lead time because it allowed us to initiate a process that, though not leisurely, could proceed with all deliberate speed, with an emphasis on the deliberateness.

We talked about the transition at great length at our regularly scheduled Board meeting in March and agreed that we would not appoint a search committee until June. But in the meantime, do a good bit of this kind of preparation for the work of the search committee. We also decided that we would have a Board meeting the first week in May and the last week in May to review input and to form a draft of this leadership statement which will go with a charge to the search committee when it's appointed for them to refine that draft, bring it back to the Board of Trustees. The Board of Trustees and search committee agree on the leadership statement, and then we know that those who are responsible for choosing Dartmouth's next president and those who are responsible for conducting the search are on the same page.

So this really is an important time for input. Once that document is done and published and put on the website, probably in mid-July, input would be welcome but it's going to be a little bit late. So that's why we're here, and I look forward to your thoughts.

The questions that we've been asking are questions that ought to be asked when one is thinking about the leadership statement. Basically, what are the challenges and opportunities that Dartmouth faces at this point in time, looking forward into the future? What are the qualities of leadership that are necessary to deal with those challenges and realize the opportunities? And then are there any other considerations? We've been hearing a great deal of constructive input. We're now just beginning to struggle a little bit with the task of putting together a leadership statement. There's an adage in the academic search world that generic leadership statements generate generic candidates. I think we could probably all agree that we're not looking for a pool of generic candidates. So again, just to emphasize that we are paying attention to what we hear, it has very practical, real impact on a very important element of the search and let's have a conversation.

**SPEAKER:** Al, maybe I'll start off with one, we didn't miss this, but a question's come to me as to whether the search committee will definitely be using a search firm? And if so, has one been identified and contracted with?

**AL MULLEY:** Yes, we will be using a search firm. We will be making an announcement about the particular search firm and why we made that choice as early as this week, so yes. Just as a point of information, the majority of academic searches now employ search consultants. That's relatively new, it wasn't the case 20 years ago, for sure. Wasn't even the case 10 years ago. But for instance, certainly the majority of searches among our peer institutions, three out of four, have engaged search consultants. So there shouldn't be anything controversial about that. Yes?

**DAN LONGNECKER, MD:** Listen, I'm Dan Longnecker from oncology. But since there seems to be an opportunity, I guess I'll say that according to my memory it's been since the '70s that we had a scientist in the Office of the President. And my recollection of the various presidents that have intervened, that there have been times when the MS administration seemed difficult to be heard by the Dartmouth College administration. I think those of us who've been around here for a while have a great respect that the

undergraduate program carries the major flag for the Dartmouth brand. But it is true that our graduate programs are in the sciences and not in the humanities and that we do have the professional schools.

So, I hope that that will be something that's on the mind of the search committee, the fact that you're in the leadership role, may be a positive sign. And I guess I hope being a scientist can in no way disqualify an individual because I think there are a lot of scientists with high regard for the humanities and value liberal education.

**AL MULLEY:** Thank you. Just reflecting on input that we've had to date, a number of people have urged that rather than being a disqualifying attribute, being a scientist might be a qualifying attribute. I certainly have heard none of the former and a good bit of the latter.

One of the interesting things about these input sessions, when it gets to the characteristics of individuals who might effectively lead Dartmouth into the challenges and opportunities, is the way a search works and the way it doesn't work. You can never afford to come to a fork in the road and choose a scientist or not, or man or woman, or alum or not. You know, it's much more process of identifying people that would have the qualities and the credentials and the capability to lead Dartmouth and looking at a whole constellation of attributes that are attached to the real people. But your point has been expressed by others and certainly resonates with me.

**PAUL MANGANIELLO, MD:** My name is Paul Manganiello, I'm ... (inaudible).

**SPEAKER:** Could you speak up, Paul? There's a bunch of noise.

**PAUL MANGANIELLO:** I'm on the committee that Bill Reed had formulated to kind of solicit information and get back to ... (inaudible).

**AL MULLEY:** I didn't mention that. One of the things that we did do is we asked the deans of each of the professional schools and art and sciences to identify some number of faculty, but that number is up to them, to fan out and have some small group conversations. There are a lot of things that people wouldn't want to say, even with a recorder that size going, and we really did want to have opportunity for lots of input to come into the Board and that has been working very well. The Committee on Priorities managed that process within art and sciences, but it's also working very well at Tuck and at Thayer.

**SPEAKER:** My record is the committee, to drill down just a little bit, the committee that Paul's talking about is an ad hoc one that Charlie Barlowe, who's in biochemistry and the other—and the Hanover campus is chairing. I'm not going to try to remember all the members, but in addition to Paul on this campus, I think it's Jocelyn Chertoff—

**PAUL MANGANIELLO:** Bill Rigby, Nuka Festov, Jerry O'Connor and that's ... (inaudible). I think Connie Brinckerhoff is also on it. And I don't remember the other—I don't think Jocelyn is on it.

**SPEAKER:** And maybe Dale Collins instead, it's one—

**PAUL MANGANIELLO:** Dale Collins.

**SPEAKER:** Dale Collins, sorry.

**AL MULLEY:** And Bill and Jerry both attended the dinner meeting that we had with the CPR, and other representatives of the other graduate schools on April 14<sup>th</sup>.

**DAVID MALENKA, MD:** I have a question. One of the hard lessons we've learned here is you can't successfully conclude a search if you can't define the job and you can't, more importantly, define a vision of what you want to be. And I've always been fairly confused about what does the Board of Trustees think Dartmouth should be 20 years

from now? Because when you listen to alumni, there seem to be different views, different perspectives. And it strikes me it's very hard to find somebody to take a leadership job unless that vision is well encapsulated and expressed. We have this confusing vision.

**AL MULLEY:** Yeah, David, that's exactly right. And that's what this leadership statement is all about. It's not just a job description, it's meant to be what do we ask somebody? What are we asking somebody to lead us into? What is the vision? What is the current state of Dartmouth, and as I say, what are the challenges and opportunities that provide direction? You will see a reflection of the Board's view of that 10, 20 year vision in this statement as it's been informed by the input that we're getting now and have before and will in the next few weeks as well.

Some of the things we're hearing and some of the things that have emanated from our own effort at developing a recent revision of the mission statement is all about trying to understand the burden and the blessing of Dartmouth's relatively unique niche. It's not a unique niche, but it's a relatively unique niche. There are few institutions that have the reputation for small class size and intimacy and focus on faculty/student interaction that Dartmouth has for its undergraduate product, that also have leading professional schools and graduate programs.

We are in all national rankings and in people's general view, compared with the latter group rather than the former group. We're compared with Harvard, Yale, Stanford, for the most part, rather than Williams, Amherst, Wesleyan. And that is a blessing if you can figure out how to leverage the uniqueness in positive ways. But when you look at the endowment per student of Harvard or Princeton, and that's who your competitors are in a highly competitive higher education environment, it's a burden.

So, a lot of what we've been thinking about ourselves during the time that I've been on the Board and a lot of what we've been hearing relates to that niche and what do you do with it. And as I said, you'll be seeing where we come out based on what we've been

hearing from art and sciences faculty, from professional school faculty, from alumni, from students.

**DAVID MALENKA:** I'd asked the question, I'll give you now my perception, my notion is that—The perception is you may be compared to those institutions, but when you look at the challenges we have in attracting leaders of departments, of sections, it's very tough to compete with those institutions. And I actually, when I think about what's happened over the last five years in terms of program building, things have been rather quiescent. And certainly as a faculty member working here, I would love to see the whole Upper Valley become a more dynamic place where there is more growth, where there is more of an emphasis actually on some of the graduate programs as opposed to the undergraduate programs. Now, I know not everybody's going to agree with that, but that's my feedback.

**AL MULLEY:** When I was talking about comparison, I was talking about competition for faculty. Clearly, the art and sciences faculty are competing with those institutions all the time. As often as not, in retention efforts as well as recruitment efforts. There are a lot of art and sciences faculty who are viewed by those institutions as extraordinarily well trained to be excellent teachers, as well as creators of new knowledge. So there's sort of a constant need for retention efforts with those particular institutions doing the potential attracting away.

Similarly, there's competition with those institutions and Tuck on a regular basis. So, competition for students at the undergraduate and professional school level, competition for faculty is a big part of this niche question. David?

**DAVID NIERENBERG, MD:** Al, thanks for coming. Thanks for taking on this important job and soliciting input. I have three very brief thoughts. Now sort of having the pleasure of serving under my fourth president and my eighth dean, and so these don't apply to any particular president or provost or dean, but I'll give them to you.

I would love to see the next president be someone who passionately believes that research throughout the university is important and that actually research on the proper scale and properly managed enhances the net value to the college. To get rid of this false argument that if you do more research, somehow you're harming the field, the atmosphere, or the learning environment of the college.

I actually think there are many students in college who benefit from research happening at Tuck, happening at Thayer, and happening at the medical school. And without those opportunities to participate in that environment, their college experience would be severely hurt. So I'm looking for someone who truly believes that, who passionately feels that research throughout the university, as long as it doesn't overpower things, brings net value to the college and it's not an either/or or split the pies now.

Similarly, I want to see the next president be someone who believes that the graduate schools that we're lucky enough to have at this university that we call Dartmouth College bring net value to the college. That it's not wow, the college is suffering because resources are being drained by the business school or the engineering school or the medical school. But isn't it wonderful that our undergrads can take courses at the medical school? Or shadow physicians at the medical school? Or can take business ethics courses at Tuck? Or can get a BSE at Thayer at the same time or in the fifth year? I think it really brings net value, and I will be looking for a presidential candidate, and hopefully a president, who really believes passionately that the value of those graduate schools to the university and to the college getting rid of what I think is a straw man argument that if you have a graduate school of X or Y or Z, that diminishes some part of the experience of college. I have not seen that at any of the other universities I've been at, and I haven't seen it here. I think it's a false argument. And so I'll be looking for a president who passionately believes and his or her actions in prior positions show action that shows that they really believe that.

And I guess the third thing—So those are not specific to the medical school. Those are research in general and graduate school in general. But I guess my third thought that I'd

share with you, Al, since you're gracious enough to come over and solicit them, is a little more specific to medical school. And as I watch Thayer grow and as I watch Tuck grow and the medical school, I have come to the conclusion that graduate schools are all important, and I don't think the medical school is more important, but I think it's a little more complex. And, you know, we have these delicate relationships and affiliations with other hospitals, with other medical components. We have these wonderful affiliation agreements that are critically important to our future with an excellent group practice called The Clinic, and a wonderful hospital called Mary Hitchcock, and a wonderful hospital called the VAMC.

And I'm looking for a president, not a president who says medical schools are the most important graduate school, I'm not looking for a president that has to be a physician or training, I am looking for a president who's been around universities enough that have had graduate schools of medicine to understand the special issues, problems, and dimensions that medical schools often bring in 70, 80 or 90 percent of the research dollars to the university. That's good, and it has problems. Medical schools have these complex affiliation agreements with things like a clinic or a VA or a hospital. That's good, but from time to time it's a problem.

And I have seen in provosts and presidents who don't really know that by background or training, that that lack of information and experience has, in my opinion, led to inadequate understanding of the tough job of a dean of a medical school and inadequate support for deans that are struggling with those tough jobs. And I'm not labeling that at any specific provost or any specific president, I've seen it with several. And I'm not arguing that the next president needs to be a physician or have a spouse who's a physician or ever had a physician in the family, but I think they have to come from a university that's wrestled with those complex issues. And I hope that the Presidential Search Committee will at least think about those complexities.

**AL MULLEY:** Thank you, David. Let me just paraphrase. You think it should be clear in view of Dartmouth's next president that there is not a conflict between research and

teaching, there is not a conflict between creation of new knowledge and transmission of new knowledge.

**DAVID:** And that it's actually good.

**AL MULLEY:** And it's actually a good thing.

**DAVID:** It's a win/win situation.

**AL MULLEY:** It's a win/win. On that one, let me just say that in the student forum, and in the faculty forum, both Ed and I said in no uncertain terms that we see the dichotomy between research and teaching as a false dichotomy. And that is one thing that we can speak with great confidence about with regard to the entire Board. In fact, the Board issued a unanimous statement to that effect back in September when it also announced some plans for improving governance at Dartmouth that were more controversial and took up more of the bandwidth. But there was a statement made by the Board about the importance of research—

**DAVID:** And I remember that and I applaud that. I just sort of going back to it—

**AL MULLEY:** It's duly noted. Second is the net positive value added by the professional schools. I think the Board would unanimously agree on that point of view as well. Part of what we're dealing with is that in the Board meetings when we talk about these things, the conversation is very different than the kind of political sloganeering that people use in order to win elections. So that if one were just listening to the politics, one would get an impression that I think on these issues, it's really quite different than the way the board collectively feels about those things. And since it's the Board's responsibility to make the appointment, I mean that to be reassuring in some ways.

Finally, the medical school relationships are complex, all medical schools are complex. If we didn't know that before the '90s, we certainly learned that in the '90s. And I think it's

fair to say that the Board recognizes that the medical school and the college have been served reasonably well by people like myself and Susan Dentzer before me and Dick Page, serving in a liaison role at a Board of Overseers, but the fiduciary responsibility for the medical school rests with the Trustees. And when we are able to expand the Board of Trustees as planned, one of the things we'll be doing is bringing in more of the kind of expertise to which you're referring onto the Board itself. You can be quite sure that there will be additional if not doctors, people with experience with medical schools and health care when we expand the Board. It's one of the reasons we feel it's so important to expand the Board. This is a very complex institution, and you need to be able to develop a Board that can meet its needs.

And your observation about somebody whose leadership, past leadership experience, would indicate some familiarity with those issues is duly noted as well.

**DAVID:** Thank you.

**AL MULLEY:** You don't need to ask questions, you can just—Statement about aspirations or what we might—Any particular issues we ought to be focusing on as we conduct this search?

**SPEAKER:** I think Dan's trying to—

**AL MULLEY:** Dan?

**DAN LONGNECKER:** This was a question. Just because I'm interested, having seen a couple of the presidents of an institution from which I hold more than one degree, go to be president of another institution. Are current college presidents regarded as the pool, or are they regarded in any way as out of bounds because they already have a commitment?

**AL MULLEY:** I think some college presidents are considered part of the candidate pool. It's up to the college president, each on an individual basis for them to decide

whether or not they're interested in making a move. It's the search committee's job, and the trustees' job at the outset, to define the opportunities and be honest about the challenges that are associated with the opportunities to attract the largest possible initial pool of qualified candidates. That would include sitting presidents, it would include sitting provosts, it would include sitting deans of large institutions. It will include some people who don't have an immediate position within the academic world right now, but probably have in the past. Simple answer is yes, some sitting presidents will be in this candidate pool.

The way it works, just to give you a look ahead, I talked about chronology looking back. I only took you as far as this leadership statement, which will probably be done and posted in mid-July. At about that time, we will be publicly receiving nominations, we're already getting some nominations because people know we're preparing for a search, but we'll be publicly receiving nominations. And we'll also be operating as an active search committee. What that means is we're already establishing relationships with what are called resources, and those resources include sitting presidents and past presidents and people whose current leadership role or past leadership role gives them a status and a stature in higher education so that they are viewed as leaders in higher education. And they not only know a lot of people that they can refer us to, but they're also very influential with those same people in helping them think about what constitutes an opportunity and a leadership position that would be an attractive capstone to a career, which is what this position would be for most people.

So we'll be doing that, and some time in the fall, we'll have a list of some 100-plus people who are qualified to be the President of Dartmouth in our view, and in the view of our search consultant. And then there's a winnowing process that goes down to about 20. And with that 20, you need some kind of a commitment from them to be in a conversation and dialogue. And then it goes from 20 to 10 or 8, and then it goes from 10 or 8 to 3 or 4, and then there's a choice made.

That underscores what I was saying earlier, about there are very, very few forks in the road where you take one and not the other. It really is this constellation of attributes that you're choosing among them.

**SPEAKER:** How does that play out time wise, Al? When do you think is sort of an average time frame, not the best possible or worst possible, we might have a president selected and on site? Because there's other things that then start up once that happens. So I just wondered in your view, is this 18 months from now, or 24 months from now?

**AL MULLEY:** Well, Jim has announced that he is stepping down in June of '09, so that is at least target. I'm sure that there would be some opportunities if the search took longer than that in order to see us through the interim period and be just fine. But, certainly the preferred option would be to have an announcement some time next spring. That's consistent with—These searches usually take six to nine to twelve months, so we're on track for an announcement some time next spring. Okay, thank you for coming.

**SPEAKER:** ... (inaudible)

**AL MULLEY:** It was good to do, though.

**SPEAKER:** Yeah, some good points.

**SPEAKER:** Feel free to talk freely now [laughter].

END OF SESSION