

Dartmouth College Presidential Search On Campus Input Meeting Conducted by Ed Haldeman'70, Chair of the Board of Trustees and Al Mulley '70, Trustee and Chair of the Search Committee

BARRY SCHERR, PROVOST: As most of you know, I'm Barry Scherr, I'm the Provost of Dartmouth, and I'll be the moderator this afternoon. I'd like to welcome everybody to this special session dealing with the presidential search process. I'd like to note at the outset that this is a public forum. This session, you can all see, is being recorded. And I know members of the press are here, including, I believe, a reporter from *The D*.

Now, as you know, your input is meant to help guide the trustees when they meet in a few weeks to develop the statement on leadership criteria. The purpose of this meeting is to give input on the three questions that the board has posed to the Dartmouth community. The questions are listed on the card you received when you entered. If you didn't get one, please raise your hand and somebody will come by and they'll get one to you. We've scheduled 90 minutes for the session, and we'll have to end promptly by 4:30.

Again, just to make sure everybody does realize, this session is being recorded specifically so that we can share your input with the Board of Trustees. And in addition, Dartmouth's communication outlets will cover this session and present excerpts. If you wish to ask a question without identifying yourself, you may write your question on a card and we will retrieve it. To offer a comment, you may also use the input form on the trustees' website, or you can simply write on the back of the card you were given at the door and leave it with one of the people by the door when you leave.

Before introducing Ed Haldeman and Al Mulley, here are a few guidelines for the session in order to allow an opportunity for as many as possible to speak and provide input. Please be ready to use one of the microphones on either side of the room, the two people standing by the doors that have those ready. And, so that as many people can speak as

possible, please keep your own remarks brief, maybe one to maximum three minutes. You can make a statement or a recommendation, you don't need to ask a question, though of course you'd be welcome to do so.

If you're running long, I'll remind you to come to your point, again, to enable more people to speak. And again, I'd like to emphasize that the session is really meant for Dartmouth faculty to provide their input. As we near the end of the session, I'll ask for final statements so we're able to end on time. Stay as long as you like, but if you need to, feel free to leave at any time.

I'll take a moment to tell you just a little bit about our two trustees. Ed Haldeman, sitting next to me, is from the class of 1970, has been a member of Dartmouth's Board of Trustees since 2004, and was elected as chairman in 2007. He is President and CEO of Putnam Investments.

Al Mulley, also from the class of 1970, is Chief of the General Medicine Division at Massachusetts General Hospital, an Associate Professor of Medicine, and Associate Professor of Health Policy at Harvard Medical School. He's been a member of the Dartmouth Board of Trustees since 2004, he is also a member of the Dartmouth Medical School Board of Overseers.

Thank you all in advance for coming and sharing your views. And now without further delay, I'd like to turn it over to Ed Haldeman and Al Mulley. Ed?

ED HALDEMAN, CHAIR OF THE BOARD OF TRUSTEES: Thanks much, Barry, and thanks to all of you for coming this afternoon to visit with us and give us your input. I have just a couple of opening comments before I turn it over to Al. One place I always like to start is just to reiterate and reemphasize the role of the board, what the board does and, maybe equally important, what the board does not do. The Board of Trustees of Dartmouth College is a body that establishes the mission, the vision, establishes long-term policy, provides oversight over the institution. What it doesn't do is run the college

on a day to day basis. Jim Wright, our president, is responsible for that, along with his leadership team.

The most important responsibility of a board is to choose the president, to make that ultimate decision. Al and I are proud to represent the board this afternoon as we embark, as we begin the early stages of the search process. Al and I have been committed to work as hard as we can to get input from all the constituencies of the college very early on in the process. And it is incredibly early. We haven't even yet established a search committee. In fact, essentially the only decision that's been reached so far is that Al is going to be the chair of the search committee. Our hope is that towards the end of this month, perhaps the beginning of June, we'll be announcing the search committee. But, even before we form the search committee, we wanted to begin the process of seeking input from the entire community, and we've been out visiting with the staff, with alumni, with faculty, with residents of the town of Hanover, in fact, to make sure that we get as much input as possible into the process very early on.

One of the reasons that I thought Al was particularly well suited for this job is because of his desire, his longing for participation and input in a process like this. And he's really been putting a huge amount of time into it already, and I'm very, very appreciative of that. Al, you might spend just a minute or two outlining the process as you see it, including what we've been doing so far in terms of seeking input.

AL MULLEY, TRUSTEE AND CHAIR OF THE PRESIDENTIAL SEARCH

COMMITTEE: I'd be happy to. Let me just remind you all of the chronology. We all learned of Jim's decision to step down in June of 2009, the first week in February. The board was really quite grateful for the advance notice that he gave us, because it gave us the opportunity to be thoughtful about the steps that we needed to take in a successful transition, one that the whole community could be engaged in and feel good about.

We had the opportunity to meet and discuss this as a board for the first time at our regularly scheduled board meeting at the beginning of March. We spent a good deal of

time at that point, that's when the board learned that I would be chairing the search. Subsequently in March, Ed and I spent some time with consultants in higher education, people who have done academic scholarly work regarding searches, as well as other experts. We also met with some sitting and past presidents and some sitting and past deans. And that was to do the kind of homework I hope you would hope that we would do to get a sense of how our peers and colleagues in higher education saw this moment in Dartmouth's history from the outside of Dartmouth.

Then we were here for two days in April, April 14th and 15th. We had already launched, with Barry's help, an effort to engage faculty through a number of channels that would allow for small group discussion among faculty with that information being channeled back to myself and Ed at this point, and to the entire Board of Trustees and eventually to a search committee. We had scheduled a meeting with the Committee on Priorities, the CPR. We also have a scheduled dinner meeting with the Committee on Policy. There will be subsequent meetings with other committees as well.

The notion there was that we would ask faculty to engage in conversations over lunch and other small group settings to get faculty sense of the collective aspirations for Dartmouth going forward. My sense is that process is going well, it will continue. I had heard the fact that we had an open forum for staff and for students and for local alumni, but not faculty, was interpreted as somehow our not being interested in faculty input. Nothing could have been further from the truth. We had this much more time-consuming and, I hope eventually, much more engaging a process planned from the outset. We talked a good deal about it at our March board meeting.

So, we thought we would just add this session on to be sure there was an opportunity for faculty to participate in an open forum as well. But believe me, there will be many other opportunities for us to get a sense of what you're thinking about Dartmouth's future.

Just to give you a sense of why we're asking these three questions and how it fits into the overall process, in that March meeting, we decided we would have a special board

meeting the first week in May, which occurred last Tuesday, and the last week in May. At the first board meeting, we would consider the preliminary input that we were getting from open forums and other sources of feedback to begin to shape, if you will, the elements of the leadership statement. We will be meeting again at the end of May to further shape that leadership statement. It eventually will be remanded to the search committee, along with a charge to the search committee when it is formed in June. That leadership statement really will be the document that will have the board and the search committee hopefully very much together, and we're selecting in its decision making going forward the collective aspirations of the Dartmouth community for Dartmouth's future. So, this is important. The three questions we're asking are serious, and we look forward to your input.

BARRY SCHERR: Well, let's open it up.

AL MULLEY: The three questions, you all have them. They're basically what are the challenge and opportunities that Dartmouth faces in its future? What are the qualities of leadership that will best prepare the next president of Dartmouth to face the challenges and realize the opportunities? And then are there other issues the search committee should be mindful of as it's making its decisions from your perspective.

BARRY SCHERR: Okay.

BENOIT CUSHMAN-ROISIN, PROFESSOR OF ENGINEERING, THAYER SCHOOL OF ENGINEERING: Should I speak into the microphone?

BARRY SCHERR: Yes. Actually, as people start to speak, just identify yourself by name and department, by the way, just so.

BENOIT CUSHMAN-ROISIN: I'm Benoit Cushman-Roisin in the School of Engineering. And before I put my two bits, I would like to, by way of preamble remark, that I find this setting a little bit intimidating. You guys are sitting up there on the stage in

the spotlight, so we got the cameras going, we have to speak into a microphone. I don't mind that a bit, but I'm afraid that it might not be the best way to elicit comments on the part of some of the people who may be a little bit more shy.

My input to the search can be summarized in just one word: sustainability. There has been a great push among college campuses to be greener, ever greener, and basically ask themselves what does it mean to be sustainable in the future. That's also the big push in companies as well. And what we have learned from both companies, private companies, as well as academic environments, is that it does not happen unless it has leadership from the top. And a good case in point here is Arizona State University where the new president, relatively new president, has declared that he was going to make his campus sustainable. So, I would like to propose this as a theme for reflection and perhaps for the new president to engage in.

ED HALDEMAN: Thank you. You know, one part of the input process that we didn't mention yet, Al, is that we have established email communication with the community and we've gotten several hundred responses already via the email. And one of the surprises as we read those comments, Al and I read all of them, one of the surprises has been how common a theme that has been. It's surprising to me. Probably it shouldn't have been, but it is a really, really dominant theme that one hears from many, many of our correspondents over email and as we've had our other sessions, we've heard that theme quite repeatedly and we appreciate your comments.

And I agree with your notion about this is a little awkward way to do it. It was precisely that reason that caused us to try to think about if we could do it more over dinners and lunches and things like that. But, we're trying all kinds of avenues to try to get as much input as possible.

AL MULLEY: By the way, of the several hundred email responses we've had so far, last time I looked, there were 27 from the faculty. So, we'd love to hear more from you.

Recognize, though, that there are 67,000 alumni, far fewer faculty. So I think proportionately, you're holding your own.

IVY SCHWEITZER, PROFESSOR OF ENGLISH: Hi, I'm Ivy Schweitzer, and I'm Professor of English and I'm Chair of Women's and Gender Studies. And thank you for holding this forum. I'd like to say I've had a lot of conversations with people, with the CPR about what we'd like to see in a president. And I just wanted to make a couple of suggestions. I think the next president has to be an academic, rather than somebody who's from politics or from the business world. It would be, I think, important for that person to have experience in higher education at an institution like Dartmouth, maybe not at Dartmouth, but like Dartmouth, I think that's very important.

Most important for me is the ability to articulate a vision for the college, and it would be, I think, maybe interesting to ask candidates who are eventually selected to articulate what that vision is and we can look at what they think that vision should be and compare it to what we think the vision should be.

But part of what I think is important is this: I was just the internal reviewer for the external review of the Hopkins Center, which the committee thought was a wonderful institution at Dartmouth. What was interesting about that experience is that it was headed by a director of a very large arts institution at the University of Indiana. And we went to different groups of people at the Hopkins Center. We interviewed staff and managers and leaders of ensembles and said, "Well, what do you think the reputation of the Hopkins Center is?" And people really didn't know. And the chair of our committee kept on saying, "Dartmouth is a leader in the field of the arts in what it does, and especially in arts outreach and education."

And it was interesting to me that people just, at the Hop, didn't know that. And I can really generalize that to a lot of other areas at the college, that we tend not to know what we're really good at. We can't compete with the big institutions for certain things, there are certain things we do much better than those institutions, and one of them is

educational outreach. And, of course, in the case of the Hop, it's also to the community as well as between the Hop and the arts and the academic side of the college.

But I think we shortchange ourselves because we're so busy with our inferiority complex or with what we think we should be that we're not actually seeing what we are and what we really do well, and it is something really special. And it is something that the students love and that faculty really love to do, and that's why we're here at Dartmouth.

So, I would like to see a president who could help us accurately assess and publicize and be proud of what we are at Dartmouth, that we are a liberal arts institution, that we do both teaching intensely and we do research intensely and those two things work together and they help each other and they're synergistic in some way, synergistic.

I think that's really important. And from the point of view of the faculty, it's really what makes being at Dartmouth special and it's why we're here. So, that would be a very large part of what I'd like to see the new president be able to articulate and help us move forward with, because there are lots of things that we can take into the next couple of decades in which we could be leaders. And it's the special things we do at Dartmouth.

ED HALDEMAN: And in your view, we haven't articulated proudly enough that vision?

IVY SCHWEITZER: Well, I think in the case of the Hop, there it is. I mean, the people working at the Hop did not recognize that they were a leader in the field of arts outreach and curricular connections. They didn't realize that. I think there are certain things that we do—I think we could be a leader in the arts, actually, with a little bit of kind of insight and a little bit of understanding. For example, Dartmouth was the kind of origin of a major dance company in the U.S., and we do not have a dance major. More or less a program, we don't have a dance major. Now, why is that? And why haven't we built on those skills?

We have an amazing amount of foreign study internships, foreign study programs. We have an amazing ability in the humanities, but I think in the last few years, we've really tried to go the corporate route, in some way, and we've really emphasized the sciences. Now, sciences are great, but we're never going to be able to compete with the big institutions in terms of the sciences. We can, actually, we have the ability to be tops in the liberal arts and in the humanities.

So I think that's, in one way, where we—I think we could better evaluate and assess what we do really well. So no, I don't think we have done it. And I think we could use a lot better publicity, actually, in the kind of achievements the faculty has made and that have been made on the scholarly side of it.

AL MULLEY: So just to paraphrase quickly, a first rate scholar with a vision that implies some growing edges and some advancement in some areas; at the same time, we celebrate current strengths? Thank you.

ROGER MASTERS, RESEARCH PROFESSOR OF GOVERNMENT, NELSON ROCKEFELLER PROFESSOR OF GOVERNMENT, EMERITUS: I want to thank you very much for coming to join us and speaking about what I think is a significant opportunity and challenge. I really think Ivy's comments are very well taken, and I want to give an example. We're undergoing the biggest change in human knowledge in all of human history. Because our graduates are going to have what's called the thousand dollar genome; in fact, you can already buy for \$9.85 the list of all the genes that have been identified. Now, this is not determinist because there's more and more evidence of gene/environment interaction, so a gene B2, B3, dopamine receptor gene. If you use cocaine as a teenager, then you're going to be schizophrenia at age 35, at 40? I mean, this is a complexity that we have trouble dealing with because of the departmental focus of our work and the specialization needed to get tenure.

For example, I had a younger scholar who wrote a paper on the causes of war, which I read because of some work I'm doing, and there was no mention of religion, al-Qaeda,

Osama bin-Laden or 9/11. I thought, “This is peculiar.” So I said, “How come there's nothing about religion?” after I read it. He said, “I don't do religion.”

Now, obviously that's an extreme case, but more and more we've had to specialize. And in that process, the gap between the social sciences and the natural sciences is a serious problem. Biology is an obvious case, but there are plenty of other cases in the other natural sciences. The example I have, just to finish this, is when I was an undergraduate, I took a course with B. F. Skinner, stimulus response model. There's an arrow, a square box that's empty, an arrow and a feedback loop. Well, with fMRIs, we can know something that's in there besides blank rocks. And I think it's wonderful that the two of you represent exactly what I think we need to encourage, which is more exploratory work and innovation in the curriculum like the human biology program that we had. And this is where I—We had a program, I taught a course with Lee Witters from the medical school. It was terrific. It's unfortunately no longer there.

I think we are of a size where one of the things we can do with the right gentle leadership is avoid the stupid mistake that Larry Summers did. “We've got to have all these courses, I'm requiring you to teach them.” I mean, one thing is never, in curriculum reform, say that any member of this faculty will be forced to teach a course that he or she does not actively want to teach. And this is the kind of place we are. But I think it's small enough that with the right kind of leadership, gentle but clear, we can actually succeed in doing something that would be national leadership in showing how every educated leader has got to be able to connect things between disciplines and not just focus on one narrow thing.

AL MULLEY: Thank you very much. I should respond for a moment as chair of the Trustees Academic Affairs Committee. We talk about this interdisciplinary question a lot and I will often reflect on the fact that I was on a student faculty committee back in 1968 with Ruth Chaplin and Ray Barrett and Ballard, and a few other students, and we planned the first human biology course. And it was because of that that I knew that I wanted to get a degree in economics while I was in medical school, and it's been a great career. I'm

not sure it would have happened at many other places. Trying to find ways to do that and make that kind of experience is available to every student, I think is really important. More so now than then. Thank you.

ALEX BARNETT, ASSISTANT PROFESSOR OF MATHEMATICS: So my name is Alex Barnett, I'm in mathematics and a junior faculty. And yeah, as a young faculty member, whatever decision you make for the president is going to potentially affect me for years, or decades even, keep fingers crossed. So that's why it's a very important issue to me. Coming to Dartmouth, you notice that there's a—I notice there's a strong culture that's improving, but there's a culture left over from the '50s of a strong fraternity group on campus, strong alumni groups represented through agents like the Dartmouth Review, and a very vocal group of alumni who would prefer Dartmouth to return to the 1950s and become a purely undergrad institution, maybe to scrap the graduate program all together, many other kind of cultural forces that they bring like—And these are reflected, I see these on campus, racial incidents on campus. I think the current President and Susan Wright, as well, have done a wonderful job at setting a good tone and dealing with these issues, getting them out in the open and getting people to—Setting the right culture in terms of dealing with racism, dealing with fraternities on campus. So, I really encourage you to find someone who will continue that tradition.

I mean, I'd just like to remind everybody that we're under attack in many ways. Academia is also seen as, for some reason, seen as a last bastion of leftism by many forces in this country right now. You all remember Lynn Cheney's list of anti-American professors that was published a few years back after 9/11. I mean, academia is under attack and we need a president that can actually be strong and set the right tone when it comes to these issues.

I think good examples, Ruth Simmons at Brown, at the moment, she's an African-American woman. She came in and started using the endowment to hire faculty and to improve the quality of programs, so she's spending endowment. She's also a great fundraiser, so that hasn't caused any problem. She's brought in a lot of money, people

trust her, she's very personable. She goes out and interacts with people on a one-on-one basis. And I know many people at Brown, and they're all very happy with that culture that she's setting.

I think Drew Faust at Harvard is another example of someone who's heading the right direction, especially after some of the cultural tone that the previous president of Harvard had set. So, I hope I don't need to go into the examples, right, the issues of where the women are able to do science, etc. Really, I thought that was rather—So that was an example of what we don't want.

So that's all I have to say, just that we're at risk of young and diverse faculty, Hanover is a difficult place to move to, especially for faculty of color and I've watched many of my colleagues—It's a difficult decision if you're going to stick this out. And if the right tone isn't set, then I think you're going to lose a lot of your talented young faculty and the quality of the institution will then decline because of that. So, I think that's all I had to say.

ED HALDEMAN: Thank you. We spend a lot of time on the board thinking about the issues of faculty recruitment and retention and the kind of community that Dartmouth is that facilitates that and makes it more difficult, thank you.

KEVIN REINHART, ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR OF RELIGION: Kevin Reinhart, I'm in the religion department, I teach Islamic studies. I'd also like to thank you for agreeing to meet with us, and I hope that the search committee will also have a forum so that they'll be able to sit and talk with the faculty that want to talk with them, perhaps without the klieg lights and formality. But, whatever is necessary, of course.

I want to make three points that I think are worth considering, at least I think so, in your search for the president. The first is that although I don't think this is an absolute red line, I think it's worth considering whether or not the president had himself or herself an undergraduate liberal arts education. I think the way that the liberal arts works, the

insistence on knowing science as well as knowing, let's say, literature or something like that, is something that is not always grasped by somebody who did a much more focused undergraduate, who did a much more pre-professional undergraduate. And I think that preparation, in my experience, can often be decisive in understanding how it is that a liberal arts institution functions and what its aspirations should be.

I also think that given a number of factors that perhaps there's no point in spending time on, I really think many of us agree, but certainly speaking for myself, that it would be good to go outside of Dartmouth to get somebody to be the president. Notwithstanding that one needs to understand how the liberal arts institutions work, I do think that's it's salutary for an institution to have voices from the outside, to have somebody who can come in and perhaps assess the strengths and weaknesses with fresh eyes and to see the things we take for granted that perhaps aren't necessary.

And the other thing I want to mention is that, and this may seem like special pleading, but certainly it seems that as the world is changing that someone with a demonstrated background of concern for the rest of the world, something along the lines that President Dickey, for example, had, who's willing to try and institutionalize that stance toward the world in many ways, Dartmouth I think has fallen behind its peers. This is something that I think Dartmouth needs to pay particular attention to. So, I hope that those two or three considerations could be part of your deliberations as you search for plausible candidates for this really, truly important position. Thank you.

ED HALDEMAN: Thanks, Kevin. And you can be sure that the search committee will have numerous sessions with the faculty in many different kinds of forums and different sized groups. As Al indicated, this is the second interaction we've had in a short period of time with the faculty. We're going to have one at dinner this evening with another separate group, and that's even before the search committee gets formed. But once that's formed, that also will find many different ways to interact with the faculty.

BARRY SCHERR: We're interacting with these committees, the Committees on Priority, the Committee on Policy, which I understand is the Committee on Committees, in order to get a sense for what works best from your point of view. We don't want to prescribe the best approach for us to engage in this important work together.

COLIN CALLOWAY, SAMSON OCCOM PROFESSOR OF NATIVE AMERICAN STUDIES, PROFESSOR OF HISTORY, AND CHAIR OF NATIVE AMERICAN STUDIES:

Good afternoon, I'm Colin Calloway and I'm on the Committee on Priorities with Deb and others, so I'm part of that conduit of getting stuff to you. But I'd like to just say something. I'm also a Chair of Native American Studies and on the Native American Council. So say something that might sound like special pleading, but it gets to Alex's point. And that is that even after all these years, Native students very often find Dartmouth a difficult place to be. We've had not too recently a series of unfortunate incidents. And I think a new president who at least is aware of that tradition, aware of Dartmouth's original mission, would be a good thing.

But perhaps more importantly, a president who is committed to diversity in real ways. I mean, I suspect that the kind of people that you will interview will all know enough to say yes, they're in favor of diversity. And what I would hope the committee would do would be push people on that to get a sense of how they see that looking and working, especially in a place like Hanover, which is not necessarily an easy place to do that. Because I think that kind of climate and that kind of culture and that kind of tone can be so important to all kinds of groups, including the Native student groups, rather than things that might be upsetting placed specifically for them. Because these are the kinds of things that have cropped occasionally for Native Americans, and for Muslims and for black students.

And I think it's too important to be something that a candidate might give the nod to as a buzzword because it sounds right. It requires, obviously, as we all know, real work and commitment and I'd hope you'd be interested in sort of teasing some of those answers out of a candidate.

ED HALDEMAN: Colin, if you were in the room doing the interviewing, what kinds of questions would you ask to try to find out, to tease out the true feelings? And what kind of responses would you be looking for back?

COLIN CALLOWAY: Well, one of the things I think is important, and one of the things that this campus has wrestled with, is how an institution like this deals with incidents that are offensive, racist, etc., in a timely manner. I think we've been caught wringing our hands about what's an appropriate response without being accused of tampering with freedom of speech. And I know there are bias protocol responses in the works now that are hopefully going to alleviate that to some extent. But what I'd hope is to be able to find a person, a president, who realizes how important it is that the students who are on the receiving end of those things do not become the people who have to educate about why those things are not appropriate in a place like this.

ED HALDEMAN: Thank you.

AL MULLEY: I just want to observe that the mission statement that we all were engaged with at some level recently, put on the website replacing an older one, embraces diversity as one of the guiding principles. What I hear you saying, and I'd love to follow up in a different setting, is that diversity that can be quantified isn't enough. You have to, if you embrace diversity in a community like this because you believe it enhances the educational opportunity for everyone who goes off to live in a global world, then once you bring the diversity to campus, how do you leverage it for those education purposes in ways that are sensitive to the differences that have to be understood. Am I paraphrasing?

COLIN CALLOWAY: Yeah.

AL MULLEY: It's a good conversation, and it would be a good conversation to have with candidates, I agree with you.

SCOT DRYSDALE, PROFESSOR OF COMPUTER SCIENCE: I'm Scot Drysdale, computer science. I guess if we're going to put in special pleadings, I'll do that first. I would hope that we have someone who would understand the effects that science and technology are having on the world today, everything from stem cell research to the Internet to energy crisis. That seems something that the president is going to be dealing with for the next decade, and I would hope that we would have somebody who would at least understand the social implications of the things involved there.

I think in this whole getting a president at this point, the elephant in the room is the ongoing trustee candidates, the expansion of the board and the thing that's been going on in the national press in here. I think things are going much better in Hanover than they're going in the world outside of Hanover, in some sense. And I think we need to have a president who can address that and deal with that and hopefully get everybody agreeing on what Dartmouth's mission is and should be.

I had the opportunity to go to a small liberal arts college, happened to be Knox College, as an undergrad. I went to Stanford for grad school, so I've seen liberal arts colleges, I've seen research universities. When I interviewed for jobs 30 years ago, I was very fortunate in that that was the year 200 Ph.D.s got out for 1,100 openings in computer science, so I was able to have more interviews than I probably would have if I were getting out now. I interviewed at places like Swarthmore that were small liberal arts colleges, I interviewed at Columbia and Brown and University of Illinois that were research universities.

Every place I interviewed said, "We care about teaching, we care about research." Every place except Dartmouth followed that by a "but." At the research universities, it was, "We don't want to hear complaints about how bad your teaching is, but once you're an adequate teacher, spend all your time doing research." At Swarthmore and places like that, the thing was, "Be an excellent teacher, and when you get a sabbatical, get a paper out." Dartmouth was the only place I interviewed, this was 30 years ago, that said, "We care about teaching, we care about research, and we mean it." There are people who have

not gotten tenure here who are very good teachers who didn't do research; there are people who do not get tenure here who are very good researchers who could not teach.

If you want to be successful at Dartmouth, you want to be very good at both, preferably outstanding at both, and at least outstanding at one. I think that's Dartmouth's niche, and I hope that the incoming president will, first, understand that; and second, be able to communicate that to the alumni and to the world because that word doesn't seem to be getting out. We hear that Dartmouth is in danger of becoming a second rate Harvard. I fear that if some of the prescriptions that are being thrown around, I don't know if they're accurate or not, are true we're in danger of becoming a second rate Williams as well. That Dartmouth's niche is not to be a research university or a liberal arts college, it's to combine the best of both. And if we get out of that niche, we're going to become a second rate something instead of a first rate Dartmouth, because I don't think there's anybody who does that job of combining those two things as well as Dartmouth does. And I hope that that can be conveyed to the candidates and we can get somebody who can get that message out. Thank you. [applause]

AL MULLEY: I should mention that I have the—I didn't mention as part of the process to date, that I had one-on-one conversations, lengthy one-on-one conversations, with all my colleagues on the board and I think I can honestly say that there's no disagreement on the board about what you've just said. I think that—

SCOT DRYSDALE: What we've seen in the press looked otherwise.

AL MULLEY: Yes, I agree with that. But I want to be clear and I would say that were my colleagues here in the room, and I don't think any of them would disagree. The interesting way it relates to the task before the search committee is how does somebody turn that rather unique niche position to an advantage rather than a competitive disadvantage? And we'll be thinking hard about that as we put together this leadership statement and as we move forward as a community, and we'll be getting candidates who think hard about that. Thank you.

JOHN WINN, PROFESSOR AND CHAIR OF CHEMISTRY: I'm John Winn from the Chemistry Department. A few years ago, I was on what's now called the Committee on Priorities back when it was called the Sub-committee on Priorities and became, then, the Committee on Priorities. And that happened to be at the time when Dartmouth's finances were in trouble and there was widespread talk across the campus about how are we going to deal with that. And it was dealt with.

But I think the most important thing that came from that time period has been a very almost, in Dartmouth's recent history at least, unheard of openness and communication between the faculty and the senior administration. Something that sometimes I think critics of the institution don't want to believe happens, but I believe, in fact, does happen. And at that time, the Committee on Priorities and Barry will remember these times well, met frequently. I think of the year in particular when the last year as the Sub-committee on Priorities before it became a full fledged committee, we were meeting every other week or so, talking about the budget situation and just having a very frank and open flow of communication from the senior administration to the faculty and back and forth.

We established a series of faculty priorities for how things should evolve. And I would hope that in searching for a new president, we're not going to just be taking Jim Wright and putting some new name in his seat, we're going to be looking for someone who will perhaps have different views of how senior administration should be organized, how lines might report in different ways. We've seen that in the past few presidents. But I hope that whoever takes Jim's place is someone who will continue the openness and transparency that has continued to grow in the last several years between the faculty and the senior administration so that we do feel as a faculty that we have, if not information stuffed down our throats through our committee structure, at least access to it when we need it. And I think that's something we've been able to do very well.

And I'd also like, just to go back to the opening remark about sustainability, because I think intellectual sustainability is a key aspect of the next presidency. Someone who can,

as I think many people here have said, guide and encourage and foster a sense of intellectual superior effort, growth and opportunity at Dartmouth, which I think we have continued to have. I came here in 1982 and I've seen remarkable changes across campus in that and creative work, as Ivy was talking about in science, in my area, and across the whole campus. Interdisciplinarity (sic) versus the single lone scholar model both have a place at Dartmouth. And that would be what I would look for.

I would go back and look at the James Bryant Conans or the Derek Boks of presidencies elsewhere who were national leaders in what higher education should be. I think Dartmouth suffers a bit from being in little Hanover in the middle of northern New England so that we don't have the quick and rapid access to the press that Harvard, Princeton, Yale may have. But still, we have ideas that are worth putting on a national stage, and to have someone with that sort of interest in and ability as a scholar of higher education in the liberal arts to bring our efforts here as a faculty to the national dialogue, I think would be an important thing as well.

AL MULLEY: Someone who is open to ongoing, meaningful dialogue with the faculty, someone who knows how, perhaps, to use to its advantage that niche position to sustain—To achieve intellectual sustainability, and somebody who recognizes both outside looking in at Dartmouth, and inside looking out at Dartmouth, its role in the world and what it has to offer and makes that available. Am I hearing you?

JOHN WINN: And encourages.

AL MULLEY: Yes, encourages. I do think that there's a real relationship between the intellectual sustainability, to use your term, and whether or not this particular niche is a burden or a blessing.

AUDIENCE: ... (inaudible) most faculty view as a blessing, for many of us has been incoherent.

AL MULLEY: And the only way it could be a burden is when you are dealing with resource allocation decisions competing with those whose endowments are so much larger and whose resources are so much greater in so many ways.

JOHN WATANABE, ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR OF ANTHROPOLOGY: Quite a group today. I'm John Watanabe, a professor in the Anthropology Department. I want to follow up on, I think, what the last two comments have been about regarding kind of intellectual leadership. You asked the question here, what qualities of leadership should the next president have in order to insure Dartmouth's continued prominence in higher education. And I think, again not making a special pleading here, but talking about the faculty in general, I think one of the ways we do that is for the faculty to do its work; the different departments and the different programs in the college know best where they need to improve and where the new developments are in their field.

And I think we try to do that and make ourselves better, and in terms of leadership, we don't need someone telling us where to go or what we should do. But it seems to me an ideal quality to look for is someone who has a clear idea of the, if you will, where we want to go, the general direction and principles and things that we want to follow, but not necessarily with some hard and fast ideas about how to get there. Because I think people will find very quickly that an institution like Dartmouth, any institution of higher education, is really much more of a fractious kind of bottom up sort of institution with faculty wanting to go off in different directions and invoking academic freedom and all those sorts of things.

And so having a president who is a scholar is important because of the respect that that person has as a scholar to gain from the faculty. But I think equally, if not more importantly, as an institutional leader, having someone who's been on a faculty, not just someone who's gotten a Ph.D. and gone off somewhere else, but who has been on a faculty, understands and appreciates the curious dynamics of academic politics, of the fact that we are a fractious lot, that we're self selected to be highly opinionated and very vocal about it, but who is willing to engage the faculty in those kinds of discussions about

priorities, about directions of the institution, about the fostering of new ideas. Not necessarily sort of either/or specific directions, but those kind of issues that affect the college as a whole I think is very important.

And it becomes even more crucial as academic disciplines become increasingly specialized and the kind of training, the kind of work and research that we need to do to keep up in our own fields tend to pull us apart and we tend to dig our own trenches narrow and deeply and often in different directions.

And I think having a president who both appreciates that, but understands how as a collective body what are the things that bring us together, and particularly, then, time to gather research and teaching. The one thing that we do as a collective body is we teach a curriculum, and we are concerned deeply here about educating our students, not only in our own specialties, but providing them with a broad-based liberal arts education. And we need to have more public discussions about what that entails and what brings the different departments and disciplines and things together that I think this institution would benefit from.

And so I think the other compelling reason for choosing a president who is an academic, not just—As I said, not just someone who's gotten a Ph.D. and gone off and done other things, but who's participated on a faculty and understands the particular and peculiar kinds of politics that happen in universities, is absolutely crucial because it will enable us to engage publicly with one another in ways that I think have been less prominent than is healthy for an institution.

AL MULLEY: A couple of responses. I often wonder if Woodrow Wilson didn't leave Princeton to become Governor of New Jersey, and then President, to get out of politics. [laughter] But just to have a sense of whether or not I'm hearing you correctly, when I joined the board I think my colleagues got tired of my talking about complex adaptive systems. And the college, any college, any institution of higher education being a classic complex adaptive system, I've been doing a little bit of reading to prepare for meeting

with candidates. And there are a whole series, I'm sure you know them, of case studies of successful college university presidents. There's one by Padilla, one by Brody, the former President of Hopkins. They each have about six or eight case studies.

And I was pleased to see that the Padilla one has an introductory chapter characterizing the job of a university or college president as leading a complex adaptive system. And by that, what they mean, my understanding of it is, you really do set direction and you set some simple rules that give people a sense of what the direction is. You set some boundaries. These are things that you don't do, and then you create some incentives and rewards.

And the metaphor that resonates with me is a leader in such an institution needs not to think like an architect or an engineer, forgive me Thayer folks, and basically chart things out; but rather, think like a parent or a gardener where you're setting an environment where the behavior you want to see emerges. And those, too, I think will be rich discussions with candidates.

JOHN WATANABE: ... (inaudible) having some excellent, if not relevant, and willing to engage in public discussions about how to get where we all want to go, I think is a preferable leader. Because that is the type of person who, in fact, can lead as fractious and diverse a group as we are and be effective, rather than, as you said, being the architect who lays out a plan and then has to get everybody in lockstep with it.

I think we're too fractious for that, but I think we can really benefit from those kinds of public discussions and engagement in which we can sort of come to accommodation. And I think that takes an incredible amount of practice, both from the top down and from the bottom up. And I think one of the things that's happened is we've lost—We're losing how to do that. We're losing how to have someone with a vision who is open to the multiple ways of getting there, as opposed to holding back until you have a specific plan and then worrying about that's going to get shot down by all the possible ways the faculty

can shoot it down. And I think having someone who can be open to that kind of open-ended management of complex systems, I think would be ideal.

AL MULLEY: Well, the vision itself implies being strategic, right? And strategic implies more the, “Here's what we're going to do and here's how we're going to get there.” And bringing the strategic thinking together with the simple rules of complex adaptive system that you're trying to see the behavior emerge from is—We're not looking for somebody who isn't sophisticated, that's for sure, and talented, that's for sure.

BARRY SCHERR: Susan?

SUSAN ACKERMAN, PROFESSOR AND CHAIR OF RELIGION: Hi, I'm Susan Ackerman from the Religion Department. I want to echo in a certain way some of the comments that have just been made, although perhaps with some slightly different language. I, too, am looking for a president who's an academic, who's a scholar, who's an intellectual and who's willing to provide that kind of academic and intellectual leadership. But I'd also just like to throw in the adjective of smart, and I mean smart in terms of savvy and politically savvy, which I think Dartmouth particularly needs. Smart in terms of sophisticated, but just smart in terms of raw brain power. This is a community filled with exceptionally smart people, both smart faculty and smart students. And a president who doesn't command our respect as having an intellect that is equal to or, ideally I think, superior to ours, someone we can learn from, is not a president I think who's ultimately going to be successful for us.

I'm also interested in a president who's confident enough in his or her own intellect that he or she is willing to appoint really smart senior administrative officers to serve on the senior leadership team. And also interested, and this goes back a little bit to Colin's comment, I'm interested in a president who's committed to a diverse leadership team, both diverse in terms of points of view, but diverse in terms of a leadership team that represents minorities, that represents women, that represents the different constituencies of our world community.

And then finally, I'm interested in a president especially who can help the arts and sciences. I don't know how urgent this need is in the medical school or Thayer or Tuck, but in the arts and sciences, I'm interested in a president who can really help lead us in a conversation about what the curriculum of a liberal arts education looks like in the 21st century. We're still teaching a 20th century liberal arts curriculum, even though we're a decade into the 21st century; in some ways, we're perhaps still teaching a 19th century liberal arts curriculum. So, I'm really interested in a president who would ask us to work hard to imagine what the curriculum looks like to take us into the next decades of the 21st century, and what that curriculum looks like in the very rapidly changing world in which we live.

AL MULLEY: To observe the comment from faculty about the importance of really smart scholar with an understanding of the academic enterprise and all of its facets and all that they can contribute, we've heard very little input from anyone that differs from that.

SUSAN ACKERMAN: Not a lot of us ... (inaudible). [laughter]

BARRY SCHERR: Other comments, questions? If not, would you like any concluding comments?

ED HALDEMAN: Just thanks so much for coming. There will be multiple chances for input. Email is always a great way to do it, but we'll be back, the search committee will be back, and there will be lots of need of input.

AL MULLEY: Thank you for being here, and I look forward to seeing more of you as this process continues.

BARRY SCHERR: Okay, thanks everyone for coming.

ED HALDEMAN: Thank you. [applause]

END OF SESSION