APPENDIX II
Statement on the Search Process

The Consultative Committee's first task was to revise and distribute a letter which had been prepared by the Executive Board concerning the search and stated the qualities and qualifications that we were seeking for our new president. Some 1,400 of these letters, signed by me, were sent out to selected individuals, and more than 15,000 were distributed in non-personalized form. The recipients included all full-time and part-time employees of the University as well as donors and faculty of other institutions, and a variety of public figures, including the heads of minority organizations. Without exception, the comments we had concerning that letter were complimentary to the effect that it contained more substance than letters of this kind normally do. It produced, moreover, 464 return letters recommending some 300 candidates.

The initial efforts of the Committee were concerned with preliminary screening of the 300 nominees who were recommended in response to our nomination. Biographies were researched, nominating letters were considered, and any information the Committee members had themselves about the nominees was expressed in a series of meetings. As a result, the list was reduced to manageable proportions - about 50 candidates. The Committee then began to assemble information about these candidates by calling faculty members, administrators, trustees, and alumni of other institutions with whom they were connected. Using information gathered in this way, the candidate list was reduced to something under 20 names.
The procedure of soliciting formal opinions about inside candidates from a representative list of faculty members was adopted on my suggestion following the recommendation we had from the chairman of the Yale search committee with whom I had spent a half day reviewing procedures and problems that committee had encountered in its search. The faculty on the Consultative Committee compiled and divided the list. Student leaders were interviewed by the student members of the Committee, and I consulted with several administrators. Simultaneously, of course, we were receiving unsolicited letters about inside nominees. And all of this information was given to the Consultative Committee and later to Executive Board.

Late in May the outside candidates who remained under active consideration were contacted by me to tell them of our interest and asked whether they would be willing to be interviewed. As is normal in any search, several persons told us that they did not want to be considered as candidates. But most were willing to be interviewed, and they were visited by Committee members. At this point the understanding was that if, after a preliminary interview, we still wanted to keep them under consideration, members of the Committee who did not participate in the first interview would be given an opportunity to meet the candidates in a second interview. Faculty, students, and trustee members were all involved in each of these interviews and impressions of the candidates were then independently submitted in writing to the Committee. The remaining internal candidates were also interviewed by the Consultative Committee in the course of a full day during the third week of August.
Early in September, after all the remaining internal and external candidates had been interviewed by as many Committee members as possible, the Consultative Committee met to evaluate these extraordinarily able people. Less than ten candidates were under consideration at that point and during an eleven-hour meeting attended by myself, four other trustees, four faculty members, and two students, each person present presented his or her evaluation of each candidate and compared them to other candidates. The discussion was a very full one which involved not only the candidates, but how well they met the criteria we had established and how they related to each person's concept of the University, its character, and its mission.

The Committee members then voted in three different ways, and the votes, together with the information and research done on the candidates who had been interviewed by the whole Committee, were presented to the Executive Board.

At a discussion session with Executive Board members, each member of the Consultative Committee was invited to present his or her personal views on candidates, whether or not they coincided with the Committee's collective evaluation. Additionally, I presented the view of the University's deans which I had received in the course of personal interviews with 12 of the 14 deans held at their request. Considerable discussion then took place in the presence of the members of the Consultative Committee who attended, and after the Consultative Committee members
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left, the members of the Executive Board proceeded to inter-
view each of the affirmatively recommended candidates. It
also proceeded to discuss thoroughly, although it did not
interview, each of the candidates who were not affirmatively
recommended. The Consultative Committee, on the suggestion
of a faculty member, requested that if the Executive Board
made a nomination of a candidate not affirmatively recommended,
it first engage in a further consultation with the Committee.
The Executive Board operated in accordance with that request.

On September 14, after two days of intensive and informal
discussion and deliberation first between the Executive
Board and the Consultative Committee and then among members
of the board, at a duly convened formal meeting of the
Executive Board, I nominated the available candidate highest
on the Consultative Committee's preferential list who was
Sheldon Hackney. There were no other nominations.