

10-21-1968

SWARTHMORE COLLEGE

October 21, 1968

MEMO TO: Swarthmore Faculty and Administration

FROM: AAUP, Swarthmore Chapter

At the chapter meeting early this month we voted to hold an open meeting for the entire college faculty and administration where opinions about the selection of the new President and the qualifications for this position would be exchanged.

The following discussion paper for this meeting was drawn up by an AAUP sub-committee consisting of Monroe Beardsley, Fred Hargadon, Martin Ostwalt, Jean Perkins, and Harrison Wright.

We cordially invite you to attend an open meeting to discuss the questions raised in this memo on Wednesday, October 30, 7:45 in Martin, Room. 201.

mer

## I. Procedures

1. Should there be an information flow from the representatives on the Search committee to the faculty at large? It is very hard to answer questions of priorities and qualifications in the abstract. If the committee found itself confronted with a dilemma about the qualifications of a particular candidate, would it be possible to have more faculty discussion at that point about the question of priorities? No names would be mentioned at all but the specific difficulties could be brought to the attention of the faculty.
2. On the issue of individual candidates, would it be desirable to have wider consultation in order to head off the appointment of a President who would turn out to be undesirable? This might be channeled through the CEP, or even one member of each department. The security question would of course be acute.
3. Do there exist contingency plans in case no suitable candidate has been found by next September?

## II. Questions to be raised with candidates

There are certain issues which we believe any candidates for this office should have at least considered even though we are not sure of the answers which he/she might be expected to give. In these cases many faculty members disagree amongst themselves as to the beliefs which a President ought to have and even more on the priority question. We suggest, therefore, that these issues be raised more in terms of measuring the candidate's intellectual acumen and sensitivity to important issues than in outlining a particular set of beliefs which we believe the ideal candidate ought to have.

1. Philosophy of education
  - variety of purposes
  - relationship of intellectual to practical
  - pressure of graduate school
  - specialization in undergraduate education
  - diversity vs generalization
2. Role of the liberal arts college
3. What kind of a faculty this entails.
4. Role of President as spokesman for the College
  - relationship of College to community at large
  - relationship of College to governmental agencies
  - importance of clear commitment on issues of civil liberties and academic freedom
  - problems of fund-raising



5. Internal problems
  - elected committees
  - role of students in policy-making committees
  - role of students in judicial processes
6. Is the President primarily responsible to the College community or is his major commitment to the wider community? What is the relation of the private college to the public sector?
7. Relationship of the President to various constituencies of the college (how he/she considers them; how to handle disagreements).
  - a. Students
  - b. Faculty
  - c. Board
  - d. Alumni
  - e. Major donors

### III. Qualifications of the person

1. Values - how should we insure that the President is firmly committed to the principles of academic freedom and civil liberties? Are there other values which we feel necessary for the President to hold?
2. Age - certain qualifications which we think desirable will automatically preclude a person either too young (under 30) or too old (over 55).
3. Sex - are we sure that we would accept a woman? If so, how much better qualified does she need to be than the best man available?
4. Race, creed, color, marital status - are these factors totally irrelevant?
5. Character - should any weight be given to such characteristics as "strong and silent," "open and friendly," "very fair even though hard to approach"? Do we have a strong preference as to general personality type?
6. Commitment to the office - do we feel that the College needs some assurance of something like a ten-year span in office, or is this entirely dependent upon the individual candidates?
7. Strong President or mediator type?  
Do we want an educational innovator who will bring his own particular slant to such areas as the curriculum and lead through force of "infectious enthusiasm"? If so, how much would such a person be limited by our commitment to the CEP innovations and institutional restructuring? Do we want to hedge this individualistic approach with some commitment to the tradition of the college in terms of its intellectual climate?

Do we want a mediator type, one who takes in ideas from others and who generates sufficient steam behind these innovations to put them into practice? This is government by consensus rather than by example. Both of these have major drawbacks and are we prepared to opt for one or the other in a vacuum?

8. Previous experience

- a. His/her own educational experience  
large university - small college  
general education - specialized education  
scholarly interests  
apprized of constraints which operate in small college atmosphere
- b. Current position  
must we have a person with an academic background or are we willing to consider someone with experience in government, business, or a foundation?
- c. administrative experience  
are we willing to take a risk on someone who has had little or no administrative experience if the other qualifications seem to be very close to our list of desirable requirements? In addition, are we restricting this type of administrative experience to the academic world?
- d. relationship to Swarthmore  
what about someone already closely connected with the college, i.e., now on faculty or administration. In general do we feel that we want someone who has had some degree of acquaintance with the College or is this irrelevant?

9. Abilities

Is it possible to identify any particular abilities which will be particularly needed by the President of this institution in the next decade or so, i.e., flexibility, accessibility.

10. Status

Do we want someone of stature or is this apt to be dangerous?  
Does the Rhodes connection play an important part?  
Do we insist on someone known in academic circles at least?