❧ 2 ❧

THE PATH TO THE PRESIDENCY

The brief history of the University of Michigan provided in chapter 1 is intended in part to illustrate the evolution of the role of the university presidency over time as the nature of the American university has changed. Tappan and Angell were analogous to headmasters, providing both intellectual and moral leadership, with strong religious backgrounds. Ruthven and Hatcher assumed broader management and executive responsibilities, as the university grew into a large, complex community. Fleming and Shapiro accepted even broader responsibilities, functioning very much on the national and even international stage, as the university became a global enterprise.

Although today's university presidents no longer play the direct role in the lives of university students that they once did in the early colonial colleges, their roles are far more complex, requiring leadership along many fronts: executive, academic, financial, political, strategic, and even (on occasion) moral. The American university president is clearly a role of great importance to both higher education and broader society. It would therefore seem logical that the preparation for this role should be rigorous and that the selection of a university president would involve a careful, thoughtful, and rational process.

In reality, however, the early careers of most university presidents

resemble more of a random walk process, careening from one assignment—and institution—to the next, driven more by chance and opportunity than by any careful design or training. Moreover, the search for and selection of a university president is a complex and all-too-frequently confusing process, conducted by the governing board of the institution according to a Byzantine process more akin to the selection of a pope than a corporate chief executive officer. Leaving aside for the moment the more logical question (raised by the musings of Giamatti quoted in the preface) of why any sane person would want to become a university president, this chapter considers the various paths to such a position. First, we need to understand just what university presidents do and how they fit into the complex organizational structure of the university.

TINKER, TAILOR, SOLDIER, SAILOR; RICH MAN, POOR MAN, BEGGAR MAN, THIEF; . . . AND UNIVERSITY PRESIDENT

Universities, like other institutions, depend on strong leadership and effective management to face the challenges and opportunities posed by an ever-changing world. Yet in many universities, the tasks of management and even leadership are held in very low regard, particularly by the faculty. To both students and faculty alike, the term *university administration* has a sinister connotation, like *federal government* or *bureaucracy* or *corporate organization*. Although many outside academe view a university president as the top rung in the academic ladder, many faculty members would rank it near the bottom, suggesting that anyone aspiring to such a position is surely lacking in intellectual ability, good judgment, and perhaps even moral integrity. In fact, one occasionally hears the suggestion—usually from one of the more outspoken members of the faculty—that any strong academic, chosen at random, could become an adequate university president. The argument is that if one can be a strong teacher and scholar, these skills should be easily transferable to other areas, such as institutional leadership. Yet, in reality, talent in leadership is probably as rare a human attribute as the ability to contribute to original scholarship.

There is little reason to suspect that talent in one characteristic implies the presence of talent in another.

There are actually several decidedly different flavors of university president. Most commonly, we think of the role as that of the leader of a university campus. But such a campus may be a component of a larger university system, in which case the campus executive is usually entitled a "chancellor" and reports to a system chief executive officer known as the "president."[1] The campus president/chancellor has a complex array of roles, involving not only executive responsibilities for the academic programs, business, and service activities (e.g., hospitals and football teams) of the campus but also important external roles, such as private fund-raising and public relations. In contrast, the president of the university system usually focuses on managing the relationship with political bodies (e.g., state government and the university governing board), along, of course, with bearing the responsibility for hiring and firing campus chancellors.

Michigan is a bit of an oddity here, since the president is both leader of the Ann Arbor campus and head of a small system including campuses at Flint and Dearborn, both of which also have chancellors. While this dual role as president of the UM system and chancellor of the Ann Arbor campus greatly enhances the authority of the position, it also doubles the headaches, because the president is responsible for national, state, community, and regent politics; fund-raising; student and faculty concerns; and intercollegiate athletics.

University presidents are expected to develop, articulate, and implement visions that sustain and enhance their institutions' academic quality and reputation, an activity that involves a broad array of academic, social, financial, and political issues that envelope a university. Through their roles as the chief executive officers of their institutions, university presidents have significant managerial responsibilities for a diverse collection of activities, ranging from education to student housing to health care to public entertainment (e.g., intercollegiate athletics). Since these generally require the expertise and experience of talented professionals, the president is the university's chief recruiter, identifying talented people, recruiting them into key university positions, and directing and supporting their activities. In

fact, one of the most common causes of a failed presidency arises from an inability to build a strong leadership team or an unwillingness to delegate adequate authority and responsibility to those more capable of handling the myriad details of university management. Unlike most corporate chief executive officers, however, the president is expected also to play an active marketing role in generating the resources needed by the university, whether by lobbying state and federal governments, seeking gifts and bequests from alumni and friends, or launching clever entrepreneurial efforts. There is an implicit expectation on most campuses that the president's job is to raise money for the provost and deans to spend, while the chief financial officer and administrative staff watch over their shoulders to make certain this is done wisely and prudently.

The university president also has a broad range of important responsibilities that might best be termed symbolic leadership. In a sense, the president and spouse are the first family of the university community, in many ways serving as the mayor of a small city of thousands of students, faculty, and staff. This public leadership role is particularly important when the university is very large. As the university's most visible leader, the president must continually grapple with the diverse array of political and social issues and interests of concern to the many stakeholders of higher education.

Moral leadership is also an important responsibility. Although it is sometimes suggested that the moral voice of the president died with the giants of the past—Angell (Michigan), Eliot (Harvard), and Wayland (Brown)—it is clear that the contemporary university continues to need leadership capable and willing to address moral issues, such as integrity, social purpose, and the primacy of academic values.[2] Moreover, as I stressed in chapter 1, presidents must understand and respect the history of their university, its long-standing values and traditions, if they are to be successful.

Finally, the president is expected to be a defender of the university and its fundamental qualities of knowledge and wisdom, truth and freedom, academic excellence and public purpose—an advocate for the immense importance of higher education to society. The forces of darkness threatening the university are many, both on and off the campus. Whether dealing with an attack launched by an opportunis-

tic politician, the personal agenda of a trustee, a student disruption, or a scandal in intercollegiate athletics, the president is expected to take up arms and defend the integrity of the institution. Needless to say, this knightly role carries with it certain hazards. The buck always stops at the president's desk.

So where does one find candidates with the skills to fit such an unusual position? Although the early leaders of American colleges were drawn primarily from teaching or religious vocations, one finds today's university presidents drawn from almost every discipline, profession, and career. They include not only academics but also leaders from government and business. Law professors were popular in the 1960s, with the need to mediate student disruptions and handle the complex relationships with state and federal government. Economists are particularly in vogue these days, perhaps because universities are once again under considerable financial stress. In these times of technological change and a knowledge-driven economy, one also finds an increasing number of university presidents drawn from the ranks of scientists and engineers.[3] University presidents from professional disciplines, such as business and medicine, are less common, perhaps because these professional schools are usually so wealthy and powerful in contemporary research universities that the faculty is afraid to "put a cat into the canary cage" by supporting the appointment of a dean of a medical or business school as university leader. Presidents of major universities are also rarely selected from education schools, because these programs are generally viewed as focused primarily on primary and secondary education.

As one looks more broadly across the landscape of American higher education, it is increasingly common to find governing boards selecting presidents with nonacademic backgrounds, such as business, government, or politics. This might be explained, in part, by the increasing financial and management complexity of the contemporary university or, in the case of public universities, by complex relationships with state and federal government. But cynics could also suggest that the selection of presidents from beyond the academy may reflect the increasing discomfort of many governing boards with "academic types" who stress academic values, such as academic freedom and tenure, rather than cost-effectiveness and productivity.

Generally, however, the most distinguished institutions still demand that those considered for presidential leadership have demonstrated achievement within academic circles. Otherwise, the university faculty is unlikely to take their leadership seriously. Since this was my own experience, I begin my discussion of the various paths to university presidency by considering the traditional academic path.

<div align="center">THE ACADEMIC LEADERSHIP LADDER</div>

To better explain both the nature of the university presidency and its leadership responsibility, it is useful to begin with a brief discussion of the layers of academic leadership within the university and the career ladders leading to various leadership positions. In reality, the university administration is simply a leadership network—primarily comprised of members of the faculty themselves, sometimes on temporary assignment—that extends throughout the university and within academic and administrative units. At the most fundamental organizational level are academic departments, such as history, surgery, and accounting. Most faculty identify first with their academic departments, since these departments relate most closely to the faculty's primary activities of teaching and research. Departments are led by chairs, usually appointed by deans for a fixed term (three to five years), albeit with input from the senior faculty members in the department.

At the next organizational level are clusters of academic departments organized into schools or colleges—such as law, medicine, engineering, and the liberal arts—and led by deans who are selected by the executive officers of the university (e.g., the provost or president). In most universities, deans are the key academic leaders responsible for academic quality. They select department chairs; recruit and evaluate faculty; and seek resources for their school, both within the university (arguing for their share of university resources) and beyond the campus (through private fund-raising or research grantsmanship). As the key line managers of the faculty of the university, they have rather considerable authority that usually aligns well with their great responsibilities.

At the highest organizational level of the university is the central administration, consisting of the president, provost, and various vice presidents (or vice-chancellors), denoted generically as the "executive officers" of the university, with broad administrative responsibilities for specific university functions, such as academic programs, student services, and business and finance. Although the executive officers report directly to the president, they are also more directly responsive to the governing board than are other academic leaders, such as deans or department chairs. The career background of executive officers is generally correlated with their functional responsibility. For example, while vice presidents for academic affairs (or provosts) and vice presidents for research generally come from faculty ranks with experience as department chairs or deans, vice presidents for business and finance usually come with solid management and financial credentials, frequently with MBAs and business experience.

It is important to understand the random nature of the careers of most academic administrators. After all, few faculty members begin their careers with aspirations to become academic leaders. Most have chosen their professions because of interests in teaching and research as well as a yearning for the independent lifestyle characterizing academe. They abhor administrative roles and look on faculty colleagues attracted (or sentenced) to administrative assignments as unfortunate souls with fundamental character flaws. Very few faculty members are willing to accept administrative appointments, and those who aggressively seek such roles are just the leaders that universities probably want to avoid.

There are many drawbacks to academic leadership roles such as department chairs or deans. These positions rarely open up at a convenient point in one's career, since most productive faculty members usually have ongoing obligations—for teaching or research grants—that are difficult to suspend for administrative assignments. Although an energetic faculty member can sometimes take on the additional burdens of chairing a major academic committee or even leading a small department or research institute, the time requirements of a major administrative assignment, such as department chair or dean, will inevitably come at the expense of scholarly activity and the ability to attract research grants. The higher administrators climb on the

academic leadership ladder, from project director to department chair
to dean to executive officer, the more likely it is that the rungs of the
ladder will burn out below them, as they lose the necessary scholarly
momentum (at least in the opinion of their colleagues) to return to
active roles in teaching and research or to attract research grants. The
pressures on department chairs and deans are a microcosm of the
pressures on today's university presidents—budgets, regulations, per-
sonnel, fund-raising, and faculty politics. The consequences, too, are
similar. Beyond a certain level, typically that of a dean, there is little
turning back to the role of a professor once again.

This raises yet another dilemma. As one moves up the academic
leadership ladder, burning the rungs below that lead back to the fac-
ulty, one sometimes bumps into a ceiling, which leaves no choice but
to jump to a ladder at another institution. The pyramid of available
academic administrative posts narrows rapidly in a university, and
these positions rarely open at the time when academic leaders seek (or
need) to move to the next rung of the ladder. Frequently, the only
alternative is to look beyond the current institution, at the possibility
of jumping to an administrative assignment at another university—
sometimes a rung up the ladder, sometimes laterally. Many senior
academic leaders have a résumé that looks almost like that of a corpo-
rate executive. They drift from institution to institution as they jump
from one leadership ladder to another, leaving both their scholarly
activity and institutional loyalty far behind.

These features of careers in academic leadership raise an obvious
question: why would anyone attracted to a university faculty position
intentionally wade into the swamp of academic administration? Aca-
demic administration is usually the furthest thing from the mind of
those faculty members with the most leadership potential and the
strongest credentials in teaching and scholarship. Rather, the most
able academic leaders have to be cajoled, seduced, or bribed into
assuming such roles.

As one who has lured many dozens of faculty members into
administrative positions and has launched them on—or, rather,
doomed them to—academic leadership careers, let me share with you
some insider tricks of the trade. The first place to look for prospective

academic leaders is among the chairs of faculty committees. Service on these committees is generally a voluntary activity, reflecting the willingness and interests of a faculty member to serve the institution beyond their customary roles of teaching and research (i.e., to accept duties above and beyond the call). Furthermore, such committee chairs are generally selected by faculty colleagues based on respect and leadership ability. Another productive approach is to find faculty members whom colleagues generally turn to for advice on important issues—although these are generally not the most outspoken people at faculty meetings. Those with leadership potential are usually characterized by broad scholarly and teaching interests, capable of seeing the big picture. They are also those who usually say no to offers of administrative appointments, at least when first approached.

My own experience as a dean and provost hunting through the groves of academe for academic leaders suggests that most are captured when they are in the wrong place at the wrong time. For example, they may be caught in a search with few other qualified candidates. Sometimes, the key personality trait is a chronic inability to say no to a request to take on a new assignment, whether because of institutional loyalty or because of fear of the consequences if a known colleague is selected for the role.

The positive aspect of the search process is the recognition that at the level of an academic department or school, the selection of academic leaders (chairs, deans, and even provosts) is usually made by knowledgeable academics who will be their immediate supervisors (e.g., a dean, provost, or president). Usually, these are seasoned academic leaders, with extensive personal experience as teachers and scholars. Because these searches are highly confidential in nature, the assessment of the credentials of possible candidates can be relatively free from political factors. Although a faculty search committee may be used to assist in the screening and vetting of candidates, the final decision is decidedly not democratic and usually will be made by a single individual. Perhaps more significant, most able academic leaders realize quickly that their own success—and fate—will be determined by the quality of their appointments. Hence, they have strong motivation to go after the very best. As will soon become apparent,

the contrast between searches at the departmental or school level, on the one hand, and presidential searches and selections, on the other, could not be greater.

Perhaps the best way for me to illustrate the meandering path that leads to a university presidency is to describe my own experience. Like the appointments of my predecessors, my selection as the eleventh president of the University of Michigan was highly dependent on politics, personalities, and chance. My path to Ann Arbor led from a small farm town in Missouri to Yale University in the East, then to a top secret nuclear research laboratory in the mountains of New Mexico, then to Pasadena, and finally back across the country again to Michigan.

Both my wife, Anne, and I had grown up in Carrollton, Missouri, a small farm town (population about 5,000 and falling) located about 70 miles northeast of Kansas City. As was typical of such farming communities, most of the boys were expected to become farmers, while the girls were expected to become housewives. Of those high school graduates fortunate enough to attend college, most chose professional majors (e.g., engineering or agriculture) at the local public colleges and universities. Yet, in a strange twist of fate, rather than following in the University of Missouri traditions of my family, I headed east for college, to Yale University. This requires a brief explanation.

When I attended high school in the late 1950s, few in my town had ever considered going out of state to college; I was only the second student from Carrollton ever to take the SAT. Largely at the encouragement of my family, I decided to apply to several of the more popular national universities. During the applications process, I learned that the elite schools of Yale and Harvard were located in New England rather than England (where I had always thought they were, along with Oxford and Cambridge), so I decided on a whim to apply to Yale, knowing absolutely nothing about it. Beyond my surprise in receiving a letter of acceptance to Yale was my awe over a telegram (the first I had ever seen) sent by the Yale football coach, encouraging me to attend Yale and play on his football team. The die was cast.

So, with Yale sight unseen, I headed off in the fall of 1960, experiencing my first airplane flight, my first trip to New York, my first adventure finding my way to Grand Central Station and taking the train up to New Haven, and my first Yale experience: freshman football practice. At the time, almost two-thirds of Yale students were from highly competitive preparatory schools, such as Andover, Exeter, and Choate. These students were already well prepared for both the academic rigors and the social graces of a blue-blood institution. In contrast, when I arrived at Yale, I was quite unprepared for its academic rigor—having never done any homework in my life—and equally unprepared for the pace of its extracurricular life.

Although I was successful on the football field (my team won the Ivy League Championship), my early academic performance was lackluster, with a B average and a realization that there was no way I was prepared to major in my chosen field, chemical engineering. (I kept cutting chemistry laboratory to attend football practice.) Fortunately, by the end of my first year, I began to figure out the Yale academic system, elevating my grades to an A average and switching to electrical engineering. I knew nothing about this field, but everyone said it was the hardest engineering major, so I reasoned that it had to be worthwhile.

My academic interests also began to broaden considerably, moving first into physics and later into an array of courses in the humanities and social sciences. My growing academic success and academic interests soon outpaced my football career, and I gave up varsity football for intramural competition during my junior year. In 1964, I graduated summa cum laude in electrical engineering and accepted a fellowship to attend graduate school at Caltech.

A further bit of explanation about my undergraduate education and degree is appropriate here. All undergraduates at Yale were required to select one of the usual disciplinary majors, but they were also required to select a minor area of concentration. Since the minor and major concentrations had to be in different areas, I selected psychology as my minor area, with a specialization in child psychology. Many years later, I would realize the fortuitous nature of this minor concentration, since this training was of critical importance in my various roles in academic administration—not so much for under-

standing students as for understanding faculty (in terms of stimulus, response, reward, reinforcement, etc.).

Meanwhile, an even more important development was occurring back in Missouri during my last years at Yale, with my courtship of a former high school classmate (and head cheerleader) then at the University of Missouri. As will become apparent later, this was a stroke of almost miraculous good fortune for higher education, since Anne's skills and wisdom were very key elements of our (and it was always *our*) leadership role at Michigan. We reached a decision during our last year in college that a long-distance relationship left much to be desired, and immediately after our graduations, we were married.

So, leaving Yale, the Ivy League, and the East Coast behind, I headed west, stopping in Missouri, where Anne and I were married following her graduation from the University of Missouri and then headed on toward California. But first we stopped off in New Mexico, where I had a summer appointment as a visiting research physicist at the Los Alamos Scientific Laboratory. In the mid-1960s, atomic energy was still shrouded in top secret security. I was required to qualify for Q-level security clearance from the Atomic Energy Commission (AEC) even to receive an AEC fellowship to study at Caltech. Needless to say, security was an even higher priority at Los Alamos, where the town that stood adjacent to the laboratory and housed the families of lab employees had only been opened to the public a few years earlier. Families of visiting scientists lived in barracks of World War II vintage, dating from the days of the Manhattan Project.

Even though we spent only a summer at Los Alamos, it proved to be a formative experience with important consequences. I worked in a technical group supporting the Rover nuclear rocket program, a top secret program intended to develop and test rocket engines powered by nuclear fission reactors. During the mid-1960s, it was planned that after the successful completion of the Apollo program to land a man on the moon, a manned mission to the planet Mars would follow rapidly, perhaps as early as 1980. Many scientists believed that chemical rockets were inadequate for manned planetary missions because of the radiation exposure associated with extended spaceflight. Hence, the nation had launched a major program at Los Alamos, Project Rover, to develop nuclear rockets for future interplanetary

missions. The project was quite successful in designing, building, and static testing a sequence of nuclear rocket engines at their Nevada test site. I worked on the test programs for these nuclear rocket engines, acquiring in the process a strong interest in both nuclear power and spaceflight.

Since nuclear rocket development was classified as a secret project, I was required to record all of my work in bound notebooks, which were then locked in a safe each evening when I left the secure area of the laboratory. This routine of recording my work—and my thoughts—in bound notebooks became a habit that continued throughout my research as a faculty member and my work as an academic administrator. Today, our bookshelves are filled with these notebooks, which are still accumulating at a rate of several each year.

After our summer experience at Los Alamos, Anne and I continued on across the country to Pasadena and Caltech. Not uncommonly, our image of Pasadena and Caltech had been formed by the television broadcasts of the Tournament of Roses Parade and the Rose Bowl, when the skies were blue and the San Gabriel Mountains ringing the city stood out sharp and clear.[4] It was quite a contrast when we arrived in late August in the midst of a smog alert that continued for weeks, blotting out the mountains and trapping the heat.

Although Pasadena was an important chapter in our family history—Anne's career; my MS and PhD degrees; and the birth of our daughters, Susan and Kathy—it was a remarkably short period, lasting only four years. Part of the reason for the brevity was the Vietnam War; with the threat of the draft always lurking in the background, there was strong motivation for graduate students to complete their degrees as rapidly as possible. It was also a time of ample job opportunities: the space and defense programs were in high gear, and universities were continuing to expand their faculties to respond to the baby boomers. I took advantage of Caltech's highly interdisciplinary character by earning my degrees in subjects spanning a range of topics in physics and mathematics. Since I had managed to complete my MS and PhD in three years, my dissertation advisors suggested that I might want to spend an additional year as an AEC postdoctoral fellow, broadening my research interests and possibly joining the Caltech faculty.

Although I was most interested in remaining at Caltech, I agreed to two job interviews at the suggestion of my faculty advisors: one at the University of California, Berkeley, and one at the University of Michigan. The Berkeley interview was hosted by the chair of the Department of Nuclear Engineering, Hans Mark, who was later to become secretary of the U.S. Air Force and then president of the University of Texas. The Michigan interview was the more problematic of the two. Michigan's Department of Nuclear Engineering was not only the first such program established in this country; it also ranked among the top such programs in the world. Despite this, I was not particularly enthusiastic about visiting Michigan to explore a job opportunity, particularly in the late winter cold. I agreed to do so as a favor to my thesis advisor, who portrayed Ann Arbor as nirvana, although it was a gray, drizzling day in March when I visited. However, Anne had grown weary of the smog and traffic of Southern California and longed to return to the Midwest. While I was flying back to Los Angeles after the interview, the department chair called Anne and told her they were going to make an offer. Since Anne had already made up her mind that California was not in our future, she accepted on the spot. Hence, I arrived back in Pasadena only to learn that the Duderstadts were headed to Michigan.

ON TO MICHIGAN

In December 1968, we loaded our furniture and our VW onto a moving van in the 90-degree heat in Pasadena (a Santa Ana condition) and boarded a plane for Michigan. We arrived in a subzero blizzard and moved into the Northwood IV housing complex on the University of Michigan's North Campus. Despite the climatic shock, we found ourselves very much at home, both in Ann Arbor and at the University of Michigan—so much so, in fact, that we have resisted occasional opportunities to move back to California and chosen to remain in Ann Arbor ever since.

For the next several years, I climbed the usual academic ladder, progressing through the ranks as assistant, associate, and then full professor of nuclear engineering. Michigan's Department of Nuclear Engineering was ideally suited to the generalist approach of a Caltech

education. It was small, research-intensive, highly interdisciplinary, and almost totally focused on graduate education. Its reputation attracted outstanding faculty and graduate students of unusual breadth and ability. Hence, it was well suited to my roving intellectual interests, first in nuclear reactor physics, then in nonequilibrium statistical mechanics, then in laser-driven thermonuclear fusion, then in supercomputers, and so on. In the early stages, most of my work was highly theoretical, requiring only a blackboard and chalk. However, my interests later evolved into using very large computers (so-called supercomputers) to simulate highly complex phenomena, such as nuclear fission and thermonuclear fusion systems.

As a theoretician, I had developed a good knack for reducing complicated problems to the simplest possible level of abstraction and for explaining complex concepts in terms that my students—and even an occasional lay audience—could understand. While many university faculty members focus on teaching only a few courses closely related to their area of expertise, I rarely taught the same course twice. As a result, I not only ended up teaching most of the undergraduate and graduate courses offered by our department, but I designed and developed many of them. Since I usually produced copious lecture notes for each of these courses, I soon shifted to writing textbooks to expand my pedagogical efforts. Although several of the textbooks written during the late 1970s continue to be used today (admittedly in very specialized fields of nuclear energy), I always viewed textbook writing as an avocation rather than as a profession.

Both the quality and quantity of my research and teaching were sufficient to propel me rapidly through the academic ranks, with promotion to associate professor in 1972 and to full professor in 1975. I soon began to realize, however, that the traditional faculty role, while enjoyable for the moment, would probably not hold my attention for the longer term. I always had great envy and admiration for my more senior faculty colleagues who had been able to maintain both scholarly interest and momentum through the several decades of their academic careers. But whatever the reason, I soon found my concentration and attention beginning to wander to other activities in the university, as I began to be drawn into faculty service and eventually administrative activities.

Several key features of this first phase of my career would have an impact later on my role as an academic leader. First, and perhaps most significant, both my educational experiences and my faculty career had been associated with institutions that were clearly among the very best in the world—Yale, Caltech, and the UM Department of Nuclear Engineering. I had developed a keen sense for not only being able to recognize excellence but also knowing firsthand the commitment it takes to achieve it. Second, both my education and my scholarly career had been in environments characterized by unusual intellectual breadth and creativity, with an exceptionally strong scientific foundation. Although I would later hear occasional grumbling that "Duderstadt is a physicist, not an engineer," I was, in truth, able to span both pure and applied scientific fields. Finally, my career had been spent in institutions with exceptionally strong programs in research and graduate education. All of these experiences would serve me well as I moved into academic leadership roles during the 1980s.

All too frequently, scholars in my particular areas of theoretical physics and mathematics have relatively short productive careers—typically only a decade or two—before they lose the fresh creativity that frequently accompanies youth and fall into the same scholarly ruts that trap their colleagues in unproductive directions. After a decade of research, I worried that my best work might already be behind me, at least in my current fields of interest. Hence, my choices were to broaden my academic interests (which I did, into such areas as computer simulation); to shift into other areas of scholarly interest (which I also did, into writing textbooks); and to explore other careers, including entering the dreaded swamp of academic administration.

Actually, although I did have some interest in academic administration, it was largely closed off to me. My department was a small one, and we already benefited from a relatively young and effective department chairman. The alternative to department leadership was to become more actively involved in the myriad faculty service activities that characterize research universities. I already had been quite actively involved in department activities, chairing our committees on curriculum, nuclear reactor safety, and department review. By the mid-1970s, I had graduated to college-wide activities, first chairing

the College of Engineering's curriculum committee and then serving on several department review committees.

My involvement with broader, university-wide issues began with my election to the executive board of the graduate school. I look back on this experience as one of the more intellectually stimulating and rewarding of my faculty service activities. Many of the university's most distinguished faculty members were elected to serve on the board, and the issues it considered were both fascinating and consequential. It stimulated me to think more broadly about the university and higher education, while developing both a better understanding of and relationships with academic programs across the university. Because of the executive nature of the board's activities, we frequently met with deans and department chairs from various academic units.

This service was followed by an even more intensive experience with academic administration, when I was asked to serve on and later chair the faculty advisory committee to the provost. The Academic Affairs Advisory Committee (AAAC) was a committee of the university's Senate Assembly (the faculty senate), charged with advising the provost and undertaking studies on various issues of concern to the Office of Academic Affairs. Since the provost at Michigan was not only the chief academic officer but also the chief budget officer of the university, the AAAC could get into almost anything having to do with the university.[5] I should note that I served on this body through two important transitions, first as Harold Shapiro succeeded Frank Rhodes as provost of the university and then as Shapiro succeeded Robben Fleming as president of the university. This committee gave me a ringside seat in observing the leadership skills of two individuals who would go on to become two of the most distinguished university presidents of the twentieth century (Rhodes at Cornell and Shapiro at both Michigan and Princeton).

During my tenure as chair of the AAAC, we launched a major study to evaluate the quality of the research environment on campus, including such controversial issues as indirect cost recovery and cost sharing, as well as administrative and technical support of research and faculty incentives for generating sponsored funding. This entire study was a bit sensitive, since it overlapped several vice presidential areas. Although we had strong support from the provost, we were

somewhat threatening to both of the vice presidential areas of research and finance. Nevertheless, we plowed ahead, stirring up considerable interest and releasing a hard-hitting report warning the university that it needed to move quickly to address the deteriorating state of the research environment, before it lost both top faculty and research funding. This was an issue that I would continue to keep front and center both during my tenure as dean of engineering and eventually as provost and president. I believe that it was largely because of the persistence and effectiveness of this effort that we were able not only to improve the research environment on campus but also to propel Michigan, during the early 1990s, from eighth to first in the nation in sponsored research activities.

There is a saying in academic circles that no good deed goes unpunished, and hence my committee service continued for the next few years, first on the university's Budget Priorities Committee, a joint group of faculty, deans, and executive officers who made the key decisions on reviewing academic and administrative units for major budget reductions, including possible discontinuance. My final service assignment was my election to the university's faculty senate and then a nomination to its executive committee. At the time, I would probably have viewed my career as a faculty politician as just about complete had I been able to serve on this committee and eventually be elected as its chair—the chair of faculty governance at the university. However, fate was to intervene.

TRAPPED IN THE GRAVITATIONAL PULL OF ACADEMIC ADMINISTRATION

Late one evening in the spring of 1981, our home telephone rang. It was Billy Frye, provost of the university, with a request that I accept an appointment as dean of engineering. Both Anne and I were surprised (perhaps "shocked" is a more apt description), since I certainly was not one of the logical candidates in the yearlong search for an engineering dean. To be sure, both of us had been quite active in university affairs for a decade. But my administrative experience was essentially zero. I had never been a department chairman. I did not even have my own secretary, and I had never supervised anybody

other than PhD students. Furthermore, I was only thirty-seven and relatively unknown inside the College of Engineering—although quite well known to the university's central administration because of my committee service.

Yet, perhaps because of the naïveté and brash confidence of youth, I quickly accepted Frye's offer, even though it brought with it the responsibilities for one of the university's largest schools, with over 300 faculty and staff, 6,000 students, and a budget of $30 million. After all, for the last several years, I had been one of a number of junior faculty members complaining loudly and bitterly about the deplorable state of the college. Now my bet had been called. I had been challenged with an opportunity to actually do something about it.

Like most of my subsequent assignments in academic administration at Michigan, my role as dean of engineering started almost immediately.[6] I was introduced to the faculty two days after accepting the position. One month later, I moved into the dean's office. During my period as dean-elect, I began meeting individually with each of the leaders of the college: its department chairs, associate deans, and key faculty. It was my good fortune to be sufficiently naive to simply assume that I would be able to select my own team, and I surprised each of my predecessor's associate deans by thanking them for their service and offering to help them return to the faculty. In my first meeting with the department chairs, two of the most powerful chairmen, who had also been candidates for the dean's position, attempted the usual power play by threatening that they would step down if they did not get their way. I simply called their bluff by thanking them for their service and asking them for help in searching for their successors, leaving both a bit stunned when I left their offices.

Another piece of good fortune was the willingness of several of the college's most outstanding young faculty to join me in the new administration, including Chuck Vest, who later succeeded me as dean and provost and eventually became president of MIT; Dan Atkins, who later became the founding dean of Michigan's new School of Information; and Scott Fogler, one of the nation's leaders in the pedagogy of engineering education. Bill Frye had taken a chance by turning the leadership of the college over to the young faculty. In a similar spirit, our team moved rapidly to restructure and

rebuild the college. During our brief five-year tenure in the dean's office, our team was able to reenergize Michigan engineering. Through a combination of strong lobbying in Lansing and the support of the university's central administration, we were able to triple the base budget of the college. We completed the thirty-year-long effort to move the college to the university's North Campus. We also recruited over 120 new faculty, doubled PhD production, tripled sponsored research support, and boosted the reputation of the college from that of an also-ran to one of the top five engineering schools in the nation. We established strong ties with industry, including strong support for our effort to build one of the most advanced computer systems in the nation.

Although I was only dean of engineering for a brief five-year period, the lessons learned during this experience stayed with me throughout my career as an academic leader. First was the importance of people. Clearly, academic institutions and programs are intensely people-dependent enterprises. The secret to success is simple: attract the very best people; provide them with the support, encouragement, and opportunity to push to the limits of their talents and dreams; then get out of their way.

There is a corollary here: if you are going to place a big bet on the future, make certain that you place it on your best people and your best programs. It is wise to always invest in areas of strength, building on them to gain the momentum to move into new areas. For this reason, we placed our largest bets—and they were very large, indeed (amounting to tens of millions of dollars)—on such programs as the Center for Integrated Manufacturing, the Solid State Electronics Laboratory, the Center for Ultrafast Optics, and the Computer Aided Engineering Network. The converse to the preceding corollary is also true: it is very dangerous to make major investments in areas of weakness in an effort to build new areas of excellence. This almost never succeeds.

My next lesson learned as dean was the importance of consistency and persistence. It is essential to stay on message both to internal constituencies (e.g., the faculty) and to external patrons (e.g., the central administration, industry, and alumni). Any uncertainty or wavering will rapidly erode the effort to build support.

In a similar sense, speed and timing are very important. Looking back two decades later, it is difficult to understand just how rapidly we pushed ahead our blitzkrieg to rebuild the College of Engineering. But it is also my belief that this was, in part, the key to our success. We were able to accelerate rapidly, building momentum along a number of fronts. Success in one area propagated to others, almost like a chain reaction. Restructuring the salary program to reward achievement drove faculty effort and morale, which in turn established a credible case for greater university support. The completion of the move to a new campus was key in recruiting strong faculty members who rapidly established the college as a major player in key national research initiatives. The experience of rebuilding the university's College of Engineering taught me that to take advantage of the opportunities, one needs to have the capacity to move very rapidly. Timing is everything. Windows of opportunity open and close very rapidly, whether in the university, state government, or Washington.

Important, too, is developing, executing, and holding to a clear strategy. Too often, academic leaders tend to react to—or even resist—external pressures and opportunities rather than taking strong, decisive actions to determine and pursue their own goals. Since I was a scientist-engineer, it is not surprising that I tended to be a leader comfortable with strategic thinking. Yet it should also be acknowledged that my particular style of planning and decision making was rather unorthodox, sometimes baffling both our university planning staff and my colleagues alike.

Once, I overheard a colleague describe my style as "fire, ready, aim," as I launched salvo after salvo of agendas and initiatives. This was not a consequence of impatience or lack of discipline. Rather, it grew from my increasing sense that traditional planning approaches were simply ineffective during periods of great change. Far too many leaders, when confronted with uncertainty, tend to fall into a mode of "ready, aim . . . ready, aim . . . ready, aim . . ." and never make a decision. By the time they are finally forced to pull the trigger, the target has moved out of range. Hence, there was indeed logic to my "anticipatory, scattershot" approach to planning and decision making.[7] I also believed that incremental change based on traditional, well-understood paradigms might be the most dangerous course of all,

because those paradigms may simply not be adequate to adapt to a time of very rapid change. If the status quo is no longer an option, if the existing paradigms are no longer valid, then more radical transformation becomes the wisest course.[8] Furthermore, during times of very rapid change and uncertainty, it is sometimes necessary to launch the actions associated with a preliminary strategy long before it is carefully thought through and completely developed.

However, pushing full speed ahead does not always lead to success. The decision process in a university can become overloaded and driven into a state of paralysis. If one asks for too much at once, the system can lock up into indecisiveness. It was important to learn how to manage the flow of requests and when subtle pressure was more effective than an all-out assault.

Beyond that, we also learned that sometimes, in order to break a logjam of indecision, it was necessary to think outside of the box. It took a great deal of creativity and ingenuity to keep the decision process moving ahead. In addition to creativity, there were also times when we needed to be prepared to push all of our chips into the center of the table. For example, when the university was frozen on its decision concerning the move of the College of Engineering to the North Campus, we offered to deplete our entire discretionary funding capacity and loan the provost $2 million to get the show on the road. When Harold Shapiro and Bill Frye were unwilling to challenge the vice president for research over our proposal for research incentives, we found a way to accomplish the same objective while avoiding executive politics. To reestablish merit rather than longevity as the primary determinant of compensation, we doubled the salaries of all assistant and associate professors in the college, an action that incurred the wrath of many of our less-active senior faculty. But we were prepared to take the heat in order to make the necessary investments in the college's future.

The importance of teamwork runs throughout my years as dean and, afterward, provost and president. The sense of teamwork among our dean's team, department chairs, executive committee, and faculty was truly extraordinary. It clearly cut through the usual hierarchy of authority that characterizes administrative organizations. This is not to say that we avoided responsibility. Sooner or later someone had to

lead the troops into battle—and suffer the consequences if the battlefield strategy was a failure. I have long become convinced that academic leadership is never effective from far behind the front lines.

Working with such a young, energetic, and talented team to rebuild the College of Engineering was an exhilarating experience, but by the mid-1980s, I was beginning to wonder what I could do for an encore. The college had undergone such dramatic change that I and my colleagues worried that the solidification of its gains might require a different leadership style than the "go for it" approach we had encouraged during our tenure. We had stretched the college in all directions, strengthening the faculty, the student body, the quality of academic programs, the facilities, and the budget. It was time to let it cure a bit with a different type of leadership. Of course, during the years I served as dean, I had been probed about other opportunities. But Anne and I were not ready to leave Ann Arbor and the university just yet.

As fate would have it, we really did not have to leave, since the provost position at Michigan opened up when Bill Frye decided in the fall of 1985 to return the following spring to his native Georgia as provost at Emory University. Harold Shapiro launched a long and quite involved search for Frye's replacement. On the positive side for me, Michigan had never selected a provost from outside the university, in part because of the concern that the learning curve was simply too steep and unforgiving in a university of its size and complexity. However, in over 175 years of Michigan history, the university had never selected anybody from engineering for a senior university position.[9]

Yet sometimes the impossible happens, and in March, while I was in Washington at a National Science Board meeting, I received a call from President Harold Shapiro's assistant asking me to return to Ann Arbor to discuss the position of provost. As in my earlier negotiations with the university, I reasoned that since our relationship would depend on a very high level of trust and confidence, I would be comfortable with whatever arrangement Shapiro devised. My only request was that I continue my service on the National Science Board, since I believed this to be of major importance to the university—and the nation, of course.

While my transition into the provost's office was about as rapid as that as my transition into the dean's—roughly six weeks between my acceptance of Shapiro's offer and taking over—there were some important differences. In sharp contrast to moving into a situation where a decade of relatively weak leadership had left the College of Engineering in shambles, I would be following in the footsteps of Billy Frye, one of the university's most able provosts, and I would be joining a very talented team of executive officers, led by a particularly insightful and effective president in Harold Shapiro. Hence, I immediately realized the importance of a smooth transition, with few personnel changes, so that I could not only build on Frye's past accomplishments and momentum but also reinforce the strong confidence that the faculty (and particularly the deans) had in his wisdom, compassion, and academic intuition to do the right thing. Frye graciously set aside a very considerable amount of time, and we met for many days to discuss the university, its challenges, and the role of the provost. It was clear from the outset that I had a great deal to learn.

As in my earlier transition to dean, I began a crash course in university-wide leadership by meeting with scores of faculty and administrators. Of particular priority here were meetings with the deans of our schools and colleges. While I already had established good peer-to-peer relationships with many of them, a new level of confidence and respect needed to be developed to support my role as their chief academic officer. I intentionally scheduled each of these meetings "on their turf" (i.e., in their offices) and followed quickly with tours of their schools. I received similar briefings from other university units, including a several-day immersion in the Medical Center (where I finally concluded that the best way to understand the complexities of this very large part of the university was to be admitted for a medical procedure).

It was important to gain a broader perspective, both historically and beyond the boundaries of the campus. I spent a considerable amount of time with the university's former presidents Harlan Hatcher and Robben Fleming, as well as traveling about the country to meet with an array of experienced education leaders, including the presidents and provosts of Harvard, Yale, Stanford, Illinois, Wisconsin, and Minnesota, as well as the heads of such university organiza-

tions as the Association of American Universities and the American Council on Education.

But clearly my most important meetings were with my new boss, Harold Shapiro. A strong relationship between the president and provost, based on mutual confidence and respect, is absolutely essential in university leadership, and despite his hectic calendar, he was always willing (and anxious) to meet with me both in the weeks prior to my becoming provost and then later throughout my tenure. We had an understanding that any time a matter of urgency arose, we would immediately set aside other activities to meet. As I have noted earlier, Harold Shapiro was a leader of truly remarkable intellect, with an exceptionally deep understanding of the nature of higher education and the particular character of the University of Michigan. One measure of how much I learned from him is the number of my notebooks filled with notes from our conversations.

Since Harold Shapiro had also served both as provost and faculty member at Michigan for almost two decades, he had accumulated a very broad experience and interest in the academic and financial intricacies of the university. He clearly knew far more than I did about many of the core activities of the university, as well as some of its particularly complex components, such as the Medical Center. I, however, had served as dean of one of the larger professional schools (engineering) and was a scientist with extensive Washington experience (serving on the National Science Board). Furthermore, I was probably more comfortable with strategic visioning than with focusing on details. Hence, although this relationship only lasted 18 months before Shapiro left for the presidency of Princeton, it worked quite well, since we complemented one another in a partnership.

Through these early conversations with Shapiro, Frye, and others in the university, it became increasingly clear that while I would be filling some very big shoes in a particularly able central administration, the university was facing some serious issues that would require a bolder and more comprehensive strategy. This was one of the key reasons that Harold Shapiro selected me as his provost and also a key reason that I accepted the position. During the late 1970s and early 1980s, the university had experienced one of the most difficult periods in its history, with deep cuts in state appropriations, considerable

campus unrest (particularly with respect to racial tensions), and the trauma of an extended period of budget cuts, program reviews, and retrenchment. Shapiro and Frye had done a masterful job of guiding the university through these rocky shoals, but the confidence of both faculty and staff was clearly shaken, and morale was low.

Hence, one of my major challenges was to shift the university from defense to offense, to restore a sense of optimism and excitement about the future. Key in this effort was to work with Shapiro to develop a new and compelling vision for the future of the university, a vision that would build on our traditions and strengths—our institutional saga—to earn the engagement and commitment of our campus community and to rebuild strong support from the public and private sector. In each meeting with faculty, deans, or executive officers, I tried to convey a sense of excitement and enthusiasm about the university's future. While I acknowledged that we still were not out of the woods yet and needed to continue to focus resources, the key was to give folks more of a sense of influence over their futures. Since most knew our success in rebuilding the College of Engineering, I tried to use some of the same themes: the importance of people; a philosophy of building from the grass roots up rather than from the top down; and strong encouragement of innovation, risk taking, and entrepreneurial behavior.

Harold Shapiro and I worked closely together to address some near-term challenges. The erosion in state support experienced during the early 1980s had essentially wiped out the university's discretionary capacity, particularly those resources available to fund new ventures. In my role as chief budget officer, I began to take steps to rebuild reserve funds, encouraging all of our academic and administrative units to control expenditures in an effort to build reserves at the local level, avoiding funding traps that might lead us into long-term funding commitments, and simply saying "no" more frequently (if ever so politely). Within a year, we had managed to restore all of the university's reserve accounts to the maximum levels they had achieved before the period of state budget cuts.

The second near-term objective was to raise the bar on faculty hiring and promotion decisions. As provost, Harold Shapiro had been quite rigorous in reviewing faculty promotion casebooks, a habit he

carried with him into the presidency. Together, we moved to create an even higher level of expectation for our various schools and colleges, paying particular attention to those programs whose culture made such evaluations difficult (most particularly in large professional schools, such as the schools of law and medicine). As provost, I made it clear to the deans that my first role would be to challenge what I perceived to be weak cases and, rather than reject them outright, ask them to reconsider or provide additional justification. Usually this was sufficient, but in some cases, it was necessary to use back channels (a staff assistant) to warn deans about resubmission of particularly weak cases, since a provost has to take care not to overtly overrule deans in such a way that it undermines their credibility with their faculty.

Not surprisingly, while I was determined to build on the achievements of my predecessor and retained most of his administration, my style was quite different. Because of the complexity of the university, the dual role of the provost as both chief academic officer and chief budget officer, and the exceptionally large number of direct reporting lines (18 deans, six associate vice presidents or vice-provosts, and a flock of directors and staff for other administrative units), it was a real effort to avoid having all of one's waking hours consumed by standing committee meetings or responding to the in-box. Yet, with so many people dependent on decisions of the provost, the ability to quickly analyze situations and make decisions was essential. Nothing frustrates deans more than indecisiveness, since they are usually creative enough to respond to a negative decision but are frozen into inaction until a decision is made. Working closely with my staff, I was brutal in simplifying the calendar and delegating to others minor decisions, such as the control of small discretionary funds.

Yet another theme of the provost years that would continue into my presidency was the importance of building a greater sense of community within the institution. Whether due to the harsh climate or the years of agonizing budget cuts, people had retreated into their foxholes, cautious and conservative in their activities and protective of their turf, with a consequent erosion in both morale and loyalty to the institution. Since Anne had recently served as president of the university's Faculty Women's Club, she knew a great many members of the

faculty family across the campus, and she began immediately to launch a wide array of events for students, faculty, and staff to draw together the campus community. Within a few weeks following my selection as provost, Anne had already established a new university tradition to honor newly promoted faculty each spring.

One of Anne's most important early efforts involved launching a series of monthly dinners held at the university's Inglis House estate to bring together 10 to 15 faculty couples from across the university. The intent was to provide faculty with new opportunities to reach beyond their disciplines, meet new people, and develop new friendships. The dinners also provided us with a marvelous opportunity to understand better what was on the faculty's mind. However, the logistics involved in carrying out the provost-faculty dinners (which were to become a university tradition that continues today) were considerable. This involved not only working with catering and clerical staff to design and conduct these events but also developing a faculty database capable of supporting the invitations to these monthly dinners. Anne also understood the importance of team building among the deans, since without some effort from the provost and president, the deans' naturally competitive natures could push the academic units apart. Each year, Anne would organize an array of events hosted by the provost (and later the president) for the deans and their spouses, from informal potluck suppers to events that showed off unusual aspects of the university.

Looking back over my notes in preparation for this book, I find the level of activity during my first year as provost quite incredible. I was involved in rebuilding the reserve funds of the university while achieving the strongest faculty salary program in a decade; creating the Michigan Mandate, which would become the cornerstone of our diversity effort during the 1990s; stimulating the construction of a series of important capital facilities for academic units (since the Replacement Hospital Project had been the primary focus of the preceding decade); launching an array of activities aimed at improving the undergraduate experience; negotiating new policies governing intercollegiate athletics; raising the standards for faculty promotion and tenure; leading a university-wide strategic planning effort; working with Anne to create a broad array of community events for stu-

dents, faculty, and staff; and a host of other activities associated with the broad responsibilities of the provost. Perhaps because of the high level of energy and enthusiasm that accompanied such an active agenda, I was able to quickly earn the confidence, respect, and strong support of the deans.

In one sense, it is probably not surprising that I was able to hit the ground running, since both my university service experiences as a faculty member and my administrative experience as the dean of one of the university's largest schools prepared me well for leadership as provost. But it is also the case that my strong support of the directions in which Harold Shapiro and Billy Frye had led the university over the preceding decade allowed me to simply accelerate (rather than change course) and invest my time and energy in continuing this agenda. Many of the same approaches I had taken as dean of engineering seemed to be equally effective at the university level: shifting from reactive to strategic leadership, that is, gathering information by listening, analyzing, determining objectives, planning a course of action, building a team, and moving out rapidly; forming the deans into a leadership team; delegating responsibility, albeit with accountability for results; and conveying a sense of great energy and enthusiasm. Beyond my role as the chief budget officer for the academic programs of the university, I viewed my most important priority as working closely with the president and deans in developing a strategic vision for the university. Within a few months, we had not only initiated a major set of planning activities involving every school and college of the university, but I had also launched a series of initiatives that would later define my presidency: a major effort to increase the racial diversity of the campus community; a series of initiatives designed to improve the undergraduate experience; an initiative to expand the international activities of the university; an aggressive plan to improve the capital facilities of the university; a far-reaching effort to achieve leadership in the use of information technology; efforts to rebuild programs in the natural sciences; and the restructuring of several key professional schools (including the schools of dentistry, library science, and education).

As the activities of the Office of the Provost accelerated, Anne and I were asked to take on additional responsibilities. The provost posi-

tion at Michigan was a particularly challenging one because of its broad range of responsibilities, since the provost serves not only as the chief academic officer of the university but also as the university's chief budget officer. The provost was also second in command and thereby empowered to serve as acting president in the event of the president's absence. Such a situation arose late in 1986, when Harold Shapiro took a brief sabbatical leave—spent partly in England and partly in New York, working at the Ford Foundation. During this period, I served as acting president in addition to my role as provost. This involved, among other activities, serving among the leaders of a Michigan expedition to the Rose Bowl in 1987. (We lost.)

ON THE BRINK

When Harold Shapiro asked me to accept the position of provost in April 1986, he conveyed his hope that I would commit to serving for at least five years. We both knew the Michigan provost position had frequently been a stepping-stone to a major university presidency (e.g., for Roger Heyns to the University of California, Berkeley; Frank Rhodes to Cornell; and Harold Shapiro at Michigan). However, Anne and I wanted to remain in Ann Arbor, so I signed on for the duration, assuming, naturally, that Harold Shapiro would remain as well.

Imagine our surprise when, almost exactly one year after I became provost, in May 1987, Harold pulled me aside the day before spring commencement to tell me he had accepted the presidency at Princeton. Actually, by that time I suspected something might be up, since rumor had it that Shapiro had been approached by Princeton during his sabbatical leave earlier that winter. Yet, although I had suspected that the ice might be getting thin under my current position at the university, I had remained solidly behind my commitment to remain as provost, turning aside several approaches concerning presidencies at other institutions.

When Shapiro's announcement became public, two things happened almost immediately that dramatically changed our lives. First, there was a very rapid transfer of power from Harold Shapiro to me. Although Shapiro was determined to serve until the end of the year

(in part, to see through the completion of the current fund-raising campaign), it was clear that most faculty saw him not only as a lame duck but as one destined to fly off to another pond. Anyone either on or off the campus who needed a decision or a commitment that would last beyond Shapiro's final months came to me in my role as not only the second-ranking officer but also one who would be in place to honor the commitment after Harold's departure. (As an aside, it is interesting to note that Anne and I experienced a quite different situation following the announcement of our own decision to step down from the Michigan presidency and return to the faculty in 1996. Although I had expected that I would almost certainly experience some erosion of power during my last year as a lame-duck president, I continued to experience the full authority of the presidency until my last day in office. There was even an increase in the number of difficult issues or decisions flowing across my desk for resolution as the end of my tenure approached, as people wanted to tie up loose ends before I stepped down. In retrospect, I believe that this sharp contrast with Shapiro's loss of power was due to the simple fact that the university community knew that Anne and I were committed to staying at Michigan. Hence, the university continued to have full confidence in our leadership as long as we remained in the presidency.)

The second major change that occurred in our lives once Shapiro announced that he was stepping down was the recognition, both on our parts and on the part of the university community, that I was now viewed as a leading candidate to succeed him—whether I believed this would actually happen or not and whether I wished it to happen or not. Within a very short time, we were propelled into the search process beyond the point of no return. Looking back, both Anne and I realize that the provost assignment was probably our downfall. Even as dean, one still retains considerable credibility with the faculty: I was still able to do research and supervise graduate students—although I usually met with them during noontime jogging through the university's arboretum; Anne was able to maintain her network of friends while serving in such important roles as the president of the Faculty Women's Club. However, once we had been captured by the immense gravitational pull of the central administration, it was

almost impossible to escape back to a normal faculty life. The Michigan provost position is a decidedly ephemeral role (even if the president remains for a longer period), since it is generally the first place other institutions look for a presidential candidate. Looking back now, Anne and I realize that the die was probably cast eventually to become a university president the minute I had accepted Shapiro's Faustian bargain to become provost.

To some degree, my path up the academic leadership ladder to the Michigan presidency was rather conventional, in the sense that it progressed naturally from professor to dean to provost and, finally, to president. Yet it stands in sharp contrast to the experiences of most of today's university presidents, since careers typically wander through several universities—or other roles in government or business—before landing in a presidency. During my years as president, there were only two other presidents among the 60 universities in the American Association of Universities who had spent their entire careers as faculty and academic leaders in a single institution (William Danforth at Washington University and Charles Young at the University of California, Los Angeles).

Of course, although my entire faculty and leadership experience had been at the University of Michigan, my own education had been forged in two other remarkable institutions: Yale University and Caltech. Yale has long viewed its educational experience as a preparation for leadership, and Caltech is characterized by a truly remarkable commitment to focus its efforts only in academic areas where it can be the very best. There was one further advantage in my own experience: the opportunity to learn the craft of university leadership from several of the most distinguished academic leaders of our times—Harlan Hatcher, Robben Fleming, Frank Rhodes, Harold Shapiro, and Billy Frye. In retrospect, a key to the role I played as Michigan's provost and president during my 10 years at the helm of the university was this combination of my experiences with three quite remarkable institutions—Michigan, Yale, and Caltech—and my relationships with some truly extraordinary academic leaders.

❧ 3 ❧

THE PRESIDENTIAL SEARCH

The search for and selection of a university president is a fascinating process. Considering the growing importance of the university in a knowledge-based society and the complexity of this leadership role, one would expect that a rigorous and informed process would be used to select a university president. This is certainly the case for most other academic leadership positions (e.g., department chairs, deans, or executive officers), whose occupants are typically selected by experienced academic leaders, assisted by faculty search committees, and driven by the recognition that the fate of academic programs—not to mention their own careers—rests on the quality of their selection. Yet, at the highest level of academic leadership, the selection of a university president is the responsibility of a governing board of lay citizens, few with extensive experience in either academic matters or the management of large, complex organizations. This board is aided by a faculty advisory committee with similarly limited knowledge concerning the role of the contemporary university president.

The contrast of a presidential search with the selection of leadership in other sectors of our society, such as business or government, could not be more severe. In the business world, the search for a corporate chief executive officer is conducted by a board of directors,