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TUFTS HILLEL
In 2017, Jeffrey Summit decided he was ready to step down as executive director of Tufts Hillel—a position he had held for 38 years. The organization had expanded tremendously since 1979, the year Summit moved into an office that had previously been a storage closet for a refrigeration unit. Tufts Hillel was now housed in a new 10,000-square-foot center on campus, the construction of which Summit had overseen. It employed nine full-time professional staff (including two rabbis), served around 700 Jewish students, had an annual budget of $1.5 million, and managed a $6.4 million endowment.

As Tufts Hillel had grown, so too had Summit. Over the course of his tenure, he earned a Ph.D. in musicology, secured faculty appointments at Tufts’ Department of Music and its Judaic Studies program, authored two books, and released a Grammy-nominated musical CD, all while managing an increasingly complex organization.

These changes—both in Tufts Hillel as an organization and in Jeffrey Summit himself—raised a dilemma for its board of directors, one that any organization replacing a beloved, long-serving chief executive might face. What sort of successor should board members look for? A less-experienced executive who—like Summit 38 years ago—is on the verge of their best work and able to oversee an organization through four decades of growth? Or a more experienced executive who—like the Summit of 2017—has already proven themselves to be a capable leader and manager?

The Tufts Hillel board wasn’t sure. It knew it was in a strong position: It had plenty of time to run a search (Summit had given them almost 18-months’ notice); the board was cohesive and well-run; the organization was financially healthy; and Tufts Hillel’s strong reputation suggested that it would have no trouble attracting talented candidates. But this was the first time the
organization had undertaken a CEO transition in a generation; a certain amount of uncertainty was inevitable.

“There’s always some anxiety,” explains Carrie Darsky, the director of executive talent management at Hillel International, who acted as a consultant on the Tufts Hillel search. “Many board members have never done a CEO search before. They are volunteers and are time-constrained. And when you’re replacing someone like Jeff, who has held down the fort for so many years, there can be incredible fear around what’s happening.”

Fortunately, the fear and uncertainty didn’t last long. Rather than fixating on the outcome, the Tufts Hillel board relied on a methodical process to navigate the transition. One of the board’s first decisions was to engage Hillel International to work with it on the search rather than run an independent search process. It took guidance from Darsky; Mimi Kravetz, Hillel International’s chief talent officer; and other consultants from Hillel International, an organization that advises 25 to 50 local Hillel affiliates on CEO searches every year and has a tried-and-tested approach to successions. The process led the board to a narrower profile of the type of leader it required and, eventually, to a candidate that the board could unanimously endorse. And yet, even as it adhered to a structure and a plan, it never lost the human touch. “You want how you handle the search to reflect on your organization—on its mission and its values,” Darsky explains. “And I think in this instance the search committee and the entire board can be proud.”

**Succession Planning**

The story of Summit’s succession begins in the early 2010s, when the Tufts Hillel board broached the delicate subject of a leadership transition with Summit. It told him that it was delighted with his performance and keen for him to stay on in the role for as long as he felt engaged and vital, but that it understood that no executive remains in place forever. Summit told the board that he just wasn’t ready to step down and that he felt he “still had a lot of time left,” according to Ted Tye, a board member and former board chair who would later chair the search committee.

The board was right to check in with Summit about his plans—Summit’s motivations and goals were indeed changing, though it took him some time to process and understand the internal change. “When is it time to go?” Summit asks rhetorically as he remembers this period in his tenure. “I struggled mightily over several years with that question because I loved the work. And I had no desire to retire.”

But through the early 2010s, Summit realized that his evolving interests no longer neatly aligned with college-age adults. “I remember talking at a Shabbat and just hearing a whoosh as what I was saying went over the heads...
of the students,” he recalls. “The issues that I wanted to talk about—sustaining meaningful work, building family, challenging how we used technology—just weren’t resonating with them.” At the same time, Summit was growing increasingly frustrated with the difficulties in bringing pro-Israel and pro-Palestinian students together in productive dialogue, and he felt drawn to teaching and mentoring colleagues in their 30s, 40s, and 50s. “When I found myself wanting to engage with new challenges, I began to allow myself to think about what it would be like to leave this amazing, wonderful thing that I had built over many years,” he explains.

Although it would have been best practice for the board to repeat its conversation with Summit each year, it had at least removed any stigma around Summit’s departure by broaching the subject once. So when Summit decided to step down in 2017, he felt comfortable approaching the board about his desire to do so.

“As much as we’d all like to be good planners, the realization that a long-serving executive wants to step down often comes upon the executive fairly quickly. So I think the lesson here is that when you have an executive approaching their 60s, despite the fact that they may not be interested in talking about a succession, it’s always good to let them know that the door is open for them, and that you want as much notice as possible so the process isn’t rushed,” Tye says.

Summit told the board he would stay for 18 months to ensure enough time to identify and hire a successor, and then spend at least six to eight weeks onboarding the new executive director into the role. To kick off the search, the board met with Hillel International’s Aviva Snyder, a campus support director provided to Tufts by Hillel International, and Chief Talent Officer Kravetz (Darsky would eventually join the duo). As there were no insider candidates—Summit’s long-serving associate director had left for a new opportunity elsewhere the year before—the board asked the trio to engage in a far-reaching international search. Engaging Hillel International gave the Tufts board access to the organization’s extensive network of potential candidates (especially those not actively looking for a new role and who might otherwise not respond to a job posting) and also promised to dramatically reduce the time commitment needed from search committee members.

Hillel International’s first step was to set up a search committee. Tye, a local real estate developer and Tufts Hillel board member, assumed the chair and, with assistance from both Kravetz and Snyder, filled in six other members. (Darsky would later call Tye one of the best search chairs she had ever worked alongside.) Along with Tye, the committee would eventually be
composed of two other board members: the Tufts university chaplain and one undergraduate student. Darsky and Snyder joined the committee as “non-voting members.” Following generally accepted best practice, Tye decided not to invite Summit on to the committee.

“One of the hardest things to tell an executive director is that they can’t be involved in the search,” Darsky explains. “They’ve been the sole decision-maker for the organization on every important issue for a long time. They often have a deep love and sense of loyalty to the organization. And yet you have to explain to them that they need to sit this one out. It’s tough.” Darsky says that Summit immediately understood—and she reassured him that he would have the chance to meet all the finalists and offer his feedback to the search committee before it made its decision.

The next step was to collect feedback from Tufts Hillel’s stakeholders to help scope the job description for Summit’s replacement. Kravetz and Snyder met with Tye to perform a stakeholder-mapping exercise that identified the key constituencies affected by a new executive director appointment. Snyder eventually interviewed students, alumni, the university chaplain, donors, the local federation, and the chief of staff to the university president.

In each interview, Snyder used a mental trick to help the stakeholder think through what qualities they should seek in a successor. “I told them ‘Let’s put Jeff in a box and put him away for a while,’” she recalls. “It often resulted in a laugh, but these were big shoes to fill, and we had to imagine what might be best for the organization beyond Jeff.” Snyder then asked some variation of the following questions:

- What should be known before the search begins?
- What qualities does the new executive director need to be successful?
- Given what is known about the organization, what can be done, right now, to capitalize on new leadership?
- What should we retain that’s excellent, and what can we achieve in this next phase for Jewish life on campus?

Snyder circulated a synthesis of the stakeholder interviews to the search committee, and the members used it to help scope the job description. Snyder says this process brings two benefits in addition to informing the search: It unearths hidden problems and opportunities within the organization that the next executive director must address. But more importantly, it helps secure buy-in from major stakeholders, which in turn helps set up the new executive director for success.

“It’s important to talk to people outside the organization—what are the needs of the university, the students who are less
Shortly before Summit told the board he would be stepping down, the board assembled a committee to draft a strategic plan—and hired a consultant to help the process. “We put that on ice,” Tye explains. “We didn’t want to complete a strategic plan and then have a new person come in with a completely different vision, so we decided to delay it.” However, the search committee and the board still undertook some “visioning” work to assist in the crafting of the job description. Snyder and Darsky led committee members through an exercise where they cast their minds four years into the future and imagined that the first class of undergraduates overseen by the new executive director was graduating. What would Tufts Hillel be doing differently? What would be the same? How would the organization feel? What are the leadership qualities the organization needed to achieve this vision? The duo also led the committee through an exercise to articulate the “deal breaker” qualities that any candidate under consideration must possess.

“As it happens, we landed on a job description that was not dissimilar to [Summit]. But that makes sense because he is a great executive director,” Snyder says. “It’s important that the process bore this out as opposed to going in with an assumption that we’d ‘find someone like Jeff,’ so the committee felt confident in their decisions moving forward.” The exercise suggested to the group that it was looking for an experienced candidate rather than a candidate similar to the engaged, the local community partners? If you don’t reach outside, you can get myopic and only focus on your own organization and you’ll miss some of the unmet needs of the people that you serve,” Snyder explains.

WHAT THE RESEARCH SAYS: SEARCH COMMITTEES

An ideal search committee should be composed of five to eight people and include a mix of past and future leadership as well as representatives of key constituencies.

Here is a sample committee:

- Incoming board chair
- Past board chair
- A member of the executive committee
- Financial chair
- A member of the board with deep hiring experience and expertise
- A board member from a partner organization with which the nonprofit works closely

TUFTS HILLEL
Darsky says that part of the miscalculation was the belief that Summit’s stature in the Hillel community would be a powerful draw. In many cases, the opposite proved true: Candidates felt intimidated by Summit’s legacy and therefore reluctant to put their names forward. “We heard ‘I can’t replace Jeff Summit’ a lot,” Darsky says. “We spoke to potential alumni candidates who told us that they entered Jewish life because of [Summit]. Candidates who knew of Summit’s legacy felt intimidated, like the shoes were too big to fill.”

Still, Snyder isn’t convinced the disappointing candidate pool was a setback. There were plenty of talented candidates on the list (indeed many have since gone on to successfully lead other large organizations), but it was only after assessing the profiles of a diverse pool that the committee realized it needed to sharpen its candidate profile. “We had rabbis (both congregational and with Hillel affiliations), non-rabbis, MBAs from the corporate sector, internal Hillel candidates, alumni and non-alumni,” she says. “In this instance, the search committee needed a diverse pool to help hone what they were actually looking for.” The search committee also received feedback from the full board, to which it reported on a regular basis, that an open, international search was desirable.

While the committee had initially felt it was open to an unorthodox, less-experienced candidate, it eventually

Sourcing the Candidates

At this point, the search committee made what it would eventually come to see as a small mistake. It decided that instead of listing the opening on Hillel’s job board and other recruiting sites, it would rely solely on Hillel International to source the candidates. “We felt that this was a high-profile, desirable job and that we wouldn’t have any problem,” Tye explains. “And we wanted a ‘shotgun’ approach; we were open to looking wide and far and finding a diverse group of candidates.”

Tye’s thinking was not unusual: In an era of LinkedIn—and at a time of record low unemployment, where relatively few people are actively looking for jobs—many organizations have found targeted recruiting to be more successful than a traditional “post and pray” approach. What’s more, Hillel International had a strong Rolodex of senior leaders at Hillel affiliates around the country with relevant experience. Hillel International spoke to over 100 people and did initial screening interviews with dozens of candidates but eventually sourced 15 plausible candidates for the search committee to review. However, none of the candidates stood out as a perfect fit.
came to see that one quality was most important—gravitas. Committee members could not define exactly what that meant, but they all felt they understood it in the way that U.S. Supreme Court Justice Potter Stewart famously expressed the threshold for pornography: I know it when I see it. The committee knew that it needed a strong personality to fill Summit’s role both at Hillel and as the Jewish leader within the university as a whole. Darsky explains: “It could be career gravitas, a person with extraordinary experience that commanded respect; or it could be academic or intellectual gravitas—someone who had published multiple articles or books on a subject. Or it could be someone with a large social media presence. But they came to realize that they needed someone of similar stature to [Summit]. In that sense, the process worked.”

The Importance of Process

Six months into the search, the committee identified three candidates deemed worthy of bringing to Tufts for in-person interviews. However, the committee also decided to briefly post the job description on a few job sites, including Hillel’s. This step would prove crucial: Tufts Hillel’s eventual hire, Naftali Brawer, only applied after seeing the posting online following a conversation with Darsky. Brawer had connections to Hillel International—he was friends with the organization’s chief innovation officer—and had heard about the opening. But it didn’t feel real or concrete to him until he saw the actual job description. “What’s interesting is that he told us he had heard that [Summit] was stepping down, but wasn’t sure what was going on. It was only after he saw the job description that he felt comfortable putting his name forward.”

Brawer—a rabbi, chief executive of a London think tank, author, and prominent voice within the United Kingdom’s Jewish community—immediately impressed the search committee. He also aced the initial “screening” video and phone interviews. In fact, Tye was so impressed that he suggested to Darsky and Snyder that they disinvite the other three finalists to the campus interviews. Darsky and Snyder demurred. One of the messages they had drilled into the search committee from the outset was the importance of process. Deviating by prematurely cutting three candidates not only would reflect badly on Tufts Hillel, but it would also risk alienating potential “second choice” candidates should Brawer not accept the position. “To me, the lesson was only invite a candidate for in-person interviews if you are sure you could happily hire them,” Darsky says. Tye and the committee eventually expanded the finalist pool to five and invited them all to campus for interviews.

Throughout the process, Snyder and Darsky had tag-teamed as the recruiting equivalent of “quality managers,”
ensuring the consistency and reliability of the process. Their goal was to allow as little bias and inconsistency to creep into the search process as possible. The pair asked the same questions in roughly the same order to all candidates during their screening interviews. If a member of the board or search committee referred a candidate, that candidate was put through the same screening process as all the candidates. At one point, a candidate asked to see the organization’s financials; Darsky and Snyder then sent the financials to all of the candidates even though they hadn’t requested them. While they cracked down on informal, side-channel communication, Darsky and Snyder also ensured that they communicated regularly with the candidates through formal channels. “One of the biggest mistakes I see is search committees that leave candidates hanging for weeks without checking in. In the end, it reassures both committees and candidates to know that they can trust a process and that they know what to expect,” Darsky says.

At one point, Summit made an innocent mistake that broke from protocol: He was contacted by a local candidate who had applied for the role. Summit invited the candidate for a campus visit. “I had to slap [Summit] on the wrist, as that’s unfair to the other candidates,” Darsky explains. “It gives the candidate a leg up through access to information that the other finalists don’t have.”

Darsky says that in many searches, outgoing executives and search committee members are resistant to seemingly cumbersome restrictions and feel they can make the process more efficient by taking short cuts or bending the rules. Darsky defends the

THE IMPORTANCE OF PROCESS

Two Israeli academics—Daniel Kahneman and Amos Tversky—were the first to begin to unravel the myth that we can trust our gut when it comes to our most important decisions. The pair showed that unstructured decision-making can lead to inconsistency and bias. It is almost always better to put our trust in processes rather than intuition—to structure our decisions around practices validated by research.
process by explaining that candidates appreciate a professionally run search—one that instills confidence that their confidentiality is protected and that puts in place a fair evaluation procedure for all candidates.

The CEO’s Journey

As the search committee progressed through the hiring process, Summit was going through his own journey. Yale School of Management’s Jeffrey Sonnenfeld, who wrote eloquently about CEO departures in his book “The Hero’s Farewell,” describes the end of an illustrious CEO’s tenure as “a plunge into the abyss...a kind of mortality.” While Summit wasn’t planning to retire—he would continue to teach and also do consulting for Hillel International—the transition out of the corner office proved more challenging than he anticipated. “If a person is making a change after many years, even if the situation is good, the change is good, it’s still going to be a complicated personal process,” Sonnenfeld explains.

Summit’s situation was confounded by the fact that for six months after he decided to step down, he didn’t tell anyone outside of his immediate family. This put a lot of stress on his wife during that time. He felt that the Jewish communal world was too small for even his closest friends—or parents—to be trusted with his secret. After his announcement, Summit used money from his discretionary fund to hire an executive coach. While he felt the engagement was helpful, the coach was focused on the tactical aspects of an executive transition. “He was a great coach, but he wasn’t a therapist. In retrospect, I didn’t have enough people to talk to, and I put too much burden on my family as a result,” Summit says.

Summit believes that the board chair at organizations with long-serving chief executives should have the courage to broach the subject of mental health with the executives as their departure approaches. He suggests framing the conversation in terms of “spiritual health”—and asking what the executive needs in terms of support through a major transition in their lives. In Summit’s case, he found solace through teaching and learning. He partnered with Scotty McLennan, a lecturer at Stanford University’s Graduate School of Business, to teach a summer seminar addressing executive transitions at the Tufts European Center in France titled “What Happens Next?”

Through the teaching experience, Summit came to see that the mix of emotions he felt around the departure was natural and had to be worked through rather than dismissed. “You don’t have to do it all at once,” he says. “I realized the year I stepped down from Tufts didn’t have to be a happy year. I didn’t need to feel joyful or happy all the time. I just needed to pay attention to what I was feeling—and be patient. That was a big revelation for me.”
Crossing the Threshold

After working under Summit’s leadership for four decades, it was natural that the organization would go through some of the same transition pains that Summit personally experienced. After Brawer’s appointment as Summit’s successor, the duo spent six weeks at the organization together. The overlap allowed Summit to not only introduce Brawer to important donors, but also allowed him to be seen wholeheartedly endorsing his successor among staff and other important stakeholders. Brawer would come to see the overlapping period as an essential element of his onboarding.

Inevitably, however, the ride wasn’t always smooth for the staff—or Brawer. The organization had found a deep groove under Summit, and a new leader caused a certain amount of disruption. Anticipating this, Summit had secured a retention bonus for his staff members to encourage them to stay on through the transition. Darsky felt that the board should have gone one step further; she had advocated for an interim CEO to the Tufts Hillel board before it undertook the search. She felt that an interim executive director would provide a “decompression chamber” and would allow the eventual permanent hire to take over a staff already accustomed to new leadership. While her suggestion wasn’t adopted, the board did internalize her advice to be patient in the early weeks of Brawer’s tenure and accept that it might take some time for him to settle in to the role. “And I told Brawer, too, that while I was sure he would be successful, he should be prepared for a bumpy takeoff,” Darsky recalls.

The staff and Brawer’s unease came to a head late in the transition period. As the day of his official departure approached, Summit spent fewer hours in his office at the advice of his executive coach; it was a way to symbolize the shift of authority to Brawer. One day, Brawer received a meeting request from a staff member, who suggested they meet in the executive director’s office. Brawer felt uncomfortable with the suggestion—Summit was technically still the executive director. To his surprise, this frustrated the staff member. She felt Brawer was the new director and so the meeting should take place in the director’s office. For Brawer, this moment made clear the frustration the staff was feeling over the transition. “The staff was confused; they weren’t sure who was in charge,” Brawer recalls. He called an all-staff meeting to address the tension. Drawing from his rabbinical studies, Brawer prepared remarks about the concept of a “liminal space,” which can be defined as “the period between ‘what was’ and ‘what’s next.’” He said liminal spaces were inherently uncomfortable and unsettling—akin to the moment between when a trapeze artist lets go of one bar and catches another. “I spoke
about liminality, and I let them share what it meant to them. I spoke from my heart. My wife and my youngest hadn’t yet moved from London. I was living in temporary accommodation; everything was in flux. I explained how this was both exciting for me but also unsettling. We have a very emotionally intelligent team, and they could use this conversation to kind of navigate through [the transition period].”

A few weeks later, on Summit’s last day, Summit and Brawer used another ceremony to mark the end of the liminal period. The entire staff congregated in Summit’s office. Summit had cleaned everything out; the empty room was another act of intentional symbolism. With the staff huddled around, Summit shared a passage from the Torah. Members of staff shared reflections and memories of Summit’s tenure in what Brawer recalls as a “ritualized process of letting go.” The moment marked a new era after 39 years—for Brawer, for the staff, and for Summit. “I thought it was very beautiful,” Brawer recalls. “The threshold was crossed.”
The following Search Agreement is established on [Insert Date] by and between Schusterman International Center and [Local Hillel].

[Local Hillel] is excited to partner with Hillel International for its shared goal of engaging the best Executive Director for [Local Hillel]. To ensure a successful search, we agree to the following:

1. Hillel International Talent Team
Responsibility: In order to manage the search, the Hillel International Talent Team will perform the following activities:

   (a) Stakeholder/Campus Intake & Agreement: Conduct interviews with designated [local Hillel] stakeholders in order to clarify the responsibilities of the position, define the competencies and characteristics of an ideal candidate, understand the culture of the organization, and discuss the logistics of the search.

   (b) Job Documentation: Compose/advice composition of job description to ensure that search advertisements conform to Hillel International’s established best practices and succeed in attracting desired candidates.

   (c) Search Strategy: Collaborate to discuss the search strategy, which outlines the search’s sourcing plans, resume screening protocol, candidate interview questions, and hiring process details.

   (d) Candidate Recruitment: Coordinate all recruitment efforts, including posting the position in a variety of sources, extensive sourcing in network and beyond, directing outreach to Hillel International’s network, and supporting [local Hillel] in leveraging its own network to attract candidates.

   (e) Application Portal: Host an online application portal, through which candidates will submit application cover letters and resumes.

   (f) Candidate Management: Catalogue and carefully track all applications and help manage communications with candidates, in conversation with [local Hillel].

   (g) Resume Screen: Review applications against pre-established qualifications to determine whether candidates advance to the next round of the search.

   (h) Skype Interview: Conduct
thorough Skype interviews with the most promising candidates to assess their degree of fit with the position requirements and organizational culture.

(i) Finalist Management: Create a “Candidate Portfolio,” consisting of a resume, cover letter, and assessment of the candidate’s fit with requirements of the position, for each candidate that is to be transitioned to [local Hillel] for consideration by search committee.

(j) Search Committee Support: Support search committee, as requested, in conducting effective and compliant interviews with promising candidates. Stay in regular contact to get updates on the search and provide guidance on the search process and candidates as needed. Debrief [local Hillel] interviews and provide guidance regarding candidates’ next steps in the process.

(k) Reference Checks: Support hiring managers, as requested, in conducting effective and compliant reference checks for any finalist(s) to whom [local Hillel] is prepared to make an employment offer.

(l) Status Reports: Deliver weekly reports regarding the status of the Search to date.

(m) Sales: Through nuanced conversations and holding a global perspective, help move the candidate to a Yes, should they receive an offer.

(n) Meeting with our CEO/President: Coordinate the interview call with Eric Fingerhut or his delegate, including preparation of supporting documentation, resume & dossier.

2. [LOCAL HILLEL] Responsibility: In order to support the Search, [local Hillel] will:

(a) Consult with the Hillel International Talent Team to discuss the needs and parameters of their search.

(b) Finalize and approve the job description.

(c) Participate in training from Hillel International to run a search and interview for success.

(d) Have pertinent search chair available for regular conversations and meetings with [Hillel International] as needed throughout the Search.

(b) Leverage the [local Hillel] network to support the Search, as deemed appropriate by [local Hillel], by sending out correspondence to professionals, leadership, funders and partners to solicit candidate referrals.

(c) Outline and stay committed to a
search timeline.

(d) Ensure ongoing and effective feedback and communication with Hillel International throughout the search.

(e) Notify Hillel International immediately of any changes in the position or hiring plan.

(f) Allow for time to finalize candidate offer, in support of Eric Fingerhut, Hillel International’s CEO and President’s role in interviewing and approving final candidate.

(f) When sending out candidate announcements, press releases, or sharing search process with community, include Hillel International.

Supporting candidates as they embark on a search with Hillel not only reflects well on Hillel but also speaks to the mitzvah of helping someone find their calling. Hillel International and the campus Hillel will strive to best serve the campus and the candidates as well as facilitate a robust, efficient search process.

Should the candidate experience suffer as a result of either party neglecting these roles, the Hillel International Talent Team reserves the right to step in to manage those issues, including communicating with the candidate pool on behalf of the campus or removing the job from public view until the issues are resolved.

We agree to work collaboratively to find top talent for Hillel's searches and to inform that process with proficiency, excellence and Jewish values.

3. ADDITIONAL POLICIES:

(a) Hillel International will manage all sourcing, advertising, and outreach through available networks, contacts and leads.

(b) [Local Hillel] and Hillel International will pool their resources and networks to expedite the Search and maximize its scope.

(c) [Local Hillel] agrees to refer potential candidates arising from both internal and external sources to Hillel International so that those candidates will receive equitable consideration against the same standards as the rest of the candidate pool.

(d) [Local Hillel] should not run parallel interview processes or meet independently with candidates outside of the process established with Hillel International.

(e) Hillel International reserves the right to communicate directly with any
APPENDIX: SEARCH AGREEMENT

candidate for the position at any time during the search, as well as to conduct post-search debriefing and follow-up with the individual who is hired into the position.

(f) [Local Hillel] understands that, outside of Hillel International’s control, candidates may simultaneously apply for this search as well as for other searches, including the possibility of other searches being managed by Hillel for other Hillel openings. As appropriate, Hillel will endeavor to inform [local Hillel] whenever it is aware that such a situation has occurred, but the candidates will retain sole power to prioritize their available opportunities.

(g) [Local Hillel] agrees that all applicants to this specific search who are not actively being considered as viable candidates in the Search may be considered by Hillel for positions at other client organizations.

Name:
Title:
Date:

Name:
Title:
Date:
Eben Harrell is a senior editor at Harvard Business Review (HBR). Before joining HBR, Harrell worked as a foreign correspondent in the London bureau of TIME; as an associate at the Harvard Kennedy School; and as the head of thought leadership for L.E.K. Consulting, a strategy consultancy. An award-winning reporter, writer, and editor, Harrell has published articles in TIME, The Economist, The Washington Post, Sports Illustrated, and other major titles. In 2017, Harrell and UC Berkeley professor Dacher Keltner won the Warren Bennis Prize, which is awarded each year by the USC Marshall School of Business to the editor and author of the best article on leadership in Harvard Business Review. Harrell holds a master’s degree from the University of St. Andrews and a bachelor of arts from Princeton University.
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