THE PEOPLE'S CHOICE
Match The Name To The Picture

A
Thomas Kiley

B
Mark Shields

C
William Taylor

D
Martin Nolan

E
David Brudnoy

F
Clay Whitehead

Answers To Appear Elsewhere In This Yearbook
It's time to stop kidding ourselves about Founder's Day.

It was either a reasonably successful Public Relations venture, or an incredibly disastrous educational program. But it certainly was not a successful management symposium.

Despite Founder's Day's educational intent, its image is clearly that of a PR tool. Think about it: if Babson's top priority for Founder's Day was to present an educational symposium, why would it be designed and implemented through the PR office? Is it an attempt to beat the faculty at its own game?

And if its ultimate goal were to have added to the management education of the abson community, there's no one who would today be calling "The People's Choice" successful. Less than 5 per cent of the students, and twenty percent of the faculty, were in attendance.

"The People's Choice" was undoubtedly successful in some respects, but for Babson it was an educational fiasco for a number of reasons.

1. It was not designed by educators. Let the PR office handle a reception or a Founder's Day dinner, but match people to the correct jobs. Introduce some faculty control to the educational aspects of the program.

2. It was not what the students wanted to see. Maybe it was what the students should have been interested in, but it has been too clearly demonstrated over the past two years that only sensationalism or freak shows will attract a crowd.

Try to get more student input before looking into a topic. Get a better reading on what would attract students to an educational program.

3. There was little honest interest in what most faculty members or students had to say about the program. The reason for this is simple: Only four faculty members and a handful of students knew about the topic or speakers until some firm decisions had been made. By that point, it was too late to be flexible in response to new input.

4. Not enough people were involved in decision making. We're not recommending an outbreak of "committee fever," but enlightened people will be more committed to a project that is partially of their undertaking. There may be a parallel between the lack of involvement in Founder's Day '76 and the lack of commitment to it at the end.

5. Too many events during decisions were made. Next year, plan ahead. The program should be well under way by mid-autumn, and the organizational structure should definitely be redesigned, starting now.

By next year, if there haven't been thoughtful changes in the use of people, planning, and ideas, Founder's Day will be only another lesson in mismanagement.

It deserves a better chance than that. With the grant from the Earl C. Sams Foundation, and the large pool of talent at Babson, there is no reason why we can't design a top-quality management symposium.

Let's also remember that its reason for being is, or should be, as an educational bonus. The only way to live up to that commitment with integrity is to begin to treat Founder's Day seriously as a management symposium.

— Babson Free Press April 22nd, 1976.
WAS FOUNDERS DAY MISMANAGED?

To the Editor:

On page two of the Babson Free Press Founders Day Supplement appeared an article quoting Robert W. Billiewicz, Chairman of the Founder’s Day Committee. In the eighth paragraph of this article Mr. Billiewicz implied some rather harsh accusations concerning former Founder’s Day Committee members. The persons implicated are Sarah McCormick, Richard Stillman, and Hugh Glazer. Through their past activities these individuals have proved themselves and their dedication to Babson. I feel it was shady of Mr. Billiewicz to make innuendos without presenting the entire picture.

I also disagree with his statement in the fourth paragraph concerning Public Relations involvement in Founder’s Day. If, as Billiewicz might recall, the decision to seek John Lindsey instead of Lawrence O’Brien was made because it was felt Lindsey would have a better media and audience draw.

For Mr. Billiewicz to only recall that Founder’s Day had problems getting started is a gross understatement. Planning for Founder’s Day ’76 should have begun before the start of classes this past September. In a November 10, 1975 report to the Earl C. Sams Foundation, Billiewicz made the following statement, “We have not yet sought commitment from individual speakers. But we have compiled a list of men and women whose positions would make them logical choices for this symposium.” Of the twenty-two names on that list, only two (actually) took part in the Founder’s Day Program. It appears that Rick Pozniak’s background and media affiliations bailed Billiewicz out from what might have been a meager program.

In this same report Billiewicz mentions a Founder’s Day steering Committee, consisting of students, faculty staff, and alumni. To the best of my knowledge no such committee existed this year. To blame any of the Founder’s Day problems on the transition period of the new P.R. Director (8th para.) is fruitless. As Billiewicz pointed out in the third and fourth paragraphs, Founder’s Day is not strictly a public relations event.

From the very beginning, Billiewicz has been guilty of misusing his personal resources. Billiewicz set himself up as some sort of patriarch. He would use a third party, whom he once referred to as his ‘go-for’ to contact members of the executive committee. Another sequence Billiewicz forgot to mention is the personality differences he created, causing the committee members to become ineffective. It was not uncommon to see Billiewicz walk by you on campus like a total stranger without so much as a hello. However, he did make it common practice to overlook a chair-person and contact committee persons directly. Any Babsonite having completed General Management and Organizational Behavior knows that his type of action does not breed high morale and cooperation.

What Mr. Billiewicz lacked in leadership he didn’t appear to make up for in the areas of ability and common sense. As stated in paragraph six, Billiewicz was upset by not being allowed to sample the food at Chateau De Ville. If he could not trust Chateau De Ville, I wonder how Billiewicz continues to eat them without having his food sampled first!

The culmination of the scenario came when Mr. Billiewicz saw fit to relieve me of ‘all administrative responsibilities.’ Billiewicz confirmed his oral termination on stationary belonging to P.R. Director Rick Pozniak. The only problem was Pozniak didn’t authorize its use and requested that Billiewicz make an apology. I am still waiting for Mr. Billiewicz’s apology for misuse of the letterhead.

I believe in Founder’s Day. I feel it is one of the best educational opportunities Babson provides. I only regret that organizationally it had to fall victim to this year’s Chairman.

Sincerely,
Hugh Glazer

The Babson Free Press April 22nd, 1976