

05-08-27A

TO: President Jack Miller
FROM: President of the University Senate

1. The attached motion of the University Senate, dealing with Appointments & Personnel Committee is presented to you for your consideration. Two additional copies are included for your use.

2. This motion was adopted by the University Senate on May 8, 2006

3. After considering this motion, please indicate your action on this form, and return it together with the original copy to the President of the University Senate.

4. Under the By-Laws of the University Senate, Section 3.8, the following schedule of action is to be observed.

a) By May 13, Senate action reported to the President of University.
(Date)

(Within five school days of the session in which they are adopted).

b) By May 23, President of the University to return the motion to the
(Date)

President of the Senate. (Within 10 school days of its receipt).

05/12/06 for [Signature]
(Date) President, University Senate (Tim Craine)

ENDORSEMENT:

TO: President of the University Senate

FROM: President Jack Miller

1. Motion Approved _____

2. Motion Disapproved _____
(Explanatory statement must be appended)

3. Action "is deferred" _____

4. Resolution Noted _____

5. Other _____

5/26/06
Date

[Signature]
President

Appointments & Personnel Committee of the Faculty Senate (C. Barrington)

Motion to accept the report and ask President Miller to work with the Committee (Wolff) : Passed

Report on Campus-Wide Executive Searches

2005-2006 Academic Year

The following report is concerned with only the process of the searches and not with the outcome.

Positive observations

1. Committees reflected diversity on campus.
2. Positions were filled in one academic year.
3. Few forces external to the committees seemed to influence their decisions.
4. Open forums allowed all members of the CCSU community to meet candidates.
5. Faculty and staff were invited to comment on candidates after campus visits.

Concerns about campus-wide executive searches

1. Job descriptions were taken from Human Resources file and did not take into account
 - a. how the position had evolved, or
 - b. how the faculty and staff working in that division imagined it needed to evolve.
2. Search committee members were selected by President Miller after soliciting volunteers during the summer break.
3. Chairs of the committees were appointed by President Miller.
4. Chairs of the committees were appointed from only among the ranks of administrators because President Miller wanted them to be of equivalent rank to the position being filled.
5. Not using a search firm limited the pool of candidates to those who were actively looking for a new position and foreclosed finding candidates who were not actively looking to relocate.

6. Committee members were unclear about the role of confidentiality in the search process; in an attempt to protect the confidentiality of candidates, too much of the search process was shrouded in secrecy.
7. Creation of the job descriptions was not part of the committees' mandate.
8. Creation of the advertisements was not part of the committees' mandate.
9. Committees did not establish a mechanism for soliciting input from faculty and staff regarding the job description.
10. President Miller added names to the list of candidates the committees invited for campus visits.
11. No time line was provided to campus for
 - a. reviewing application files,
 - b. narrowing the number of candidates,
 - c. conducting initial interviews,
 - d. bringing finalists to campus, and
 - e. making an offer.
12. The committees did not provide regular updates to faculty and staff on the campus listserv.
13. Within searches, committee members did not exhibit a consensus on how to apply categories and criteria in the matrix used to select candidates for "minimum qualifications," "minimally qualified," and "finalist."
14. The campus meetings and visits were abbreviated.
15. No campus-wide bulletins announced the candidates' entire itinerary.
16. Candidates had limited opportunities to meet faculty and staff in order to discuss campus concerns.
17. Faculty and staff feedback did not seem to be a priority.
18. Finalists were not sent copies of the AAUP and SUOF-AFSCME contracts.

Recommendations for future searches

1. Decisions of such magnitude for the vitality of CCSU should not be rushed.
2. Campus-wide administrative searches should be more akin to faculty searches—known for their thoroughness—rather than a staff search.
3. Committee member should be prepared to make an extensive, even burdensome, time commitment.
4. Committees should be partially elected by faculty and staff and partially appointed by administrator to whom the new administrator will report.
5. The committees should select their own chairpersons, who should not have to be of equivalent rank to the open executive position.
6. The job description and ad should be written by the search committees after soliciting and receiving information from
 - a. the administrator immediately superior to the position,
 - b. other pertinent administrators, and
 - c. faculty and staff working in the division.
7. A search firm should be retained, especially in searches for the highest level of administrators, in order to
 - a. facilitate the search and necessary paperwork, and
 - b. locate candidates who might not otherwise respond to an advertisement.
8. In addition to receiving the current instruction on Affirmative Action guidelines, committee members should receive adequate training on the protocols of executive searches. Moreover, confidentiality agreements should be made with committee members to clarify that the process must remain transparent while keeping the names of applicants and finalists confidential.
9. One of the committee's highest priorities should be designing and implementing mechanisms, such as a dedicated website, for
 - a. soliciting input from faculty and staff.
 - b. disseminating to faculty and staff regular updates, such as
 - § a time line for

- § reviewing application files,
- § narrowing the number of candidates,
- § conducting initial interviews,
- § bringing finalists to campus, and
- § making an offer;
- § data on numbers of applications received; and
- § candidates' campus itinerary.

10. Selection of candidates to visit campus should be left to the committee.

11. For top-level candidates, campus visits should extend to at least 1½ days.

12. More varied forums and constituencies should be included in candidates' campus visits.

13. Questionnaires at each forum should be provided for attendees to complete and give immediate feed back on candidates

14. A copy of all appropriate contracts should be included in the packet of information sent to finalists.