

Retrospective Review of the 2019 Presidential Search Process

BACKGROUND

With the recent appointment of Interim President Becky Johnson, the Board has turned its attention to the next presidential search process. The OSU community is eager to hear from the Board about how it will conduct the next search process and provide opportunities for engagement by members of the university community and public. Over the past two months, the Board has heard a great deal about this in public comment, written correspondence, and most explicitly in the March 18 motion and April 8 resolution passed by the OSU Faculty Senate.

To help the Board set the course for the next search, Board Chair Rani Borkar initiated a retrospective review of the 2019 presidential search process. A retrospective review is an opportunity to evaluate a work effort after it is completed. The review gathers feedback on what went well to ensure those elements are sustained going forward and also identifies what could or should be done differently in the future. At the Chair's request, Trustee Paul Kelly is leading the review.

As background for the review, a summary of the major elements of the 2019 search process is provided in Attachment 1.

COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT

The retrospective is gathering community feedback through an online survey tool and virtual workshops. On May 4, the Board Chair announced the retrospective review to the university community, launching an online survey tool at this [retrospective review webpage](#). The survey is open through May 17.

Trustee Kelly has also convened several virtual workshops that included a combination of trustees, individuals involved in the last search, members of the Faculty Senate ad hoc committee on presidential hiring processes, and other stakeholders.

COMMUNITY FEEDBACK

A summary of feedback gathered from the survey and workshops as of May 14 is included in Attachment 1. Attachment 2 provides average survey rankings by affiliation for each element of the search process. *Revised Attachments 1 and 2 will be provided to trustees at the close of the survey and workshops and additional highlights noted.*

The topic of due diligence and background checks has consistently been raised in comments throughout elements of the survey and came up with workshop participants as well. The Board has a separate effort underway to provide an independent, outside review of the due diligence performed in the last search. This work is being overseen by Vice Chair Kirk Schueler and Trustee Julia Brim-Edwards and is expected to be complete by July. An update on the approach that will be used for this effort will be presented as part of the retrospective review at the May 21 Board meeting.

MAY 21 BOARD DISCUSSION

Retrospective Review

During its May 21 retrospective discussion, trustees will consider the feedback gathered in the retrospective review and discuss as a group what went well in the last search process and what the Board might consider doing differently in the next search.

This discussion is not intended to close review and consideration of the last presidential search or discussion regarding the next search, as the Board will continue to gather input from a broad range of stakeholders before its October 7 meeting, the first meeting of the Board in the next academic year. At that meeting, the Board will discuss further the process and timeline for the next presidential search.

Community Engagement with Finalists

The primary theme of comments received to date in the online survey was the need in the next search process for more community engagement with finalists. This theme was echoed by many workshop participants.

Tension between candidate confidentiality and finalists visiting campus is the subject of regular debate in higher education, as highlighted in the following two Chronicle of Higher Education articles:

- <https://www.chronicle.com/article/sorry-professors-but-presidential-searches-should-be-secret/>
- <https://www.chronicle.com/article/sorry-headhunters-but-the-healthiest-presidential-searches-are-open/>

Given the focus and importance of this aspect of the search process, the breakout groups at each virtual workshop did a deeper dive discussion of the benefits and tradeoffs associated with campus visits with finalists versus a fully confidential search.

In the discussion, workshop participants underscored the benefit of bringing finalists to OSU in terms of broad community buy-in regarding the search process and the candidate ultimately selected.

Participants discussed the benefit of knowing who the finalists are; being able to use their network of colleagues nationally to assess the qualifications of finalists; and providing feedback on the candidacy of finalists. Participants noted that this type of community engagement also can build important interpersonal connections with the new president before they take office.

Many participants acknowledged that some candidates, particularly sitting presidents, might not be willing to be considered due the public nature of campus visits and the loss of confidentiality. This led to further discussion of the demographics of sitting university presidents and OSU's desire for a diverse pool of applicants, with some noting that thinking beyond sitting presidents could have benefits to the goal of achieving a diverse pool.

Workshop participants talked about the format for those visits, if finalists do visit the university as part of the next search process. Given OSU's statewide presence, participants noted the need for both in person and streaming options for forums to maximize access for community members and discussed the idea of holding smaller gatherings with specific stakeholder groups.

There was a general sense that more than one finalist should visit. Beyond that, workshop participants advised that the total number of finalists should be based on who is a truly viable candidate for the position.

While the Board will not begin the search process until next fall, given the primacy of this aspect of the search process, Trustee Kelly recommends that the Board consider the question of whether finalists will visit OSU during the next presidential search as part of its May 21 review discussion.

Search Firm

During the May 21 discussion, it would be valuable to gather initial feedback from trustees on whether they are interested in using the guarantee provision of the WittKieffer contract from the 2019 presidential search. This provision provides that, "If the executive WittKieffer places at your organization ceases to be employed by Oregon State in any capacity within one year of his/her commencement of employment, WittKieffer will search for a replacement to fill the original position at no additional professional fee."

OSU Procurement and Board Office staff have followed the necessary notification steps to retain this option for the Board. Trustees might reflect on under what terms or conditions they would consider using Witt Kieffer's guarantee. For example, the Board could decide to run the due diligence, background checks, and reference checks through a separate firm or process, and retain WittKieffer to focus on assisting with engaging the community in the development of the position profile and networking and recruiting of a diverse, talented pool of candidates.

2019 Presidential Search Process

The following table provides a summary of the major elements of the 2019 presidential search process, related guidance from the Association of Governing Boards of Universities and Colleges (AGB), feedback provided at the May 12 and 14 virtual workshop, and survey comments relevant to each phase of the search as of May 14 (comments shown in bold occurred multiple times in the survey).

Search Phase	Description	Related AGB Guidance ¹	What went well	What could be done differently
Communication	<p>With then President Ed Ray’s announcement of his plans to step down as president and return to faculty, the OSU Board immediately launched a 2019 Presidential Search and Selection webpage to provide regular updates to the OSU community and partners, promote opportunities for engagement in the search process, gather input and feedback, and solicit nominations for the position of president.</p> <p>In addition to the webpage, university-wide updates, media notices and public meeting notices were regularly sent to the community, stakeholders and members of the media. Throughout the search, updates were provided to many groups, including OSU administrative and academic leadership, the Faculty Senate, ASOSU cabinet, the Office of Diversity & Cultural Engagement and the Governor’s Office.</p>	<p>Active communication to key constituencies regarding presidential transition and layout next steps.</p> <p>Public website devoted to search easily accessible to serve as primary means of communication.</p>	<p>Workshops:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Website provided information about the process that was accessible to all. • Good information provided to university community. <p>Survey:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Broad communication to university community; regular updates on search; robust website. • Good communication of change in leadership. • Early and complete communication; updated website frequently; numerous email communications. 	<p>Workshops:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Regular reporting back to Faculty Senate. <p>Survey:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • More transparency later in the search process. • Communicate names of finalists in advance. • Make lead candidates public; allow faculty to voice opinions on all candidates via surveys. • Make selection process for final candidates clearer. • Provide quarterly updates to Faculty Senate during process. • Post all interview dates, emphasize ways to engage in the process and ways to provide feedback. • Have a roadmap of the process that can be followed along the way. • Make sure that communication is two way between the Board and the community. • Communicate more succinctly. • Send occasional messages to all students; don’t rely on ASOSU and ASCC to get the word out. • More emails at key decision points.

¹ JS Johnson and JP Ferrare, A Complete Guide to Presidential Search for Universities and Colleges, 2018 AGB Press.

Search Phase	Description	Related AGB Guidance ¹	What went well	What could be done differently
<p>Search Firm Selection</p>	<p>Board office staff completed national research on search firms used by land grant universities for president/chancellor level searches since 2013. This research identified search firms that have most frequently been used for this level of searches.</p> <p>Based on this research, the university contracting office requested written responses from 10 firms regarding the search opportunity.</p> <p>In February 2019, the Board Chair convened a Search Firm Selection Committee to solicit proposals from firms experienced in conducting university president searches. The committee included the Search Committee Chair, Senior Vice Provost for Faculty Affairs, Vice President & Chief Diversity Officer, Chief Human Resources Officer, Board Secretary, and Chief Assistant to the President/Assistant Board Secretary.</p> <p>After reviewing proposals, interviewing firms, and conducting reference checks, the committee provided a recommendation to the Board Chair based on the firms' prior experience, commitment to diversity and record of placement of diverse candidates, alignment with OSU's timeline and process, and ability to identify and screen best candidates, and Witt/Kieffer was selected as the search firm.</p>	<p>Most boards at public independent bachelor's, master's, and doctoral institutions employ outside help from a search consulting firm (AGB references 2017 study by Gagliardi and others finding that 71 to 82% of these institutions use firms).</p> <p>To select a firm, research firms experience at similar institutions, conduct interviews, develop contract that specifies budget, timeline, and expectations.</p>	<p>Survey:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Selection process went well, included research with other institutions and reference checking. • Reputable firm and reasonable choice. 	<p>Workshops:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Be clear on roles; make sure we don't rely too heavily on the search firm to share our narrative. • The selection of the search firm will be essential to not only the selection of the president but also how the process is perceived; may need a bigger and more transparent process for selecting the search firm. • Consider a different firm for the next process. • A search firm's value is bringing candidates that are happy in their current job. How do we add our institutional values or input into the process? <p>Survey:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Make the search firm selection process more transparent. • Do a more thorough background check on candidates. • Do not hire a national firm to find the next president. • Look for a firm with a demonstrated track record of advancing racially diverse finalists and concluding racially diverse hires. • Select a different firm. • If used, do not let the search firm have too much power. • Hire a firm that wants to listen to the community. • Involve students and faculty in the selection of the firm if used. • Use a similar process for selecting firm in the next search. • Find a firm with diverse employees. • Include someone from Faculty Senate Executive Committee on search firm selection committee. • Significantly reduce the scope of the search firm. • More reference checking and due diligence on the search firms being considered. • Make vetting of the candidates a primary job of the search firm.

Search Phase	Description	Related AGB Guidance ¹	What went well	What could be done differently
<p>Public Board Meeting to Discuss the Search Process & Timeline</p>	<p>In April 2019, the Board of Trustees held a public meeting to discuss the search process, its timeline and key elements of the search. In advance of the public meeting, a proposed timeline and process were developed following a review of national higher education publications and interviews with land grant and R1 research institutions that had completed chancellor or president searches within the prior five years. Interviews of peer institutions covered the search process and its length; how search committee members were identified and how to engage people outside of the committee; experiences with search firms; and the onboarding of a new president.</p> <p>The public meeting’s discussion focused on:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The need for community engagement in listening sessions and online feedback to gather input on the characteristics and experience desired in Oregon State’s next president; • The timing and process to recruit candidates and the role of the search committee in reviewing candidates and selecting individuals to participate in a first round of interviews; • A proposed hybrid process for conducting a confidential search in which there would be an interview phase with candidates and a stakeholder group to provide feedback on the finalists while maintaining confidentiality of candidates to help the university recruit from the broadest pool of academic leaders, many of whom may hold key positions at other universities; • The search firm’s strategies for recruiting a diverse applicant pool and placement rate for women and people of color; • Development of an employment contract with the assistance of outside counsel and OSU general counsel and completion of a compensation study by the Board Office in partnership with OSU Human Resources to inform compensation levels and terms of the contract; and • Efforts to ensure a smooth transition for the next president, including the plan to appoint a transition team to assist with the process. 	<p>Establish search framework in advance of presidential transition (Note: The OSU Board established guidelines for the search and selection of a president in October 2016.)</p> <p>Be transparent in sharing the process that will be used and the timeline for the search.</p>	<p>Workshops:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Putting aside the ultimate outcome, the process was well organized; confidentiality was well-maintained. • Having made the decision upfront to have a confidential search, the process went well under those limitations (no leaks; people took the process seriously and honored confidentiality). <p>Survey:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Board was clear about the process it was using. 	<p>Workshops:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Don’t hurry the process. • Make sure to have a roadmap for the process. Where do we display this roadmap and how? This should be reflected in the position description, and also how we work with the search firm. • Perhaps convene a focus group or smaller group in advance of the process to provide input or parallel input with a committee or stakeholder group. • Hybrid approach did not best serve our community. <p>Survey:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Hold open forums with candidates. • Give the OSU community a chance to weigh in on finalists. • Have community input at every step of the process. • Focus less on confidentiality and more on community involvement. • Bring finalists in person for open forums and meetings with different stakeholder groups. • Involve the community in designing the process and what and when information should be shared. • Be as open as possible about what is happening. • Finalists should have the courage to be identified publicly. • Allow relevant university leaders to determine finalists. • More emphasis on community engagement and transparency.

<p>Search Committee Composition and Charge</p>	<p>In Mar/April 2019, the Board Chair solicited a selection of names from the OSU Faculty Senate president, Associated Students of the OSU, and Associated Students of Cascades Campus for the presidential search committee. Selection was guided by the Board’s guidelines for presidential search and selection. There also was consideration of the skills, background, and diversity of the committee (gender, race, ethnicity; mission elements of teaching, research, outreach; position types (faculty, classified, administrative); division/college across university).</p> <p>Based on solicited input from the Provost’s Office, Faculty Senate President, ASOSU and ASCC leaders, the staff trustee and others, the Board Chair appointed and convened a Presidential Search Committee. The 15-member committee was composed of OSU trustees, faculty, students, administrators, staff and alumni, as well as representatives from higher education outside of OSU and the broader community. The Presidential Search Committee included a search advocate. Selection of committee members considered the background, skills, and diversity of the committee as a whole across elements of the university’s mission (teaching, research, and outreach), position types, units and campuses, gender, race and ethnicity. The chair of the search committee served as spokesperson for the committee.</p> <p>The Presidential Search Committee was tasked with:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Managing the process to identify candidates interested in serving as Oregon State University’s next president. Identifying from the pool of applicants first round semifinalists and interviewing semifinalists. Preparing a report for the Board Chair summarizing the strengths and weaknesses of semifinalists to aid in selecting finalists for the second round of interviews with stakeholders and trustees. <p>Search committee members participated in OSU’s Office of Institutional Diversity’s search and bias training prior to reviewing candidate information and conducting interviews.</p> <p>A search advocate served as member of the Presidential Search Committee and provided input on the draft Presidential Leadership Profile. In August/September 2019, the search advocate convened a seven-member subgroup of the committee to develop a criteria matrix that described each qualification identified in the presidential profile. The subgroup also specified the relative importance of each qualification and the relationship to the position, screening criteria, and when to assess. The draft criteria matrix was shared with the full Presidential Search Committee, discussed, and finalized based on feedback received from the committee.</p>	<p>Appoint a search committee that is broadly representative.</p> <p>Establish formal written charge for the search committee including expectations around communication outside of the committee.</p> <p>Because of their responsibility for the leadership transition, trustees typically make up more than half of the search committee members, preferably with members whose terms will extend at least a year or two into the new presidency.</p> <p>Search chair should be a board member.</p> <p>Board chair should not chair the search committee, given their principle function to lead the Board in the final selection.</p>	<p>Workshops:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Broad representation of university community and stakeholder groups – faculty, staff, community, outside constituents; well organized process with search committee. Glad that Extension was at the table. It was good that the committee included a search advocate. <p>Survey:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Diverse committee; thoughtful approach. Broad, encompassing group. Committee worked well together. Using a search advocate and including the chief diversity officer. Committee engagement in position profile. Transparent, consultative and inclusive. Providing bias training. Strong mix of community members and OSU stakeholders. Committee did well with their charge and will developing a thorough criteria matrix and assessing candidates. The process for groups to nominate members. 	<p>Workshops:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Add more: faculty; affinity group members; senior leaders; more representation of research mission; graduate student; professional staff (but don’t make the committee so big it can’t function). Give the committee more time at each phase to do its work. Consider whether members of the Board should be on the committee. Do not discourage the search committee members from doing Google searches. This activity is discouraged by the search advocate program and means less people looking for information about the candidates. Better advertise listening sessions. <p>Survey:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Core elements of mission in teaching, research, and service should be better represented. Have more representation of scientific faculty. Involve more university community leaders. Involve more students. Use a search advocate from another institution or from the equity and inclusion office. Require those interested in serving to submit an application. Include reputational faculty and those participating in core areas of excellence such as distinguished professors, directors of large institutes. Provide effective means of the committee getting information about the candidate. Have a nomination or election process for selecting committee members. Allow more time with each candidate in interview process. Do not include members of the Board on the committee. Include representation from Hatfield Marine Science Center. Include alumnus and/or donor from historically underrepresented background. Do not let the search advocate approach limit access to publicly available information. Include faculty union representation. Have more input from low level staff rather than high level administrators. Committee selection should focus on seeking individuals who understand the complexity of the president’s position and not community representation. Complete criteria matrix before finalizing position profile and involve the entire committee, not a subgroup.
---	---	---	---	--

Search Phase	Description	Related AGB Guidance ¹	What went well	What could be done differently
<p>Listening Sessions to Develop Leadership Profile</p>	<p>In April/May 2019, the Board conducted a multi-pronged community engagement effort to gather input on the university's strengths and the challenges that OSU will face over the next 10 years, as well as input regarding the recommended skills, qualities and attributes that OSU's next president should possess. Each listening session also included an overview of the hybrid confidential search process and search timeline.</p> <p>Eleven listening sessions were hosted across the state with university and community stakeholders to gather input. An online survey was also launched and gathered feedback from April 15 to May 20, 2019.</p> <p>Each listening session was hosted by an OSU trustee. Listening sessions were formatted for broad participation of OSU community members and other partners and some were formatted to focus on specific groups such as faculty and students. Sessions were held in Corvallis, Newport, Bend, and Portland. Recordings of a subset of sessions were posted on the search webpage for viewing by members of the community who were not able to attend.</p> <p>Meetings were also held with academic and university leadership to discuss the challenges, opportunities, and objectives for the position.</p> <p>A Presidential Leadership Profile was created based on community input and reviewed by the Presidential Search Committee. Following public comment process, the OSU Board finalized the presidential profile at a public board meeting at the end of May 2019. The profile served as the basis for the Presidential Search Committee to assist the Board in recruiting and identifying a strong pool of candidates. The presidential profile also was used for advertisements, requests for nominations and other forms of recruitment of candidates. Ultimately and most importantly, the presidential profile provided the criteria for the Board's selection of the president.</p>	<p>Take stock of institution's strengths, weaknesses, and challenges.</p> <p>Engage the institution's broad community in the development of the position profile.</p> <p>Board adoption of position profile.</p> <p>Candidates reviewed against set criteria.</p> <p>Conduct self-assessment of the board (Note: OSU Board self-assessment completed annually).</p>	<p>Workshops:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Commitment towards info gathering from various stakeholders on what needs they had from a president. • Good outreach that we should continue to have. • Summary of the position profile was of high quality and well summarized. Very thorough and if read a good sense of what everyone was looking for. • Qualities and qualifications was a well laid out document. • Listening sessions to develop leadership profile were important and meaningful. • Good outreach that we should continue to have. • Listening sessions conducted very professionally. • Communication leading up to sessions was good. <p>Survey:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Scheduling of listening sessions well communicated, well organized, anyone who wanted to weigh in had an opportunity to do so. • Good that faculty were invited to information session and sought input on what was needed in a president. • Multiple sessions and online survey to develop search profile. • The various campuses were able to provide feedback at listening sessions across state. • Profile did a good job of representing challenges and opportunities. • Input carefully captured and developed into profile. 	<p>Workshops:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Give ample time to get broad input from a variety of stakeholders. • Start with a conversation about where the university is heading (road map). • Focus selection criteria and craft criteria to be independent rather than highly correlated (last search listed 18 qualities/experience needed). • Revisit the profile to appeal to a broader group of potential candidates (rising stars, provosts). • At the time search began, the shadow of a long serving president might have limited how people were thinking about the next president; might have made it difficult to imagine creatively what the president could do and what the Board might want. • Opportunity to think deeply about specific goals for the president, rather than just broad terms ("understand and support values of OSU"). This definition of climate/culture/need characteristics is ripe for deep stakeholder input and greater transparency into what the university needs in the future and how to move forward. • Take the time to get this right, and focus stakeholder input on this development of the candidate profile and what we want the president to do and be. • The profile was created to attract a sitting President – could it be a sitting Provost? How do we create an opportunity for a rising star? • Continue to structure in a way that attracts sitting presidents. <p>Survey:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Identify a more focused list of criteria and be clearer about how criteria will be used in each phase of the process; not a big list of qualities that Ed Ray had. • Add more focus on diversity and inclusion. • Add more focus on achievement gaps. • Selection criteria should not exclude candidates from underrepresented background. • Seek greater attendance or other options for increasing engagement levels and provide sufficient support for hosting. • Perhaps host listening sessions at the mid and end-point of the search. • Give more weight to candidates coming from within OSU. • Make sure that the candidate selected matches the traits identified in the leadership profile. • Core elements of our mission (teaching, research, and service) should be better represented in the profile.

Search Phase	Description	Related AGB Guidance ¹	What went well	What could be done differently
<p>Networking and Recruitment of Prospective Candidates</p>	<p>Over summer/early fall 2019, the Board conducted national advertising and recruitment efforts (including in the Chronicle of Higher Education, Diverse Issues in Higher Ed, HigherEd Jobs, Inside Higher Ed, Academic Keys, American Conference of Academic Deans, Blacks in Higher Education, Women in Higher Education, Hispanic Outlook in Higher Education, and other venues).</p> <p>The Board launched a presidential nomination website. Members of the search committee, university leadership, faculty and others were encouraged to engage their individual networks to identify potential nominees for president. Over summer and early fall of 2019, more than 160 nominations were received, and search firm consultants and Search Committee Chair conducted outreach to nominees and other potential candidates.</p>	<p>Advise potential candidates of expectations of confidentiality based on the search process that will be used.</p> <p>Reach out broadly with a combination of advertising, soliciting nominations, and direct recruiting to ensure talented pool of candidates.</p>	<p>Workshops:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Good pool of capable people to choose from; benefit of good outside information from the search firm. • Confidential vetting through search firm may have attracted some people to apply who would not have otherwise. • High quality finalists. <p>Survey:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A large pool of qualified candidates was identified; pool was not restricted by the search firm list and included names submitted as nominations. • Among those that participated in the last search, there was diverse, high quality pool of candidates at each stage (original pool, semi-finalists, finalists). 	<p>Workshops:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Rely on search committee to do more active recruiting. <p>Survey:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Be more transparent during this phase, communicating updates and activities associated with recruitment. • Tap into faculty knowledge about possible candidates. • Consider whether the best “talent” is outside the organization. • Focus on sitting presidents should not drive process. • Do not allow search firm to push a particular candidate • Focus more on recruiting provosts and vice presidents at higher ranked universities, those individuals that are on their way up. • Don’t assume experience at similar institutions is the most important quality in this job, given the unprecedented challenges in public higher education; look for creativity and vision. • Closely examine how the criteria are used to winnow the pool. • Seek out historically underrepresented populations. • Do not use a search firm. • Cast a larger net, consider leaders from other sectors. • Examine how the criteria are applied at each phase of process (recruitment, semifinalists, finalists). • Provide more information of search firm efforts to the search committee. • Do more outreach to prospective candidates from people other than the search firm. • Recruitment is not necessary for a position at a land grant public university; just the opportunity will draw qualified candidates. • Do more recruiting at national conferences and other professional events. • Send announcements to broader list of organizations.

Search Phase	Description	Related AGB Guidance ¹	What went well	What could be done differently
<p>Selection of Semifinalists and Finalists</p>	<p>In September/October 2019, the Presidential Search Committee reviewed materials received from applicants and selected 12 semifinalists for first round interviews based on the criteria established in the Presidential Leadership Profile.</p> <p>Due diligence materials were gathered for each of the semifinalists and provided to the search committee. Materials included: employment verification; academic degrees, professional licenses, and certifications verifications; and a media and public search (including Nexus, local newspapers, Google and Google news, and other sources such as university websites, journals, and fraud databases). Interview questions developed with search committee and adapted case by case based on due diligence findings for the candidate.</p> <p>First round interviews with semifinalists were conducted confidentially, in person, and at off-site locations. Following the interviews, the Presidential Search Committee prepared a report for the Board Chair identifying the strengths and weaknesses of the semifinalists and identifying a recommended subset of candidates to advance to the second round of interviews. Using this feedback, the Board Chair selected four finalists to forward for second round interviews with the Stakeholder Group and trustees. The demographics of the four finalists were: two women, two men; two people of color, two white; two sitting presidents, two provosts.</p>	<p>Seek consensus among search committee members in reducing the pool, rather than taking votes to promote discussion and information sharing.</p> <p>Candidates reviewed against set criteria.</p> <p>Background checks involving criminal record, involvement in legal cases, verification of employment and credit history, driving records and department of motor vehicle records.</p>	<p>Workshops:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Great work at keeping confidentiality; quality of finalists was excellent. • Felt like there was a broad pool of qualified and creative candidates. • Appeared that background checks by search firm was extensive and substantial. <p>Survey:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Standard process and good process. • Good consensus building process to identify semifinalists and finalists, with diverse points of view heard and discussed among search committee. • Good diversity and experience in pool of candidates. • Good pool of candidates with experience at R1 and land grant institutions. • Board Chair listened to the recommendations of the search committee. 	<p>Workshops:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Revisit search advocate program stance on Google and internet searches of candidates. • Confidentiality comes at the expense of broad vetting of candidates. • Confidentiality should end with the identification and visit by finalists. • Must include opportunity for community to connect with finalists. • Need to consider deeply how to address the risk created by the confidentiality process. • Could have had more information on the background of the candidates. • Search firm should have done more vetting of candidates/background research. • Make sure that search firm is proactive in sharing information about candidates. • Independent firm should do background check. <p>Survey:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Faculty must be allowed to use their professional networks to help with vetting before final decision is make. • Have open on campus visits; record forums and post so broad community can provide feedback. • When the pool is narrowed to finalists, the process should be open. • Improve the quality of the due diligence and background check process. • Actively recruit a diverse pool of candidates. • Include presentations from the final candidates to the university community. • Have the search committee review the media and due diligence materials a second time before forwarding recommendations for the finalists. • Bring the stakeholder group in at the first-round stage of recommending finalists. • Have more trustees review the recommendations from the search committee when making determination of finalists. • Be clear on how stakeholder input will be used.

<p>Stakeholder Group Composition and Charge</p>	<p>In October/November 2019, based on input from the Provost's Office, Faculty Senate President, and ASOSU and ASCC leadership, the Board Chair appointed a 25-member Stakeholder Group, composed of OSU faculty, students, staff, and administrators as well as members of the broader community. Members of the Stakeholder Group engaged confidentially in the interview process with finalists and provided feedback to the Board on the strengths and attributes of the finalists with respect to the qualifications identified in the Board's Presidential Leadership Profile. A selection of stakeholder group members considered the background, skills, and diversity of the committee as a whole across elements of the university's mission (teaching, research, and outreach), position types, units and campuses, gender, race and ethnicity.</p> <p>In advance of meeting with finalists, Stakeholder Group members participated in an orientation session regarding how to recognize and mitigate implicit bias led by OSU's Chief Diversity Officer.</p>	<p>AGB notes that the increasing use of closed searches and describes the "hybrid" approach used by some universities in which finalists are not announced but meet with a limited group of stakeholders.</p>	<p>Workshops:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Stakeholder group provided diverse voices. • Good representation across units in stakeholder group. <p>Survey:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Broad representation of community, representing various interests. • Board's compromise approach to ensuring candidate confidentiality while pulling in a large group of stakeholders was well done. • Stakeholder group approach engaged a number of key stakeholders in the search process. • Hybrid approach allowed qualified candidates to come forward without fear; ensured more voices involved while maintaining confidentiality of candidates. • Feedback from the stakeholder group provided to trustees in advance of their meetings with finalists. 	<p>Workshops:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Stakeholder committee very limited in ability to provide meaningful input. • Stakeholder group had 1 hour with candidates; more time would have been better to more deeply assess how candidates interact, build relationships. • Stakeholder group should have had time to discuss and evaluate finalists as a group. • Might want to think more deeply about what types of industries are represented in the stakeholder group. <p>Survey:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Bring candidates to the university for public forms instead. • While hybrid process was well executed, finalists should be open for broad public input. • Make it more clear how feedback from stakeholders will be used. • Candidate confidentiality should not be more important than stakeholder input. • Integrate more community-based representations from other areas of the state. • Ensure that the stakeholder group approach allows for actual participation from faculty, staff, students, and community. • Have more transparency in how the stakeholder group is selected. • Allow the stakeholder group flexibility in researching finalists and contacting their counterparts at other institutions to get feedback on candidates. • Have more varied stakeholders with more staff and fewer administrators. • Add more students. • Add labor representatives. • Add more instructor level faculty. • Add more representation from other OSU locations. • Add more non-OSU employees. • Add the provost to this group. • Add more vice provosts. • Allow stakeholder group to dig into the candidates' record, rather than limiting use of search engines due to the search advocate guidelines. • Allow more time for stakeholders to meet with finalists. • Allow more opportunity for stakeholder group members to discuss finalists as a group. • Do not include the foundation. • Conduct due diligence through an entity separate from the search firm, search committee and stakeholder group.
--	--	---	---	---

Search Phase	Description	Related AGB Guidance ¹	What went well	What could be done differently
<p>Ranking of Finalists and Final Selection Process</p>	<p>In November/December 2019, the four finalists met with the Stakeholder Group and with members of the Board. Stakeholder Group members provided feedback on each finalist based on the qualifications and priorities identified in the Board’s Presidential Leadership Profile. Group members provided individual feedback to trustees via a survey tool in advance of the Board’s interview with each finalist. Reference checks were conducted on each finalist and a summary of each reference check was provided to the trustees. The Board met in executive session to rank the finalists against the priorities for the position and delegated to the Board Chair in public session the responsibility to negotiate with the finalists in ranked order and to consult with the Governor’s designee. Off list reference checks were performed on candidates in ranked order.</p> <p>Following the negotiation phase, in public session, the Board considered the appointment of the president and the employment agreement.</p>	<p>Board is responsible for the selection of presidents.</p> <p>Open campus visits benefit both the candidates and the campus community.</p> <p>Engage all constituencies.</p> <p>(AGB notes that increasing use of closed searches and describes the “hybrid” approach used by some universities in which finalists are not announced but meet with a limited group of stakeholders).</p>	<p>Survey:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Recruited strong candidate pool. Good that off-list references were included. 	<p>Workshops:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Confidentiality should end with the identification of finalists; we should bring finalists to campus. No specific target number of finalists--we should bring the finalists who are truly viable candidates for the position. Avoid numbers. Consider ahead what we want to get out of the in-person visit. The university community will likely want to have an opportunity to vet multiple finalists (bringing one will not be enough). There was a lot of input at the beginning, but not throughout. Final candidates should come to campus and events. There should be an opportunity to connect with the candidates. Would like finalists to make a presentation and be presented to the OSU community. The time allowed for the search committee to discuss each candidate was extremely limited and felt very rushed. <p>Survey:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Open the process to allow finalists to engage with the community. Expand reference checking and further explore any red flags identified. Once a candidate makes it to the finalist stage, there should be a public announcement of their names and a public forum. With a public phase at the finalist stage, faculty and others are able to gather information on the candidates from colleagues at other institutions; this helps with the vetting process. Hire an investigator to do background check on finalists. Don’t focus on replacing a prior long serving president, focus on diversity and inclusion. Allow more time before the finalists are interviewed to conduct additional background checking and reference checking. Allow more time for review and discussion of the background check materials. More time for trustees to interview each finalist.

Retrospective Review: Survey Feedback

Average ranking as of Friday, May 14 by survey section and affiliation.

Affiliation	Count	Communications	Search firm selection process	Use of hybrid approach to engaging the community and maintaining candidate confidentiality	Composition and charge of the presidential search committee	Community engagement in the development of the leadership profile	Networking and recruitment of prospective candidates	Process for identifying semifinalists and finalists	Composition and charge of the stakeholder group	Process for ranking finalists
Point Scale	---	4	5	4	5	5	5	5	5	4
Student	17	1.8	2.1	2.3	3.1	3.3	3.3	2.5	3.1	2.0
Academic or Professional Faculty	67	1.9	2.1	1.7	2.6	2.8	2.7	2.1	2.6	1.6
Staff	16	1.9	1.7	1.2	2.2	2.2	2.5	1.9	1.9	1.5
Alumni / Donor	18	2.5	2.8	2.3	3.3	3.9	3.8	3.0	3.5	2.8
University Leadership	7	2.7	3.2	2.2	2.9	4.2	4.2	3.8	3.7	2.6
Community Member	17	2.2	2.5	2.3	3.0	3.5	3.3	2.8	3.2	1.9
Member of the OSU Board of Trustees	10	3.4	4.1	2.8	3.9	4.3	4.5	3.8	4.5	3.0
Member of the 2019 Presidential Search Committee	6	3.2	4.0	3.2	4.4	4.3	4.7	4.7	4.0	3.3
Member of the 2019 Presidential Search Stakeholder Group	12	2.9	3.2	2.2	3.2	3.8	3.7	2.9	3.2	1.7
Other	2	---	2.0	1.0	3.0	---	---	4.0	---	2.0

May 20 – 21, 2021 Board of Trustees Meetings