

# Retrospective Review

## 2019 Presidential Search Process



May 21, 2021

# Update on the Due Diligence Review

## Refining scope and approach

Perform an independent background check on Dr. Alexander at the time of the search

Review background check performed by WittKeiffer in the last search; identify gaps and areas that should have been flagged and/or needed more comprehensive analysis

Prepare a summary report:

- comparing the results of the two checks and

- providing findings related to validation and assessment of candidates' backgrounds, professional accomplishments, and reference checks



# Retrospective Review

What went well?

What could be done differently?

# Community Engagement

On-line survey from May 4 to May 17

Virtual workshops

Trustees, participants in last search process, other stakeholders, members of  
Faculty Senate ad hoc committee

Summaries in attachments 1 & 2



## Goals for the Discussion

Any aspects of the last process that we want to be sure to carry forward in the next search process?

What might we consider doing differently in the next search process?

Are there specific process steps we see as appropriate to emphasize in the next search?



## **A few takeaways – what went well?**

- Good communication at the beginning phases of the process (leadership transition, listening sessions, opportunity for community engagement)
- Diverse and broad representation on search committee
- Listening sessions were appreciated, well organized, and well communicated and at multiple locations across the state.
- Leadership profile did a good job reflecting community input about what was needed in a president
- Highly qualified and diverse pools of candidates at each stage of the process
- Stakeholder group broadly representative of the community
- For the most part confidentiality maintained, even with a 25-member stakeholder group added to the process

## **A few takeaways – what we might do differently?**

- Consider bringing finalists to the university so the community gets a chance to engage with them and provide feedback on their candidacy
- Perhaps spend more time drilling down with the community about the criteria for the position and prioritizing most important traits and experience needed
- Consider adding a few more faculty to the search committee - faculty representative across the university's research, teaching and engagement mission
- Get creative on communications and engaging with the community during the networking and finalists phases
- Need for a “feedback loop” for community search participants throughout process, while maintaining candidate confidentiality until final stage
- In sum, “Communication, communication, communication”