

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, 14, and 18 virtual workshop, and survey comments relevant to each phase of the search as of the close of the survey on May 17 (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. General approach to communicating went as well as it can. Regardless of what communication goes out, a portion of the community will not see it or understand/retain it. 	<p>Workshops:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Regular reporting back to Faculty Senate. Need for more “facilitative tools” for campus leaders to engage with their units, groups, faculty, etc. around the search and to channel the results of that back to the process as a whole. OSU values need to remain central to how the search plays out. <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. More communication on why the Board is using a search firm and evidence to support its approach to confidentiality. More communications as the search progresses and information about the types of questions asked in interviews.

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. • Deliberative process with multiple perspectives. • Diverse, competent committee members. 	<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 search 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. • Includes someone on the selection committee from the Equity and Inclusion office. • Spend less on 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). • Clarity of the process provided by the search firm. • Outreach and research conducted about presidential searches at other institutions. <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. • Provide ongoing feedback loop between the board, search committee, and community. • Confidentiality of the search created a strange dynamic within the community with in group – out group dynamics. <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. • Have less focus on confidentiality and more focus on engagement by the OSU community. • Be clear on how the input from the stakeholder group will be used. • In order to build trust for the selected candidate, provide for community at the finalist stage.

<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. Clear communications on selection of search committee 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. Include opportunity for people involved in care of students to participate. <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.
---	--	---	---	---

Search Phase	Description	Related AGB Guidance ¹	What went well	What could be done differently
				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Complete criteria matrix before finalizing position profile and involve the entire committee, not a subgroup. • Perhaps make the criteria matrix public. • Add more professional faculty and staff. • Pay careful attention to ensure that people from underrepresented groups are included.

<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. • Listening sessions were good. • Strong effort at the outset to gain feedback. <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. • Very thorough approach. • Listening sessions were very good; tone likely driven by positive view of the president at the time. 	<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. • Better advertise listening sessions. • Provide more information about how the information captured in the listening sessions would be used/integrated into the process. • Make sure the middle and end of the search process is well communication and give opportunities for input. <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
				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Plan for potentially more emotional listening process and think about how to help manage toward a positive outcome in developing leadership profile. • Ensure adequate access for listening session locations.

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. • Inclusive pool of candidates. <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). • Proper outreach and recruiting used. 	<p>Workshops:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Rely on search committee to do more active recruiting. • Move beyond looking for sitting presidents. • Think more broadly about where to pull candidates from such as historically black colleges and universities and tribal colleges. • Broaden the profile to actively seek candidates who are BIPOC. <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. • Spend money on ads, not a search firm. • Take a broader community based/advertising approach.

<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. • Get input from faculty on the questions that will asked of candidates. • Be sure to get references from rank and file members of the candidates' institution. • Bring finalists to campus. <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. • Involve more trustees in the trustees in the selection of finalists.
--	---	---	---	--

<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. Be clear how stakeholder input will be used. Summarize input from groups and share how the input was used. Provide opportunity for input in formation of stakeholder group. Include representation from people who do care work at the university. Examine ways to more effectively get feedback back to the board. <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, including those outside of student government. 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.
--	--	---	---	--

Search Phase	Description	Related AGB Guidance ¹	What went well	What could be done differently
				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Conduct due diligence through an entity separate from the search firm, search committee and stakeholder group. • Add more professional faculty and staff. • Allow additional time for submitting comments on each candidate.

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. Allow more time for the search committee to discuss each candidate. Opportunity for the community to meet finalists would help to build trust in the selected candidate. <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. Share a summary of the stakeholder input. Have a subset of the search committee do reference checking.