The University of Missouri is currently evaluating the structure and needs for a presidential search to be completed in 2016. This document outlines proposed search structures (and key considerations) to be used by the University of Missouri Board of Curators, in council with UM System Human Resources, to determine the optimal approach to filling this leadership opening.

The University of Missouri will look to utilize campus and system leadership along with representatives from faculty members, staff, administrators, alumni, students, and other key stakeholders to execute this search.

Focus of deliberations concerning search methodology and committee structure should center on the following:

- **End result:** hiring the best leader to serve as UM President
- **Progress:** moving the institution forward on strategic initiatives
- **Inclusion:** prioritize institutional inclusion across all disciplines

In this digital age, many of the elements that impact the search come from access to information and the process of a search of this magnitude. Considerations for candidate confidentiality are important in order to build a robust pool, however, the need to remain as transparent as possible and ensure full engagement from campus, system and community stakeholders is essential as well.

It is recommended that an Executive Search Firm be utilized to assist in the development of a diverse candidate pool, provide guidance to process and selection strategies, and ensure current market influences are considered in deliberations.

To support the logistics, structure, and communication needs of this search, UM System has identified that the following individuals will support the Curators in their efforts to complete this search in the calendar year of 2016:

- Kelley Stuck, Interim Vice President, Human Resources
- Cindy Harmon, Secretary of the Board of Curators
- Steve Owens, General Counsel
- Tracy Fuemmeler, Executive Assistant, Office of Human Resources
- Tim McIntosh, Senior Human Resource Consultant, UM System

This document outlines the considerations of completing a presidential search in an open, closed, or hybrid model.

- **Open:** Candidate and Committee conversations remain open to the public (with few exceptions, i.e. negotiations, etc.) with regular updates provided to general populations
- **Closed:** Candidate and Committee conversations remain closed to the public and held confidential until the selected candidate accepts the position and a formal announcement is made.
- **Hybrid:** Candidate and Committee conversations begin in closed process to maintain confidentiality of possible candidates until a clear finalist(s) is recommended by the committee. At that point, finalist(s) are announced and public forums and events are held to engage populations interested in interacting.

Each structure is modeled below to provide all considerations for UM Curators. The following components should be embedded in the search, regardless to which model is selected:

- **Stakeholder Engagement:** Faculty, Staff, Student, Alumni, Community
- **Regular Communication:** both to and from stakeholders and search committee members
- **Respect and Confidentiality:** vital to maintaining the high standards of the University of Missouri and respect for the level of candidates considered
- **Process Transparency:** the selected process should be provided to the general public with an estimated timeline of completion and regular updates

January 13, 2016
### SEARCH GOALS

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1)</td>
<td>Design and execute a leadership selection process that bolsters the institution’s strengths.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2)</td>
<td>Select a leader to move the University of Missouri forward in accomplishing its mission to discover, disseminate, preserve, and apply knowledge.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### COMMITTEE STRUCTURE

As seen with previous Presidential searches at the University of Missouri and other institutions, this search should utilize a Search Committee (Committee), the makeup of which is determined by the UM Board of Curators (Board). The Board will also identify a Committee Chair. The Committee will recommend a final candidate(s) for action by the Board.

Support for the search will be provided by the UM Board Secretary and UM Interim Vice President for Human Resources (VPHR) who will provide logistical staff support and communication to the Committee and oversee strategic and compliant process considerations, engaging other staff support as needed.

In addition to the roles of the Board and Committee, the selection process should include stakeholder input, either through membership directly on the Committee, or through an advisory committee format.

Advisory bodies are generally responsible for providing feedback and voice expectations of their constituent stakeholders they represent, but do not have decision-making authority. Should the Board choose to use an Advisory Committee the following should be considered:

- Use of a nomination process to create the group.
- How to best utilize this group to serve as the public face of the institution during the search, especially if a closed or hybrid search process is selected.

Considerations for Search Advisory Members:

- Are all constituencies (students, faculty, staff, alumni, parents, Board members, friends of the institution) represented in some meaningful way?
- Is there diversity on the committee, in terms of race and ethnicity, gender, socioeconomic background, sexual orientation, religion, length of service/tenure with the institution, etc.?
- What technical expertise can this person bring as a member? Specialists in the following fields are possible considerations: finance, budget, law, human resources, fundraising, information technology, university affairs, admissions, etc.
- Is there confidence in each member’s ability and willingness to keep matters confidential and to commit the time to focus on the multitudes of perspectives needed for this critical hire?

Regardless of the approach, input and feedback should be included from the populations indicated above.

(Note: See Roles and Responsibilities document for additional information.)

Following for consideration are three search strategies that can utilized in Presidential/Executive searches.

---
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### OPEN SEARCH

Candidate and Committee conversations **remain open to the public** (with few exceptions, i.e. negotiations, references, etc.) with regular updates provided to general populations via determined methods of engagement. Timeline at 12 months.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pros:</th>
<th>Cons:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1) Transparency of search process for all stakeholders.</td>
<td>1) Candidates possess little/no confidentiality in their considerations. Thus, “active” candidates are likely the only candidates able to be considered (those actively engaged in finding new opportunities as opposed to “passive”, where they are ‘open’ to new roles, but content to stay in their current employment).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) Highest engagement from stakeholder groups.</td>
<td>2) Stakeholder input will likely be loud and constant, and can affect the pool as the search progresses. This could lengthen the time to complete the search and creates a risk that the “loudest voices” determine the outcome of the search.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3) Search Advisory Committee may not be necessary and, if used, is not responsible for being the ‘voice’ of the various stakeholder groups.</td>
<td>3) Development of candidate pool would take longer in order to build a robust pool of candidates that are in ‘stable’ positions, which allow their candidacy to remain public without concerns of backlash in their current role.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4) Stakeholder input can provide the Committee with real-time feedback on candidate credentials.</td>
<td>4) Likely to reduce candidates from industries other than higher education.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5) Create opportunity for institutional consensus in the selected candidate. (Committee, stakeholders, and Board all have opportunities to view/evaluate candidates throughout the process).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6) Broader public exposure provides greater information on candidate previous experience.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### CLOSED SEARCH

Candidate and Committee conversations remain **closed to the public and held confidential** until the selected candidate accepts the position and a formal announcement is made. Timeline at 8 months.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pros:</th>
<th>Cons:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1) Ability to maintain candidate confidentiality throughout the process—helps ensure robust pool of both active and passive candidates.</td>
<td>1) Stakeholders may feel their “voice” is not being heard and considered.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) Insulates the institution from any negative candidate developments becoming public and possibly impacting the search timeline or public perceptions of the position. (e.g. candidate withdraws late in the search process)</td>
<td>2) Selected candidate is hired before any feedback on their credentials are gained from stakeholder groups.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3) Likely to create the most diverse and robust candidate pool.</td>
<td>3) May create the perception of mistrust for the governing board and/or key decision-makers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4) Likely to generate vocal and public dissenting opinions.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Candidate and Committee conversations **begin in closed process** to maintain confidentiality of possible candidates until a clear finalist(s) is/ recommended by the Committee. At that point, **finalist(s) are announced and public forums** are held to engage populations interested in interacting. Final Board action is delayed until after finalist forums are held to allow for complete stakeholder feedback. Timeline at 9 months.

**Pros:**

1) Balances sensitivities of both stakeholders' needs and desires, as well as candidates' needs and desires.
2) Allows time for a confidential, robust candidate pool to be developed, vetted, and selected from before disclosing finalists for public reactions/considerations.
3) Insulates UM from negative candidate developments.
4) Best complies with a 'high-engagement' culture found at the University of Missouri while meeting candidate confidentiality needs until near the end of the search.

**Cons:**

1) Requires careful planning by the institution, search Committee, advisory bodies, and the search firm.
2) Requires Committee to build trust and maintain engagement with stakeholder groups throughout the initial 'closed' portion of the search, in order to best position candidates for endorsement when they are announced.
3) Stakeholder feedback from open forums provides limited stakeholder feedback samples.
4) Creates a risk that a candidate may withdraw late in the process (critical to inform candidates at the beginning of the search).

**Key Consideration Summary**

A well-run search can be an occasion for community renewal and partnership between the Board, campuses and communities, as well as an opportunity to elevate expectations about an institution’s future.

Adopting a completely closed search process is likely to generate considerable but understandable resistance by the communities.

Candidate confidentiality is a critical component to successful searches.

An Executive Search Firm is highly recommended for this search to provide the institution with clear support and guidance.

The selected search plan needs to be communicated early and reiterated multiple times throughout the process, irrespective to which search plan is chosen.

An advisory committee that is representative of the various stakeholder groups can be utilized to interact on behalf of the Board with both the candidates that they evaluate, as well as the campus and community populations they represent.

The two likely goals of this search: finding the right leader for the University of Missouri and designing an inclusive, selective selection process that bolsters the institutions reputation, need to be heavily factored in deliberations.