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THE POLITICS OF CHOICE: AN ANALYSIS OF THE PRESIDENTIAL SEARCH AND SELECTION PROCESS

ABSTRACT

This dissertation analyzes the process of searching for and selecting a college or university president. Many researchers in the field of higher education have provided commentaries in the form of books and articles on the realities of search and selection procedures. As one composite voice, how do they assess the status of current hiring practices? Also, experts in presidential searches have offered their views on the subject in the form of search guides designed for boards of trustees and administrative personnel to make this activity better understood and more efficient. What the dissertation examines is whether or not these guides provide comprehensive treatment of the process of searching for and selecting a president.
In investigating these questions, the complex nature of the search and selection process is revealed. The analysis expands on what is discussed in the search guides. It focuses on what the search guides offer and what they do not. Recommendations for improving the presidential search and selection process based on this research are offered.

MICHAEL THOMAS KELLY

DEPARTMENT: EDUCATION PROGRAM: HIGHER EDUCATION

THE COLLEGE OF WILLIAM AND MARY IN VIRGINIA
PREFACE

Introduction

This study examines the search for and selection of college and university presidents. The following pages offer a brief overview of the study's methodology and limitations on the generalizability of its findings.

Methodology of the Study

The study takes the form of a descriptive analysis where data have been gathered from different sources and compared and contrasted so as to develop a set of conclusions. Data are triangulated and arranged into three distinct categories or phases. The first phase is an in-depth examination and comparison of presidential search guides. Search guides are books written to assist governing boards and search committee members coordinate a presidential search and selection process. Data gathered through this investigation form the basis of preliminary impressions about the search and selection process which are
tested in phases two and three.

The second phase of the study takes the form of an analysis of written commentaries (or critiques) of the search and selection process. These documents have been written by current and past presidents of higher education institutions, those who have served on search committees, candidates for presidencies, and researchers in the study of higher education. The review of the written commentaries was intended to identify those factors in the search and selection process which are important but many have been glossed over or avoided by the guides. The written commentaries are either specific to one search and selection process or describe some aspect(s) of the process in general. The preliminary impressions made through the analysis of the search guides are examined in light of additional data rendered from the written commentaries.

For further perspectives, the third phase of data collection consisted of a series of oral histories gathered from three groups—trustees, search committee members, and presidents. Most of the oral histories relate to specific search and selection processes (from one public and one private institution). Additionally, oral histories were gathered from college and university presidents to gain an understanding of the process from the candidates' point of view. The goal of this phase of the study was to offer supplemental commentaries about the search and selection process.
process which would assist in formulating a set of conclusions about the accuracy of the search guides.

Limitations

There are two limitations to the study's conclusions which must be noted. The study does not utilize all known search guides. Rather, a representative cross section of search guides, new and old, has been collected. The study may not draw completely valid conclusions because not every available search guide has been utilized in the analysis. However, the search guides gathered for the study provide a composite image of typical preparatory literature currently available to governing boards, search committees, and those interested in the presidential search and selection process as an object of study.

Also, the specific search and selection processes examined through the gathering of oral histories may not include or describe every potential problem or possible dynamic in all search and selection processes. The two searches analyzed were selected because they are reasonably representative of the vast majority of the search and selection processes which occur in higher education. Hence, the conclusions based on the data rendered from the
examination of the specific search and selection processes (taken together) offer general images of the process from both the public and private sectors.

Qualitative research, in general, is based on inductive reasoning (i.e.: examining specific cases so that universal conclusions can be drawn) and as such may limit the reliability of the conclusions and recommendations proposed in a study because anomalies and exceptions may exist. Thus, it is essential to select cases which are representative of the majority of cases in the aggregate. The goal of qualitative research is to develop a composite image of the phenomenon being studied. Hence, due to the nature qualitative research caution must be applied when generalizing the conclusions and recommendations presented in this study.
THE POLITICS OF CHOICE: AN ANALYSIS OF THE PRESIDENTIAL SEARCH AND SELECTION PROCESS.
CHAPTER 1: SEARCH GUIDES

Introduction

The intent of Chapter 1 is to comparatively analyze guides or hiring college and university presidents. The guides examined are: The Search Committee Handbook (1989), by Ted Marchese, Presidential Search (1984), by John Nason, The Selection of College and University Presidents (1974), by Joseph Kauffman, Institutional Search (1989), by Stephen Garrison, Deciding Who Shall Lead (1986) by the Association of Governing Boards, and How College Presidents are Chosen (1968), by Frederick Bolman. These documents are designed to provide "comprehensive" instructions for governing boards of colleges and universities in coordinating a search and selection process from inception of the search committee to ensuring a smooth transition of power by anew president.

All the guides express the logic that it is possible to improve the hiring process by following a series of prescribed steps. Certain key steps are common in almost all of the guides. They are forming the search committee, developing a series of institutional needs and relating those to specific job qualifications or personal
characteristics, coordinating a candidate pool and screening the applications, providing a strategy for interviewing candidates, making the selection, and introducing the new president to the campus community and to the general public. Other significant elements of the process which are frequently addressed are assuring confidentiality, using private consulting firms, negotiating the terms of employment, and accommodating the needs of the president's spouse in the search and selection process as well as in the contractual agreement.

The analysis critiques the guides and considers if they reflect the true nature of the search and selection process. The analysis also considers which factors in the process enhance or inhibit the hiring of a president and to what extent the search guides provide guidance on how to manage the dynamics of the process (Referred to in the guides as "politics"). As a conclusion, the analysis discusses what the search guides do well and what elements of the process are avoided or omitted. Preliminary impressions on the overall "comprehensiveness" of the search guides form the basis for determining the usefulness of these documents. Also, the preliminary impressions are valuable in indicating how to develop a more comprehensive search guide.

Many researchers in the study of higher education such as Nason (1984) contend the most important task for a college or university governing board is hiring a new
president. The search for and selection of a president is a complex and time consuming process made up of many interconnected and sequential steps impacted upon by an environment filled with tensions producing politics, conflicts, and ambiguities.

The search guides differ slightly in number and sequence of some of the steps but the guides tend to agree that first major step in the search and selection process is to organize a search committee to carry out the actual process on behalf of the governing board.

Section 1: Organizing the Search Committee

The search guides offer differing perspectives on organizing the primary unit for coordinating the hiring process: the search committee. In the event that a president leaves the campus immediately after resigning, Nason (1984, p.2), suggests before the search committee is organized the institution's governing board must appoint an acting or interim president who may or may not be a candidate for the presidency. The acting or interim president is a guiding force in directing the trustees in their search.

Nason proposes several strategies in organizing the search committee. The most common practice is to develop one committee to administer both the search and selection
phase of the process. A less common approach, but one that is becoming more widely used, is to coordinate two committees—one whose task is to accept nominations, screen applicants, and provide initial interviews of the candidates. The second committee then makes the selection. He cautions the two committee format poses the danger that the search committee could usurp the function of the selection committee, making the latter committee less purposeful, possibly leading to competition over influence on the process between the two groups. (p.3) Another alternative is to organize a search and selection committee of trustees assisted by advisory committees made up of faculty, students, and alumni. Many institutions have guidelines stating how the search committee is to be organized and who should make up its membership.

Nason's research reveals the size of search committees can vary. Search committees at four-year public colleges, for instance, range from 3 to 21 members with a median of 10. The size ranges for private and church related four-year colleges are 4 to 25 and 3 to 21 respectively, each with a median of 10.

The single search and selection committee is made up of representatives from various campus and non-campus groups. These groups are students, trustees, faculty, alumni, administrative staff personnel, state officials (in the case of a public institution), and participants from the general
community. With the diversity of interests and needs in the new president, Nason sees a danger, "...diverse viewpoints will cancel each other out and eliminate the strongest candidates." (p.4) However, he points out the inclusion of various interested groups in the search and selection process make it more legitimate in the eyes of those in the academic community and can be helpful in lending diverse opinions in analyzing the candidates' suitability for the presidency. (p.5)

Two additional essential factors in organizing the search committee, according to Nason (1984), are appointing a committed and respected person as committee chair and charging the committee with its objectives within the task at hand. Appointing an effective chairperson will promote trust and respect and confidence in the group among the committee members and be the site for advice and leadership as well. The committee chair is appointed by the board and can be a trustee or other person deemed totally devoted to the institution and to the proper outcome of the process. The chair's first task is to appoint the members of the committee itself. Nason suggests the most common method employed to accomplish this is to accept nominations from organizations on campus such as the faculty senate, student government, and alumni association and also extend invitations to groups outside the campus including the state and municipal governments. These groups would appoint
representatives to serve on the committee to represent their interests in the search and selection process. Approval of the individuals is made by the committee chair.

Finally, Nason comments committees function more effectively when they are given a clear sense of mission in the form of a charge communicated from the governing board. Issues conveyed are developing an institutional needs statement and subsequent selection criteria, instructions for the process, timeline, adherence to affirmative action guidelines, access to private consultants, confidentiality, and funding.

Garrison (1989) offers important additional perspectives into organizing the search committee. His analysis initially deals with the size of the search committee. Based on his experience the search committee should be kept as small as possible. Larger committees have a higher probability of factions developing around differing leaders challenging the authority of the committee chairperson. Ideally, the search committee should consist of eight individuals (somewhat smaller than those revealed by Nason's research). (p.23) Though it is suggested that eight members is the optimal size for a search committee, Garrison provides no elaboration as to why that number is preferred.
Garrison also addresses the two committee format and argues that a search committee bases its choice of finalists on hundreds of hours of painstaking deliberation whereas the selection committee (usually made up of trustees) must come to a conclusion in little more than a few hours. (p.24) Though Garrison does not reject the two committee format outright, he does point to the above disadvantage as a reason for avoiding its use.

Kauffman (1974) contends the selection of the new president must ultimately be made by the board, however, the procedural elements of seeking nominations, screening applicants, and providing initial interviews should be conducted by a representative search committee. The committee is not a group independent of the board, but is an ad hoc-style group functioning under the auspices of the governing board. The board is solely responsible for defining the role of the search committee and its members. Similar to the views expressed by Garrison, Kauffman believes it is advantageous to permit the inclusion of representatives from various campus sub-groups, e.g.: faculty, students, and administrative staff.

Marchese (1989) sees the search committee as smaller in size than those proposed by either Garrison or Nason. In Marchese's view, committees of fewer than five members lack critical mass. Ten to fifteen members' sense of belonging and commitment to the group and to the task falls short.
Committees of five or six members are seen as preferable. Membership should be made up of representatives from the students body, faculty, and alumni, but also from retirees of the institution and community figures. This brings together a small sample of the various parties closely linked to the search and the campus and it is consistent with democratic decision making common in higher education in this country.

Marchese argues that the committee chair is important to the proper functioning of the search committee. Whoever is selected to chair the committee, the person must be one whom the committee members respect. The main objectives of the chair early in the search process are to organize the committee and, very importantly, establish a sense of cohesion within the group.

Marchese also describes the significance of charging the committee. Beyond the characteristics of the charge made above by Nason, he adds the committee must consider at the outset of the process the qualities needed to fulfill the job description of president and to satisfy the intangible elements of the position such as work ethic and personality. Also, the committee must understand the scope and limits of its task and to understand the role of a private consultant if one is hired to assist in the search. In sum, before the committee begins the search process the group must become familiar with the rules and regulations
surrounding the search, the methods of communication between the committee members and the board, the essential nature of confidentiality, any budget constraints, and staff assistance available for their usage.

The guides suggest developing a search committee consisting of representatives from various campus and off-campus constituencies. They suggest size of the search committee may average 6 to 10 members. Once organized, the committee must select a leader, determine the structure and rules for the search including timeline and divide the process into phases. The committee must also consider the needs of the campus relative to the new president and relate those needs to a set of specific professional qualifications and personal characteristics. The following section provides additional details on this latter issue.

Section 2: Assessing Institutional Needs

The next step in the search and selection process for the search committee and the governing board is to investigate institutional needs relative to two factors. First, where should the college or university go in the next five to ten years? Second, what specific aptitudes relating to these needs are to be identified in the candidates for the presidency? The authors of the search guides all point out the importance of assessing institutional needs—though
they may have different opinions surrounding the overall purpose and objectives of this exercise.

Marchese (1989) (who would commence a search process with this step) sees the self-study period within the overall search and selection process as an organization's opportunity to re-think the vacancy and explore new goals and directions for the post to be filled. Specific questions to be asked are:

"What larger developments within society, higher education, or within the position's special characteristics prompt different ways of thinking about the post? Given the institution's strategic aims, what background and abilities might the college need in the post to meet its own agenda? Considering the composition of the administration as a whole, is there a special need in this search to bring forward minority or women candidates? And finally, what can we learn from the past five years' experience with the post?" (Marchese, 1989, p. 1-2)

Nason (1984) states the governing board must set criteria for the presidential selection based on an institutional needs analysis projected ten years into the future of the institution. He also notes the board can turn to the academic community as a whole for needs which are then translated into professional qualities and personal characteristics. These characteristics are communicated to the search committee and become a portion of the group's official mandate or charge. Specific issues for exploration
are changes in goals of the institution, fiscal management, educational expansion, consolidation of educational programs, enrollment, educational quality, physical plant, collective bargaining, student life and activities, governance, and self-image. The overall objective of exploring institutional needs in this way is to develop a presidential profile of qualities the new president is to possess. The qualities include an understanding of what education is all about, a certain degree of administrative ability, and leadership potential. The profile must be relevant to the needs analysis and closely match the ten year goal projection developed earlier.

A report on improving presidential searches authored by the Association of Governing Boards (1986) contends the change of a president provides a time of rich opportunity for new vision, renewed energy, and fresh perspectives. It is time to examine institutional problems, prospects, and challenges--and to shape the institution's direction. Though the board will be the body to assess institutional needs, the change in leadership will affect the entire academic community. Hence, it is wise to consult with various campus constituencies such as faculty, students, and alumni to add their perspectives to those of the board. Consultation can be undertaken by members of the board or by outside consultants.
Additionally, Bolman (1968) suggests institutional needs are to be explored so that a search will have a clear purpose and have potential to be successful. Realistic search committees and boards develop qualifications based on needs to be addressed in the decade to come. A chair of a board of trustees clearly states, "Look for a man to fill tomorrow's needs." (p. 21) (And, if there are any doubts as to tomorrow's needs the search committee or board must take time to determine them.) Relating the institutional needs to qualifications is also purposeful and important. The most common qualities in new presidents based on Bolman's research are academic stature, administrative acumen, personality, ability to meet special local requirements, religious affiliation, a political affiliation, and a "good wife." 1

Garrison (1989) does not analyze institutional needs per se but does discuss search specifications for candidates. He cautions that search committees can go through a reality check when their "dream list" of qualifications is in no way achieved by the applicants in the pool. In fact, many committees search for, as Father Timothy Healy states, "God on a Good Day." (p.31) To develop realistic specification in a new president requires dispassionate analysis of needs based on hard hitting real world questions and arriving at an honest examination of where the institution is today and where it wants to be in
the future. It is only until these questions are answered that a set of realistic search specifications can be developed.

The guides suggest that a crucial step in the search for a new president involves an in depth examination of institutional needs and then relating those needs to specific criteria for selecting the new leader. As the guides point out, many of these exercises generate unrealistic or unachievable selection criteria—useless to the search committee and the institution. Assessing institutional needs relative to the selection of a new president requires honest reflections on the current status of an institution and a realistic projection of where the institution may go in the near future. The institutional needs must be refined by the search committee members into a set of personal attributes and professional qualifications best suited to bringing these needs to fruition.

Section 3: Collecting the Pool of Applicants

There is quite a bit of conflicting opinion in the search guides pertaining to how to attract candidates for a presidency. Kauffman (1974) states many institutions may seek internal candidates to thus avoid an external search. Other institutions find it beneficial to coordinate a full-scale external search due to their regional or national
stature. Most colleges and universities, however, seek both internal and external candidates and give full consideration to the largest number of applicants attracted to the position. Affirmative Action guidelines as mandated from the state and federal government are required to actively seek nominations from qualified minorities, particularly women, blacks, and Hispanics.

Kauffman argues an expansive search for candidates necessitates a strategy to generate interest in the position. To do this involves an aggressive advertising campaign including placing announcements about the vacancy in trade publications such as the Chronicle of Higher Education and in national daily newspapers such as the Washington Post and the New York Times. Other helpful techniques in soliciting responses from interested parties are mailing news releases to scholarly organizations (AAUP is an example) and requesting nominations from faculty, students, alumni, and other groups interested in the well-being of the institution. Kauffman cautions that many potential candidates who are experienced with the personnel function in higher education accept the "goldfish bowl" nature of their existence and thus are reluctant to readily place their names in nomination for fear that their status as a candidate may be revealed and possibly result in problems for them in their present position. This fear is especially significant for current presidents. As a remedy,
Kauffman suggests individuals be directed not to submit a formal application for a position but only provide a letter of interest and perhaps a resume and permit the search committee to encourage those deemed most acceptable to complete the application process thereby expressing an interest in the position without making a full commitment to follow through on their candidacy at this early stage in the process. Also, search committees are urged to hold such letters, phone calls, and other communication in strictest confidence.

Search committees often proceed from the logical premise that the larger the pool of applicants the more likely the best candidate will be found. In fact, Bolman (1968) estimates some searches can produce over 500 names (two hundred names is very common). Most search consultants suggest collecting 150-200 applicants in order to acquire a suitable list of finalists for a presidency. Though these numbers sound staggeringly high, many if not most of those included in the pool are not interested in the position and will drop out early in the process.

Furthermore, Nason's (1984) research indicates four-year institutions attract from 20-400 names with a median number of 216. Four-year private and church-related institutions can attract from 50-500 names with a median of 240. Collecting a pool of applicants of this size requires an active strategy of promoting the position and the
institutions (not unlike the methods introduced by Kauffman). However, Nason contends many of those best qualified to serve as president do not show immediate interest. Search committees are urged to "recruit" candidates and encourage reluctant individuals to become involved in the search process. Attracting these persons is often a delicate and drawn out procedure, but if handled with tact, timeliness, and persistence, the overall quality of the pool is enhanced.

Concerning the existence of a strong internal candidate, Nason believes it has definite advantages—e.g., it avoids the need to develop a full-scale search and saves time and a considerable amount of money. But, he also points out there are definite disadvantages. There is an assumption held by search committees that an internal candidate is a known quantity which makes it easier for the institution to adapt to "new" leadership or that the internal candidate may maintain the style and goals of his or her predecessor. This is not always the case. Many times an internal candidate is much less a "local hero" than informal reports suggest. Also, selecting an internal candidate, though simpler than coordinating an external search may not be what the institution needs at that time in its history. Hence, extreme care and a clear vision of future institutional needs relative to a new president is essential when weighing the merits of selecting an internal
candidate or commencing an external search process. (p.38-39)

Garrison (1989) reiterates the positive attributes of actively recruiting candidates. Search committees must consider listing names of potential presidents as a means of proactively hunting for existing talent (current presidents) and emerging talent (deans or others who may be considered potential future presidents). Research into the educational background and experience of the potential applicants, along with studying the leadership of prestigious colleges and universities, Garrison argues, separates the "shot gun" approach to the nomination process from the techniques often employed by private consulting firms.

The most productive source of nominations, based on Garrison's research are:

1. Personal knowledge of candidates by members of the search committee.
2. Nominations developed by direct, verbal solicitation.
3. Nominations provided by consultants.
4. Nominations developed through an analytical research process.

(The least productive method is self nominations resulting from advertisements in popular or professional trade journals.)
The benefits of selecting a strong internal candidate is also addressed by Marchese. Avoiding internal candidates can save a search committee the vicissitudes of a search that mixes internal and external candidates. In a full scale search, committees may have a bias against internal candidates based on a false assumption that an individual outside the institution is always better than an insider or that it is preferable to go with someone unfamiliar with the institution. Search committees are advised to begin the search process by seeking serious internal candidates, and if little interest is conveyed, expand the search to external sources.

Marchese (1989) makes many of the same suggestions brought out above. In particular, he recommends actively researching potential applicants while seeking nominations through person-to-person contacts and through advertisements in national daily newspapers and periodicals such as The Chronicle of Higher Education.

He does make one unique recommendation. The search committee, while looking outwardly for applicants, must also look inwardly— from within the ranks of the institution. This includes serious consideration being given to faculty members, current administrators and particularly to the acting president (if one has been appointed).
The search guides agree that searching for a pool of qualified applicants requires imagination and creativity. The terms used in the guides such as "active search" and "proactive research" imply that search committees must not expect applicants to rush to send in resumes simply because an advertisement was placed in a newspaper or trade journal; or worse, that word of mouth is a sufficient publicity tool. Wise search committee members know what sort of leader they are looking for and actively pursue those determined (at least potentially) most suitable for the position.

Section 4: Search Consultants

Search consulting firms are private, usually for-profit, organizations that may be hired to assist colleges and universities search for and select a president. Marchese (1989) notes, since the 1980s, governing boards and search committees are more frequently relying on the guidance of private consulting firms to provide advice and support in the search and selection process. The purposes of using a consulting firm vary. Nason (1984) identifies these purposes as: to advise and assist in setting up the committee's procedures, to help define institutional needs and establish desirable selection criteria, to develop a pool of candidates, to screen the candidate roster, to
conduct interviews, to make site visits to the candidates' current campuses, and to participate in the selection process.

As was noted earlier, many excellent potential candidates are often not readily interested in a position and have to be actively recruited. There are always plenty of individuals aspiring to the position but truly qualified persons do not necessarily apply. Nason argues consultants are particularly helpful in attracting these individuals. Why is this so? Marchese (1989) contends consultants are effective in recruiting qualified individuals because the potential candidate can drop his or her name in the hat without the fear of leaks of confidentiality (avoiding "Sunshine Laws" which dictate public institutions to disclose candidates' names and qualifications to the public). Consultants can also lend speed and objectivity to the search process.

Furthermore, Nason (1984) states the use of consultants is especially advantageous when institutions are in a crisis situation where two or more presidents have come and gone in rapid succession. Also, the use of consultants may be advisable when a president's ouster was extremely stormy, where feelings of distrust and antagonism have affected faculty, students, and trustees. Search committees that consider themselves inexperienced in the search for and selection of a new president can gain much from the
assistance of a consulting firm.

However, there are disadvantages to hiring a consulting firm as well. Garrison (1989) notes cost as one factor. Fees to consultants can range from $25,000 to $50,000 depending on their level of involvement in the search process. And, Nason contends search committees may feel relying on outside assistance is aberrant to the academic traditions of the institution.

Clearly, the single deciding factor in hiring a consulting firm is to establish whether or not the search committee and governing boards have adequate experience and time to facilitate a search and selection process themselves. This single factor, along with an understanding of the aforementioned disadvantages, must be considered very early on in the search process.

Hence, there are clear advantages and disadvantages in hiring a consulting firm to assist in developing and administering a search and selection process. As mentioned earlier, the use of consultants has become common in the 1980s. Three of the search guides noted above present at least some discussion of the issue. Certainly, elaboration on this issue is necessary. The remainder of the guides, namely Kauffman (1974) and Bolman (1968) were written prior to consultants becoming involved in searches in higher education. Thus, the older guides do not analyze the issue of consultants.
Section 5: Confidentiality

Assuring candidates confidential treatment in the search and selection process is significant in conducting an effective and successful hiring procedure. Garrison (1989) points out it is absolutely essential that search committees keep their deliberations private if they wish to have the opportunity to evaluate a top quality slate of leaders for their position. The key factor relative to the issue of confidentiality in the search and selection process is "Sunshine Legislation." The A.G.B. (1989) report suggests managing the process within these constraints and assuring confidential treatment of candidates begins with establishing a good working relationship with the media:

"Boards should anticipate dealing with the media and develop a plan for working with them. Establishing good relations with the media is wise in all communities, but essential in states governed by "sunshine" laws. Boards should appoint a spokesperson and decide what type of information they will release. The spokesperson or board chair should contact media representatives well in advance of the search to help them understand why confidentiality with respect to the individuals involved is important and to assure them that the process itself will be as open as possible. The balance between deliberate discretion and an open process is a delicate one, but early and consistent contact with the media to educate them and to provide appropriate information is a good investment. (p.4)
The media are not the only groups to feel openness in the search and selection process is important. Marchese (1989) states, "The ethics of academe promotes free and open communication, the sharing of ideas and information... It is against this strong wind, then, that search committees must insist upon totally different norms, no open sharing, no private reporting, no snippet, even gossip." (p.14) The overriding need is to protect the identity of people who have allowed themselves to be scrutinized as candidates.

What can happen when leaks occur? Marchese presents this example as a case in point:

At a Midwestern state university, a committee member at a party teased a gathering with clues about how to identify the search finalists. A reporter on hand took the challenge, and (using travel records) a day later correctly identified seven of the eight finalists in the paper. By the following day, four of the eight had withdrawn from the search (angrily), including three of the top candidates. (p. 14)

Based on this scenario and dozens of others, the essence of good recruiting is that candidates know the extent to which the privacy of their application will be kept confidential. Second, search committee members have a duty to one another to protect the freest expression of opinion in committee deliberation. Especially in discussing individual candidates, every remark must be taken as privileged. Each committee member must accept the responsibility not to
mention a name or status of any candidate outside the confines of the deliberation room. They should not make reports on the committee's progress to their representative group. They are first and foremost members of the search committee. If a committee member is unable to provide these assurances or act according to these stipulations, he or she should resign membership without delay. (p. 14)

In the remaining guides, Kaufmman's (1974) discussion of confidentiality takes the form of a one paragraph claim that committee members must not break their pledge to abide by the rules for confidentiality set forth at the beginning of the search and selection process. Nason (1984) considers confidentiality in a similar fashion to the A.G.B. Report. Nason argues that confidentiality is an example of the conflict between, "an individual's right to privacy and the public's right to know." (p.18) Managing confidentiality involves understanding how the committee will handle public relations in light of interest in the search by outside parties and relative to prevailing Sunshine Legislation.

Thus, the search guides agree that preserving confidentiality is essential to an effective search and selection process. Recommending how a committee can accomplish this goal is somewhat unclear. However, the guides imply search committees must develop a well thought out plan to address confidentiality and adhere to the plan closely throughout the search and selection process.
Section 6: Screening the Applicant Pool

The purpose of screening applicants is to narrow the field to a manageable number. This process may take as long as several months depending upon the size of the pool. Nason (1984) suggests the average length of the screening process is 2 to 3 months. Another factor which may result in a longer screening process is the method employed by the committee to analyze the data.

Before screening can actually occur, a preliminary question must be answered. Nason claims search committees must clarify for themselves the size of the eventual select list of finalists, precisely who does the screening, and how extensive the investigation into the background of the candidates is to be.

The size of the select list is generally dependent upon the overall perceived quality of the leadership in the pool. Nason (1984) cites search veteran Frederick Ness who recommends the screening process be conducted in phases. In the first phase the pool is reduced to 15-20 names. In the second phase, the pool is narrowed again to 8 to 10 and then a third time to those who will be recommended to the board.
There are numerous ways to accomplish the screening procedure. Nason proposes five alternatives. First, is to have each committee member review every applicant's dossier. Though the technique is time consuming, many committees believe it is the only method of ensuring thoroughness. The second technique is to sub-divide the committee into teams and provide an equal number of dossiers to each. The sub-committees review the documents and report preliminary rankings to the entire group. Screening in this manner requires trust and compromise and can lead to uneasiness on the part of committee members because sub-committees may use different standards for judging the merits of the applicants assigned to them. The third technique is to appoint a special screening committee made up of faculty, students, and staff who report their conclusions to the search committee for approval. The findings of the screening committee, once agreed upon by the search committee are passed on to the board. A fourth route is to assign the screening to one individual--usually the chairperson. This requires a high degree of confidence from the committee in the judgement of a single person. The individual must be prepared to defend his or her findings to the entire group. Finally, the screening can be farmed out to a search consultant. Though the use of consultants saves the committee time and trouble, the group may lose a sense of teamwork and accomplishment by not becoming involved in the
screening stage of the search. As mentioned earlier, consultants are also expensive.

How are the decisions made in narrowing the field? What information is generated? What questions are asked? Where are answers sought? How aggressive must the committee be in pursuing the background of candidates? Nason recommends the committees must begin by studying the documents at their disposal. Biographic data can be gained through references. However, letters attached to the application from present or former colleagues are of little value. These documents are often written for the candidate's liking and not for the prospective employer. Hence, it is unlikely references will be very objective. As an alternative, committees are urged to contact, either in writing for by telephone, individuals at the candidate's current place of employment. Confidentiality must be ensured to the respondent and from the respondent to the committee.

The AGB report (1989) considers references to be more of a problem than a help in that they are often not written in a "real world" view. Using the telephone for recommendations may be helpful, but must be limited only to those on a shortened list (before the list of finalists is developed). The report suggests that this technique generates more valid (and valuable) data about the candidates than can be gained from letters of reference.
Bolman (1968) sees the first step in the screening process as, "weeding out those names whom the board or the committee conclude do not belong in the running." (p. 36) These names often can be removed without argument. The key to the screening process is to gather quality information about each candidate.

A faculty committee member states,

"We did a great deal of paper work in connection with each candidate. At one point, our list numbered 150 or so. In the case of a great many of them, voluminous notes were put together, and field notes were added." (p. 37)

This statement conveys how extensive information can be in a search process. But as a trustee indicates, it can also be incomplete,

"I felt that the information we received about the candidates was very scant. It did not compare with the factfinding that goes on before someone is hired for industry, even at the level of, say, comptroller. The information that both the board and the faculty members collected about candidates was mostly gossip and usually nothing of real importance. Nor could we really quiz the candidates. Frankly, if our appointee worked out, it will simply be a matter of luck." (p. 38)

What is advisable? Bolman recommends not to discount a Dark Horse. He cites a committee member, "Don't stop with first impressions. Be as exhaustive as possible. Board as well
as faculty members should obey this principle." (p. 39)

Kauffman (1974) offers little in additional details but reiterates Nason's view that the entire committee need not review every file. However, records must be kept noting basic reasons why one person was desirable while another person was not. Regarding references, Kauffman recommends sending out written requests stating the criteria for selection which helps respondents focus their letters on matters of direct significance to the committee.

More comprehensive treatment is offered by Garrison (1989) who describes the screening process as a "living process" where the system is organized so that new data and new names can be added throughout the deliberation. The committee must acknowledge the fact that they make decisions based on inadequate data though they may contend they have conducted a thorough analysis. In reality it is impossible to gather data of a sufficient quantity and quality to know completely the appropriateness of each candidate. Therefore, the review of the application materials must be adaptable when new and important data are obtained.

At this stage in the process, Garrison suggests the committee develop a biographic sketch for each candidate—such as those offered in the Who's Who publications. The biographical sketches provide a summary of the candidates' education, professional, personal background, and special talents which then can be reviewed by the committee.
He also is supportive of rank ordering the candidates in the pool. As the screening process evolves, those candidates who should be given full consideration are placed on an "A" list. Those who appear interesting but where additional information must be gathered are placed on the "B" list. The "C" list contains individuals who will not be discounted but are those who may be reconsidered at a later time, if necessary.

According to Garrison, three screening criteria are introduced; they are academic strengths, administrative and managerial strengths, and personal strengths. Specific questions relative to these criteria are drafted and used in grading each candidate to produce an overall numerical score. These scores can be rank ordered from the most appropriate candidates to the least.

Marchese (1989) recommends the committee begin screening applicants by taking a "census" of the pool. Questions to be addressed in the census are: "What is the number of women and minority applicants; is this sufficient? And, are we satisfied with the quality of the pool? If the answers to these question are not conducive to the commencement of the screening process, additional applicants must be brought forward.

As with Nason, Marchese points out the committee must determine how the data will be analyzed. Most typically, there is little time for each committee member to review
each dossier; therefore, it is stressed the committee be
broken up into 2-3 member teams and be given an equal share
of the pool. He suggests candidates be graded on a three
dimensional scale of aptness of background, evidence of
preferred qualifications, and apparent special talents.
They then are graded on a 1-5 scale in each category. The
scores are tallied and the candidates are rank ordered.

Beyond the nuts and bolts of the process, Marchese
stresses hunting for talent. Each committee member is
expected to offer up two "personal choices" perhaps not on
the top of any informal tally and placed without challenge
into the pool once it is initially cut. The final review
includes the full committee and begins with the census
offered at the beginning of the process. Second, the
committee members introduce their "personal choices" for the
review of the entire group. The screening process, the
comparing and contrasting of scores, qualifications, points
of view requires a full-afternoon at which time the pool is
narrowed to 20 or so names. Once this is done, additional
information on the semi-finalists may be gathered. The
remaining task is to narrow the field again, this time to 6
to 8 individuals who are offered interviews. The additional
cut may take another full afternoon of deliberation. At
this crucial moment, Marchese urges committee members to use
all the information at their disposal, to keep in mind the
preferred qualifications, and to be mindful of personal
biases. Most importantly, it is essential that no single individual can insist upon a given candidate.

Regardless of the particular technique employed by the search committee, one central theme in the search guides is evident. Applications must be screened based on a set plan of action. Elements within the plan are setting a time limit for the screening process, knowing what the end product will be (e.g.: a list of 6 finalists), and determining whether or not to divide the committee into teams and parcel out an equal number of applications to each team. Most importantly, the committee must understand what the institutional needs are relative to selecting a new president and possess a precise image of the qualifications most sought. The elements of the plan must be communicated by the chairperson to the committee prior to the commencement of the screening process.

Section 7: Organizing and Conducting Interviews

Different institutions organize interviews and the selection of a president based on their needs and unique characteristics. Kauffman (1974) argues a "single" all-college committee may require candidates to make one campus visit. Other institutions who have advisory committees or separate search and selection committees may conduct preliminary interviews. The goal of this
procedure is to critique the candidates' performance and then narrow the field to three to five finalists. Those individuals considered as top contenders for the position are then to be interviewed by either the full search committee or by the board. These interviews are more lengthy than the initial interviews and may include the candidate's spouse. Many institutions conduct "marathon" interviews, where the candidates are interviewed by the search committee as well as faculty, staff, and student groups. The design of the "marathon" interview is to engage the candidates in a lengthy and aggressive series of interviews to determine which individuals are most serious about the position. At this stage in the search and selection process it is not unlikely that the competition for the presidency is fierce with representatives of the search committee and the constituent groups siding behind one or another candidate based on educational philosophy, professional background, or personal qualities. These interviews expose the candidates to the scrutiny of various interested parties on and off campus. Hence, assuring confidentiality at this stage is practically impossible. Due to the complexity of the process just described, tensions may run high for the candidates, the search committee, and for other campus representatives involved.
Bolman (1968) points out many search committees deem it wise to visit finalists at their home campuses. This usually involves a meeting with one or two members of the search committee. Other committees prefer to invite finalists to their campus to meet the committee and faculty and student groups. The goal of campus interviews is to observe the finalists in a variety of situations, both professional and social. The finalists meet with faculty, administrators, and board members as well as tour the physical plant and even meet with the outgoing president. Bolman urges committees to provide each finalist with detailed information about the institution so that they are well informed before arriving for the interview. The interviews can be structured in a variety of ways, but they must permit it to be possible for the committee to determine each finalist's poise, general personality, and ability to talk and think clearly.

Before interviewing commences, Nason (1984) recommends interviewers be trained on how to interview. Thoughtful candidates come to the campus full of questions about how the campus operates and about problems and future prospects. For public institutions these individuals may inquire as to the political climate between the institution and the state government. Candidates must receive extensive information on the campus well in advance of the interviews.
In scheduling interviews, Nason points out, private institutions often select a neutral sight to meet with candidates to ensure confidentiality. Public institutions are more inclined (due to 'Sunshine Laws') to conduct their interviews on campus. Interviews are scheduled so candidates do not bump into one another and include a number of sessions with different parties (e.g.: the search committee, faculty, and students groups) but leave some private time for the candidate to gather his or her thoughts and relax.

Nason suggests, the great merit of interviewing is that it provides the opportunity to give the search committee an idea of the candidates' personality, character, and style. The interview much enable the committee to determine what sort of person each candidate is, how comprehensive his or her knowledge base is, and indicate the person's sense of humor and compassion. Questions can be structured so that comparison of data can be accomplished easier or they can be open-ended (these questions, though more difficult to compare candidates on, do tend to be individually more illuminating).

Nason concludes the discussion by suggesting certain actions which must follow each interview. First, committee members must keep records of their impressions about each candidate. This can be done with a standardized rating sheet or in the form of personal notes. Second, the select
list must become more select—those who may be invited back to the campus for additional meetings with the board.

Third, at the conclusion of the interview phase, the committee chairperson or a selected board member must promptly contact each candidate interviewed and apprize the person as to their status.

To Marchese (1989) the interview stage begins when there are perhaps eight names on the "select" list. The need is two-fold: to know these individuals better than their mothers do, and to "court" them. The knowing-courting process is complex. The committee may need to become detectives in their inquiries without driving candidates away.

Once the candidates are informed of their status and agree to be reviewed by the committee, Marchese suggests it is worth while to conduct six to eight phone interviews on each candidate. During this process, it is important not to discount a candidate simply because someone received a less than glowing review. A bad recommendation may indicate the limitations of a particular candidate. If, however, a definite pattern of bad information emerges, it may be wise to reconsider the candidate's further involvement in the search process.

Once satisfied with the results of the telephone interview, Marchese recommends, visiting the candidates on their present campuses. Campus visits not only are
informative and permit the committee to meet the candidates face-to-face, but a candidate's willingness to participate in such an interview indicates his or her sincere interest in the position. At this stage it is also wise to check the candidates' credentials. Marchese's research reveals 15-25% of resumes inquired about in the corporate ranks are fraudulent—certainly this can be expected in higher education as well.

When all the telephone calls are made, all the campuses visited, and the personnel checks completed, the information gathered on the candidates is compared by the committee. From the eight individuals surviving the field is then narrowed to three—those who are asked to visit the campus. Though Marchese suggests three finalists as optimal, additional candidates can receive invitations. He stresses, though, "Bring no more candidates to campus than you are sure about." (p. 40) The interview itself must designed to promote two-way learning and two-way attraction (making the match).

Planning the campus visit is of the utmost importance. According to Marchese, the plan can consist of the following elements.

1. Provide each candidate with a fair picture of the campus setting and person's role at the institution including time, obligations, and institutional goals.

2. Determine each candidate's source of motivation, work style, and level of maturity.
3. Develop questions to ascertain the candidate's personal agenda, educational philosophy, and approach to problem solving.

4. Get a feel of "fit" between the candidate and the institution.

5. Get a further idea on how the candidate might address concerns relevant to the institution. The committee may invent a situation that the candidate would respond to. (p. 41)

However the committee structures the interviews, guards against bias, keeps to the plan developed prior to the beginning of the interview phase, and collects feedback from the committee members and from the candidates. Finally, committees must be mindful of Affirmative Action and Equal Employment Opportunity guidelines throughout the search and selection process. A key question to continually consider is: Does the pool include sufficient women and minority representation? If it is found the pool does not, additional candidates must be sought.

Garrison (1989) believes each person on the search committee's "A" list must be visited on-site—on the candidate's home campus. "On site visits provide both the candidate and the search committee the appropriate level of human interaction necessary to move from reading an impersonal piece of paper to developing an enthusiastic response toward an opportunity to work with a respected group of people. On a more objective plane, the visit allows the candidate the opportunity to ask all questions that might arise in his or her mind prior to accepting an
offer to visit the institution." (p. 105)

In Garrison's view, the key to a successful interview lies with the chairperson, whose job it is to initiate the interview session and move it from a strict question and answer period (rather stilted and uncomfortable for both parties) to an intensive yet interesting dialogue. The chairperson must set the ground rules for the discussion and ensure that the committee knows the background of the candidate. The most appropriate role for the candidate during the interview is to provide what Garrison labels a "consultative" function, where he or she provides advice and possible corrective measures to current institutional concerns. The consultative exercise is non-threatening in nature and allows the candidate to demonstrate competence, leadership, and management and problem solving skills.

Garrison also offers a sample check list of factors to be examined in the interview setting. These characteristics include:

1. To demonstrate leadership of breadth, vision, and status.
2. To present proven abilities to administer a large and complex organization.
3. To present the ability to represent the institution to its several constituent groups (i.e.: students, faculty, staff, alumni).
4. To show an understanding and commitment to the mission of the institution.
5. To display public profession and personal practice of fundamental values held in common by the institution and its constituent groups.

6. To demonstrate experience in a professional/technical field.

7. And finally, to display experience in fundraising. (p. 113)

The search guides' discussion of the interview phase presents different suggestions on how to organize this process. Regardless of the specific method employed by the search committee, the interview must educate the committee about the professional and personal attributes of each candidate. Also, the interviews provide the opportunity for the committee to offer to the candidate an attractive view of the position and of the institution.

Central to conducting a series of interviews effectively are two key factors. The first factor is to maintain confidentiality throughout the process—i.e.: to keep secret, as best as possible, the candidate's identity from outside interests. Second, as the interview schedule continues, each candidate must receive regular contacts from the institution as to the progress of the process and the status of his or her standing within the pool. Thus, courtesy to the candidates particularly in their need for confidentiality and to be kept informed about their status are essential in conducting interviews effectively.
Section 8: Making the Selection

Interestingly, four of the six search guides analyzed for this section do not address how search and selection committees and governing boards actually select a new president from a list of finalists. For instance, Kauffman (1974) ends a chapter on coordinating interviews by considering the role of the spouse in such an experience and suggesting that if a satisfactory candidate is not found the committee must search for additional names. His chapter entitled, "Making the Appointment" begins in the following manner, "Once the board has made its choice, the actual terms of the appointment must be arranged." (p. 51) Hence, Kauffman moves from interviewing candidates to negotiating the contract with the president designate. Nothing is offered on how to close the selection phase by offering the position to a finalist. Similarly, Marchese (1989), Garrison (1989), and the A.G.B. Report (1989) provide little guidance as well. On the other hand, Nason (1984) and Bolman (1968) do make recommendations and note improvements in organizing and managing the selection process.

Nason states the final decision rests with the board of trustees. If the committee has recommended one candidate, the board must either ratify or reject the
committee's decision. Rejection rarely happens. Deciding whether to recommend one name or a list of names in rank order is an issue the committee must clarify prior to embarking on the search and selection process. A wise moment to address this issue is during the development of the "charge" to the committee. Determining what the board wants as an end product of the committee's work will ensure an expected result from the committee. Nason's research indicates 24 per cent of the 4-year public institutions surveyed for his guide utilize the single nomination method; 85 percent of 4-year private institutions in the same sample utilize this method. The difference results from many state-owned colleges and universities having to adhere to legislative guidelines (such as the rule of three) when hiring senior administrators. Still, the choice is the board's to make. It is its legal obligation to reject a nominee as inappropriate. However, rejection rarely happens due to the additional time required to recommend another individual and the resulting ill feelings that are inevitably expressed by the members of the search committee. The board may of course ask the committee's nominee to the campus for another meeting and review his or her application materials or contact references. In most instances, the board, after careful consideration, will approve the committees choice.
In a similar vein, Bolman states, "In the course of the long process of list-making, investigation, and interviews, some selection committees find that one name rises unmistakably to the top; that, by the time the last candidate is investigated, there is one who, in everyone's mind, is "the man." (p. 44) However, a committee may reach the same point in the search and find itself divided, where two or more names are deemed "first choices". The board then is left to make the decision and accept any repercussions it may bring about. Bolman presents a statement made by a trustee concerning this type of situation:

"Faculty sentiment began to crystallize with strong academic experience. Meanwhile, board sentiment began crystallizing around a man who had relatively little academic background. One or two of the board felt that the faculty sentiment should be given full consideration. But the majority opinion on the board finally prevailed. The board took a bit in its own teeth, despite faculty sentiment, and elected the man with the lesser academic background." (p. 44)

In state institutions another dynamic of the selection process is getting state approval of a nominee before actually offering the position to the person. Frequently this is merely a formality, but politically astute boards must heed such regulations. Bowman cites a chairperson of board of trustees of a state system of higher education:
"The Governor's approval is always sought regarding the heads of state educational institutions. Indeed, the board makes sure that the selected person is introduced to the Governor before making the actual appointment. But the Governor does not interfere in any way with the selection process. (p. 45)

As a final recommendation, Bolman suggests that boards present to each finalist what has been named, "the Harvard offer." Simply stated, before the final selection is made, the desired candidate will be asked, "If you were offered the position, would you accept?" The candidate should be forthright in stating whether or not he or she will accept the position but also if selected when he or she would be available to begin work.

Though the guides by Kauffman and Bolman present at least some analysis of the selection phase of the process, no search guide addresses this issue in a comprehensive fashion. The guides offer little or no description of the dynamics of this most crucial portion of the entire hiring procedure. Why is this so? It can be implied that, since the goal of the guides is to offer prescriptive steps in administering a search and selection process, presenting an analysis of the dynamics of the selection phase may be a diversion from the stated goal. Also, it may be that suggesting a series of steps is a much easier task then bringing in the non-linear dynamics of the process as well. At any rate, the guides only provide a partial picture of the intricacies of the selection phase of the process.
Section 9: Terms of Employment

Now that the new president has been selected, the duties of the search committee and the board are about to conclude. However, there is important business to accomplish before the new president assumes office. The first issue to be considered by the board at the conclusion of the selection phase (or by its appointee: the search committee) is to negotiate the terms of the new president's contract. The AGB Report (1986) notes once the board extends an offer it needs to simultaneously begin to deal with the new president's compensation, fringe benefits, housing, expectation of social role, and evaluation of performance. Even conditions for termination of the appointment must be understood by both parties from the beginning. Addressing these important issues early makes it possible to avoid future misunderstandings, frustrations, and regrets.

Marchese (1989) makes a similar claim but suggests that the terms of employment must also include start date and length of term and detailed supervisory responsibilities. When negotiating these issues it is essential that the writing of the agreement be as specific as possible. Kauffman (1974) adds that the contract must also contain a
description of the relationship the new president will have with the governing board. The role of president relative to the board must be clarified prior to the individual assuming office. Specific questions to be addressed are: "If the president is expected to innovate, correct difficulties and make changes in the institution, will the board recognize and support the personnel changes that may be required to achieve these goals? Are there any "sacred cows" of which the candidates must be aware? And, does the board understand and accept the new president's need for adequate staff support?"

(p. 56)

Nason (1984) offers no additional insights on terms of the contract but states that the document must be divided into three areas of concentration: financial (salary, benefits), professional (extramural activities), and administrative (dates of appointment, conditions for termination, and provisions for performance evaluation).

Hence, the guides recommend that the terms of the contract be clearly defined and agreed upon prior to the new president taking office. Beyond the obligatory salary and benefits, the contract must also stipulate provisions for all the president's activities related to the position. Attention to details seems to be the key factor in this discussion.
Section 10: The Spouse

Kauffmann (1974) states, "The spouse plays an important part in the successful performance of a married president. Very often the selection committee's reaction to the spouse will be crucial to the final decision. Expectations regarding the role of the spouse should not be taken for granted." (p. 54) As a result, Kauffmann recommends boards must pay appropriate attention to the needs of the spouse relative to the presidency. The president and the spouse must be viewed as a team and provisions must be made to aid the two in their official activities. The board should be sensitive to the extensive and varied duties in which the presidential team will become involved. In Kauffmann's opinion, the board must support the president's spouse in tangible ways by providing travel money, staffing, and suitable office space. (p. 55)

The AGB (1986) report suggests boards should clarify the role of the spouse in the president's contract. Specific questions to be asked are:

1. "What role would the spouse or family members like to play?"
2. What kind of staff and budget support are available?
3. Will there be any compensation? Are retirement or annuity plans available?"
4. "What provisions are there for the spouse and/or family members to travel with the president on institutional business, and/or to attend professional meetings at institutional expenses?" (p. 12)

The most comprehensive treatment of this issue is offered by Garrison (1989). He states,

"If anything has changed in institutional leadership over the past twenty years, it is the relationship between the spouse and directors of our highly visible, public and private organizations. Gone are the days when spouses were expected to stay at home, decorate the house, attend or give garden or tea parties, and spend their lives in energetic and public support of the head of an institution. Increasingly, spouses have professional careers or vocations of their own that can separate the social life of a spouse from an institution's leadership." (p. 123)

As a result, boards must recognize the changing role of the spouse and be sensitive to the career needs of that person in the search and selection process.

The selection process is as much a chance to scrutinize the spouse as it is to meet the candidate. During the interview period, Garrison suggests involving the spouse in the process as much as possible and being mindful of the person's distinctive needs. The committee must make a demonstrative effort to get a reading on the spouse as much as the presidential candidate. The chair of the search committee should take the opportunity to clearly lay out the obligations that would be expected of the spouse. Sensitivity must be paid to the busy social and professional schedule in which the spouse will become involved. There is a need to supply this individual sufficient staff, monies,
and official recognition commensurate with the position.

The guides noted above offer at least some discussion on the issue of the impact and importance of the spouse in the search and selection process. Other guides, e.g.: Bolman (1968), provide no analysis at all on this issue. However, treatment of this issue in the guides is uneven and not comprehensive. A more in depth analysis is necessary.

Section 11, The Final Step: The Announcement

Before announcing the selection of the new president to the public, it is Marchese's (1989) opinion that the designated individual must be provided time to gracefully resign his or her present position. The announcement itself should serve two primary purposes; first, to introduce the new president to the campus and to the general community; and second, to communicate positive expectations about the individual selected (i.e.: what a fine choice was made and the good fortune it is that this person is joining the institution at such a crucial/exciting time in its history). Though the work of the search committee is for all intents and purposes complete, the group must contact all candidates involved in the search to express their thanks. The new president is also urged to communicate by letter his gratitude to the search committee and to the board for his
or her selection.

The AGB Report (1986) points out the selection of a president is big news for the campus grapevine. As with Marchese (1989), the Report recommends making the most of this public relations vehicle but first the president designate should be allowed to resign at home. Simultaneously, members of the search committee or governing board must contact the other finalists to inform them about the decision.

Nason (1974) suggests faculty, students, and administrative staff be informed as to the identity of the new president as quickly as possible to dispel any rumors or speculations that may be circulating concerning the culmination of the search and selection process. These parties should be informed well in advance of any public announcement of the selection. Announcements to the public include a press conferences as well as the writing and distribution of press releases to the members of the media. Alumni must also be informed through the alumni newsletter or through a special mailing concerning the search, selection, the appointment, and the qualifications of the new president.

The announcement of the hiring of a new president provides an opportunity for a college or university to outwardly display its excitement about the new appointment and to convey to the public the successful completetion of a
months long process. At the same time, the announcement must be made with tact and especially with appropriate planning. The guides noted above suggest no announcement should be made until the other finalists are aware of the choice and until the president designate has had the opportunity to respectfully resign his or her current position.

Section 12: Politics and Conflict: The Dynamics of the Search and Selection Process

No search guide provides a separate chapter devoted to the issue of politics and how it can affect the search and selection process. That is not to say the guides do not address the issue at all. They do offer some analysis on politics in the search and selection process, albeit in an indirect and uneven fashion. For instance, Kauffman (1974) implies the potential realities of the search and selection process when he states, "There is a necessary tension in the search, screening, and selection procedure: between (1) a process that would be gentle and attractive to excellent candidates, and (2) a more open process that enables a microcosm of the institution to participate in order to achieve an initial consensus of all the groups who might otherwise attempt to withhold legitimization of the leader." (p.46)
Garrison (1989) adds this insight, "The management of nonprofit institutions (and the selection of future leadership) is a political process where one is continually attempting to reach compromise between many constituencies usually in conflict with one another." (p. 13) Furthermore, Marchese (1989) suggests the political potential of the search and selection process as emanating from the development of the search committee which has become the norm in presidential selection in the past twenty years. He contends the search committee format was conceived to be the most effective means of democratizing the search and selection process by making it more participatory in nature. Ideally, the representative search committee symbolizes an advance; however, certain deficiencies exist as well. According to Marchese,

"Their (search committee's) use raises to a new order the amount of precious time invested in search. A committee, other things being equal, will always take longer to accomplish the same task. In judging talents a committee is open to the charge that its internal needs for agreement "level down" searches, that committee action seldom results in the usual but brilliant appointment. And for all the positive outcomes that might be realized through committee service a poorly conceived search process can alienate and embitter its members and divide the campus community." (p. 3)

During the selection phase of the process, Bolman (1968) concludes one of two eventualities will occur. First, the process may result in the search committee and
the trustees agreeing on one candidate quite readily. On the other hand, these groups may reach the same stage in the process and be divided on more than one individual. For instance, the faculty representative on the search committee may be in support of one candidate where the trustees may be behind another. What occurs in such cases varies from institution to institution depending upon the weight the trustees are willing to give to the faculty decision in the choice of president.

Bolman asked a chair of a board of trustees if he would ever again oversee a search and selection process, the trustee replied, "I'd resign. I very honestly would never want to live through such an experience again. It was tedious; it was full of conflict..." (p. 47) In his recommendations for improving the search and selection process, Bolman implies the desirability of avoiding the political potentials of a representative search process by suggesting that a faculty search committee should be only required to submit names for board approval and then be dismissed. The board would then be left to make the final decision. (p. 51) Nothing is added of the possible consequences for the board and the campus when the body selects a president not deemed acceptable by the faculty. Certainly, the negative repercussions of a decision such as this would be extensive.
Nason (1984) adds little in addressing the politics of the search and selection process other than to raise a claim, similar to that of Bolman, that faculty sentiment impacts greatly on the board's decision. Faculty sometimes resent what they consider is indifference to their needs when the board approves a nomination against their wishes. A hornets nest of resistance is often stirred from within the faculty ranks possibly resulting in the board being forced to reconsider its decision. This possible eventuality emanates from search and selection processes which become "popularity contests" --where different campus constituencies side with different finalists. The conflicts concerning the selection of the appropriate individual can become heated and, at least potentially, the board finds it has disappointed some group on the campus, often faculty or students. As it has been alluded to earlier, the treatment the search guides provide in comprehensively analyzing the search and selection process is somewhat lacking; specifically, the guides as a group, do not provide sufficient coverage of the dynamics (i.e.: politics, conflict) which (per Bolman) seem to be present from the inception of the committee to the announcement of the appointment. The guides do offer in depth analyses on the sequential 'procedural' steps necessary to conduct a search process but offer little concrete advice on the functioning of the individuals within the scope of each step. One can
assume this is so because the sequencing of prescribed steps permits the authors to present the search and selection process as rational—relatively easy to describe, facilitate and organize. For instance, all the guides describe the following steps: organizing the committee, seeking nominations, screening the applicant pool, and interviewing candidates. An assumption is drawn that analyzing these steps and placing them into a convenient rational sequence can permit the reader to more easily understand how to facilitate each step and to conceive how the steps are interconnected. Thus, describing these steps as such can only enhance the reader's understanding of the search and selection process. However, analyzing these steps tells only part of the story. In recalling the insights made by Bowman it is clear the representative search committee format spawns politics, tensions, and conflicts of all kinds. Yet, no search guide adequately describes the realities of the process. Thus, little guidance is provided as to how a search committee or board can manage politics and how to gauge when it begins to break down the process. Hence, the guides can inhibit understanding of the search and selection process by avoiding these issues.

For example, Bolman conveys to the reader that their exists considerable conflict between the search committee, board, and even candidates. Unfortunately, the conflict is not described nor is its scope within the search and
selection process put into perspective. Nothing is added as to how a search committee or board can function in this environment. Most importantly, little substantive guidance is offered to the readers in monitoring when conflict (or politics as it is referred to in other guides) negatively affects the successful functioning of the search and selection process.

Hence, the guides do not adequately address the issue of politics in the search and selection process. They do imply that politics exists and that it can cause problems, but no in-depth discussion of the issue is offered.

The guides then, do not provide comprehensive analysis of the search and selection process. They concentrate on discussions on the procedural portions of the process and either gloss over or avoid the complex and potentially frustrating environment in which the process exists.

Section 13: Preliminary Conclusions and Recommendations

Based on the above analysis the following statements are presented as preliminary conclusions:

1. The search guides, for the most part, attempt to portray the search and selection process as rational and logical.
2. The guides assume that by following their prescribed steps the end product will be more effective hiring procedures.

3. The guides offer in depth analysis of these procedural steps and present an adequate set of recommendations to improve the functioning of each step.

4. However, the guides do not describe in any in depth fashion the environment in which the steps are followed.

5. The guides allude to the politics, tensions, and conflict inherent in the search and selection process but offer little or no guidance into how a committee or board can prepare for or manage this eventuality.

6. The search guides provide only a limited analysis of the complexities and the frustration encountered in administering a search and selection process. What is missing in the guides is a complete analysis of the politics of the search and selection process--how to understand its origins, its advantages and its disadvantages, and how to manage it successfully.
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7. Based on the comparison of the search guides presented in this chapter it is clear their comprehensiveness and quality vary depending on their age, length, and point of view. Nason (1984), Marchese (1989), and Garrison (1989) present perhaps the best of discussions. They are relatively comprehensive and are fairly recent publications. The A.G.B. Report (1986) is too brief. Bolman's volume (1968) is not comprehensive and is dated. (Bolman's guide, though, provides many interesting insights through its quotations.) Finally, Kauffman's guide (1974) provides useful advice but the advice is only limited to the procedural steps of the process.

8. Therefore, the search guides do not offer an overall comprehensive assessment of the search and selection process.

Chapter 2 provides insights into the politics of the search and selection process by presenting critiques in the form of written commentaries on the process from past college and university presidents and from researchers in higher education. Specifically, the written commentaries provide additional perspectives into the politics of the search and selection process—a level of analysis that the search guides lack. It is in adding these additional perspectives that a "comprehensive analysis" of the search
and selection process will begin to be developed.
Footnotes

1 Bolman's book, though possessing many interesting perspectives on the search and selection process is the oldest of the group used for this project and suffers from a sexist stance siding towards males. His research, done in the mid 1960's, indicated of the 116 presidents surveyed, 114 were men. His male focus then is understandable but is a bit out of step with the 1990's.

2 ...state laws which ensure public access to searches for presidents in the public sector and the attendant participation of the local (or possibly national) media in committee meetings and interviews.
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CHAPTER 2: WRITTEN COMMENTARIES

Introduction

The purpose of Chapter 2 is to provide additional insights into the search and selection process. As discussed in Chapter 1, the dynamics of the search and selection process are described (albeit briefly) in the search guides but no guide addresses this issue in any comprehensive fashion. Therefore, Chapter 2 partially fills this "comprehensiveness gap" by analyzing written commentaries on the general level of effectiveness or ineffectiveness of the search and selection process. Additionally, Chapter 2 discusses how politics and conflict can enhance and/or inhibit the functioning of the hiring of a new college or university president.

Individuals offering written commentaries come from different academic areas and professions. They include past presidents, professors, trustees, researchers in higher education, consultants, and newspaper reporters.

The written commentaries take the form of books on the nature and status of the search and selection process, scholarly journals, and trade publications. For the purpose of this analysis, the written commentaries are arranged into
four sections. Section 1 addresses those commentaries pertaining to the early stages of the search and selection process; namely, organizing the search committee, defining institutional needs, and using consultants. Section 2 reviews written commentaries focusing on developing and maintaining a candidate pool as well as the issue of confidentiality in the search and selection process. Section 3 is devoted to commentaries addressing the responsibilities of the spouse. Section 4 presents a discussion of politics and the selection process. Section 5 offers a summation of data introduced and draws conclusions from those data relative to the analysis presented in Chapter 1.

Many of the written commentaries cited in Chapter 2 are noted throughout the entire length of the section. Others, however, have a much narrower focus and as such are only discussed in the context of (a) specific issue(s). Hence, many written commentaries are cited quite frequently, while others are described in only one or two sections.

Section 1: The Early Stages of the Process

Organizing the Search Committee

The authors of the written commentaries cited below have mixed reviews on the development of the search
committee, use of consultants, and in general, the early stages of the search and selection process.

For instance, Warren Bennis (1973) begins his critique of the modern search and selection process by comparing it to search and selection processes of the earlier half of this century. Decades ago, the hiring of a president was a once in a lifetime experience for many board members. Individuals on and off the campus, such as faculty, alumni, financial benefactors, and other college presidents were the main sources of nominees. The process has changed significantly over the years. Now, colleges and universities are expected to choose a new leader in the open through a process which includes the participation of students and faculty, not on the periphery of the process, in but in the midst of the committee deliberations. Bennis states the process is expected to be democratic in nature—although it rarely achieves that ideal.

Kauffman (1980) states that boards compete with faculty and students for dominance of the search and selection process. Also, boards must consider the legitimacy of authority and power in a human organization.

"How does one's authority obtain legitimization without appearing imperious and arbitrary? How does a governing board assure its appointee that the various constituent groups well accept his or her authority and be cooperative at least at the outset? In my view, the best way to achieve such cooperation is to gain the consensus or support of the representation, participation, or consultation in the search process." (p. 18)
Furthermore, Kauffman contends a new president is often viewed as a link between all the constituents of the institution who enables a college or university to attain its goals. The key to the search and selection process is, then, to select a new leader the campus can fully support. Failure to consult and include these groups in the process will undoubtedly lead to resentment and lack of commitment to the new president. "Enabling these groups' participation can sometimes be more difficult than the search process itself." (p. 19)

McLaughlin and Riesman (1985, 342) provide additional perspectives into the early segments of the process. The first important issue to address in the search and selection process is how the search committee will be composed. The issue becomes one of delegated responsibility versus direct participation. Constituents are often unwilling to delegate the choice of a new president to trustees or others. Participatory democracy in the search and selection process has come to symbolize that every possible interest group has a right to representation on the search committee. McLaughlin and Reisman's research indicates faculty regard themselves as largely under-represented on the search committee and push to have their numbers increased. Faculty senates and collective bargaining agreements demand equal representation for the various academic and staff divisions and include an equal portion of both genders. As a
result, McLaughlin and Riesman conclude search committees often take on a Noah's Ark composition. Committees are often too large and unwieldy and are seen less as an efficacious device for hiring a president than as a symbol of an institution's commitment to egalitarianism. (p. 342-343)

The authors' research also reveals most search committees are very large, though the research findings introduced in Chapter 1 clearly indicate smaller committees are more effective and efficient. Of the fifty-two respondents to McLaughlin and Riesman's survey, thirty institutions had committees with more than ten members. Several institutions reported committees as large as twenty, twenty-five, and thirty—bodies too large to be successful in screening and interviewing candidates. The size issue resulting from trustees bending to the demands of campus groups for direct democracy in the search and selection process also leads to other problems such as making confidentiality virtually impossible.

Thus, fairness in developing the search committee can become an end in itself. Failure to invite representation from students and faculty can defeat a search and selection process before it begins. As a result, committees are much larger than perhaps they need to be. As mentioned by McLaughlin and Riesman (1985), large committees inhibit confidentiality and add to the potential for unnecessary
Defining Institutional Needs

Comparatively, Clark Kerr (1984) contends that before a search can commence the first step in the process should be (though seldom is) to project the future of the institution. Both the board and the faculty must develop objectives and views of the institution's future path and determine what sort of leadership will be necessary to bring those visions to fruition. (p. 17) Kerr presents four obstacles which exist preventing the institution from getting an advance vision of its future:

1. Lack of time and pressures in getting a new president in place.

2. Lack of an agency for careful consideration--the search committee often believes that a vision of the future goes beyond its proper assignment.

3. The tendency to compare candidates with one another rather than with the requirements of the particular presidency in the light of the future needs of the institution.

4. The desire of the board for a new openness to participation in the process of defining the future needs. (p.18)
Differing perceptions of the future direction and needs of an institution of higher education can affect a search and selection process. As a factual case in point, Benjamin McArthur (1989) has recorded the dynamic environment, tensions, politics, and conflicts which surrounded the University of Chicago's 1929 presidential search which, after an intense and embittered process, brought forward 29 year-old Robert Maynard Hutchins, Dean of the Yale University Law School. Hutchins would later become one on the foremost educators in United States history.

McArthur notes, at the outset of the search and selection process, several influential faculty expressed the belief that the administration and trustees intended to use the presidential appointment as a means of creating a new sort of institution—opposite the feeling of the faculty in general. In essence, the faculty's perception of the University's future was that it should remain a first rate research university. On the other hand, board members defined the institution's future direction as that of becoming a highly competitive undergraduate institution dedicated to liberal arts study. McArthur points out,

"From its founding the University of Chicago has been renowned primarily as a graduate institution. But during the 1920s, College life increasingly colored the University community. As elsewhere, Chicago undergraduates were caught up in the whirl of athletics and extracurriculars that over-shadowed academics. ...the undergraduate College was viewed by some as an "unwanted, ill-begotten brat." After briefly flirting
with the idea of closing the College, the administration decided instead to strengthen it, seeking to improve both curriculum and instruction and expand dormitory capacity. But many faculty saw this commitment to reform as a betrayal of the University's original purpose in favor of what they considered the clubby, socially minded Eastern Ivies. The belief of some influential faculty that administration and trustees intended to use the presidential appointment as a means of creating a more collegiate institution freighted the search with far-reaching significance.

In pursuit of developing the "College" concept, the trustees had a plan. McArthur records William E. Dodd, chair of the history department and search committee member, recalling the search with much interest and excitement because it was felt the trustees would attempt to force on the faculty their insider candidate, university vice president, Frederick Woodward. A scheme readily acknowledged by the faculty and one which was totally unsuitable. Dodd's contention was that Woodward as president would ensure adoption of the trustees' agenda for the future of the institution. Dodd noted in his diary, "...it is felt the Trustees mean to force Woodward on us...and the college scheme not suited to us." (p. 29) Certainly, the faculty would not tolerate either the trustees' "college" plan or Woodward as president. Hence, the battle lines were drawn early in the search and selection process. As a result, "a highly charged, adversarial atmosphere" surrounded the faculty selection of their five representatives to the search committee in the
Defining the future direction of the institution has an enormous impact on the search and selection process. Rival conceptions of the future direction of the institution can embroil trustees, faculty, and students in a struggle over the campus's destiny. It makes the process more troublesome, makes the organizational environment more complex, and makes decision making more ambiguous and frustrating.

**Use of Consultants**

As was mentioned in Chapter 1, the search guides offer much advice regarding the use of private consultants. The written commentaries address the benefits and pitfalls of utilizing consultants and provide additional insights both about consultants and their impact on the search and selection process.

McLaughlin and Riesman (1984) support the use of consultants in the search for and selection of college and university presidents. They point out that the increased use of consultants reflects the growing complexity of the search and selection process. At the outset of the process, consultants are very helpful in guiding and organizing the search phase.
Particularly, consultants are sensitive to needs for confidentiality throughout the process. (p. 15)

Most importantly, the consultant can persuade search committees to look actively for candidates. McLaughlin and Riesman state many trustees and search committees falsely assume that the position and the institution will sell themselves—that a simple advertisement and informal networking will generate a quality pool of nominees. They contend search committees, in particular, often act as selection committees rather than search committees; hence, they view their role in a confused fashion. Consultants can clarify this role and make the process operate much smoother. (p. 15)

McLaughlin and Riesman also suggest one of the greatest services provided by consultants is to educate the search committee on the importance of maintaining confidentiality. The most common breaches occur when faculty members on the search committee call their colleagues on a candidate's present campus for an informal and impromptu reference, not realizing they are altering the candidate's status at home and as a candidate in the process. Consultants can advise search committee members how to avoid these sorts of difficulties. (p. 16)
Though there are definite advantages to utilizing the services of consultants in the search and selection process, certain conditions preclude the use of consultants and disadvantages exist as well. For instance, in the public sector some states have experienced search advisors available who work out of the central personnel office to assist with personnel searches in state agencies. Thus, making private consultants unnecessary. The search advisors provide services similar to those offered by private consultants but are considered an in-house resource. Also, an institution's need for outside help in the search and selection process is sometimes stymied by the fear of negative faculty and public reaction to the expense (e.g., search consultant Ronald Stead reported in a 1984 that his firm, Presidential Search and Assessment Services, charges upwards of $15,000). Furthermore, some consultants refuse to work in states where Sunshine Laws make confidentiality impossible. McLaughlin and Riesman indicate inexperienced search committees can become intimidated by the consultants through a fear that the consultant and possibly the chairperson of the committee may manipulate the process to some predetermined end. The potentiality of this hazard is exacerbated when the consultant is hired prior to the development of the search committee. (p. 21) Another possible hazard is that consultants may pre-judge a candidate's suitability in one search based on the person's
failures in other searches. The consultant's assumption is that if Candidate A was inappropriate for College X, then he or she will not be acceptable to College Y.

According to McLaughlin and Riesman, the primary caveat concerning the use of consultants is that committees must guard against being too dependent on their services. The administering of the process and the decision ultimately rests on the shoulders of the search committee and the governing board. The consultant must only be hired to fulfill a predetermined step or steps in the process and serve on a purely advisory capacity. Failure to acknowledge these factors may produce an unexpected or inappropriate end product and result in possible resentment from the campus community since the president selected was the choice of an outsider.

Much of McLaughlin and Riesman's conclusions are reiterated by Touchton (1989). Her article attempts to answer the following questions:

1. What types of assistance are available for professional search firms?
2. Under what circumstances might the use of a professional search firm be advisable?
3. How does one choose a search firm?
4. What is involved in being a good client?
5. And, what does it cost? (p. 6)
Consultants come in all shapes and sizes—from limited to full service agencies. Touchton urges trustees and committees to first explore their needs for a consultant before the search and selection process gets underway. The main criterion for the hiring of a consultant is whether or not the institution has enough inside experience to effectively conduct a search and selection process on its own. (p. 7)

She also points to specific disadvantages in hiring consultants. In her view, the most significant disadvantage is cost. Also, the process can become impeded when the search committee allows the consultants to take on so much of the process that the committee misses vital aspects of the experience or worse, they abdicate responsibility for the outcomes of the search. (p. 9)

These problems may lead to the refusal of the campus community to accept the decision of the consultant or the lack of a feeling of confidence in the final candidate. With these warnings in mind, Touchton concludes consultants can be very helpful to trustees and search committees in the search and selection process. The key to success when using a consultant is in establishing an effective working relationship between institutional representatives and the firm.
Thus, as search committees grow in size and tasks such as defining institutional needs become more complex, consultants can be invaluable in assisting trustees and search committees understand the intricacies of the search and selection process. As noted above, before a consultant is hired, the consultant's role in the search and selection process must be determined by the governing board.

Section 2: Establishing and Maintaining the Candidate Pool and Confidentiality

Kauffman (1980) remarks,

"It has become increasingly difficult, if not impossible, for most institutions merely to seek an outstanding person and appoint that person as president. Laws, regulations, and bylaws notwithstanding, the expectation of constituencies, participation, and a rational process prohibit such straight forward action. Indeed, the political nature of the presidential role today requires a person be willing to go through the entire process if he or she wishes to be a credible leader. Nevertheless, there is a serious problem of complexity; governing boards and their search committees must not be defeated by it." (p. 24)

He points out that it is often difficult to attract the most qualified individuals to a presidency because it requires the person to be nominated by another party or to apply in writing. Usually, effective presidents are in positions they are not interested in leaving and search committees are often left wondering how to attract these persons. Kauffman
advises search committees to actively seek out appropriate "potential" nominees and encourage them to apply after first bringing the position to their attention, suggesting how the institution would benefit from the person's experience, and asking their permission to enter their name into the pool. (p. 25) Often these efforts are ineffective in light of Sunshine Laws which prohibits the names of nominees from being held in confidence. Potential nominees are sometimes reluctant to enter a search due to prior knowledge of an institution's ineffective search and selection procedures. For instance, public colleges and universities elect or are forced to follow, a government personnel search and selection process which may be adequate for lesser civil service positions but totally useless or even detrimental to an institution's presidential search and selection process. This, combined with the Sunshine Law dilemma (to be discussed in length later) indicates that government intervention can negatively affect the search and selection process and, as a result, stymie the quest for effective presidential leadership.

Bennis (1973) argues that many candidate pools are too large—that a national (full scale) search for a small regional college is unnecessary. He suggests search committees initiate an intelligently designed and administered limited canvas instead of a national search. Also, time and money should not be wasted in aggressively
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attempting to attract potential nominees who it is clearly felt are uninterested in the institution and the position. Time and money would, however, be more effectively used in attracting only those who are known to be available. Serious consideration should be given only to those candidates whose leadership style is known to be acceptable to the board and search committee in light of the search criteria. The overall benefits of the limited canvas approach are savings of precious time, money, energy, and enthusiasm of the search committee and the board.

Also, not every search needs to start from scratch. Bennis considers it wise to investigate candidates considered in searches at similar institutions. The names of candidates not selected in other searches may be gained through the outside contacts of an institution's governing board. This technique has a two-fold benefit: it provides a model of how to organize (or not organize) a search and selection process and offers a ready pool of potential candidates. These techniques proposed by Bennis are quite unique when compared to the advice provided in the search guides.

Porter (1983) in a sense reiterated Bennis' feelings when he conveys a quote from a college president, "The pool is so small. Almost everybody has been approached before. So they get wary." Porter continues, "The problems can begin with the first maladroit contact from an institution."
I will not respond to a letter which asks me to declare my candidacy. This gives the good people a chance to drop out right away." (p. 43)

Porter asked presidents why such an awkward (and potentially ineffective) technique is used and why presidents react to it in this manner? Apparently, there is an institutional desire to insist upon commitment in advance—the better to screen and evaluate candidates and it saves valuable time. Every search begins with a large pool of applicants which are screened quickly. This process is self-defeating to the committee and is resented by many strong candidates. The resentment emanates from the board or committee's awkward approach in attracting candidates and a perceived discourtesy toward the candidates' need to consider fully their career options relative to their possible candidacy. This resentment may run much deeper than boards and committees realize.

Other factors which inhibit attracting and retaining candidates are delays and confidentiality leaks. Porter argues all delays are inexcusable and are usually the result of bad communication flow. For instance,

"All too often they (the candidates) receive an early and tentative contact albeit a delicate and stylish one, followed by months of silence. They have no idea of their status, and yet they know that the passage of time without action is productive of press exposure. In limbo, they wonder at a search process that places them in so vulnerable a position... Yet each week that passes heightens the vulnerability to publicity."
More than one individual may withdraw and there goes the list." (p. 44)

The other major factor Porter notes as inhibiting the search and selection process is leaks in confidentiality.

"The most controversial aspect of presidential recruitment these days is a trend toward "openness" and broad institutional involvement, beyond the organized committee and board machinery--specifically illustrated by the public or quasi-public campus visits of the candidates who are regarded as finalists." (p. 45)

As this statement implies, the size of the organizational machinery contributes to fostering leaks and Porter asks--why the extra apparatus? There are two reasons--Sunshine Laws in place over public institutions and the residual effect of the 1960s' at participatory democracy and decision making. For these reasons the search and selection process has become complex, (perhaps overly complex) and negatively affects the procurement of effective presidential leadership on many campuses.

Kauffman (1980) recommends developing a plan to deal with the issue of confidentiality at the beginning of the search. Private colleges and universities have much more control over confidentiality than their counterparts in the public sector who are more often than not, mandated by state law to administer a search in the open--in full view of all campus constituencies, legislators, and the media. (p. 23)
These difficulties in the search and selection process common in the public sector vary from state to state. Florida and Minnesota, for example, permit the press to know the names of candidates and to be present at interviews and even as the board votes to accept or reject a finalist. Other states provide exemptions to the standard openness policies when it can be demonstrated or documented by the institution that the openness will seriously impede the effectiveness of the search and selection process. (Kauffman, p. 23)

Still, Kauffman (1980), Kerr (1984), and particularly McLaughlin and Riesman (1986) all suggest that one of the most frustrating and potentially disastrous difficulties with the search and selection process revolves around the issue of confidentiality. It is clearly evident from their research that candidates are willing to participate in a search and selection process as long as their identities are not divulged to the press or others who may leak their status to the public. The candidates' fear is that premature notice of their interest in seeking other employment may cause trouble for them in their present positions. If their interests were known at home, the employer (governing board) may conclude that they are in some way dissatisfied with their present situation (doing damage to their impact and credibility and fostering a
lessening of confidence in them on the campus).

McLaughlin and Riesman (1984) point out that many top candidates for "choice" presidencies dropped out of the process early on when their identities were divulged to the general public. These leaks can directly impede the search and selection process and adversely impact presidential leadership overall. (p. 16)

Stead (1984) goes so far as to say that the issue of confidentiality is the one characteristic most different between search and selection in the public and private sectors:

"Confidentiality is more a problem with the public institutions because of the sunshine laws and open record laws of various states. This is a particular problem for highly visible public urban universities where the media can often be very aggressive and present a constant treat to the search committee legitimate need to protect the identities of the candidates. At private colleges the job is somewhat easier because they are not subject to many of the legal interdictions of the public sector--although confidentiality is also a major concern in these searches." (p. 20)

Furthermore, McLaughlin and Riesman (1986) report Sunshine Laws have proliferated in the past decade and though individual statutes vary, all fifty states have legislation on the books espousing the principle that the business of public institutions must be conducted in public. McLaughlin and Riesman reiterate that these laws have caused many difficulties and frustrations for boards and committees--and particularly for candidates who risk
possible ridicule and embarrassment when their names are brought out. (p. 471) (Recall Porters' assertion regarding the sensitivity of many candidates status in the process).

Openness can also make a mockery of the interview phase for those candidates who opt to continue in the process. With so many diverse interests and with so many individuals (both campus and non-campus) participating, the notion of the campus interview has been compared to a "beauty contest" or a "tribal custom" (Porter, p.45). "A candidate may be unaware that this spectacle is planned until he learns that he is being seriously considered and must decide, as the price for preserving his candidacy, whether or not to agree to participate." (p. 45)

In light of many states' intrusions into public search and selection processes, several institutions have challenged disclosure regulations and sunshine laws in the courts. Cage (1989) discusses presidential searches in Georgia, Florida, and Michigan and public institutions' fight to release them from Sunshine Laws. The dilemma boils down to public interest groups and newspapers claiming that colleges and universities are hiding information about their searches--information the public has the right to know. The colleges reply that excessive openness hurts their chances to find quality pools of candidates. (p. A13)
The outcomes of these arguments depend on the particular and legal traditions of the state involved. For instance, the Supreme Court in Georgia sided with the Atlanta Journal-Constitution and against Georgia State University that the public does have the right to access all records about the search--except for the evaluation forms of the board, its staff and the letters of recommendation on the candidates. States are attempting to amend these laws in the courts however, no legal precedents exist to alter Sunshine Laws and preserve confidentiality. For colleges and universities, the outcomes of these legal battles are significant.

The citations above suggest one, if not the major, impediment to the search and selection process is the issue of confidentiality. A lack of confidentiality can negatively affect a search committee's ability to maintain an applicant pool. Leaks of confidentiality can occur at anytime. Individuals both from within and outside the search and selection process can leak information. Developing mechanisms to ensure confidentiality seem essential. Yet, those offering written commentaries do not offer any recommendations to address this important and troublesome issue.
Section 3: Involvement of the Spouse

An added factor in the search and selection process which has grown in significance over the past few years is the role of the spouse. For the married president the duties of the spouse are considerable. The spouse arranges and is present at scores of important social events, volunteers time to community organizations, and participates with the president in a wide array of dinners, concerts, benefits and other activities to attract potential donors and to spread good tidings from the campus. As Townsend (1987) indicates, in the past decades the role of the spouse (traditionally female) has been significant in support of the duties of the president though formal recognition (both tangible and verbal) has been limited.

The University of Chicago search provides an interesting example. McArthur (1989) points out, that during the search and selection process, as Robert Maynard Hutchins' candidacy began to be looked at more seriously, greater consideration was given to the suitability of Hutchins' wife—Maude McVeigh Hutchins. The search committee was uncertain if Mrs. Hutchins would be able to fulfill "the hostessing functions expected of the first lady." (p. 29) McArthur noted, "Whatever the result of the
inquiries, Maude Hutchins would later bridle at her social duties as President's wife, preferring to pursue her career as a sculptor." (p. 29)

Times are changing. Many institutions are offering salaries, formal recognition, and offices and staff personnel as a negotiable part of the president's compensation package. This is good news and is consistent with the extensive duties of the spouse and the key role he/she plays in the selection process and the presidency itself.

Generally, boards and the search committee view the presidency as a team effort—a combination of abilities and talents between the president and the spouse. As a result, the success of the interview is not only dependent upon the performance of the presidential candidate but of the spouse as well. Indeed, candidates have been dropped at the conclusion of the interview phase due to the perception of unacceptable qualities or background of the candidate's partner. Hence, the spouse not only plays a critical role in the success of the president once in office but also in the success of the presidential candidate being offered the position.
Section 4: Politics and Selection

As with the search guides, the written commentaries offer limited insights into the selection phase of the process; however, a few do give a glimpse of the politics and difficulties inherent in this phase.

Porter (1983) contends candidates often question the final outcome (presumably, those who were not chosen). To these individuals their concern is based on a contention that there is "too much talk and too little research" and that chemistry between the candidate and the board or search committee is often too highly weighed in comparison to record of experience.

"What is meant here, I believe, is that the final selection may be overly dependent upon two or three interviews with trustees; that the race is too likely to go to the glib, personable individual, who can make a favorable first impression. As recruiters themselves (the candidates) they know how ambiguous an interview can be, how easily it may be influenced by the vagrant question and hasty answer. And they have doubts." (Porter, p. 46)

Kerr (1982) adds the selection phase of the process can be more accurately described as a "rejection" process. The person who ends up as president often is not the best candidate for the position but rather the last survivor from
the long list. Some top candidates, due to a score of variant factors (leaks of confidentiality appear to be top on the list), opt out of the process before getting to the selection phase leaving the pool depleted of talented individuals and requiring the search committee and trustees to wrestle with the dilemma of either extending the search and selection process or offering the position to "the best under the circumstances." (p. 6) No wonder Kerr titled his article, "Crisis in Leadership"!

In considering the politics of the selection phase, McArthur's (1989) description of the University of Chicago search which brought Robert Maynard Hutchins from Yale, presents an apt case in point. The selection phase heated up as many of the candidates were dropped from the list or indicated their lack of interest in the position. As these names were removed, Hutchins began to become a more seriously considered candidate. The search committee's major concern about Hutchins was his age and perceived inexperience. As Dean of the Yale Law School, he distinguished himself nationally as a rising star in higher education. However, the dissenting trustees were cautious about offering the helm to such a youthful person (regardless of potential). Much discussion ensued over Hutchins' candidacy.
To his advantage, Hutchins was considered an "ideal compromise choice for the strained feelings at the University." (McArthur, p. 29) The faculty members on the search committee, including William E. Dodd, saw Hutchins as someone agreeable to the research goals the faculty had for the school. On the other hand, trustees and administrators, advocates of the "College" plan, liked Hutchins' Yale pedigree. (p. 29) McArthur notes,

"An astute administrator, credited with significant reforms in legal education, espousing commitment to research, and endorsed by foundation leaders--Hutchins seemed for the moment a man for all seasons." (p. 31)

Still Hutchins' youth was a major negative factor. His nomination was boosted by the persistence of one influential trustee. Edwin Embree, in a letter to the search chair and fellow trustee, Harold Swift, swayed Swift's support and eventually turned the board in Hutchins' favor. Embree wrote,

"I think there is a great danger that this University may settle down to be a good average institution - a calamity both to the University and America... I think the decision so momentous that it is well worth staking everything in hope of doing something brilliant and distinctive. (For Chicago to return to the leadership role known under William Rainey Harper). To do this, Embree, stated, required "youth, intelligence, and courage. Hutchins has these to a remarkable degree... It is true that there is some gamble in choosing so young a man but the stakes are
Swift was so influenced by the letter that he suggested the search committee invite Hutchins to campus. In early April, 1929 Hutchins was interviewed. He was invited back for a follow up interview in mid-April and on the 22nd of the month was offered the presidency. Hutchins requested a release from his contract at Yale and the president, James Rowland Angell, reluctantly agreed to the request. Hutchins accepted the presidency of the University of Chicago on April 24th, 1929.

In light of the rival conceptions of the University of Chicago’s future during the 1920s’, Bennis (1973) comments that a university’s search for a new president is never a neutral process. "Done poorly, it tends to further polarize a campus, to demarcate more rigidly the barriers between trustees, faculty, faculty and students, campus and community." (p. 67) But, Bennis continues, "...when a search is responsive, when the needs and desires of all the constituencies involved are at least acknowledged, the search process succeeds in much more than producing a warm body to fill the president’s chair. It serves also as a vehicle for community building, for healing (political) wounds and lessening estrangements." (p. 68) Bennis concludes that in order to derive these benefits, the search
need only be good, not necessarily, perfect. Fairness in the search is the principal key to success.

Therefore, managing the political realities of the search and selection process can make the process more effective, solve, or at least address, campus turf wars and controversies. Also, managing politics can set up a supportive climate for the new president. Accomplishing this goal requires attention to the needs of the constituent groups on campus from the outset of the process. These needs must be understood and incorporated in some substantial fashion into the needs of the institution from which a new president is selected.

Incorporating various campus needs into the all-encompassing institutional needs of the search and selection process requires compromise in an environment of institutional renewal and of goodwill between faculty, students, administrators, and trustees. Working together toward a unified set of goals is the key not only to a successful search and selection process but to a stronger sense of campus identity for the institution.

Section 5: Conclusion

The written commentaries offer unique perspectives on what factors can lead a search and selection process to become ineffective, how they can be mishandled, and what
factors enhance and inhibit the process. Certainly comprehensive treatment of the dynamics, conflicts, and politics, and how to improve the search and selection process requires additional insights. These are provided and analyzed in Chapter 3—Oral Histories.

As final commentaries, Porter (1983) notes that committees and trustees work as a group who advise and support each other—only the candidate is alone. Yet, in the search for a college or university president, the committee and the board are totally dependent upon the quality of the pool of candidates. It is due to this fact that these groups must improve their search and selection processes. (p. 47) Kerr (1982) adds that the president is still the single most important person in the life of a college or university. The central responsibility of the board remains how to get "the best possible people and give them the best possible circumstances." (p. 7)
Footnotes

1 However, Touchton does not explore how an institution can determine whether or not this circumstance exists.
References


Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.


Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.
CHAPTER 3: ORAL HISTORIES

Introduction

To add perspectives to the search and selection process beyond those provided in the previous chapters, Chapter 3 presents insights from a series of oral histories which were conducted with four college presidents, four search committee members, and five trustees or administrators who work with governing boards. The oral histories are organized into three groupings. The first grouping is representative of a specific search and selection process at a public institution. The public institution is a highly selective state-owned university which offers liberal arts studies at both the undergraduate and graduate levels. The second grouping comprises oral histories of a search and selection process at a private institution. The private institution examined is a selective, four-year, church-related college concentrating in liberal arts studies at the undergraduate level. The third grouping consists of oral histories which have been gathered from current college and university presidents from both public and private institutions. The intent of Chapter 3 is to elaborate on
the search and selection process by describing the procedural elements of the process and to analyze the "organizational politics" and "interpersonal dynamics" between members of the search committee, the governing board, and the candidates (through the perspective of current presidents). The end product is a discussion of the search and selection process which supplements the analyses in Chapters 1 and 2.

Chapter 3 is organized into sections similar to those in the two previous chapters. Section 1 discusses the early stages of the search phase by describing the organization of search committees, the use of search consultants, and application screening processes. Section 2 addresses interview strategies, the selection phase, contract negotiations, and the announcement of the appointment. Section 3 analyzes the involvement of the spouse in the process. Section 4 discusses the issue of confidentiality. Section 5 considers the search and selection process as an exercise in organizational politics. Section 6 presents a discussion of the overall process from the point of view of the candidate. This section is based on insights gained from current college and university presidents. Section 7 is devoted solely to an examination of the direct and indirect connections of the search and selection process to the overall issue of effective presidential leadership. Section 8 compares and contrasts
search and selection processes at public and private institutions of higher education. Finally, Section 9 considers the search guides' comprehensiveness in light of the data gained through the oral histories, and it presents conclusions drawn from the entire analysis.

Section 1: Early Stages: Organization of the Committee, Setting Up the Process, Gathering Applications, and the Use of Consultants

The respondents were asked to describe how their search was organized. A search committee member (Anonymous, 1990k) from a private institution recalls the committee consisted of ten members--three board members, three alumni, three faculty members elected by the faculty at large, and one student (the president of the student body at the time). The committee was led by the secretary to the board (one of the trustee representatives) who provided a direct communications link to the full board and administrative support for the committee. A trustee member of the same committee (Anonymous, 1990j) reported the same number and constituent groupings.
Comparatively, a search committee member (Anonymous, 1990b) for a search at a public institution recalls a much different configuration. The committee was made up of two faculty representatives from the liberal arts division (the largest segment of the academic community within the institution), one member each from law, education, business, and deep-sea sciences, two alumni, and the nine trustees. Among the trustees were members selected at large from the full board and those who were appointed (ex officio) as chair and secretary, respectively. The total number of members of this body was seventeen. The committee, organized in this configuration, brought forth a unique set of dynamics which impacted the search process as it unfolded. The secretary to the committee (Anonymous, 1990e) responded that the faculty contingent of the group was represented most strongly by members of the liberal arts division. The secretary also commented that since the liberal arts constituted the largest segment of the faculty and students of the institution, these faculty had a significant impact on the balance of the entire faculty representation on the committee. In fact, this individual considered the committee to hold a "liberal arts versus everyone else mentality."

Faculty representatives interviewed at both institutions acknowledged this dynamic but in quite a different way. One faculty member on the search committee
(Anonymous, 1990f) suggested that the committee was heavily weighted toward trustees and much effort was put forth by the faculty members on the committee to counterbalance their influence.

At this early stage of both processes, both committees were instructed what their roles were as search committees. The role of the search committee at the private institution was to gather and screen a pool of applicants, conduct initial and secondary interviews, winnow the field through comparing applications, checking references, and interviewing, and then selecting one candidate who was then presented to the governing board for approval. The public institution, on the other hand, had a much different goal. The search committee was instructed to perform the same duties as the committee from the private institution but they were not to select a final nominee. Their only goal was to generate a list of three finalists and present these names to the board who would then make the selection of president. (As it will be noted later, this technique resulted in some frustration on the part of the committee, particularly from the faculty representatives.)

Next, the search committee members were asked if the process they participated in was organized to be a rational, step-by-step process. All responded in the affirmative; however, one committee member at the public institution (Anonymous, 1990b) stated that though every attempt was made
to organize the search process to follow a rational pattern of sequential steps, in reality the process was rather unpredictable, particularly in the phase where the applicant pool was cut. The contention was that too much time was spent with obvious non-contenders which threw-off the set timeline and subsequent phases of the process.

The level of training between the two searches was quite different. The search at the public institution did not use a "comprehensive" search guide. However, the chairperson of the committee supplied the entire group with reprints of articles on conducting an effective search from such journals as Association of Governing Boards Reports. Were these helpful? A committee member (Anonymous, 1990b) contended that the articles were helpful in giving background to and understanding of the entire process.

At the private institution, a trustee (Anonymous, 1990j) reported using Kauffman's guide (1974) as well as reprints of articles. Interestingly, though printed material on organizing and conducting a search and selection process was available to the board, none was utilized by the institution's search committee. A committee member (Anonymous, 1990k) remembered no such preparatory material being available. In fact, no training at all was provided. The only taste of a search and selection process experienced by most members of the committee was gained through searches for Deans and other subordinate administrators.
For those who did have preparatory material at their disposal, they were asked if this information closely approximated the search and selection process. A faculty representative on the search committee (Anonymous, 1990b) in the public search stated that the material was indeed helpful, but that it did not prepare the committee for the factionalism and resulting tensions between committee members as the process unfolded. Oddly, a trustee member (Anonymous, 1990g) of the same committee felt that the material was extremely helpful, particularly for faculty representatives who were less experienced in searches of this type.

An important step in the process addressed in the search guides concerns the governing board presenting a charge to the search committee—formally communicating to the group a general timeline, the institutional needs, and goals of the search and selection process. Though no formal charge was given to the committee for the private search, needs were developed for that committee. A trustee (Anonymous, 1990j) described the needs as all the characteristics the president at the time did not have. The committee was to look for an academic—someone with an earned doctorate and (at least) some scholarly accomplishments. They were also to search for someone with teaching and administrative experience at an institution similar in size and structure to their campus. Also, they
wanted someone who was sensitive to faculty needs as well as an experienced fundraiser. Most interesting was a board member's (Anonymous, 1990l) comment that the president at the time so embroiled the campus, by losing the confidence of many of the campus constituencies (including faculty and students) that choosing someone who worked closely with that individual (an internal candidate) would not be acceptable. Thus, finding an outside candidate to be president was paramount. A search committee member (Anonymous, 1990k) and the current president (Anonymous, 1990i) reiterated these claims. Again, beyond the needs noted above, the timeline and rules and regulations for the functioning of the committee were developed by the committee itself—not as a charge from the governing board.

In the public search the charge to the search committee was handled a bit differently. A trustee (Anonymous, 1990g) recalled communications going out to faculty, students, alumni, and state government officials requesting input into characteristics in a new president which would be incorporated into a charge to the search committee. Specific qualities articulated to the committee were: alumni status, someone rising in his or her career, being of strong academic standing, with an outstanding record in fundraising, an ability to relate to the student body, and an appropriate degree pedigree. An administrative secretary to the board (Anonymous, 1989) also noted that the
institution's agenda for the search was to find a president who would continue to strengthen the academic reputation of the institution, establish a larger endowment, and improve faculty salaries. Two search committee members (Anonymous, 1990b; Anonymous, 1990f) questioned about this element of the search process recalled receiving a direct charge from the board; however, one member (Anonymous, 1990b) stated that the charge was not detailed enough.

In both searches, the openings were advertised in similar ways. Notices were placed in the Chronicle of Higher Education and requests for nominations were sought from alumni and faculty as well as from governmental figures in the case of the public institution. This method of publicizing the opening generated 166 viable applications in the private search and in the range of 150 for the public search.

Once the applications were gathered the pools were screened. In the private search, a committee member (Anonymous, 1990k) recalls the entire search committee of ten screened the entire applicant pool of 166 en mass and then split into smaller groups to examine the applications in detail. The committee member stated this was done to permit the entire committee to examine each application and draw preliminary conclusions about the early contenders before dividing into teams to critique equal shares of the pool in an in depth fashion. From the original pool of 166,
the pool was narrowed to 30 semi-finalists. For these applicants the procedure of checking references was added to the process, and from this assemblage, a list of 12 finalists was generated through committee consensus.

Arriving at these twelve names was no easy task. A trustee (Anonymous, 1990j) mentioned the prevailing wind blew toward bending to the faculty's demand to identify academicians--presumably those who would relate well to their needs. Prior to commencing the search, board members were aware that faculty needs would be pervasive and paramount. As a result, much attention and consideration went to narrowing the pool to those who would be supported by the faculty. Others on the search committee, including the trustees, were interested in seeking someone with a religious background (the institution is closely affiliated with a major protestant denomination); however, the faculty's claim on the new presidents made the characteristics in the new president, and thus the entire search and selection process, rather narrow. Due to this, no real conflict between the committee and the board occurred in the screening process (or for that matter throughout the entire process). In fact, a faculty member on the search committee (Anonymous, 1990k) stated screening the applications was the most enjoyable portion of the search because it was during this phase that the committee became unified around a set of characteristics and needs
(i.e.: the faculty's needs). It is no wonder the person had such fond memories.

The gathering and screening of applications at the public institution was quite different in organization and in the interpersonal dynamics surrounding the process. A committee member (Anonymous, 1990b) recalled that the technique of placing advertisements in newspapers and professional journals and requesting nominations was not sufficient to generate a quality pool of applicants. Also, the committee (particularly the board members who comprised a majority of the committee) often pursued candidates employed at much larger universities. The search committee member concluded that the search committee spent too much time "looking up" for applicants rather than "around" (where the most suitable pool of potential candidates were to be found). The committee member followed this comment by stating that the process would have been streamlined if the board, and specifically, the committee, clearly defined who (what) they were looking for in a new president.

A trustee (Anonymous, 1990g) described the screening process in the public search as being done in several phases. The first phase cut obvious non-contenders from the pool. The second cut narrowed the pool to 20 semi-finalists. Before the list was finalized the chairperson of the committee asked if there was anyone in the pool to be reconsidered. There was no one. The next cut narrowed the
pool to 10 finalists. These individuals were invited to campus for an initial interview and their backgrounds were checked through formal and informal phone calls by search committee members to the candidates' home campuses. These duties were parcelled out to individual search committee members. Much of the reference checking was done in a non-structured manner. For instance, if a committee member knew a colleague or had an acquaintance at an institution where one of the candidates was employed, the person would place a phone call to that individual to inquire about the candidate. As a result of this technique, confidentiality was leaked as many individuals contacted had no idea that the person inquired about was a viable candidate for a university presidency. In some instances the word quickly spread and soon a preliminary list of finalists appeared in the press causing some dismay on the part of committee members, the board, and the candidates.

During the screening phase two factions developed within the public institution's search committee. A faction highly feared by the faculty representative on the committee was the trustees--many of whom it was widely known were supporting the candidacy of a local applicant who had some political clout, regional recognition, but limited experience in higher education. Seeing the candidate possibly making a strong contention for the presidency alarmed many of the faculty contingent on the committee. A
faculty representative on the committee (Anonymous, 1990f) recalled this development as a major early stumbling block in the process. The candidate had considerable support from the trustees on the committee (and on the board as well); however, the committee member described how the faculty contingent made it clear to the full committee that if the person was chosen, the faculty on the committee and on the campus in general may rebel against the process and against board. This was the last thing the board wanted to have happen. A trustee (Anonymous, 1990g) noted the search was organized so that unrest from the faculty would be avoided. As a result, the candidate was dropped from the process at this stage. Hence, in the early phases of the process, infighting and wrangling within the search committee had already occurred.

The oral histories gathered for both searches provided few perspectives on the use of consultants. In the private search no consultant was hired. In fact, at the time the search took place, the use of private search firms had not begun to be extensively used in higher education.

In the public search, a consultant was used but not to any great extent. Advice was gained in assisting the committee in generating the pool of applicants—that is all. It was the opinion of the chairperson of the search committee (Anonymous, 1990g) that sufficient expertise existed within the search committee and within the board to
administer the entire process without outside assistance.

Conclusions

Even in the early phases, the public and private search processes both contain unique problems, needs, and dynamics. Thus far, it is evident that these processes are much more complex than the hypothetical or prescribed search formats outlined in the search guides. For instance, the search guides do not discuss how ambiguous, complicated, and potentially divisive the screening process can become. The guides suggest necessary steps to follow in order to gather applicants and screen them, but little is offered as a description of the environment in which these phases of the search and selection process take place. From the analyses of the two searches to this point, it is obvious that the institutional climate in which the processes were administered had a significant impact on the relationship between the search committee and the governing board. Apparently, this relationship can be positive and proactive or can be filled with suspicion and tension. The search guides neglect discussing the "social atmosphere" which encompasses the search and selection process and as such only offer a partial picture of what may occur as the process unfolds. The following section describes further
intricacies of the search and selection process.

Section 2: Interviewing, Selection, Contract Negotiations, the Announcement, and Politics

Both the public and private searches required that all candidates who were elevated to the "select list" participate in initial screening interviews. 1

A trustee (Anonymous, 1990j) in the private search remembered the interviews as taking place at an off campus location (a hotel) where the entire committee interviewed each "select candidate" in 2 to 3 hour meetings. A search committee member (Anonymous, 1990k) recalled the intent of the initial interviews as a chance for the committee to consider the personal qualities of each candidate and to come to a preliminary conclusion in finding individuals who were acceptable to all sides--faculty, alumni, trustees, and students. From these initial face-to-face contacts, the field was then narrowed to three finalists who were invited with their spouses to the campus for a marathon two-day interview where the finalists and spouses met with to all segments of the campus community. 2
According to a committee member (Anonymous, 1990k), as the three finalists were interviewed on the campus, two-person teams of search committee members traveled to each candidate's home campus to question faculty, students, alumni, and administrative personnel. The goal of these trips was to gather further perspectives on the person's administrative and professional manner and to determine whether or not there were any "skeletons in the closet." The teams reported their findings to the entire committee and at the end of the interview phase, the search committee was prepared to select one candidate from the list of three finalists to submit to the governing board for approval.

The interview phase in the public search utilized a similar plan. The chairperson of the search committee (Anonymous, 1990g) noted a select list of six candidates was developed by the committee and invitations to campus were extended. Three candidates came at a time to the campus to meet alumni, deans, and to tour the campus. The chairperson of the search was extremely careful to maintain an air of consistency between the interviews. For instance, those meeting the candidates were required to ask the same questions of each candidate. The level of detail was quite surprising. Even the meals served to the six candidates were the same. Humorously, a faculty representative of the search committee (Anonymous, 1990h) noted that eating the same meal six times in a row was a major negative factor in
an evaluation of the overall process. However, the individual was complimentary about the way consistency was maintained.

At the completion of this phase of the process, the search committee convened to narrow the field from six to the recommended three finalists who were then invited back to campus with their spouses for an extended session of interviews. The process of cutting the field to three was not without its difficulties. A faculty representative (Anonymous, 1990b) on the search committee described the process as "unnerving." A considerable amount of wrangling occurred between committee members in comparing and contrasting particular candidates' background. These disputes became rather vindictive, as the faculty representative recalled, and the list finalists was developed through what this individual considered to be "horsetrading." With the three names now identified by the search committee, a list was forwarded to the board for the selection phase.

Upon the delivery of the three names to the board, the search committee was disbanded. Here, the board invited the finalists with their spouses to the campus for formal interviews where the couple (all were married) met with representatives of the entire campus community and the board for in-depth discussions. A trustee recalled (Anonymous, 1990g) the goal of this procedure was for the board to get a
sense of "fit" between each finalist and spouse and the campus and board. At the conclusion of the interviews the full board met to select the new president.

The selection procedure appeared to by completely without conflict. According to a trustee (Anonymous, 1990g), the board met in a designated private location on the campus where they were instructed in the process of selection. They were to make secret written ballots for the candidate of their choice. The trustee recalled expecting several ballots as necessary to make the selection. The votes were made, collected, and tallied by two members of the board. The name of the individual receiving the most votes was presented to the chairperson of the board. The name was then introduced to the board and motion was made to accept the designee as president. The motion passed unanimously. With the selection of the new president now completed, the chairperson of the search committee called the governor of the state to make the announcement. Hence, the selection was done in a rational, orderly fashion.

In the case of the private institution, much the same scenario took place. The three finalists were interviewed with their spouses. Upon completion of the interview process, the board met to select the new president. At this stage, a clear front runner was apparent. The board voted to accept the passage of a motion to select the front runner. The motion passed. The chairperson of the search
and selection committee telephoned the designee to extend a verbal offer—which was accepted. The telephone call was then followed by a formal written offer which was signed and returned.

Interestingly, the committee felt it necessary to make the "Harvard Offer" to each of the finalists. Each was asked, "If offered the position, would you indeed take the job?" This technique was employed to insure the committee that each of the candidates was serious about the position and about coming to the campus. This seemed to be the case as the selected finalist at the private institution accepted the presidency without reservations.

**Contract Negotiations**

The final phase of the search and selection process is developing the contract for the new president. The search guides (i.e.: Marchese (1989) and Nason (1984)) suggest this be done with time, care, and in detail. Clearly, this was not the case at the private institution. A board member (Anonymous, 1990j) recalled discussing only the starting salary with the president. Other details were hammered out long after the president assumed office. The president of that institution (Anonymous, 1990i) labeled himself as naive in terms of understanding and defining the various elements
of the contract. The president suggested it would have been helpful to have employed some sort of outside agent to negotiate the contract—particularly for those elements of the contract which were overlooked; namely, recognition of the spouse.

These difficulties did not occur in the public search. Most, if not all of the president's current contract including salary, benefits, and term of appointment were negotiated between the president and the board prior to the president taking office. If any details were overlooked, the data gathered did not indicate this as being the case.

Making the Announcement

As for making the appointment of the new president public, the chair of the search committee (Anonymous, 1990g) at the private institution remembered the search culminated by inviting the new president and spouse to the campus to be formally introduced to the campus community. Simultaneously, a press release was distributed to the media in the surrounding communities. There was no formal press conference. That is not to say there was no interest on the part of the media in the outcome of the search. Quite the contrary was the case. (The issue of media relations is discussed in a later section on confidentiality.)
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At the public institution, immediately following the selection of the new president, a press release was communicated to United Press International, the Associated Press, and to the local media. Simultaneously, a presentation of the selection was made on the campus for faculty, students, and staff. Oddly, a faculty representative of the search committee (Anonymous, 1990b) remembered receiving no prior notice of the selection. The person got word of the choice through the newspaper. The individual felt that the search committee members were left out of the process and given little special consideration after their work was completed. It was evident in receiving this oral history that some residual frustration still existed.

Politics

In both searches much of the political activities occurred during the early stages of the process. Hence, the selection phases were, for the most part, free of conflict. In the case of the private institution major concessions were given to the faculty prior to the search process beginning. As for the public institution, the oral histories indicate the selection phase included little if any conflict since only the governing board was left to make the final decision. A more comprehensive examination of the
politics in these search and selection processes is presented in a later section.

Section 3: Involvement of the Spouse

Committee members and trustees in both searches were asked if the involvement of a spouse had a significant impact on the candidate's status in the process. All respondents answered in the affirmative. According to a committee member (Anonymous 1990f) in the public search, one candidate was dropped from the search due to the unsuitability of the spouse (wife). In essence, the personal attributes of the spouse were considered inappropriate to the committee. The committee member noted the chairperson of the search committee was quite adamant about dropping the candidate due to the spouse. The chairperson (Anonymous, 1990g) questioned on this matter stated that when a president is married, the qualities of the spouse become extremely important to an institution and to a successful presidency. Due to this, when it was determined that a spouse is unacceptable to the committee, the candidate is no longer in contention. When asked why the spouse was unacceptable, the chairperson responded the she (the wife) was clearly accustomed to the finer things and would have not fit in well with the character of either
the institution or the office. The chairperson thought it unfortunate to drop a strong contender from the search for this reason (because the candidate was a top ranked scholar, manager, and fundraiser) but when hiring a presidential couple, the qualities of the spouse are as important as the qualities of the candidate.

In the private search, much the same rationale existed. A search committee member (Anonymous, 1990k) stated that each finalist was invited to campus with his spouse for the sole purpose of seeing the "team" act in a variety of settings. The clear top contender during the selection phase, who also became president, was chosen not solely because the person was most appropriate to be president, but also because the spouse was suitable. Here again, the perception is, when a candidate is married, the qualities of the spouse become extremely important. The notion of a presidential team is key in this regard.

With the spouse playing such an important role in the selection phase of the process (and in the presidency itself), was the spouse accommodated formally in the president's contract (or separately in an individual contract)? Little indication was given that the spouse was included in the contract at the public institution. However, a trustee (Anonymous, 1990g) noted some mention was made of accommodating the needs of the spouse in some tangible way. What was unclear was whether this was done formally (through
the contract) or informally, through offering some sort of formal recognition of the spouse's role on campus.

It was evident in the private search that no formal recognition of the spouse's role was made by the institution. As it was mentioned earlier, the original contract for the president covered only starting salary and benefits. The needs of the spouse were not taken into account at that time. The president of the institution (Anonymous, 1990i) regretted this happening but blamed his own inexperience for permitting this to happen.

Hence, the involvement of spouses in both searches played a significant role in selecting the new presidents. In fact, it is surprising how much impact the spouses had on the selection process. Clearly, if top candidates can be dropped due to the unsuitable nature of the spouses, then the role of these individuals must be extremely important. At least the governing boards and search committees in the search and selection processes examined here seem to think so.

Section 4: Confidentiality

In discussing confidentiality, the issue took two distinctive paths. Confidentiality in the search and selection process revolves around the maintenance of the candidate's anonymity to those on the home front until such
time that the person must make a statement declaring candidacy for another position. Second, confidentiality involves not divulging names prematurely to the media. Certainly the latter can affect the former, but both elements are thought of as independent, yet inter-related factors.

Was confidentiality a concern in both searches?—yes. Was confidentiality broken during the searches?—yes. Were methods employed by both institutions to make the search as confidential as possible?—yes. Were these methods effective?—somewhat.

The public search was organized to keep much of the committee deliberations off the campus— in a secret location. As a state-owned institution the public's right to know is guaranteed through the state's Sunshine Laws. However, the state in which the institution resides permits agencies to exempt themselves from these laws when it can be demonstrated that the close involvement of the press and the public in general would seriously hamper the process's successful outcome. The exemption was employed in this search. As a result, the impact of the press and public was limited. That is not to say that off campus entities— namely the press, were uninterested in the search. On the contrary, the local media went to some lengths to find out who the top contenders were prior to the institution making a formal announcement.
According to the chairperson of the search committee (Anonymous, 1990g), a confidentiality leak cost the committee one highly experienced candidate. Evidently, the name of the candidate was leaked by a member of the search committee (either inadvertently or on purpose) to the media which published the name in the press. The candidate, fearing a negative response from the current institution, removed his application from contention. A search committee member (Anonymous, 1990f) recalled this leak, regretted it happening, and considered the incident as indicative of the importance of maintaining confidentiality in the search and selection process.

In the private search, confidentiality was as important but was more easily maintained since private institutions are not obligated to follow Sunshine Laws. Search committee members attempted to preserve confidentiality in light of a mounting number of inquiries made by the press as the selection drew nearer. A committee member (Anonymous, 1990k) recalled being contacted at home by members of the media requesting "a scoop" as to who were the front runners or who was on the inside track to be the next president of the institution.

A trustee at the private institution (Anonymous, 1990j) described the extremes at which one reporter went to find out who the new president was. By the time the choice was made, the names of the finalists were already public.
Reporters from the local media contacted members of the search committee, the president's office, and trustees. Everyone on the campus was rather tight-lipped about the decision. Next, the reporter began to call the current offices of the finalists to get their input. According to the current president of the institution (Anonymous, 1990i), eventually the reporter began contacting the candidates' homes. When a reporter contacted the candidate's (now president's) home it was communicated by a member of the household staff that the couple were away in a city quite close to the institution for a meeting. The reporter got the "scoop" and a story was then printed in a local newspaper the following day—spoiling the campus's opportunity for a surprise announcement.

Though the leak did not have any significant negative impact on the process at this institution, residual negative memories still exist. Further analysis and elaboration on the issue of confidentiality is offered in following sections.

Section 5: Politics and the Search and Selection Process

All those providing oral histories were asked to respond directly to a question concerning the politics which occurs in the search and selection process. In analyzing
the responses grouped according to their involvement in either the private or public search, it was found that in this comparison, the public search contained far more conflict, (pressure being applied by competing groups), and more in-fighting, than in the private search. That is not to say political behavior was not a factor in the private search. Conflict was, however, reduced early in the search process by a major concession being made from one contingent of the search committee to another (i.e.: trustees to the faculty).

The public search presents an interesting account of the politics of the search and selection process. As it was pointed out earlier, the search committee had divided itself along two general lines--faculty and trustees. The main stumbling block, the consideration of one candidate with a considerable amount of political clout with the local trustees, was eliminated rather early in the search process as the faculty voiced its disapproval of the candidate as a serious contender. A faculty member (Anonymous, 1990b) recalled an off campus meeting between the candidate who was the object of the faculty representatives' discontent and members of the search committee. At this meeting it communicated by members of the search committee that the candidate's presidential aspirations were indeed valid and honorable but that his continued involvement in the search would be an up-hill battle based on the concerns of the
faculty. As a result of the meeting, the candidate was not elevated to the list of six selected finalists.

As for the overall atmosphere within the ranks of the committee, frustration was felt on the part of the faculty contingent due to what was perceived as a hidden agenda and "backdoor maneuvering" by a number of the trustees on the committee. The purpose of these activities was to further the cause of one candidate over another. The faculty member on the committee (Anonymous, 1990b) described this situation as disheartening. The faculty representative claimed some trustees on the committee were uninformed about what the institution needed in a new president and that these individuals were biased toward candidates who had prior influence at the institution, candidates who were, overall, unsuitable for the position. With many perspectives about the presidency and the institution considered slanted, even reckless, the faculty representative considered the environment within the search committee to be strained and frustrating at times.

A trustee of the public institution (Anonymous, 1990e) recalled the search process as a battle between the faculty ranks and the trustees for dominance over the outcome of the search. Both factions were playing toward their own agenda (implying a lack of unity about the direction of the institution). The trustee considered politics to be part and parcel to the search and selection process in general.
and concluded that in this search, politics drew out the process, made it frustrating, but did not impede the process to any great extent. Also, the individual stated that the day-to-day politics of the institution influenced the search committee. As a microcosm of the entire campus community, the committee was impacted by the same power structures on the campus. The trustee concluded that the true influence over the search came down to, "who has got the horse."--or in other words--who has the political power. It seems in this search the political power was shared and exercised toward one agenda or another, not toward a unified set of goals for the institution.

Beyond factionalism, covert activities occurred in the public institution's search as well. A search committee member (Anonymous, 1990b) recalled informal phone calls being made between committee members in order to sway an individual toward one candidate and away from another. Specifically, the committee member considered the prevailing power coming from the governing board being exerted on the trustee members of the committee and on the faculty representatives as well.

Who was the mediator between the two rival factions in the search committee? According to a search committee member (Anonymous, 1990h), it was most certainly the chairperson. When the political activity surrounding the viability of a particular candidate began to divert the
direction of the search, the chair confronted this in a completely impartial manner. As a result, the faculty contingent had great confidence in the impartiality and the opinions of the chair. From the perspective of all providing oral accounts of this search process, with the existing power structure notwithstanding, the true power to move the process along rested on the shoulders of the chairperson. The chairperson exercised power impartially and effectively.

Turning to the private search, a faculty member of the search committee (Anonymous, 1990k) recalled that the tenure of the previous president was marked with tension between the president and the faculty which eventually spilled over to the governing board for action. Before any formal action was taken by the board (e.g.: a vote of no confidence) the president gave a one-year notice of departure from the institution. The board understood how great the need was to provide the faculty with a president they could trust and relate to. As a result, the board considered quelling any faculty rumbling by addressing their needs through the search process. A trustee (Anonymous, 1990j) remembered a faculty revolt being imminent if their needs were not met. The board concluded, in the best interest of the institution, the faculty must be appeased. Hence, the search centered around finding someone who was a recognized scholar with a track record of teaching, publishing, and
dealing directly and proactively with concerns of the faculty. The trustees stated many board members were interested in interviewing potential presidents with a background in theology (The institution is affiliated with a major protestant denomination). However, the needs of the faculty were recognized as so significant that other sorts of individuals were not even considered in the search process. In fact, it seemed that the institution defined quite clearly what was needed in a new president soon after the previous president gave notice of resignation.

Interestingly, a member of the private institution's search committee (Anonymous, 1990k) noted that the two other groups on the search committee, alumni and students, had a negligible effect on the outcome of needs development. They also had limited impact on the outcome of the entire process. Alumni, it was recalled, were used primarily as a buffer between the two major representative groups on the committee--faculty and trustees. The committee member viewed the alumni representatives as able to be easily swayed toward the prevailing wind (i.e.: toward the faculty needs). Yet the alumni did provide a valuable third perspective; although, they had no significant impact on the outcome of the process.
The written commentaries on the politics of the search and selection process (Bennis, 1973; McArthur, 1989) indicate how divisive the negotiations in the presidential selection process can be. Oddly, divisiveness did not occur in the selection of the president at the private institution. A faculty member (Anonymous, 1990k) recalled, because needs were determined so early, that the entire search and selection process was quite a unifying experience. Hence, politics was not a significant factor in the search for and selection of the president at the private institution. According to those offering oral histories, the entire process was rather enjoyable (Though, as a committee member (Anonymous, 1990k) noted, it was a bit drawn out).

The oral histories from both institutions describe the dynamic environment and the politics of the search and selection process. It can be seen in the remarks made by the trustees and search committee members that conflicts and frustrations often develop in the process as an offshoot of the political climate of the institution. Also, politics and conflict were not limited to the selection phase of the process. Rather, they were present from the formation of the search committee onward. In the two examples described above, politics was much less present in the selection phase. Politics seemed to be much more a factor in molding the process of defining institutional needs and in screening
the applicant pool. Most surprisingly, was the indication that the environment of the institution at the time the search and selection process began impacted greatly on the relationships between the two most significant representative groups on the search committee—trustees and faculty.

Did politics impede the search and selection processes? Not to any great extent. In fact, the in-fighting and conflicts evident in the public search served to unify interests in the committee and in the governing board to complete the process successfully—which did happen. However, memories of the tensions and frustrations still linger.

In the case of the private institution, the necessity for new leadership and a spirit of campus renewal brought about by the resignation of the previous president, created a climate of excitement about the search and restored feelings of optimism for the institution. The climate, at least, indirectly influenced the development of a unified institutional needs statement and created an atmosphere of teamwork within the search committee. As a result of the institutional climate, cooperation was paramount and politics was decreased.
Section 6: The Presidents' Perspectives

To provide additional perspectives on the search and selection process, oral histories were gathered from four college and university presidents—two from public institutions and two from private institutions. Excerpts from an oral history given by a president have already been introduced (from the private institution whose search and selection process has been described above). The four oral histories together offer insights on the search and selection process in the public and private sectors from a new point of view—from those who were once candidates for positions and who now occupy current presidencies. What do they have to say about the search and selection process?

The president (Anonymous, 1990c) of a two-year state-owned institution recalls the atmosphere of the campus, prior to his arrival, as in turmoil. Much interest at the time was paid to making the institution a four-year college, but due to opposition voiced from another local, primarily black institution state institution (and in light of the civil rights crisis at the time (late 1960s), the state urged the institution to remain as it was. As a result, the conversion to a four-year college never took place. The failure of the campus to become a four-year institution had
a negative effect on the confidence level in the previous president held by the faculty, students, and administrators. Furthermore, the president noted the faculty was not cohesive. There was an influential faction of the faculty that as a block made its own academic decisions and basically looked after itself. Attempts at changing this arrangement were resisted strongly. Hence, as a new arrival, the president was faced with dealing with the potential civil rights crisis and a reorganization of the faculty—certainly both significant challenges.

The search and selection process which brought the current president to the campus was quite similar in structure to the two processes described above. The individual submitted a formal application which was reviewed by the search committee. According to the president, the pool was narrowed to ten semi-finalists who were interviewed on the campus. Then, three finalists and their spouses were invited back to campus for a two-day interview where each couple met with faculty, students, and members of the local chamber of commerce. Following this series of interviews, two finalists (the eventual president and another individual) were unexpectedly invited back to the campus a third time for an additional interview by the full governing board. Shortly thereafter, the president was elected by the board.
Overall, the president considered the process very well organized. Regular communications about the progress of the search were relayed to the candidates by the secretary to the search committee. The interviews were fairly well planned and executed. However, the president remembered the faculty segment of the two day interview as less than effective. The session began with coffee and doughnut social followed by an oral presentation by with a question and answer session as a conclusion. The conversation seemed strained and the question and answer session was indicative of a faculty full of frustration looking for answers but at the same time hesitant to seek change. The candidate and the spouse participated in several social gatherings, toured the campus, and were shown the president's house. Interestingly, though the spouse was included in the entirety of the second interview, this individual was largely forgotten after the process concluded. The president still holds some residual frustration since the spouse is involved in planning and presenting social and civic activities without adequate support staff or resources.

Another source of frustration for the president was an unanticipated added step to the selection phase. When one finalist dropped out of the process, it was decided to interview the two remaining candidates a third time--this time by the full governing board. Following the third
interview, the president received an offer the next day by a member of the board. In retrospect, the president felt the third interview lengthened the process and did not present any new information for either side. Also, it indicated a certain level of disorganization on the part of the organizers of the process. Hence, the president concluded the third interview was an unnecessary step and possibly represented the board's confusion about what it wanted in a new president.

Following the acceptance of the job offer, a contract was negotiated in general terms (salary and benefits). The president's spouse was not included in the contract. The president stated that if the contract negotiation could have been done over, the person would have negotiated the contract in much more detail.

Additionally, the president found that it would have been beneficial (due to the prevailing political climate of the campus) to bring in an administrative team to develop and administer the needed organizational and academic changes. This was not requested by the president as a candidate and was not possible when the presidency began. Negotiating this detail prior to taking office would have made wrestling with the significant institutional changes more manageable.
According to the president, politics within the search and selection process became evident as the search committee screened and winnowed the candidate pool. The politics became somewhat divisive as the search committee wrestled with the issue of the continued involvement of an inside applicant whose candidacy was being supported by many senior faculty. The faculty held considerable political power over the process. Ultimately, the decision rested on the shoulders of the board. The faculty certainly exercised their power and influence to seek the presidency for one of their own (a play to force the board into selecting a president who would maintain the status quo). However, the board acted in the interest of the entire academic community, and selected an outside candidate so as to ensure that the necessary institutional changes would be developed.

The President of a Four-Year Private College

Many of the views of the president of the private four-year institution (whose search and selection process was described above) have already been introduced. The president's depiction of the search as well organized and practically without conflict is consistent with the oral histories gathered from search committee members and
trustees from that institution.

According to the president (Anonymous, 1990i), the institution was looking for a president with a strong academic background, who had a proven track record as a successful manager, and possessed visionary leadership. Humorously, the president stated the institution was looking for basically someone opposite from the immediate past president.

After forwarding an application to the search committee, nothing was communicated from the institution for quite some time until the secretary to the search committee telephoned the individual to come for an initial interview. Not too long after the conclusion of that interview the individual was contacted again for a second, on campus, interview. Simultaneously the institution scheduled a site visit for members of the search committee to travel to the individual's current campus to interview colleagues, supervisors, and subordinates.

The president recalled the campus interviews being handled well. After meeting with the various campus constituencies, the board asked if offered the position would the individual accept. The president answered in the affirmative. Not soon after the conclusion of the campus interview it was learned from a campus contact that the individual was the front runner. Shortly after the conclusion of the second interview a job offer was extended.
The president remembered being pleased that the time between
the campus interview and the offer being extended was short.
The president's fear was that recklessness in communicating
the offer could constitute cruel and inhuman treatment by
drawing out the process and increasing tension by making
the person wait for an answer.

It has already been noted that the president of the
four-year private institution was inexperienced in
negotiating a contract. Many details, particularly those
involving the duties of and support for the president's
spouse were totally overlooked. The board took particular
interest in the background and professional experiences of
the spouse. Failure to seek a detailed contract, caused
frustrations particularly for the spouse since the person
would receive no tangible support through the president's
contract. Over time, these details were added. For
instance, the president reported it took seven years for the
spouse to receive official recognition from the institution.
After that period the spouse received official status as
Presidential Associate for College Relations as formal
recognition including staff assistance and monies.

Regarding the political atmosphere of the search, the
president considers politics an integral, important, and
inescapable factor in the search and selection process. In
this search, the key political factor was mistrust on the
part of faculty toward the trustees emanating from the
poorly handled search and selection process which resulted in bringing the previous president to the campus. Evidently, a significant amount of disgust existed in the faculty ranks over the unsuitability of the previous president. Though the current president did not claim the previous president was guilty of mismanagement, during the previous presidents' term, enrollments had dropped, the financial standing of the institution was shaky, and a serious threat was voiced from the faculty to institute collective bargaining on the campus. All these factors may have impacted the search and selection process but the current president felt little influence from them as a candidate.

The President of a Four-Year Public College

Next, an oral history was received from a president (Anonymous, 1990a) of a four-year, state-owned institution who was selected from an applicant pool of 203. Both external and internal candidates submitted applications. All internal candidates were not elevated to the plateau of finalist. Of the 203 submitting applications, 33 were asked to submit long letters to the search committee outlining their educational philosophy; from the pool of 33, five finalists were chosen. As a candidate, the president was
very much a dark horse--later it was learned the individual was ranked 26 of the pool of 33 and then fifth out of the list of five finalists. Overall, the president contended the process was beautifully done. It was even suggested that it be used as a model for other institutions to follow.

After applying for the position through an advertisement in the Chronicle of Higher Education, both (then) candidate and spouse were assigned a representative of the search committee who kept the couple apprized of the process as it developed. The contacts from the representative of the search committee were made frequently throughout the process.

Regarding the institution's needs in a new president, the respondent was not informed of them directly, but in the preliminary stages of the process it became evident that the institution was looking for a CEO to manage a "growing state college." Particularly, the institution was looking for a president with excellent people skills. Specific institutional problems that needed to be addressed were to enhance communication between the faculty and administration, to decrease tension between these two groups, and to strengthen outside connections with the state legislature.

The candidate and spouse participated in a two-day interview. In retrospect, the individual reported that the interviews were handled very well. In the first interview
session, held on campus, the couple were interviewed separately throughout the day and then together at a dinner party. The schedule began at 7am where the candidate met with campus groups--faculty, financial donors, and community figures. There were also individual meetings with administrators (including the current president), faculty, and students, small department meetings, and a community meeting which was open to the entire campus. Specifically in the college-wide interview, the questions were extremely frank. The audience was looking for someone not stress prone and with a good sense of humor. In the small group meetings in faculty departments, professors were interested in learning how the candidate would address current turf conflicts--they were looking for someone with a broad-based orientation to faculty concerns. According to the (now) president, the interviews were forthright and candid and allowed the individual to be presented accurately.

Confidentiality in the process was a non-issue during the president's candidacy. The president had already given a one-year notice of departure to a previous institution. Representatives of the search committee communicated to each finalist that a team of committee members would visit each of the finalist's campuses to interview faculty, administrators and students. In the president's case, it was agreed to allow the team to make the trip, but the president requested that the on-site visit only be done at
the later stages of the selection phase of the process. The committee complied with this request.

Regarding the issue of politics, there was a strong internal candidate with considerable clout among members of the state legislature. However, no legislator influenced the search and selection process. From the president's perception, the on campus political impediments were few. Furthermore, the president noted that the governing board did not pressure the faculty to support the board's choice for president. The rationale for the board's decision is unclear. (When asked if he was the faculty's choice, the president answered in the affirmative.) If the board was dissatisfied with the selection it did not communicate this through the search committee or by choosing someone else during the selection phase of the process. In essence, the faculty representatives made it clear who they wanted and the board did not challenge their stand.

The president also stated that his spouse was well accommodated in the process. The spouse, too, was interviewed by various members of the campus and off campus communities. Her personal qualities were integral in the selection of this candidate. In the contractual arrangement the board and the president-elect ironed out a specific compensation package for the spouse. She receives no salary but is responsible for the use of the state-owned house and receive adequate administrative support in carrying out
duties as the spouse of the president. The president estimated that 25-50% of the decision in his selection rested on the suitability of his spouse. The president was later told that one finalist was rejected from the process due to the spouses perceived incompatibility with board members.

**The President of a Private University**

The final president who offered an oral history (Anonymous, 1990d) is the president of a small church-related university. The president became interested in the institution when informed about the vacancy by an influential member of the institution's governing board, who also urged the individual to apply for the job. The president perceived the position as extremely attractive because it constituted a challenge. The institution had great prospects for the future in that it had outstanding opportunities for moving to the next stage of its development--to become one of the top ranked small universities in the nation. The institution was also attractive because it possessed three key characteristics in an institution on the move up--it had a clear identity, it possessed well defined institutional goals, and was an institution "poised for greatness".
The institution was searching for a new president who was well experienced in academics, who had an excellent degree pedigree, who had teaching and faculty experience, and strength in fundraising. The institution was also looking for someone reasonably youthful and who was in good health.

The president saw the search and selection process at this institution developing in very similar ways to searches he participated in the past (this was his third presidency.) The early stages of the process, application and initial contact with the search committee, the president labeled the "flirtation stage." He recalled this stage as quite fun—having the search committee express their interest and persuade you to apply for the position. Soon after that initial stage—things got serious. The president called the second stag the "credentialing stage." Here the committee compared resumes and snooped around to find out more about the candidates. During this stage names were dropped from the process quickly. In the search process which brought him to this campus, 200 applications were received from a pool gathered nationally.

The president labeled the third phase "the political phase." As the pool is narrowed (to 30 names in the case of this search) the committee wrangles over qualifications, background, and seeks a close "fit" between the institutional needs and the candidates' qualifications. It
is at this stage rivalries within the search committee usually pop up as factions (namely faculty, trustees, and sometimes administrators) as they become at odds with one another over their own parochial perceptions of the institution and its goals and directions in light of the needs developed at the beginning of the search.

The third phase is where interpersonal chemistry becomes important. Often political agendas are challenged within the search committee between members of the committee and the candidates as chemistry, point of view, and educational philosophy come face-to-face with the institution's values assumed in the process. To candidates, this stage—in the form of interviews—can become very psychologically demanding. As a result, the pinnacle of the process (the selection) surrounds the chemistry between the committee and the candidate within the scope of the values of the institution. Thus, chemistry ultimately becomes the final deciding factor in selecting a president.

As with the other presidents offering oral histories, this president also concluded that the search and selection process which brought him to the campus was well organized and administered. Confidentiality was a major factor in the search and selection process. In fact, the president complained somewhat at the lengths at which the institution went to preserve confidentiality. Meetings with the search committee and the board were scheduled in secret locations.
The president wanted to meet informally with faculty, staff, and students. However, the interviews and all contacts with the institution were done through the search committee. Personal meetings were limited to a small group of trustees and faculty representatives.

The president also noted that the use of a consultant was seen as very beneficial to the process. From a candidate's perspective (one who was initially reluctant to apply for the position) the consultant was instrumental. The consultant subtly persuaded him to apply for the position and suggested the mutual benefits of the presidency for his career and the future of the institution. Hence, consultants are important recruiting tools as well as assistants to search committees and governing boards.

Furthermore, the president mentioned that his spouse was very well accommodated in the search and selection process and in the contract negotiation stage. With so many two career relationships, both the president and the spouse must be accommodated officially in the contract. Particularly for the spouse, the duties assigned to the person require tangible means of support. Accommodations must be made to permit the spouse to pursue his or her own career path while fulfilling the usual obligations as one-half of the presidential team. Specifically, the president suggested all institutions of higher education must make a concerted effort to involve and support the spouse. The
governing board must see the presidency as a team effort when the president is married and accommodate the interests of the spouse and incorporate those interests on and off campus.

Conclusions

Together, the presidents offer a unique point of view in analyzing the search and selection process. The opportunity to apply for a new presidency is an important career move. The presidents seemed interested in seeking positions that present new challenges. None of the presidents shied away from any of the significant organizational dilemmas facing the institutions at the outset of their presidencies.

As for the search and selection process itself, the presidents were pleased overall with the effectiveness of the processes which brought them to their respective campuses. However, two central concerns were obvious. First, search and selection processes can become too long resulting in the candidates becoming impatient and tense about their status. Regular communications from the institution to the candidates seem the key to alleviating, or at least lessening, tension. Second, confidentiality is of paramount importance to candidates. In order for the
candidates to allow their names to be placed in the applicant pool, they need assurances that their identities will not be divulged. Their anonymity must be preserved as long as possible. Leaks of confidentiality may negatively affect the candidates' status in their current positions possibly causing them to drop out of a search and selection process. Not only are confidentiality leaks potentially injurious to candidates, but they are also dysfunctional to the search and selection process. Leaks, resulting in the loss of highly experienced candidates, lead to a depleted candidate pool—depleted both in number and in overall quality.

Who has responsibility to provide regular communication to candidates and to preserve confidentiality? The presidents suggest that these issues must be priorities for the search committee. But, the first efforts in addressing these issues must come from the governing board. The board is the legal entity which is charged with the hiring of a new president; and hence, must be aware of the needs of the candidates as well as the needs of the institution. It is the board's responsibility to instruct the search committee to carry out the search and selection process properly by being sensitive to the needs of the candidates.

The observations in this chapter made by the presidents are consistent with those offered in Porter (1983) in, "The Presidential Search As the Presidents See It." From the
presidents' perspectives, an effective search and selection process involves treating the candidates with courtesy. Courteous treatment includes receiving continuous communication about the search from the search committee and preserving the candidates' confidentiality throughout the process.

The search guides look at the search and selection process through the eyes of governing board members. As such, the guides provide only a partial image of the complexities and pressures which surround the process. The guides do not analyze the search and selection process from all sides, in that the perspectives of the candidates are left out. For example, all the search guides offer techniques for dealing with the issue of confidentiality, but they do not comprehensively address why this issue is important or what can be expected when confidentiality is breached. Including the viewpoints of college and university presidents would make the search guides more complete and creditable.

Section 7: Connections to the Presidency

Many of those offering oral histories responded to a question concerning the connections between the search and selection process and the overall issue of presidential
leadership. They were asked: "How does the search and selection process relate either directly or indirectly to the issue presidential leadership?" In essence, "How does an effective hiring procedure relate to an effective presidency?" The responses were extremely interesting.

All of the respondents, with the exception of one search committee member, saw distinct connections between an effectively administered search and selection process and a successful presidency. A search committee member (Anonymous, 1990b) was awed by the importance of the search and selection process as it relates to a successful presidency. The individual considered the relationship strong and direct. Another search committee member (Anonymous, 1990k) stated that a good search and selection process in an environment of goodwill between the constituencies with the search and selection process can result in the selection of an excellent president. According to this person, the key to developing a good process and to getting the presidency off to a good start is to begin with a unified set of institutional goals.

Trustees reiterated much the same sentiment. One trustee (Anonymous, 1990j) contended that an effective search and selection process directly related to effective presidential leadership. The trustee noted, however, that the process can only set up an atmosphere of mutual support between the board and the new president. Once the president
is in office there is always the chance that a surprise can occur. Yet, this possibility should never overwhelm the thinking of the board. The board must have confidence in the process, in those involved with it, and with the product of the process, the new president. If the environment is supportive and if the arrival of the new president is considered as a new start for the institution, then the presidency would in almost all instances be productive and successful. Another trustee (Anonymous 19901), who is a professional search consultant by trade, sees the search and selection process and the presidency in a one-to-one relationship. As with the previous insight, the trustee/consultant suggests that if the atmosphere of the process is one of institutional renewal and the process is looked upon by the campus and those directly involved in it as positive, then the presidency would certainly be off to a good start.

Still another trustee (Anonymous, 1990g) sees the relationship this way: The search and selection process, organized well, can set up a strong foundation for the presidency to follow. Though the process is often a "song and dance," if it can facilitate the proper climate for the new president to serve, then the process has been successful.
The presidents also echoed these feelings. One president (Anonymous, 1990a) stated that a well organized search and selection process will attract the most appropriate candidates. If the committee and the board are aware of the importance of seeking only those who will produce decisive leadership, then the process is a success and will result in an effective presidency. In essence, an institution cannot expect the product of the process (the presidency) to be successful if the process is flawed. Another president (Anonymous, 1990d) saw it this way. If the institution's constituencies have a level of confidence and integrity in the search and selection process, and if these groups are willing to be lead, then this is the key to starting off an effective presidency. Trust in the new president can come, at least initially, from an effective search and selection process.

The above insights and perspectives about the relationship between the search and selection process and an effective president are quite consistent: A properly organized and administered search and selection process can promote an environment for effective presidential leadership. Of those responding to this question, only one individual felt differently. A search committee member (Anonymous, 1990h) noted that a committee or a board can never know how the person chosen as president will behave once in office. There will always be a certain level of
uncertainty until long after the office is occupied whether the process was ultimately a success. In this person's opinion, an effectively managed search and selection process can help, but it provides no assurances in this regard.

Section 8: Private Versus Public Searches

Specific respondents were asked what differences exist between search and selection processes in the private and public sector. A search committee member (Anonymous, 1990j) at a private institution stated that there are two distinctions between public and private search and selection processes. The first distinction is that public searches are impacted so much more by external influences; namely state government. Governmental involvement in the search and selection process is ensured through laws such as Affirmative Action and Equal Employment Opportunity Guidelines and Sunshine Legislation. When asked why these laws would not impact the private sector as significantly, the committee member responded they do; however, the monitoring mechanisms within state government are geared primarily to public searches. The private sector colleges and universities must follow Affirmative Action and Equal Employment Opportunity guidelines (the search in which this individual participated generated several women and other
minority candidates), yet the state government does not monitor private institutions as closely.

A trustee reiterated (Anonymous, 19901) this insight by commenting that public institutions of higher education experience many external constraints that the private institutions do not. The guidelines and laws introduced above are expressions of societal values that the government expects public institutions to incorporate in their hiring procedures. As a result, public institutions are very much influenced by and responsive to their external environment—significantly more so than their counterparts in the private sector.

The issue of Sunshine Legislation is a prime example of governmental influences in public higher education. The trustee noted that the expectation that search processes be open to public inspection and involvement results in many public searches being at a distinct disadvantage to their counterparts in the private sector. Many well qualified candidates will opt not to have their names put into nomination at public institutions for fear that their candidacy will be made public too early, doing damage to them in their present positions. The trustee claimed this circumstance negatively affects leadership in public higher education overall. Unfortunately, many aspiring presidents (and particularly standing presidents) avoid public searches and direct their career paths toward the private sector—
where the search and selection processes can permit a higher degree of confidentiality. A president of a private institution (Anonymous, 1990i) echoed these sentiments and provided a specific example in a search at a public institution near his campus. As an outside observer, the president contended that the search at the state institution was too public. The word was out within the potential pool of candidates, that even though the institution was making every effort to preserve confidentiality, leaks were a distinct possibility due to the state's prevailing Sunshine Laws and an overly interested local press. Consequently, many well qualified potential candidates did not have their names entered into nomination. According to the president, as the search and selection process continued at least one prime candidate dropped out of the process because confidentiality leaks were occurring. The president's recollection of the search was that members within the search committee and the board were leaking names in the press so that top contenders would drop out early. The reason was to provide a candidate further down candidate the list (one with strong contacts to the institution's board) a better shot at the presidency. The respondent recalled these events with dismay and disappointment in the institution.
Thus, public higher education possesses more governmental constraints that influence the search and selection process than institutions in the private sector. These constraints make it more difficult for public institutions to gather and maintain a candidate pool and to determine their own destiny free of external influences. On the other hand, these constraints force public institutions to become more responsive to their external environments. For instance, Affirmative Action Guidelines force public colleges and universities to coordinate search and selection processes which are equitable to minority applicants. In this way, public higher education closely mirrors the values and mores of the society in general. Yet other laws, such as Sunshine Legislation, though appealing to the public's right to know about the functioning of any state-owned institution, can damage an institution's opportunity to secure effective executive leadership. Being responsive to the needs of the society is a double-edged sword.

Concerning politics in the search and selection process, the public search generated more political behavior and conflict than the private search, but the divisiveness of the politics between the search committee members in the public search did not seriously impede the search and selection process. Hence, it cannot be concluded with confidence that politics is more common in or potentially more detrimental to public institutions. As presented
earlier, politics seems to be more a product of institutional climate at the time a search takes place than a function of an institution's affiliations.

Section 9: Conclusion

Oral Histories and the Search Guides: Advice from Search Participants

All the respondents for this chapter were asked the following questions: "If you were writing a search guide to assist (trustees/search committee members) in hiring a president, what would you describe as the most important factors in ensuring a successful outcome? What advice or guidance would you give?" The responses to both questions were surprising and interesting.

A trustee (Anonymous, 1990g) advised that a search guide must describe how a board can bring about a sense of commitment toward a proactive search and selection process among the search committee members. In the trustee's view, commitment begins by having the committee to first agree on a unified set of institutional needs--one vision of what the institution is and where it wants to go. Second, a committee must relate these needs to a set of specific criteria for the selection of the new president. These
criteria (or characteristics) in the new president should complement the institutional needs and assist in bringing them to fruition. Another trustee (Anonymous, 1990j) explained that any guide for the search for and selection of a college or university president must propose that a timeline for the process be ironed out and agreed upon by the board and search committee well in advance of the commencement of the search process. Furthermore, all campus constituencies must be kept informed as the process develops and specific details about the progress of the search must be made available to all interested parties. The trustee also suggested that committees and governing boards must never lose sight of the fact that the search for a new president is not solely the board's or the faculty's responsibility. The search and selection process is a normal evolution for the entire campus. In this way, the search and selection process belongs to the institution, not just to one or two campus groups. The trustee's final bit of advice was that boards and committees must be expedient as possible in searching for and selecting a president.

An ex-officio trustee (Anonymous, 1990e) who participated directly in a search process as a secretary to the board suggested a guide must point out that the product of the process must be what is best for the institution—not for one campus sub-group. The hiring of a president must not be done to appease a particular segment of the academic
community but be in the best interests of the entire institution. Regarding the issue of politics, the trustee noted a guide should argue that prevailing tensions or hot issues be acknowledged, or better, addressed by the board early (preferably before the formation of the committee). The board must conceive of a plan to work with the political eventualities of the search and selection process. The board must be prepared not to shy away from fights, but know how to manage them effectively. The trustee's point was that the more the board and the committee can cooperate and unify their efforts toward facilitating the process, the better for the board, the committee, the candidates, and for the institution. Hence, lessening the effects of politics as an impediment to the process is a key to a successful search and selection process.

Another trustee (Anonymous, 19901) took a much different track toward the question. The individual stated that receiving quality assistance in the process was key to an effective search and selection process. This begins with the hiring of a consultant. The consultant can assist the board and the committee in developing needs, organizing the committee, and addressing the political struggles of the campus which can pop up in the process. The trustee suggested bringing the consultant in as early as possible, ideally before politics takes over. Also, the trustee stated that search guides must urge those involved in the
process to develop a timeline early and to stick to it. Furthermore, he claimed that searches often fail when either the board or the committee do not define needs, know where the institution is going, and understand the campus climate at the time the current president resigns. These dynamics can all influence the successful outcome of a search and selection process. A comprehensive search guide would provide advice in dealing with these dynamics.

Search committee members provided additional insights. One committee member (Anonymous, 1990f) noted the most important part of the search and selection process is maintaining an air of consistency between the interviews as the candidates visit the campus. By utilizing the same questions, meeting locations, and schedules, the candidates can be more effectively compared. Another search committee member (Anonymous, 1990b) advised, as many of the above individuals have done—know what you want, then precisely define characteristics in the new president, and if possible, list possible candidates who most closely match those characteristics. The committee member also addressed the politics of the process by cautioning that if certain search committee members represent a particular point of view they must watch out for dirty tricks. Also, the individual advised that it is better to select a president who is on the ascent professionally rather than to select "a known person."
Another committee member (Anonymous, 1990k) thought it advantageous for faculty representatives on the committee to be the advocates for the educational mission of the institution and allow the board to be concerned with the related issues of administrative style and fundraising. Effective management style and fundraising abilities will foster and support the educational mission. But, this committee member stressed the search committee members must be open to other points of view. Only committee members who are willing to be open to different perspectives and reach consensus without infighting and conflict can expect a successful search and selection process.

According to another committee member (Anonymous, 1990h), the format for the search and selection process must be as relaxed as possible. Committee meetings and the interaction between the committee and the board should be informal and cordial. Doing this promotes a sense of openness between the committee members and the board and fosters good feeling about the process and a team atmosphere. Also, establishing open lines of communication for the candidates is crucial in apprising these individuals of developments in the process in an expedient fashion. Finally, the committee member suggested that the committee must be representative of the various contingent groups interested in the search and selection process; namely, faculty, administrators, students, and board members. The
committee member argued representation on the committee must be balanced. In the search and selection process the committee member participated in the committee was, in this individual's opinion, overly represented by trustees. The committee member indicated that additional faculty members on the committee would have balanced the power structure within the group.

The presidents, too, had valuable insights. One president (Anonymous, 1990d) was emphatic in stating that above all, confidentiality must be maintained at all costs. Also, the president advised that the search for candidates be as proactive as possible by knowing what you are looking for and being open with the people you are interviewing. Furthermore, the president urged search committees and governing boards to be as forthright and honest as possible with the candidates as the process develops. Another important factor that search committees and governing boards must consider is how the relationship would end and negotiate it into the contract.

Also, the president contended the search is very much a two way street. As the search committee and the board are looking at candidates the candidates are looking at the institution. In order to attract and keep interested top candidates, the committee and board must look attractive and present a positive and exciting picture of the campus. The search and selection process is a chance for parties on both
sides of the table to "sell themselves" for their mutual benefit.

In the opinion of another president (Anonymous, 1990a), a well organized search will attract and continue to interest attractive candidates. Maintaining an effective search is then paramount in selecting the proper president. The president suggested a search committee or board cannot expect a good outcome when the process is flawed. If the campus is organizationally out of balance due to a lack of leadership, candidates may become reluctant to continue in the search and selection process. The campus community must look toward particular candidates as individuals who would restore the leadership balance on the campus.

The basic question to be ironed out at the beginning of the search, as one president concluded (Anonymous, 1990c), is how to incorporate the needs of the campus with the professional and personal needs of the candidate. Establishing this link will lead to an environment satisfactory to both the candidate and institution. Also, the president pointed out, some colleges and universities, due to their relative youth, have little institutional memory. They have no experience in coordinating a search and selection process since few presidents were hired in the past. Hence, consultants can assist in this regard by bringing to the committee and the board valuable advice and experience in organizing and administering a successful
search and selection process. Finally, the president suggested giving students and faculty more ownership in the process. Applications for the presidency should be open for all interested parties to inspect and compare. The president concluded ideas, opinions, and needs of the faculty and students must be the attended to honestly and with respect by the search committee and board throughout the process--right up to the end.

The recommendations presented above offer real-life perspectives into issues the search guides address; namely, needs development, consultants, and confidentiality. Other advice given consists of techniques for making the search and selection process more effective. For instance, interpreting information gained through interviews can be more easily analyzed when the interviews are consistent with one another (where the questions asked and individuals involved are similar throughout the process). Additionally, the recommendations made above which involve understanding the "sociology" of the search committee, (power structures derived from factionalism is a key dynamic of this sociology) could be included in the search guides in order to make them comprehensive.
Discussion

Chapter 3 has presented insights on all aspects of the search and selection process from those most closely involved with it—search committee members, trustees, and candidates. Though this analysis was extensive and expressed many points of view on each factor within the search and selection process, several important conclusions can be drawn:

Conclusion 1. Committee members, trustees, and presidents responded that the search guides are incomplete. In fact, one college president (Anonymous, 1990a) noted that the currently available search guides are totally of no value because they do not provide enough in depth analysis of many important factors within the search and selection process.

Conclusion 2. Institutional needs must be explored completely before a governing board and its search committee can embark on a search and selection process. Institutions as a whole must envision where they are, where they want to go, what the key problems facing the institution are (or will be), and then relate these needs to characteristics in a new president. It was suggested in a written commentary, (Kerr, 1984) and in the oral histories that many
institutions do not do this -- or perhaps it is done but not in any unified fashion involving all campus constituencies. The search and selection process is much more than the time to hire a new president. It marks a rare opportunity for a college or university to explore its current environment and plan for the future in an atmosphere of institutional renewal. As discussed earlier, a trustee (Anonymous, 1990) remarked that when a search and selection process is administered in an atmosphere of institutional renewal the product of the process will be, more than likely, appropriate and pleasing to the institution and to the new president.

Conclusion 3. One factor that seems to impede the development of a unified set of institutional needs and the atmosphere of renewal is divisive political behavior between the power factions within the search committee—namely the governing board members and the faculty. These behaviors seem to take several forms—controversy over which is the most powerful faction within the committee, which agenda is more important, a simple unwillingness to work together in an atmosphere of mutual goodwill, and subterfuge undermining candidates to boost the candidacy of others within the process itself (a.k.a. dirty tricks).

Politics is almost always looked at as a negative factor in the process. In fact, a trustee (Anonymous, 1990) who is also a private search consultant, will only
become involved in a search as a consultant early in the process before the politics takes over. Probably, no one would disagree that politics can impede a search process and is ever present within the process from beginning to end. But, how can it be managed and how can it be utilized to enhance the organizational process involved in hiring a college or university president?

A search committee member (Anonymous, 1990k) suggested to address as early as possible the political realities on the campus which potentially may have impact on the process. Get all pertinent issues out on the table and most importantly, promote open communication between the involved parties. This may need to be articulated first from the governing board so that the "outsiders" involved in the process (i.e.: any non-board member)--faculty, alumni, and students) are not immediately on the defensive and will not develop methods to counteract the perceived influence of the board over the process. Taking this initiative, a board most certainly would help in smoothing over some rough issues or at least indicate to the other parties that they are aware of their concerns. Also, the board will demonstrate that it is willing to discuss the issues openly and that it will incorporate the other groups' needs into the overall needs statement. The needs statement will then be the guide for the search and selection process.
Politics, if understood and managed, can enhance a search and selection process directly. Negotiation and consensus building can promote an atmosphere of constructive criticism and productive comparison from the analysis of individual applications, to the interviews, and to the final selection. These behaviors enable those involved to think more deeply about their needs and the institution's mutual needs and how each candidate relates to them. Discussions by members of the search committee should be honest, frank, and to the point. Any hidden agenda should be cast away. Honest comparison in this sense can unify a search committee even though individual groups represented in the committee may have slightly different conceptions of how qualifications match the institution's needs. This comparison, when done under these rules and in an environment of renewal, can be a significant enhancement to the search and selection process and to the institution overall.

Conclusion 4. Governing boards and search committees must be aware of the importance of maintaining confidentiality. Though assuring confidentiality may be more difficult in the public sector than in the private sector, mechanisms must be developed to provide confidential treatment for candidates. The necessity is clear, if potential candidates can be assured that their identities will not be divulged, then they would be freer to apply. As
stated earlier, Sunshine Laws open public searches, but make candidates unwilling or at least reluctant to apply. The result is a leadership dilemma for the more visible public institutions in some states. For these institutions, boards and search committee must develop methods to preserve confidentiality while following legislation that promotes openness. However this is handled, (meeting in off-campus locations or requesting interested parties to contact an institution's public relations office for the press releases and any specific information about the process), it must be done ethically and consistently. It has already been noted that leaks can cost institutions top candidates. Hence, preserving confidentiality in both the public and private sector is essential in developing an effective search and selection process.

**Conclusion 5.** For married presidents, the personal qualities, education, and professional experience of the spouse are key factors in the selection of a new president. The significance of the spouse must not be taken lightly. As noted above, candidates have been dropped from selections due to perceived unacceptable qualities of the spouse. Thus, knowing the spouse as well as a committee can is essential when hiring a presidential team. But with putting so much emphasis on the president's spouse comes the responsibility on the part of governing board to recognize the spouse in tangible ways in the contractual phase of the
process; and later, after the presidency begins by providing the spouse with the opportunity to impact that campus beyond the required social events and fundraisers. Formal acknowledgement must be given to the spouse by providing an acceptable level of staff and financial support in coordinating and presenting the scores of events which go on throughout the academic year. Also, acknowledgements and accommodations must be made for the spouse's unique professional qualifications or individual career. The oral histories clearly indicate, the spouse has an enormous impact on the success of a candidacy and then in the presidency. A college or university must formally support the spouse in a manner consistent with the time and effort expended in service to the institution.

Conclusion 6. In the final stages of the selection phase, assessment of the chemistry between a finalist and the search committee and governing board is crucial because it is the one factor which can be weighed when the experiences and credentials of all the finalists have been thoroughly compared and contrasted. In essence, the entire process ultimately boils down to a sense of "fit" between the candidate and the committee and board.

Two presidents (Anonymous, 1990a; Anonymous 1990d) responding to a question regarding the significance of personal chemistry between the candidates and those from the institution both stated they were amazed at its importance.
One president estimated that 50% of the entire decision rested on the proper fit between the finalists and the institution. The other president estimated that 75% of the selection of a new president boils down to the right chemistry. Again, when all the finalists are on an equal plain professionally, chemistry becomes the key comparative factor and ultimately a main criterion for selection (even though it is never articulated at the beginning of the search and selection process). A comprehensive search guide must point out that chemistry is an unquantifiable, unmeasurable, yet an essential dynamic within the process of selecting a new college or university president. Search committees and governing board must understand this fact early and be prepared to answer the tough question of "Who fits best?" as the process draws to a close.

Finally, two presidents (Anonymous, 1990a; Anonymous, 1990d) have voiced several key concerns (or outright complaints) about how institutions manage search and selection processes. Their insights are presented here as conclusions:

Conclusion 7. The presidents have suggested the processes are too long and drawn out. A comprehensive search guide must present mechanisms to streamline the search and selection process. Open and regular communication between the institution and each candidate is essential from the start. Due to inevitable delays, another
president (Anonymous, 1990i) considered the search and selection process brutal. The process promotes undue tensions when committee members and board take too long making decisions.

Conclusion 8. Governing boards which are, for whatever reason, unprepared when the search and selection process commences do a disservice to themselves, to their institutions, and to the candidates. Boards need guidance in how to keep to a timeline, manage politics effectively, and generally how to deal with this complex organizational function played out in an incredibly dynamic environment. One president (Anonymous, 1990a) articulated a key theme of this entire chapter. The president advised possible candidates not get involved in a search when it is determined the institution, board, faculty, or search committee are in disarray. No benefits can be derived from involvement in a search and selection process which is in a state of confusion. Also the president suggested, as others have, boards must define what the institution is and where it is going. From the answers to those questions the board must determine what the institution is looking for in a new president. Once this is accomplished, then an institution can embark on a search with a confidence in the process and with optimism for the future.
Hence, Chapter 3 has examined the search and selection from all sides: from the perspective of trustees, search committee members, and candidates. Also, Chapter 3 has compared and contrasted the search and selection process in the public and private sectors and has looked at the politics inherent in the process. It is clear from this analysis that the search and selection process is a lengthy, complex, and often ambiguous organizational function which is played out in an incredibly dynamic institutional environment. The search guides present the search and selection process as able to be administered in a rational, orderly, and well organized fashion. The discussion of the process offered in Chapter 3 indicates that the management of a search and selection process is more intricate, subtle, and potentially political in nature than the search guides suggests. Thus, understanding the sequential steps in the search and selection process, as implied in the search guides, tells only half the story. Administering a search and selection process properly requires an understanding of the dynamics of the process and of the interpersonal conflict which seem to be part and parcel to the process itself.
Footnotes

1 In both searches the "select list" comprised 10 candidates.

2 In this search, all finalists were male and married.
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CHAPTER 4: CONCLUSIONS

Introduction

Chapter 4 presents conclusions drawn from the data on the presidential search and selection process analyzed in the three preceding chapters. Based on these conclusions, recommendations are made for improving the effectiveness of the process of hiring a college or university president. Chapter 4 concludes with an examination of connections between the search and selection process in the broader issue of presidential leadership in higher education.

Chapter 4 is divided into six sections. Section 1 addresses conclusions on and recommendations for the early phases of the search and selection process. Also, Section 1 considers politics and conflict in the early phases of the search and selection process. Section 2 addresses gathering and screening the applicant pool, and the impact of politics and conflict in these phases. Section 3 examines the interview phase, the involvement of the spouse, confidentiality, and politics relative to these issues. Section 4 discusses the selection phase of the process and
the politics that can occur in making the choice, the announcement of the selection, and negotiating the new president's contract.

The two concluding sections consider the search and selection process in its broader contexts. Section 5 presents recommendations for improving the search and selection process by examining issues which can inhibit the effectiveness of the process if mishandled. Section 5 also discusses the overall value, comprehensiveness, and accuracy of the search guides. Finally, Section 6 offers concluding remarks about the search and selection process as it pertains to presidential leadership.

To develop a sense of closure, the research questions outlined in the proposal for this study will be re-introduced followed by the pertinent conclusion(s), discussion, and recommendations. Two issues, the Spouse and Confidentiality, are addressed throughout the chapter. The research questions for each issue will be noted as they are introduced in the text.

The conclusions and recommendations presented in Chapter 4 are based on the comparative analysis of the search guides, on written comments on the search and selection process, and on oral histories. The data gathered through this methodology describe probably most, if not all, potential problems and possible dynamics in search and selection processes. The conclusions and recommendations
offered are based on a composite image of the search and selection process. Hence, due to the nature to the study, caution must be applied when generalizing the conclusions and recommendations discussed in the following pages.

Section 1: The Early Phase of the Search and Selection Process.

Research Question: How are search committees organized? How large are they and which constituencies are represented on the committee—board members, faculty, students, and administrative personnel?

Conclusion: The most common method of organizing a search and selection process is through the development of a representative search committee. To maximize organizational efficiency, the size of the search committee should be small.

A governing board, upon receipt of a president's departure, must decide how to initiate the search for and selection of a new president. Some institutions have search and selection procedures set forth through the governing board itself. Others must rely on the experience of their members (and often from outside consultants) in organizing the process. For those institutions that must begin from scratch, it is important to decide how the process will be organized. Based on the tradition in American higher education for participatory democracy, the representative search committee is the most common route to follow. As
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pointed out by Nason (1984), search committees can take two
general forms. First, the group could take the form of a
search and selection committee. The committee searches for
and selects a new president with the governing board left to
review the decision and either approve or reject the
committee's choice. Second, the governing board may
organize a representative search committee whose job it is
to gather, screen, and interview a pool of candidates with
the end product being the generation of a list of finalists.
The list of finalists is then forwarded to the governing
board where one individual is selected from the list. Based
on the data introduced in Chapter 3, the latter form may be
effective in selecting a president, but the residual
negative effects for the search committee involving
exclusion from the selection phase, often makes this
organizational structure less than completely appropriate.
Recalling the insights of a search committee member
(Anonymous, 1990b) from the public search described in the
previous chapter, the committee's exclusion from selecting
the final candidate resulted in bad feelings on the part of
the search committee toward the board, no sense of closure
for the search committee, and left the group without a sense
of accomplishment overall.
The representative search committee includes members of all major campus constituencies, faculty, students, administrators, and trustees. The representatives of these groups within the committee must develop a sense of ownership over the search and selection process and connection toward the new president. Hence, permitting the search committee to select its nominee from the list of finalists seems essential for the acceptance of the new president on the campus—at least initially. For this reason, Nason's first technique of organizing the search committee is preferred. Appointing one committee to gather screen, interview and make the choice will permit the committee to receive a sense of closure and accomplishment. Also, the campus in total will be more likely to support a new president selected from a representative search committee as opposed to a governing board who it may be felt does not reflect the diverse interests and opinions of the campus community.

However, the governing board is the group holding the legal responsibility for hiring the new president. It is the board which organizes the search committee and is charged with monitoring and evaluating its progress. Although the representative search committee should be given ownership over the search and selection process, only the board can make the final selection.
The size of the search committee is an important issue as well. McLaughlin and Riesman's (1985) research revealed that search committees are generally too large and that attempting to make committees more representative of the campus community increases the size of the committees even more. Committees of 25 or 30 members, noted as the extreme in their research, increase the likelihood of the process becoming unwieldy and increasing the potential for leaks of confidentiality. McLaughlin and Riesman, recommend much smaller committees, as do Nason (1984), Garrison, (1989), and Marchese (1989). The range of the recommended size for a search committee revealed through these individuals' research is 5-8 members. The main question, then, for a governing board, at this stage in the process is, "How can we keep a committee small enough to keep it efficient, but at the same time maintain representativeness?" Certainly, faculty and trustees must be involved. These are two essential groups to be recognized because they have the most stock in the successful outcome of the process. Thus, the backbone of the committee should be made up of these groups. It may be recalled that in Chapter 3, a search committee member (Anonymous, 1990b) claimed that the search committee in the public search was weighted heavily toward trustees making the faculty contingent steadfast in counteracting the trustee's influence over the process. Furthermore, the most common origin of political struggles within the search
committee emanates from conflict between the faculty and trustees. For this reason it is recommended, that even within a small committee of 5-8 members, the faculty and trustee representatives be equal in number. For example, if a committee is to consist of seven members, it would be wise to appoint two faculty representatives and two trustees to the committee. In this way the influence of these two (potentially) rival groups would be counter-balanced. The three remaining slots on the committee would constitute independent representatives. For instance, a student representative could be appointed as can one each from alumni and the administration. These independent representatives would offer excellent third perspectives and would temper the decisions made by the two majority groups—faculty and trustees.

Selection of the search committee members should be done in a decentralized fashion. As suggested by Kauffman (1974) boards are urged to permit faculty, alumni, and administrators, to select their own representatives to the search committee. This gives each group a sense of ownership over the decision of who will be the representative and promotes a sense of fairness and autonomy within the groups.

The board as well may appoint several of its members as representatives to the search committee. Board members on the search committee will participate in the search and
selection process along with the representatives from the faculty, students, and administrative ranks. Also, the board members will report the search committee's progress back to the full board. Approval of all members of the search committee may be done by the governing board.

Upon their first meeting, the search committee members must become acquainted with one another. An ice breaking experience, (for example an informal reception), may be helpful in linking names with faces, setting the stage for beginning the search and selection process by unifying the group's diverse assemblage. The second point of business for the search committee is to appoint a chairperson. Often the chairperson is appointed by the board, but if it is a goal to allow the committee ownership of the process, the committee should permitted to select its own leader. A leader may emerge naturally from the ice breaker activity, or one may be nominated from within the committee itself. Whether the chairperson emerges or is determined through a formal nomination process, the search committee must select someone who is completely committed to the success of the search and selection process and is willing to lead the committee in an impartial and unbiased fashion. The chairperson must be well organized and have a keen awareness of the political environment of the campus and how this climate may impact the search process. The chairperson must also be aware of the potential for conflict and be able to
identify when conflict changes from productive debate to unproductive arguments impeding the search and selection process. Hence, the chair's role is tough, but essential.

The relationship between the board and the search committee must also be considered early in the process. Kauffman (1974) states that the search committee is not an independent group but one working under the auspices of the governing board. The board is solely responsible for defining the role of the committee and its members. Yet, the board must have confidence in the functioning of the committee and rely heavily on the combined expertise of its members. The relationship between the board and the search committee should be symbiotic in nature. The board will be able to make a better decision on the final ratification of the selected candidate when it receives valuable information from the committee. The board should not attempt to interfere or divert the direction of the committee's progress. On the other hand, the committee must realize that the board and only the board is solely responsible for the selection of the new president. The committee must respect the board's role in the process. The committee members must understand that their job is to search for and select a new president on behalf of the board and for the entire institution. Thus, the authority of the board must be respected. Communication between the board and the committee must be regular and productive and the
relationship between the board and the committee must be constructive.

Assessing Institutional Needs

Research Question: What factors are considered when developing an institutional needs statement relative to hiring a president? How do these factors influence the criteria for the selection of the president?

Conclusion: Before commencing the search and selection process, institutional needs relative to the presidency should be determined.

As Marchese (1989) contends, assessing the institution's needs provides the search committee and the board of trustees the opportunity to rethink the vacancy in terms of the future needs of the institution. This task, however, is not limited to the committee and the board. In the example of the public search described in Chapter 3, the entire academic community, including students, faculty, trustees, and alumni took part in suggesting needs relative to where the institution should go in the near future. The needs identified through this process were incorporated into an overall needs statement from which selection criteria for the new president were developed.
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Nason (1984) recommends that institutional needs be projected 10 years into the future for the institution. Though this advice seems sound, it does not take into account the different opinions of the various campus and constituencies how they may see the needs and direction of the institution in varying ways. McArthur's (1989) analysis of the search and selection process which brought Robert Maynard Hutchins to the University of Chicago provides a case in point. The faculty saw the university as continuing its emphasis in research whereas the administration and trustees were interested in beefing up the undergraduate college. These competing goals created a conflicting environment within the search committee.

Conflict can be decreased when goals are unified. The case of the private search discussed in Chapter 3 is a prime example and implies that a unified set of institutional goals can make a search and selection process less ambiguous, less divisive, and will result in a decrease in conflict and politics among committee members, and among committee members and trustees. However, the private search examined in this study and the 1929 University of Chicago search indicate that successful search processes can be conducted with or without a unified set of goals, in that, conflict does not preclude the effective search for and selection of a new president. Conflicting opinions about the future direction of the institution as they pertain to
the selection of a new president may, however, make the process longer and cause frustrations on the part of committee members, trustees, and candidates. If an institution does not know what it is or what it wants to become, the lack of a clear identity and clear institutional goals will have at least some impact on the search and selection process. However, a key point suggested by a trustee cited in Chapter 3 (Anonymous, 1990i), is an institution of higher education to should enter into the search and selection process in an atmosphere of excitement and institutional renewal. And, as Bolman (1968) declares, a search with a clearer purpose will be potentially more successful when needs are unified.

Institutional needs and goals relative to the search process also must be realistic. Garrison (1989) states that many institutions enter into a search for a new president with a set of selection criteria which are unrealistic—in that no candidate would come close to approximating the qualifications set forth by the search committee. Hence, it is recommended that selection criteria realistically portray the institution's needs relating to qualities and experiences new presidents should possess. Moreover, all goals and needs must also be operationalized. For instance, if a goal is to improve faculty relations with the selection criterion being to select a recognized scholar, the term 'recognized scholar' must be defined. The board and search
committee must determine what 'recognized scholar' means in terms of the institution and of the search for a new president. For example, the term could be defined as someone who has published and taught in one academic discipline. This definition provides greater detail and a clearer idea of the characteristics a potential president should have.

Kerr (1984) indicates that goals must be well defined, yet, projecting the future direction of a college or university in terms of goals is often overshadowed by the enormous task of conducting a search and selection process. For this reason, it is recommended that defining needs, goals, and the resulting selection criteria be a prime early task of the search committee. The governing board may initiate a goal developing process upon notification of the vacancy and hand the process over to the search committee when the committee is organized. With all the organizational details and potential conflicts to manage, perhaps the earliest stages of the process should be set aside to formalize institutional goals. The board and committee can work in tandem to sample the academic community in gathering needs for the institution. Even if differing goals and needs emerge from this process, the task would certainly at least be meaningful (if not unifying) for the campus. Defining needs and goals in this way would enhance ownership and acceptance in the search and selection
process on the part of those not closely involved with it; namely, rank-and-file faculty, students, administrators, and alumni.

Charging the Search Committee

Conclusion: The search committee should receive a detailed charge from the governing board before commencing the search and selection process.

As Nason (1984) suggests, an important but often overlooked portion of the early stages of the search and selection process is for the board to charge the search committee with the task at hand--to search for and select a new president. The charge must be as detailed as possible. Important factors in the charge to the committee are a set timeline for the process; a formal list of the institutional needs, goals, and selection criteria; the organization of the process; and the expected end product (e.g.: the submission of one name to the board for consideration). The charge to the search committee must be communicated to the search committee prior to gathering applications for the position. The charge may be in document form so that the committee members can refer to it as the search and selection process develops. However, a verbal charge may suffice. The intent of this task is to make the search committee members mindful of the timeline, the selection
criteria, and the overall goals of the search and selection process.

Consultants

Research Question: What benefits can be derived from utilizing an outside search consultant firm? What are the caveats to hiring consultants?

Conclusion: Search consultants can be extremely helpful in facilitating an effective search and selection process. However, certain caveats must be understood.

A final issue to resolve at the early phase of the search and selection process is whether or not the institution should hire a private outside consultant to assist in the process. McLaughlin and Riesman (1984) have stated that consultants can be extremely helpful to governing boards and search committees when board or committee members are inexperienced in the search and selection process. Yet, they caution, consultants can, if not supervised, take control of a search and selection process, leaving the board and committee with little authority over the final selection of president. This may also result in a lack of confidence in the final choice from the campus community because the selection was not done by the institution's personnel, but rather by an outsider.
Thus, if a consultant is to be hired, the board and search committee must consider the following factors before making the decision to hire a consultant. First, know the cost. Stead (1983) noted that his search consulting firm charges upwards of $15,000 for its services. If the budget for the search and selection process does not include these monies, the inclusion of the consultant in the process would be disadvantageous. Also, costs of the search and selection process must be kept under control. Second, bring in the consultant early. A trustee (Anonymous, 1990i) who is a consultant by trade and who was cited in Chapter 3, stated that it is important for boards and search committees to involve the consultant early in the process preferably before politics takes over. Along with this suggestion is the recommendation that the role of the consulting firm be defined prior its direct involvement in the process. For instance, if it is determined that the consultant is to be hired to assist with the gathering and screening of the applicant pool, a written statement to this effect must be agreed upon by the consultant and the institution before the process begins. Third, as Touchton (1989) recommends, before a consultant is hired the board must determine if the members of the search committee have sufficient experience in administering searches of this type. Making this determination would, then, predicate the hiring of a consultant. Finally, if a consultant is hired, the board
must communicate in no uncertain terms that the board is solely responsible for the management of the search and selection process. The consultant's role is to assist and advise the board and the search committee, not to take charge of the entire process. Final approval to move ahead with the consultant's recommendations must be agreed upon by institutional entities—the board and search committee.

Section 2: Collecting and Screening the Pool of Applicants

Research Question: How is a pool of applicants gathered and which seem to be the most prevalent methods of developing this group?

Gathering the Applicant Pool

Conclusion: Gathering a pool of top applicants requires that the search committee to develop a creative and comprehensive plan of action.

Kauffman (1974) states that an expansive search for candidates requires a strategy to generate interest in the presidency and in the institution. Therefore, a search committee should engage in an active process of gathering candidates for the pool. A common falsehood intimated in some of the search guides (Nason, 1984; Kauffman, 1974) is
that boards and search committees need only place a notice in a newspaper or trade journal and applications will flock in from all over the country. Though this technique is quick and may generate many applications, the overall quality of the pool may be questionable. As a result, Nason (1984) and Marchese (1989) suggest an active strategy in gathering applicants for a presidency. Beyond publicizing the opening in journals, such as the Chronicle of Higher Education, and daily newspapers, such as the New York Times, a search committee must also seek nominations for candidacies in the search process from alumni, faculty, state government representatives, and from presidents at peer institutions. Furthermore, the institution should aggressively pursue potential candidates felt to be top quality educators even though they may not be initially interested in the position. A college president (Anonymous, 1990e) cited in Chapter 3 notes that consultants are particularly adept in subtly persuading potential candidates (particularly standing presidents) to apply. For individuals initially reluctant, Porter (1983) states that their hesitation stems from confidentiality concerns and the fear of making a full commitment too early. Likewise, Kauffman (1980) points out many potential candidates are not interested in the position since they are comfortable and effective in their present positions. Therefore, gathering nominations becomes difficult. How can these individuals be
encouraged to apply? Kauffman suggests that prime candidates, not necessarily interested in the position at the start, be allowed to informally enter their name into nomination. If their name would be divulged, the candidate could then deny making a formal application while learning more about the institution and having the opportunity to gauge the search committee's seriousness about the candidacy. In essence, this technique provides the institution and the candidate the chance to learn more about each other without making formal commitments on either side.

A strategy for gathering an applicant pool must also be comprehensive. Both internal and external candidates must be able to apply. Kauffman (1974) contends opening the search to the largest number of potential candidates possible includes accepting nominations for internal candidates. The advantage of this technique is to attract the most potential leaders from the largest pool possible.

Often, the necessity for a search occurs so suddenly or the demand for quick resolution is so immediate, that a comprehensive search may be inappropriate. Bennis (1973) presents a worthy alternative. Time and energy can be saved when, either the search is limited to a specific geographic region (i.e.: Bennis' Limited Canvas) or an institution uses names of presidential candidates turned down at recent searches at similar institutions. These two techniques would be beneficial in saving valuable time; however, a
comprehensive approach seems to be best if time is less of a factor in the search and selection process.

Perceptions of who should comprise the applicant pool is an important factor. As a search committee member stated in Chapter 3 (Anonymous, 1990b) the public institution did not possess a completely realistic vision of who would be appropriate as president. As a result, members of the search committee spent considerable time nominating individuals who were inappropriate for the search. For instance, the search committee member claimed that the search committee hoped to attract applicants from much larger universities. However, the search committee member contended that the best candidates were found when the committee scanned institutions of similar size. Also, the search committee generated names of individuals who were obvious non-contenders--e.g.: those who were managers in some capacity but who had no experience in higher education. Generating these names prolonged the screening process and may have implied that the institution really did not know what it wanted in a president (an issue which goes back to the discussion of institutional needs and goals as they pertain to the search and selection process). Therefore, before a search committee can begin to gather a pool of applicants the committee and the institution must know what sort of individual it wants. The committee should identify candidates who realistically meet the needs identified
earlier in the process. The candidate pool should not be a
dream list of individuals but a true to life representation
of the type of leadership the institution needs for the next
stage in its development.

Screening the Applicant Pool

Research Question: What methods are available to
screen the applicants?

Conclusion: The search committee must develop a
detailed plan for screening the applicant pool. The
screening process is time consuming and can generate
conflict between search committee members.

The purpose of screening the applicant pool is to
narrow the roster of names to a list of finalists who will
be invited to campus for an interviews. Nason (1984) notes
the screening process could take two to three months.
Before the screening process commences, the search committee
must have a plan developed as to how the pool will be
narrowed. A plan for screening the applicant pool should
have two aims. First, the plan must indicate how the pool
will be winnowed and how many stages of comparison will be
necessary to come up with a list of finalists. For example,
the first phase of screening could drop any obvious non-
contender. The goal here would be to limit the pool to 15-
20 semi-finalists. Next, this group would be screened and narrowed again to the finalist list of, say, 6-8 names—individuals who will be invited to campus for interviews. Also, the search committee must develop a plan to attack how the committee will screen the applications. Two common techniques are to have one committee screen all applications en mass and then split into separate committees for in-depth analyses of equal shares of the pool. (This is the plan used in the private search outlined in Chapter 3.) Alternatively, the search committee could be sub-divided at the outset of the screening process with equal shares of the pool given to each group upon the beginning of this phase. For this technique to be implemented effectively, Nason (1984) notes, that a high degree of trust is required between search committee members. The committee members' willingness to accept each other's opinions on the viability of each application is essential. Other techniques are described in Chapter 1. However the search committee decides to screen the applications, a plan should be determined and agreed upon prior to the beginning of the screening procedure.

Beyond the nuts and bolts of the screening process there are several special considerations to incorporate into the structure of analyzing the applicant pool. First of these is to acknowledge Affirmative Action guidelines throughout the process. As pointed out by Kauffman (1974),
before screening actually occurs, the committee must scan
the pool to determine if there are acceptable numbers of
blacks, Hispanics, and women in the pool. If the numbers of
these groups are not satisfactory, then additional names
must be gathered. Monitoring for a cultural and racial mix
should continue throughout the screening process.

Second, as Nason (1984) contends, written letters of
suggests letters of reference lack a 'real world' view.
These documents are often written for the benefit of the
candidate rather than for the search committee. Hence,
analysis of references is of little value. As a worthy
replacement, telephone contacts are suggested. Nason states
that it is wise to contact individuals on each candidate's
home campus to receive their insights on the acceptability
of the candidate as a potential president. These
conversations are generally more reliable and valid than
written references and provide fresher information since
they are timed to the search and they are spontaneous--
addressing specific needs of the search committee. One
caution, however, should be kept in mind when utilizing this
technique: Telephone contacts may lead to leaks of
confidentiality (possibly the most significant impediment to
managing an effective search and selection process). To
avoid confidentiality leaks, prior to making telephone calls
to the candidates' campuses, the search committee should
contact each candidate and ask permission. Also, receiving an O.K. from the candidate to contact individuals on the home front indicates the person's sincere interest in acquiring the new position. The implication is, if the candidate agrees to permit the search committee to make inquiries on the home campus, the candidate must be seriously interested in obtaining the position. Third, as the pool is screened candidates are dropped fairly quickly.

It is possible to overlook or prematurely cut an attractive candidate. Thus, as argued by Marchese (1989) and Bolman (1968), committee members should be permitted to recommend one "dark horse" candidate for additional consideration. The "dark horse" technique can prevent a search committee from inadvertently overlooking someone with great potential.

Also, on-going research into candidates' backgrounds must occur. According to Garrison (1989), the screening process is, in his judgement, a "living process." Data pertaining to each candidate is gathered and incorporated into the process as it unfolds. Analyses of the candidates are developing throughout the screening process. The search committee must be prepared to utilize this new information as it becomes available. The information includes written descriptions of the candidates' backgrounds gathered from national publications such as Who's Who and from analysis of each candidate's professional writing. Valuable data can
also be collected from conversations with those knowledgeable of the candidates professional and personal qualities. The search committee must adapt to new information on candidates as it becomes available and rearrange any preliminary rankings of the candidates accordingly.

As mentioned in Chapter 3, politics and conflict are very common in the screening phase as factions within the search committee exercise their influence in promoting who they feel are top contenders within the pool of applicants. Though politics and conflict are inevitable and can enhance the screening process when managed correctly, the chair of the search committee must know when these activities become impediments to the process. The goal is for conflict to result in consensus (a consensus building exercise) as the pool is screened and narrowed. Conflict, in this form, is proactive—enhancing the functioning of the committee and the end product of the screening process.

However, as mentioned by a search committee member (Anonymous, 1990b) cited in Chapter 3, politics can create undo tension, frustrations, pressures, and extend the screening procedure beyond its designated time limit. It is inevitable that factions will develop within the search committee—usually between the faculty and trustee representation over dominance of the process. Politics and conflict are natural developments within any group decision.
making activity. The search committee member recalled politics and conflict becoming a major stumbling block in the screening process. An observant and assertive chairperson could most certainly lessen the dysfunctional aspects of these behaviors.

The chairperson of the search committee is solely responsible for managing the conflict and attempting to build consensus within the group. The key for managing politics and conflict successfully is to manage through strong leadership, adhering to the goals of the search and the time line set forth at the beginning of the process. Also, the committee chairperson must exercise influence over the search committee to push the process along when the conflicts become dysfunctional and begin to divert the goals of the search and selection process. The chair should also be aware that subterfuge (circumventing the process) or dirty tricks are possible particularly when the factions within the search committee are extremely adamant about their positions. The chairperson must supervise the screening process carefully and scan and evaluate the search committee members' behavior without becoming intrusive. Unacceptable activities can result in search committee members doubting the validity of the group's decision and questioning the authority of the chair. Unchecked subterfuge known by the members of the search committee can put the search and selection process in doubt resulting in a
potential lack of acceptance of the end product—the new president.

The gathering and screening of the applicant pool are essential aspects of the search and selection process. The search guides describe them as preliminarily procedural in nature. Certainly, much of the gathering and screening requires going through a series of organizational steps. However, as it is described above, the process is much more ambiguous and the environment within the search committee much more dynamic than the search guides convey. Understanding how to gather and screen applicants comprehensively in a proactive environment is a key factor in ensuring a successful search and selection process.

Section 3: Interviews, the Spouse, and Confidentiality

Interviewing Candidates

Research Question: How are interviews conducted? Who participates in the interviews?

Conclusion: Interviews should be well organized and be viewed as a recruiting tool as well as a means of evaluating candidates. Respect for the needs of the candidates is essential in the interview process.
Interviewing candidates usually takes two forms. First, a search committee may offer initial interviews to serious contenders—those who made the second cut in the screening process. These interviews are often scheduled for one day for the 10 or so individuals to visit representatives of the search committee on campus or, at a specified off-campus location. Both searches described in Chapter 3 utilized this method. In the case of the public institution, initial interviews were scheduled on campus where the candidates met with various campus groups in a variety of settings. On the other hand, the private institution coordinated a series of initial interviews at an off campus location (a hotel). The intent of the initial interviews in both search and selection processes was the same—for the committee to meet, face-to-face the semi-finalists, to receive a preliminary impression of their professional presentation, poise, and interpersonal manner. The initial interviews also provided another tool of comparison for the search committees in narrowing their fields to three finalists who would then be interviewed at length on the campuses. In essence, initial interviews provide additional comparative data in the screening process and indicate how seriously interested each semi-finalist is in the position.
Second, once the pool is narrowed to a list of finalists, these individuals are invited back to the campus for marathon interviews. During this series of interviews the candidate and spouse (if married) are interviewed separately and together in a number of settings with representatives from various campus constituencies. These constituencies include faculty, students, alumni, administrators, and even, in the case of public institutions, state representatives.

The purposes of the interviews are to look for a sense of "fit" between the candidate and the institution, to evaluate analytical skills and poise, to answer any questions the candidate may have, and to sell the institution. It is during the interview phase that the personalities of the candidates become important. As a president (Anonymous, 1990e) noted in Chapter 3, when qualifications and experiences are equal, the main factor for comparison to be determined in the interview stage (and later in the selection phase) is chemistry -- or the sense of "fit" referred to earlier.

The format of the individual interview sessions can vary based on the needs of the search committee and the particular campus constituency involved. It is wise to provide the candidates the opportunity to respond to questions at a campus-wide session. Also, opportunities should be scheduled for the candidates to meet with
individual departments, student groups, and administrators. If possible, as mentioned by a president (Anonymous, 1990c) cited in Chapter 3, it is beneficial for the candidate to meet the outgoing president. The line of questions in the interviews should be as consistent as possible, particularly for the search committee. Consistency in the questions asked is important because it permits the search committee to more easily compare the candidates' responses.

Furthermore, Marchese (1989) and Bolman (1968) recommend, as finalists are interviewed by their prospective campus, teams of search committee members should travel to the candidates' current campuses to interview individuals the candidates work with on a daily basis. The purpose of the campus visits is to gain further insights into the professional style and personal attributes of the finalists from those who are working with them directly. This technique was used in the private search described in Chapter 3. A search committee member (Anonymous, 1990g) considered the campus visits very valuable in that they rendered excellent comparative data about the finalists. Prior to making the campus visits, the consent of each finalist must be received. The person must understand that at this stage in the process his or her status as a finalist can no longer be kept confidential. Agreeing to the campus visit will indicate the finalist's sincere interest in the position.
Each finalist must also formally meet with the governing board so that board members may get a chance to interview each person prior to making the selection. If the search committee's goal is to forward three names to the board for selection (vote), the board may not need to interview the candidates a third time. Doing this wastes time and increases the finalists' level of tension. A president (Anonymous, 1990c) cited in Chapter 3, declared a third and separate campus interview with the board is a wasteful and purposeless activity. Preferably, the board may interview the finalist within the marathon interview schedule, to question the person directly, rather than relying on opinions and hear-say depictions of the individual (without, then, requiring the finalist to return to the campus for a third time). Providing the board an opportunity to meet each finalist during the marathon interview will assist the members in making their analysis of the finalists in a more well informed fashion. Hence, the board will be able to make a more knowledgeable decision in the selection phase.

Along with these recommendations, certain caveats must be noted. Porter's (1983) research indicates presidents contend that interviews are less purposeful than they should be because their goal is to explore interpersonal chemistry between the search committee, board, and campus in general. In other words, the interviews may, though not specifically
a stated goal, overly consider the "fit" between the finalists and the board, committee, and institution, rather than exploring the finalists' records of accomplishment and experiences as they pertain to the position.

Also, the interview phase is where the search and selection process gets serious. Candidates must choose whether to continue in the process or drop out. If they chose to continue, they must realize that assuring confidentiality is more difficult because their candidacy (through their appearance on the campus) will be out in the open—at least to the campus constituencies. Additionally, as suggested earlier in this chapter, the interview phase is as much a recruiting tool as it is a screening mechanism. Candidates involved in the interviews must be serious about their participation in the process; likewise, the institutional representatives must indicate that they are seriously interested in recruiting the candidates. The interviews, then, become a means of "selling" the institution. Interviews also provide information about the candidate not gained through written documents or telephone conversations.

Therefore, since interviews offer multiple benefits (both for the campus and for the candidates). They must be well planned, consistent with one another so that the data generated is easy comparable, and permit the candidate the opportunity to present him/herself in the most realistic
light possible. The interviews must also provide the institution the opportunity to present itself realistically to the candidate. Presenting a genuine portrayal of the campus environment will allow the candidate to receive and analyze an accurate view of the campus and will offer the institution the opportunity to learn how the prospective president may respond to the tensions of the position and to the issues facing the institution in the future.

The Spouse

Research Question: How is the president's spouse included in the overall search and selection process?

Conclusion: The professional experiences and interpersonal characteristics of the spouse are extremely important in hiring a married president. The needs to the spouse must be accommodated throughout the search and selection process.

Along with the presidential candidate, another individual may become involved in the interview phase. That person is the candidate's spouse. For the married candidate, the background, poise, and interpersonal manner of the spouse are extremely important to the selection of a new president. Search participants cited in Chapter 3 (Anonymous, 1990f; Anonymous 1990h) have indicated personal qualities and professional accomplishments of the president's spouse are essential for the hiring of a married
candidate. As a result, these individuals note that prime candidates were dropped from the search and selection process because the spouse was deemed inappropriate by the board and search committee. Hence, search committees and the governing boards place a high value on the characteristics of the spouse.

Due to the special obligations of the spouse, and since the person has a great impact on the outcome of the search and selection process, the board and search committee should pay special attention to his or her particular needs. The spouse must first receive separate and courteous treatment within the search and selection process by being given the opportunity to meet with various campus groups in order to get an appreciation for the unique characteristics of the campus community. Also, as Garrison suggests (1989), a search committee and board must clearly communicate to the spouse what the institution's expectations are as a member of the campus community in the role of "spouse of the president." Additionally, the search committee and board must learn about the professional experiences and needs of the spouse and incorporate these data into the final selection. Essentially, the board and search committee must be mindful that, when a president is married, the office itself must be considered a team effort. Demonstrating team cohesion requires provisions for both individuals to express themselves adequately in the interview schedule. (Attention
to the spousal role must also be given during the contractual phase after the president is selected. Detailed recommendations on the spouse's needs during this phase are addressed later.)

Confidentiality

Research Question: Why is confidentiality such a significant issue? How can it be maintained?

Conclusion: Many top candidates will only participate in a search and selection process when their identities are not divulged. Maintaining confidentiality is often extremely difficult particularly in light of Open Record or Sunshine Laws.

Confidentiality is perhaps the one major impediment to the successful management of a presidential search and selection process. The issue of confidentiality involves keeping the names of candidates as private as possible throughout the search and selection process. Faculty, trustees, and other members of the search committee must be committed to preserving confidentiality and to the importance of it within the search and selection process. Marchese (1989), Garrison (1989), Kauffman (1974), and Nason (1984) all suggest the importance of maintaining confidentiality is paramount. McLaughlin and Riesman (1986) note how confidentiality leaks can impede the search and selection process particularly in light of Sunshine
Legislation. Maintaining confidentiality requires managing communications from the search committee, from the members of other campus groups, and to off campus sources such as the media. What is needed is for search committees to develop a plan to deal with this sensitive and important issue.

Kauffman (1974), Kerr (1984), and McLaughlin and Riesman (1986) point out that candidates are willing to participate in the search and selection process as long as their identities are not divulged to the press (or to others) who may leak their status to the public—particularly to their current employers. Sunshine Laws make ensuring confidentiality a difficult and cumbersome matter. The issue as stated by Nason (1984) is one of a conflict between an individual's right of privacy against the public's right to know. Furthermore, Stead (1983) indicates confidentiality is more difficult to maintain in the public sector due to the prevailing Sunshine Laws in individual states. Hence, Stead notes that this is the main difference between searches in the public and private sector. In essence, confidentiality can be more easily maintained at private colleges and universities since these institutions are not obligated to adhere to Sunshine Laws.

For public higher education, the effect of sunshine legislation is depleted pools of candidates. A trustee (Anonymous, 1990i) offering an oral history in Chapter 3
notes that Sunshine Laws make becoming a presidential candidate in the public sector more difficult and less attractive. Highly qualified individuals are reluctant to become candidates because many public institutions are not able to preserve their status in confidence. Hence, the trustee contends the pool of qualified potential candidates in public higher education is smaller and of lesser quality than the pool for private colleges and universities. What can be done?

First, at the inception of the search and selection process, the board must communicate to the chairperson of the search committee and to the committee at-large that maintaining confidentiality in the search and selection process is of chief importance to ensuring a successful outcome. Public institutions must become aware of the prevailing Sunshine Laws of the state in which they reside and interpret these laws to understand how they can potentially affect the search and selection process. Institutions in the private sector would not need to explore confidentiality relative to these laws. However, a search committee (regardless of affiliation) must develop a well defined plan early in the search and selection process to deal with confidentiality in order to prevent leaks from occurring.
Elements of such a plan include, as Garrison (1989) suggests, appointing a spokesperson to be the main conduit of information to the outside. The spokesperson must develop a plan to educate and manage the curiosity of the media and others outside the process. The spokesperson will convey to these interested parties how they may participate, when they can get involved, and where information about the process can be received. Rather than considering the outsiders (particularly the media) as opponents, it is wise to view them as interested individuals and provide for them a vehicle to receive information. The conduit for communication about the search and selection process could be the spokesperson (him/herself) or may be the institution's media relations department. Thus, the media, and all others apart from the search and selection process, must be educated as to how they may tap into the lines of communications.

For the search committee itself, the spokesperson must understand, as pointed out by Marchese (1989), that providing confidentiality is a difficult task because it rubs against the grain of free expression in an academic environment. With faculty able to freely examine, criticize, and suggest insights into the search and selection process, confidentiality becomes, at times, difficult (if not impossible) to maintain. Hence, the spokesperson must educate the search committee that
maintaining confidentiality requires more than managing the interest of the media but also the curiosity of the campus in general. The individual must impress upon the committee that all information about the progress of the search and selection process be limited to messages conveyed from the spokesperson alone. Informal contacts to other campus groups or individuals from committee members may result in leaks of confidentiality which then may result in the loss of a highly qualified and experienced candidate. The spokesperson must clearly indicate that confidentiality in the search and selection process is paramount to gathering and preserving the best quality pool of candidates for the institution. Search committee members must understand their obligation not to divulge information about the search and selection process to anyone as the process develops. All communication must come from the spokesperson.

Also, the search committee and the board (through the appointed spokesperson) have an obligation to update the campus about the progress of the search and selection process on a regular basis. The messages must be timely and provide quality information without divulging the names of the candidates directly. Thus, as the messages must be managed for the media, so must the messages to the campus in general be managed as well.
Again, the key to maintaining confidentiality is to develop a plan early in the search and selection process. Developing a plan to manage such an important issue requires search committee members to understand the importance of maintaining confidentiality and to be committed to the institution and to the search and selection process itself and not to divulge information about the progress of the process—even informally. Thus, essential elements of a scheme to manage confidentiality are planning, education and understanding, and commitment.

Also, it was indicated in Chapter 3 by a search committee member (Anonymous, 1990b) that leaks of confidentiality can be used as a mechanism to advance the status of one candidate over another. Search committee members may deliberately leak a name to the press in hopes that the individual would drop out of the process advancing the name of another candidate presumably lower on the list. Clearly, these sorts of activities (called subterfuge and dirty tricks by the search committee member) must be discouraged, and if encountered, eliminated from the process. Covert political tactics are incompatible with the effective administration of the search and selection process. The chairperson of the search committee must acknowledge the potential for these sorts of behaviors when distinct factions exist within the search committee, where goals are unclear and where these different factions hold
rival sets of objectives for the search and selection process and for the institution.

**Personal Interplay/Politics and Conflict**

Research Question: What is the nature of personal interplay between the participants in the search and selection process? What specific interpersonal dynamics are at work and what are their various manifestations in the search and selection process?

Conclusion: The search and selection process is much more than a series of interlocking procedural steps. There is a need to recognize and address the political realities which are inherent in the process.

The search and selection process is a complex organizational function which is played out in an incredibly dynamic social environment. As such, coordinating an effective search and selection process requires the commitment of the players in the process to understand the intricacies of the procedures involved in hiring a president. Also, the players must at least attempt to understand such ambiguous issues as the campus climate which surrounds the search, the needs of the various players in the process, and how to productively interact with individuals who may possess differing opinions as to who would be best as president.
The clash of ideas, needs, and opinions within the search committee and between the committee and the board surrounding the suitability of each candidate can result in a variety of behaviors—some overt, some covert. The overarching label given to these behaviors is "politics." Politics within the search and selection process can manifest itself as conflict, in-fighting, consensus building, "deals being struck", arguments, subtle arm twisting, and subterfuge. Politics is, in a sense, a possible by-product of any human interaction in organizations. It is easy to conceive politics as a negative--a detriment to organizational process. But, if politics can be managed effectively, it will not impede, and may even enhance, the effectiveness of any organizational process including the process of hiring a college or university president.

Conflict and Politics During the Interview Phase

Research Question: How are political behaviors such as in-fighting, the development of factions, within the search committee, and subtle or overt coercion managed? How much is healthy for a search and selection process and how can it become dysfunctional to the committee members and to the candidates?
Conclusion: The responsibility of managing political behavior within the search committee falls on the shoulders of the committee chairperson. The chairperson should be knowledgeable in various techniques of addressing dysfunctional politics.

Conflict and politics in the interview phase may occur most commonly within the search committee after the interviews are concluded, when the field is narrowed to a list of finalists. Factions within the committee, usually faculty and trustees, may square off against one another in a power struggle ensuing over who is eventually elevated to the finalist plateau. Though these conflicts are not necessarily dysfunctional to the outcome of the search and selection process, when they are not supervised and managed, they can cause delays in the process and create unwanted tensions within the search committee. Hence, managing factionalism is essential in such an environment. This is a prime responsibility of the search committee chairperson. The chairperson must be sensitive to the evolving dynamics within the search committee throughout the search and selection and be able to determine when negotiations and discussions about the candidates move from productive to divisive. If divisions within the search committee bring about dysfunction, the chairperson must assertively address this development and suggest methods of resolving the conflict so that the process can move forward.
Techniques of confronting dysfunctional conflict may include direct confrontation, where the chairperson presents the perceived issues to the entire search committee or to the particular individuals involved. The purpose of these activities is to bring out the roots of the conflict and to address them directly so that an accord (or understanding) between the conflicting parties can be agreed upon. The chairperson can also address dysfunctional conflict by avoiding direct confrontation but by forcing the process along. Pushing the process forward can be accomplished by setting an intermediate timeline for the search committee to determine the finalists and insisting that the deadline be met. Through this method, the committee members must limit or intensify their negotiations as the deadline approaches. Also, the chair may mediate the conflict. If an impasse is reached where the factions cannot reach a decision, then the chair must persuade the groups to reach some sort of compromise to move the process forward. Mediation takes assertiveness, sensitivity, an understanding of the various factions' needs, and a conception of the dynamics between the groups (e.g.: Is the environment supportive or is there animosity?). The techniques of addressing dysfunctional conflict are certainly not limited to these three methods, but they do provide a general indication of the avenues available to manage politics and conflict within the search committee. For example, the chairperson of the search
committee (Anonymous, 1990f) at the public institution discussed in Chapter 3, utilized the intermediate timeline and mediation techniques in addressing conflict within the search committee. The chair argued that these techniques were effective in confronting dysfunctional conflict and assisting in moving the process forward.

Section 4: Selection, the Announcement, and Contract Negotiations

Selection

Research Question: How is the selection phase of the process coordinated?

Conclusion: The selection phase seems to be far less politically charged than earlier steps in the search and selection process. Addressing any dysfunctional political behavior during the selection phase is the responsibility of the leadership of the governing board.

The research compiled for Chapter 3 reveals that the selection phase is far less political in nature than the screening and interview phases. In the search and selection processes examined in Chapter 3, the selection phases were completed practically without any conflict. Why was this so? In the case of the private institution, the board received one nominee from the search committee as their
choice. As mentioned earlier, it was determined that the new president was predetermined by the search committee and board at the early stages of the process to take a particular form—one which was not disputed by the board. Hence, the potential for conflict in the selection phase from the board—i.e.: rejecting the nominee and sending the search committee back to choose another did not occur. Furthermore, Bolman (1968) was cited in Chapter 1 as stating that boards rarely turn down the selection of the search committee since choosing another individual from the pool would require additional time in deliberating the decision and in possibly inviting candidates back to the campus for additional comparative interviews. Also, rejecting the choice of the search committee negates the authority of the search committee leading to animosity between the committee and the board and in a loss of confidence in the search process on the part of the committee as well as tension on the campus. For these reasons, governing boards faced with ratifying the selection of a search committee generally do not shoot down the choice of the search committee. Hence, the selection phase at the private institution described in Chapter 3 is consistent with Bolman's insights.

In the case of the public institution, again the selection of the new president was accomplished without major conflict. As in the previous example, the board made the final decision, this time, from a list of three
finalists. The selection of the new president was done in an orderly and rational manner.

Based on these two cases, why does the selection phase seem less political and generate less conflict and tension than the screening or interview phases? Possibly because the final choice is made by one campus group—the governing board. Without the direct input of other campus constituencies, the board can make its decision free of concerns voiced from individuals outside the group. Yet, there is the potential that factions within the board may exist creating possible conflict within the selection phase. However, this did not occur in the two examples described in the previous chapter. If conflict lengthens the time necessary for the board to make a decision, the chairperson of the board is responsible for getting the other board members to move the process along or, at least, to develop a plan of action to address the concerns of the factions within the board. Whatever action is taken by the chair, timeliness must be kept in mind. Keeping top candidates waiting may only heighten their level of frustration and increases the likelihood that one or more candidates may drop out. Hence, conflict within the selection phase must be dealt with quickly and in a forthright manner.

Furthermore, Porter (1983) notes that presidential candidates feel that the selection of the new president is less a matter of experience and professional accomplishment.
and more a matter of interpersonal chemistry between the individual candidate and the governing board or the search committee. A president (Anonymous, 1990e) cited in Chapter 3 would agree with this assessment of the selection phase. According to the president, the finalists, upon reaching the selection phase, generally are considered by the board members as comparatively equal in experience, education, and background. Thus, chemistry or "fit" between the candidate and the board becomes the single deciding factor in the selection of a new president. It is not that the sense of "fit" is overemphasized in this phase, but rather, that all other factors being equal, "fit" is the last factor that can be compared. Hence, interpersonal chemistry often becomes the deciding factor in the selection of a new president.

Two additional factors seem essential in making the selection of the president:

The Spouse

First, as discussed earlier, the spouse has an enormous impact on the selection of a married president. The sense of "fit" between the candidate and the board is essential. Likewise, the sense of "fit" between the board and the spouse is critical as well. It was noted in Chapter 3 (Anonymous, 1990a), a president estimated the spouse's involvement in the search and selection process can account
for 25-50% of the decision to select a particular candidate. The role and impact of the spouse in the search and selection process must not be underemphasized. And, as suggested previously, the search committee and the board have an obligation to fully accommodate the needs of the spouse in the search and selection process and later if the candidate and spouse are selected to become the institution's "presidential team."

**Confidentiality**

Second, due to the potential of confidentiality leaks and hesitance to fully commit to the search for the long run, it is often difficult to gauge a candidate's interest in the position. Receiving some verbal commitment to the institution is important because it can aid the search committee and the board in determining who is the most interested in the position—a key factor in making the final decision. Bolman (1968) and a trustee (Anonymous, 1990g) of the private institution whose search was described in Chapter 3, provide a unique recommendation. Each finalist, upon completion of the campus interview should be given, what Bolman terms, "the Harvard Offer." Simply stated, the "Harvard Offer" is a verbal commitment from the candidate to accept the position if offered it. The candidate would be
asked by a member of the board or search committee, "If you were offered the position, who you accept it?" An answer in the affirmative would indicate the candidate's sincere interest in acquiring the position and willingness to commit to the institution at least throughout the selection phase. By seeking this informal verbal commitment, the board can make its decision based on a final comparison of those most interested in becoming the institution's new president and with the knowledge that whoever the board selects the offer will be accepted. The trustee stated, this technique proved valuable and effective in the search and selection process in which he participated.

Making the Announcement

Research Question: How is the appointment of the new president's selection handled?

Conclusion: The governing board should develop a detailed plan to announce the selection of the new president. The selection announcement should be made (either verbally or in writing) to the media, to the candidates not selected, and to the campus in general including the members of the search committee.

Marchese (1989) states the announcement of the selection of the new president serves three distinct purposes. First, the announcement is a formal opportunity
for the governing board to introduce the new president to the campus community. Second, the announcement serves as the communication of the conclusion of the search and selection process. Third, the announcement of the appointment can communicate that the institution is lucky to have chosen such a fine individual as its new president and how it looks with optimism toward the future. The announcement is, as such, an important public relations vehicle. Furthermore, Nason (1984) points out that the announcement must be made as quickly as possible so that the media will not beat the institution to the announcement and spoil the institution's surprise. Also, making the announcement soon after the selection serves to dispel rumors about the selection emanating from within the campus. Though this recommendation is appropriate, before any announcement is made several important tasks must be completed. First, the president designate must be given the opportunity to resign his or her current position. Simultaneously, members of the board should contact the other finalists and members of the search committee and inform them of the selection. Also, letters of the selection should be sent to all those who had applied for the position.

Second, prior to the public announcement of the selection, the board must contact each member of the search committee and inform them of the decision. Contacting the
committee members is important because the search committee spent months administering a lengthy and often frustrating process. The committee seeks closure as much as the candidates and the board do. They deserve special attention with regard to the announcement. Also, each committee member must receive a verbal and written word of thanks from the board for their contributions to the institution. Failure to inform the search committee members of the decision in a formal fashion may lead to confusion and anger based on the perception that the board is insensitive toward the committee members' need for information. To reinforce this point, a search committee member (Anonymous, 1990b) in the search and selection process at the public institution described in Chapter 3 complained that the board failed to inform the committee of the selection prior to the announcement, resulting in residual bad feelings toward the governing board.

Thus, making the announcement of the selection of a new college or university president, to be well handled, involves much more than a press conference or distributing press releases. The announcement must be made to the entire campus community, and to entities outside the campus including the media, (and in the case of public higher education), to the appropriate state government officials. Whichever methods are used to educate the various interested parties (e.g.: press conferences, news releases, telephone
calls, letters, etc.), the announcement of the selection of the president requires planning, a keen sense of timing, and thoughtfulness—particularly to the finalists and candidates not chosen and to the members of the search committee.

**Negotiating the Terms of Employment**

Research Question: What factors in the terms of employment are addressed between the board and the president-designate prior to the contract being signed?

Conclusion: The new president's contract should be comprehensive in nature and accommodate the needs of the spouse (in the event that the spouse does not receive a separate contract).

Two presidents cited in Chapter 3 lamented the fact that they did not successfully negotiate their contract at the time their tenures began. For whatever reason, the presidents did not properly define their contracts with their respective governing boards beyond salary and fringe benefits. Later, the lack of details became evident and the presidents were locked into contracts with which they had little satisfaction. Hence, it is advisable that a board and a new president negotiate terms of a comprehensive contract.
Elements of a comprehensive contract have been noted in the search guides. The A.G.B. Report (1986) advises presidents and board members to negotiate the president's contract shortly after the offer is extended. Elements of the comprehensive contract include salary, fringe benefits, housing, expectation of social role, evaluation of job performance, and conditions of the termination of the appointment. Furthermore, Marchese (1989) states that a contract must also include the length of the term of employment (e.g.: five years, ten years), and a detailed description of supervisory responsibilities including a written description of the relationship between the president and the governing board. In writing a new president's contract, the board must be conscious of contractual details. If details seem to be overlooked, the president must bring them up for consideration.

Finally, the president's contract must also include the compensation, benefits, and staff support provided for the president's spouse. As was noted earlier, the spousal role in the presidency is extremely important. Yet, the compensation and formal recognition of the spouse is sometimes overlooked by some institutions. Preferably, a spouse may want a separate contract outlining duties and compensation for time and effort provided as the spouse of the president. However, attending to the spouse's needs within the president's contract would suffice. Again, the
key to developing a comprehensive contract for a new president (or presidential team) is concentration on the specific details of the presidency in all aspects of the position.

Section 5: Factors Which Can Enhance or Inhibit the Search and Selection Process

Throughout the pages of this study key factors that are closely related the success of a search and selection process for a college or university president have been presented. These factors are:

1. The development of realistic institutional needs and related selection criteria;
2. The decision to hire a private search consultant;
3. The issue of confidentiality;
4. The acknowledgement of politics in the search and selection process;
5. And, the necessity for clear and decisive leadership by the board and the chairperson in planning and managing the process.

These factors, if managed properly can greatly enhance the effectiveness of a search and selection process. Conversely, the effectiveness of the search and selection process can be inhibited when these factors are mishandled. Section 5 discusses these factors one by one as additional
conclusions to those noted above. Also, Section 5 presents recommendations based of the findings of the study for managing the factors successfully.

Defining Goals for the Search and Selection Process

Conclusion 1:

As mentioned earlier in the chapter, determining institutional goals and related selection criteria for a search and selection process is one means of enhancing the effectiveness of a presidential hiring procedure. In the description of the search and selection process at the private institution outlined in Chapter 3, it was evident that the process ran smoothly and resulted in a limited amount of unproductive conflict because goals for the search (relative to the needs of the institution) were unified among the campus constituent groups—namely, the faculty and the trustees. Hence, it can be concluded that achieving unified goals is one way of gathering support for the process on the campus and in administering the process more efficiently. Goals in this sense are the foundation for the campus' future and underpinning of the search and selection process specifically.
Yet, as noted in the description of the University of Chicago's search (McArthur, 1989) discussed in Chapter 2, a successful hiring procedure can be coordinated when goals are in competition with one another. The search and selection process can still be considered effective, but this requires the members of the search committee and the board (those whose goals are in competition with one another) to compromise. Compromise involves understanding the needs of the groups represented in the search committee and through negotiation developing a composite list of required characteristics in a new president. Though doing this would undoubtedly take up valuable time and may result in-fighting and tension, the example of the University of Chicago search indicates that the end product would probably be positive.

Furthermore, (and as discussed earlier in this and the previous chapter) goals must also be realistic. A central concern of many of those offering oral histories relative to the development of goals is "knowing what you want and understanding what the institution is and what it wants to become." When goals are consistent with the current or evolving identity of the institution and when the goals are consistent with the pressing and future needs of the campus, then it can be anticipated that the individual selected as president will be most appropriate to attain these goals.
The Use of Consultants

Conclusion 2:

Another factor which can enhance or inhibit the search and selection process is the use of consultants. An earlier discussion in this chapter suggested that consultants can be very helpful in organizing and administering an effective search and selection process. Yet, the search and selection process can be inhibited through the involvement of consultants under certain circumstances. These circumstances surround the over involvement of the consultant in the process. When search committees and boards rely too heavily on the expertise of the consultant, or when the consultant (as expert) takes charge of the process, then the process can create unexpected and unwanted effects. For example, it was noted in Chapter 2 that a consultant may overwhelm a search committee and take control of the process leading to the hiring of a president who may not be appropriate to the campus community. Also, the board may opt to permit a consultant to administer the entire search and selection process, relinquishing all responsibility to an outside entity. As with the previous example, a similar result may occur.
Therefore, governing boards must always understand that the search and selection process is their legal responsibility. The choice of the new president is ultimately theirs to make. Hence, parameters must be set for the involvement of a consultant if one is hired. The role of the consultant within the broad scope of the search and selection process must be pre-determined by the board and agreed upon by consultant prior to the commencement of the process. Also, the relationship between the consultant and the search committee must be clearly defined. The consultant should be hired to advise the committee in selecting the most appropriate search techniques in coordinating the search and selection process. The consultant should not be given free reign to plan and administer the process. When these factors are determined in advance of the search and selection process, then any unexpected or unwanted effects of the consultant's participation will be avoided. The board and search committee must be sure of their authority and must communicate their control over the search and selection process before the consultant begins work.
Confidentiality and the Needs of the Candidates

Conclusion 3:

One of the central themes of the study is that attending to the needs of the candidates is extremely important to developing an effective search and selection process. These needs include confidential treatment of candidates' status within the process, the need for regular communication throughout the search and selection process, and the need to accommodate the spouse in the process and in contract negotiations.

The two latter needs are important because they can provide the candidate (and the spouse) a level of satisfaction with the treatment provided by the institution. The result of these efforts is a lessening of tension surrounding the candidate's status within the process. However, the most significant need of the candidates is confidentiality. Though ensuring complete confidential treatment for the entirety of the search and selection process is perhaps an impossibility, it is incumbent upon the search committee and governing board to develop a plan to limit the potential for leaks of confidentiality as much as possible. As described throughout the study, leaks can
deplete the pool of candidates and decrease the quality of the pool overall. A specific technique to address this issue was introduced earlier in the chapter. Attending to the needs of the candidates (particularly to their need for confidentiality) can enhance the search and selection process. On the other hand, failure to address these needs can inhibit the effectiveness of the process.

Managing Politics

Conclusion 4:

Another central theme in the study is that politics and conflict within the search committee and between the search committee and the governing board is part and parcel of the search and selection process itself. Politics (or personal interplay) is a natural portion of any organizational function. Hence, conflict and politics is to be expected—even encouraged.

A successful search and selection process can only be brought about when the various factions within the search committee and within the governing board negotiate and build consensus toward the making of the decisions throughout the search and selection process. However, conflict and politics can become so pervasive and possibly dysfunctional
to the process that the goals which drive the process may be diverted. When the goals for the process become secondary to the negotiations, politics has taken over. Hence, conflict and politics in this way inhibit the search and selection process. The result of this is the wasting of valuable time in unproductive discussions (arguments) or a break down in communication if an impasse is reached between the political factions within the search committee or board. Also, as indicated in Chapter 3, subterfuge can occur. These sort of behaviors are not consistent with an effective search and selection process and must be identified and halted.

Managing the conflict and politics of the search and selection process requires clear leadership from the chair of the search committee. When conflicts get so heated or when the politics of the process divert the process's goals, the committee chairperson must intervene. Doing this requires cutting through the politics and persuading (or demanding) the factions involved to deal with the issues which are the cause of the conflict. Then, the chairperson must get the process back on track and moving forward.
Leadership and Planning

Conclusion 5:

Clear and effective leadership is not only required in managing conflict and politics, but it is necessary throughout the search and selection process. Leadership emanates initially from the board in its development of the organization scheme for the search and selection process—most significantly in the coordination of the search committee. Then the board, through the chairperson (or through the chair of the search committee) charges the committee with its task, including details such as timeline, and budget considerations. Additionally, the chair should convey to the search committee the need to determine the future direction of the campus relative to personal characteristics and professional aptitudes in a new president. From that analysis, the committee should conceive goals for the search and selection process and develop a set of specific selection criteria. As the process unfolds leadership for administering the process shifts from the board to the chairperson of the search committee. It is the committee chair who is responsible for the day-to-day operations of the search committee, including
monitoring the progress of the group in all the aforementioned steps in the search and selection process.

The chairperson must have the goals of the search and selection process in the forefront of his or her mind. The chairperson must also intuitively sense when the goals are becoming secondary to a political agenda. Also, in managing the members of the committee in their decision making, the chairperson must be insightful, impartial, and creditable in the eyes of the search committee. Most importantly, the chair must be completely devoted to the successful completion of the search and selection process and to the ideals of the institution in general.

Conclusion 6: The Overall Value of the Search Guides.

The following three research questions are answered in the following discussion:

Research Questions:

1. Which tell tale signs within the guides (e.g.: vagueness, avoidance, over-concentration on certain factors at the expense of others) provide clues into which seem to be the less complex (more easily dealt with) portions of the process and which factors are more ambiguous and difficult to analyze?
2. Do these guides overlook any important factors in the search and selection process? Are some factors thoroughly discussed while others are either overlooked or address only briefly?

3. Which factors within the search and selection process are common to all or most of the guides?

Conclusion: Generally, the search guides omit any in-depth analysis of the social dynamics which occur in the search and selection process. Rather, they limit their discussions to the sequence of organizational steps in the process.

As discussed in Chapter 1, the search guides provide insights into planning and administering a presidential search and selection process. The authors suggest procedural steps involved in coordinating a search and selection process and do offer many valuable techniques for organizing and carrying out a search and selection process more effectively.

However, it was pointed out in Chapter 1 that the guides do not offer comprehensive treatment to all the significant issues surrounding the hiring of a new college or university president. The authors of the guides, whether knowingly or unknowingly, avoid discussing one essential issue; namely, the personal interplay (and its prime manifestation--politics) between the players in the process. This study has indicated just how significant that issue is.
Why are personal interplay and politics avoided by the search guides? Interplay and politics are difficult to understand and interpret. Only a skilled sociologist with experience in organizational behavior could decipher and explain the complexity of the human interaction which occurs in a search and selection process. The authors of the search guides consider themselves (or are considered by others) as experts in the search and selection process because they have experience as search committee members or as former candidates. As such, the authors look at search and selection process as a series of interlocking organizational procedures rather than as a complex and often ambiguous exchange of needs, opinions, and emotions.

Personal interplay and politics notwithstanding, the search guides do make useful recommendations, but those who potentially will utilize the guides (trustees and search committee members) should understand that the intricacies of the search and selection process go way beyond the scope of the procedural steps. The dynamics of the human interaction within the search committee and among the committee, the board, and the candidates must be understood as well.

The common procedural steps outlined in most of the search guides became the format for addressing the steps within the pages of the study. As noted in Chapter 1, the process begins with the inception of the search committee
and the development of an institutional needs statement. It then proceeds through gathering and screening a pool of candidates, considering outside help, maintaining confidentiality, conducting interviews, making and announcing the selection, and, finally, to developing the new president's contract.

Primary Research Question: Do these guides accurately reflect the true nature of the search and selection process?

Conclusion: The search guides do not provide a comprehensive assessment of the search and selection process.

The search guides tell only half of the story. In order for search participants (specifically trustees and search committee members) to gain a comprehensive knowledge of the search and selection process, the guides should include discussions on addressing and managing politics and sensitizing the reader to anticipate when politics becomes an impediment to the process. Also, the guides should recommend ways to enhance group cohesion between the members of a representative search committee and offer exercises to teach committee members and trustees how to make effective decisions through group consensus.
By addressing all the pertinent issues (procedural and interpersonal) surrounding the complex, time consuming, and tension producing nature of the search and selection process, committee members, trustees, and candidates may gain a higher level of satisfaction with the process and potentially enhance presidential leadership overall.

Section 6, Concluding Remarks: Connections between the Search and Selection Process and Effective Presidential Leadership.

Finally, how does the search and selection process relate to effective presidential leadership? The data gathered on this issue and discussed in Chapter 3 suggest that there is a strong and direct connection between a successful search and selection process and effective presidential leadership. Insights from the previous chapter note that developing and administering a successful search and selection process can set the foundation for an effective presidency.

An "if/then" relationship exists between the search and selection process and effective presidential leadership. When all the conditions (the "ifs") for a successful search and selection process exist, then the likely result will be (at least initially) an effective presidency. The
conditions necessary for success include, establishing goodwill among the campus participants in the process (i.e.: faculty and trustees, as well as administrators and students), creating an environment on the campus so that the process is administered in a spirit of institutional renewal, and developing a unified set of goals. Also, an atmosphere of mutual support among the board members and the new president can assist in creating an environment conducive to effective leadership. When these conditions are met, a college or university presidency should be off to a good start.

As a concluding comment, to paraphrase the insight of a trustee (Anonymous, 1990i) cited in Chapter 3: The search and selection process, organized well, can set up a strong foundation for the presidency to build upon. Though the process is often a "song and dance", if it can facilitate the proper institutional climate in which the new president will serve, then the process has been successful. Therefore, facilitating the proper institutional climate for the new president is the final over-arching goal of the search and selection process.
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