

Proposed Guidelines for Department Head Searches

[The Committee on Policy Review recommends this language go to the joint committee formed to work on this policy.]

Proposed Guidelines:

Search Committee Membership

1. Department faculty shall elect a majority of the faculty members of the search committee. Other members may be appointed by the Dean to make sure all ranks and areas in the department are adequately represented on the committee, but in all cases appointed members shall comprise less than 50% of the committee membership.
2. The chair of the search committee shall be nominated by the members of the search committee, and, in no case, be an untenured faculty member. This nomination is subject to approval by the dean. Chairs of search committees shall be considered members of the committee.
3. No hiring authority (Dean or Provost) shall serve as a member of the committee or attend meetings of the committee.
4. Search committees should include as broad and representative a group as possible. Because experience and institutional memory are important factors in effective shared governance, in no case shall pre-tenure faculty form the majority of the search committee. The AAUP has addressed these issues directly:

The role of the faculty in the selection of an administrator other than a president should reflect the extent of legitimate faculty interest in the position. In the case of an academic administrator whose function is mainly advisory to a president or whose responsibilities do not include academic policy, the faculty's role in the search should be appropriate to its involvement with the office. Other academic administrators, such as the dean of a college or a person of equivalent responsibility, are by the nature of their duties more directly dependent upon faculty support. In such instances, the composition of the search committee should reflect the primacy of faculty interest, and the faculty component of the committee should be chosen by the faculty of the unit or by a representative body of the faculty ("Faculty Participation in the Selection, Evaluation, and Retention of Administrators," 1981: <https://www.aaup.org/report/faculty-evaluation-administrators>).
5. Committee members from another department who are appointed by the Dean must have research/experience that is relevant to the department doing the search. These appointments from outside the department should occur only under rare circumstances (e.g., insufficient department size, need for relevant experience, or lack of diversity). Such non-departmental members of the search committee should be approved by a majority vote of the department faculty.

Search Committee Process

6. The search committee, and especially the chair, is responsible for assuring that the full faculty of the department is able to participate at various stages of the search process. This begins with the vetting of the position announcement. A draft of the position announcement is initially developed by the search committee. The position announcement shall be discussed and vetted by the committee and by the department as a whole, prior to posting. AAUP guidelines state:
Prior to announcing a faculty vacancy, there should be agreement among all responsible parties on each major element of the position (e.g., rank, salary, and eligibility for tenure), how the position relates to the department's (or the equivalent unit's) likely needs for the future, the expectations concerning the professional work of the faculty member(s) being recruited, and the resources that will be provided to help the faculty member(s) meet those expectations. (AAUP and Council of Colleges of Arts and Sciences, "The Ethics of Recruitment and Faculty Appointments," 1993: <http://www.ccas.net/files/EthicStatement.pdf>).
7. After the date of first consideration has passed, the search committee shall meet as a group to discuss all applicants, choosing those for whom a phone interview is to be recommended. This should be a large enough number of semi-finalists to ensure a diverse pool of applicants continues into the next stages of the consideration process.
8. After completion of phone interviews, the search committee shall meet as a group to discuss and rank the semi-finalists, before scheduling campus visits. When feasible, the qualifications of the candidates being given strong consideration should be reviewed by all members of the department faculty, not just the members of the search committee. Individual departments may have processes uniquely appropriate to them, while maintaining the confidential nature of the applicant materials. The chair of the search committee shall assure that materials are available so faculty can participate in a comprehensive review of candidates being given serious consideration. The search committee will make recommendations for campus visits to the top candidates based on their review and the input of the broader departmental membership.
9. During the campus visits, the full faculty of the department will be included in the schedule of interview events, including at least one interview and a presentation. After the campus visits, the search committee shall meet as a group to discuss and rank the finalists, making a clear recommendation for each candidate. These recommendations, including rationale, shall include any candidates deemed by the committee to be unacceptable. Furthermore, the rationale for all acceptable candidates should include a delineation of strengths and weaknesses. In no case shall hiring authorities, committee chairs, or other committee members attempt to influence votes or solicit feedback privately. All faculty, staff, and student written feedback on candidates shall be made available to every member of the committee on the original forms in which they were submitted so as to ensure that the committee sees all responses in context. The

recommendation of the committee shall be recorded and presented to the department, as shall the decision of the hiring authorities (i.e., Dean and/or Provost), particularly when they differ from the recommendation of the committee.

10. Before the offer is to be made, the search committee and hiring authorities shall meet with the faculty to discuss the rationale for wanting to offer a position to a particular candidate. Before any Department Head candidate can be offered a position, they must be deemed “acceptable” by a majority vote of the faculty in the department, who will have adequate opportunities to review the files of the finalists, including the CV and cover letter. All Department Head candidates shall, in on campus interviews, be expected to present their research/creative work as any other faculty candidate would be.
11. Because the expectation is that Department Heads are to be hired with tenure (Faculty Handbook, Section 3.8.2), the tenured members of the department shall vote on tenure for any prospective candidate, based on department criteria for faculty members in the department (not administrators), before an offer may be made. Per the *Faculty Handbook*, no job offer may be made to a candidate without an affirmative tenure vote of the tenured faculty of the department:

Tenure Upon Hire

An applicant for a position as Associate Professor or Professor may be offered tenure as a condition of initial employment only under the following circumstances: (1) the possession of academic credentials reflecting exemplary teaching and service experience, as well as excellence in research, including nationally recognized peer-reviewed publications in the applicant's academic discipline, and (2) an affirmative vote of a majority of the tenured faculty in the affected department.

12. Department faculty should be informed regarding the length of term for the contract offered the incoming DH.

Substantive Changes and Additions in Op7.10 Recruiting a Diverse Workforce

In some cases, the committee strengthened statements in the operating policy, changing “should” to “shall” (see 5.5, 6.0, and 6.1 for examples). Where a substantive change is recommended, I have provided a list with the change **marked in Red**.

In one case, Rachael Dockery and Melissa Berry are working on revising language to bring it into compliance with current law and hiring regulations (see 2nd paragraph in 7.6). Tammy Few is also being asked to evaluate the language of the first paragraph in 7.7 that deals with ADA requirements.

1.1

Search Committee Chair – The Search Committee Chair is the liaison between the Department Approver and hiring unit and the search committee. The Chair ensures that the search process follows University guidelines, maintains the official record of all committee activities and serves as its official spokesperson. **With respect to searches for faculty or academic department heads, the Search Committee Chair, when possible, shall not be an untenured faculty member.**

1.7

For academic administrator searches, only the search committee and the administrators in the supervisory chain will review applicant files. The search committee **shall** make letters of application and vitas of candidates selected for **on-campus** interviews available to **faculty members in the hiring department and may also make them available to** other members of the campus community as appropriate.

1.8

It is appropriate for the Provost and/or Dean/Division Approver to meet with the search committee during the search process to give the search committee its charge. The Provost and/or Dean/Division Approver should not, however, otherwise participate in or attend meetings of the search committee, as the presence of the Provost and/or Dean/Division Approver during search committee meetings may unduly influence or hinder the search committee’s objectivity and independence in discharging its search obligations.

2.2

- Search committees should include members with a variety of perspectives and sensitivity to equity and diversity issues. **With respect to searches for faculty or academic department heads, if possible, a majority of search committee members shall be comprised of faculty members from the academic department in which the new hire will serve.**

5.3

No **individual** is an applicant until he or she has contacted the University by letter, or electronically, and submitted all of the required documents. Only bona-fide applicants who submitted a letter of interest, resume/ curriculum vitae, employment application, and provided references, **may** be evaluated by the search committee.

5.6

- Refrain from assessing applicant qualifications based on a single standard. Consider creating separate short lists ranking applicants on different criteria. **Examples might include but are not limited to** teaching, research potential, collaborative potential, mentoring capacity. Develop the final shortlist by taking the top candidates across different criteria.

6.2

For **professional staff**, academic administrative and faculty searches, a minimum of one (1) off-the-list reference call is required.

7.3

- Since candidates are generally concerned about time frames, they should be informed of the **anticipated** date by which they will next hear from the University regarding the search process.

7.5

Consistent with 5.4, it is strongly recommended that search committees conduct telephone or video conference interviews prior to inviting any candidates for on-campus interviews.

7.6

As part of the interview process, candidates **should** meet with members of the department, the Department Approver, the Dean/Division Approver, the Executive Approver, and other appropriate administrators and staff members. **Candidates for a Department Head position will meet with faculty members and staff of the academic department.** To obtain the maximum benefit from these interviews, the hiring unit should circulate a copy of each candidates resume, a copy of the job description and a copy of the interview schedule.

8.0

The search committee **is charged with providing** a list of the finalists' strengths and weaknesses to the Department Approver.

8.1

The search committee is not responsible for deciding which candidate is to be hired for a particular position. Rather, the Department Approver, in consultation with the Dean/Division Approver or Executive Approver, will select the finalist to be offered the position based on the ability of the finalist to perform the job requirements as evidenced by the credentials, interviews, references, job-related criteria, and diversity objectives of the University.

8.2

With respect to the decision on granting rank and tenure to academic administrators, it will be based on departmental guidelines (see 10.2).

8.4

With approval from the Executive Approver, an appointment letter is prepared and issued to the finalist. (Note: The Office of the Provost issues all appointment letters for faculty **and academic administrator positions**.)

10.2

When a Department Approver seeks to hire an academic administrator with tenure **and rank**, the department or school to which the faculty member would be initially assigned must be asked to conduct a tenure vote **based on departmental guidelines**, and a statement of the departmental faculty vote must be submitted to the Office of the Provost.

Suggested changes in “Academic Department Heads and School Directors Manual”

(<https://www.missouristate.edu/assets/Provost/AcademicManual.pdf>)

Suggested changes are marked in RED.

Section II.A

The Dean, in consultation with the Provost, authorizes any search for a Head. Subject to the approval of the Provost, the Dean, and in consultation with the department faculty, determines the parameters of the search process. The Dean and Provost decide if the search is to be internal or external. A Head or a tenured Full Professor from another department in the college will participate in the search process, generally acting as search committee chair. Searches for Heads follow the established process outlined by the Provost’s Office and Office for Institutional Equity and Compliance.

Section II.C

The Dean, after consulting the department faculty, and with approval of the Provost and Board of Governors, makes the final selection of the Head and establishes any parameters of the appointment, including elements both included and not included in this document (e.g. interim appointments). Granting of rank and tenure will be based on departmental policy and on a vote of the department’s faculty (see Op. pol. 7.10, especially section 10.2). All specific conditions for the Head’s term should be made clear in the appointment letter, along with the clear understanding that Heads serve at the will of their Dean, Provost, and President.

The department head shall be appointed for a fixed term of years not to exceed five (5) years in length, and the terms shall be included in the appointment letter. Appointments for Acting/Interim Heads may be for one or two years, pursuant to the Search Guidelines. Per Op.3.08-2, and as a general rule, an academic administrator may be reappointed to up to two additional terms of up to five years each (15 years in total service in a specific position). Heads receive twelve-month assignments which generally begin on August 1 of a given year. It might be beneficial for Heads to begin their initial appointment earlier in the summer resulting in a period of overlap and transition with the previous administration. However, a term beginning prior to August 1 requires approval of the Dean and Provost.

**Report to MSU Faculty Senate regarding Missouri Association of Faculty Senates (MAFS)
Fall 2019 meeting**

Attendees: Elizabeth Walker and Cameron Wickham

Date of Report: October 11, 2019

Overview

MAFS is a gathering of faculty leaders from the four-year public universities in Missouri. They meet twice a year in Jefferson City. Guests typically include someone from MDHEWD, AAUP, COPHE, and other legislative liaisons. During the meetings, faculty leaders share successes and challenges of shared governance. MSU tries to send at least two people to each meeting, often the chair-elect, chair, and past chair, as available to attend. Sometimes the Faculty Senate sends a representative who is not a member of the FSEC.

October 2019 Meeting

- Universities that sent representatives were Truman State, Missouri Western, NW Missouri State, and Central Missouri, and a representative from AAUP.
- Monday dinner included discussion with Robin Wenneker from CBHE, Mara Woody, Deputy Commissioner of the Missouri Department of Higher Education and Workforce Development (MDHEWD) 1, and Dr. Greg Komer from the American Association of University Professors (AAUP). Board member Wenneker shared what she was recently asked in her confirmation hearing, including transfers, how to evaluate quality of Missouri higher education, mental health, diversity, and student safety. Deputy Commissioner Woody spoke about equity in education and rural outreach. Dr. Komer spoke about the importance of academic freedom as it relates to shared governance and concern about the growing reliance of universities on contingent faculty (nontenured). Note: MDHE is now MDHEWD (Missouri Department of Higher Education and Workforce Development) and has new web address <https://dhewd.mo.gov>.
- Tuesday discussion began with the new website and a plan to gather reports from member institutions to put together in one larger report to the CBHE. Other topics included access to mental health services for students, monitoring the quality of dual credit and online classes, and the decrease in tenure lines as non-tenure lines increase in hiring. Representatives from NWMSU were very appreciative of the recent MSU Hiring Trends Report and found it useful in their dialog with their own administration--other institutions requested a copy.
- Dr. Walker and I reported on large issues at the forefront at MSU this year, including the senate taskforces on mental health and on retention, as well as the SEM efforts. As noted above, there is much interest in mental health issues now so the mental health taskforce is timely.