MINNESOTA STATE COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES
BOARD OF TRUSTEES

Agenda Item Summary Sheet

Committee: Human Resources Committee   **Date of Meeting:** November 17, 2010

Agenda Item: Executive Search Process

☐ Proposed Policy Change	☐ Approvals Required by Policy
☐ Other Approvals	☐ Monitoring

☒ Information

Cite policy requirement, or explain why item is on the Board agenda:
To update the trustees on improvements made to the executive search process

Scheduled Presenter(s):
Lori Lamb, Vice Chancellor for Human Resources

Outline of Key Points:
- An overview of improvements to the executive search process

Background Information:
One of the goals selected by the Chancellor for the coming year is to improve the executive search process. Vice Chancellor Lamb will present information on improvements to the executive search process that have already been implemented, and those that are planned for implementation in Fiscal Year 2011.

INFORMATION ITEM

EXECUTIVE SEARCH PROCESS

BACKGROUND:

One of the goals selected by the Chancellor for the coming year is to improve the executive search process. Vice Chancellor Lamb will present information on improvements to the executive search process that have already been implemented, and those that are planned for implementation in the Fiscal Year 2011. The attached matrix outlines these improvement initiatives.

Date: November 17, 2010

Executive Search Process Improvements

November 4, 2010

Concern	Potential Remedy	Pros	Cons	Implementation
Implemented for 2010:				
Insufficient candidate information at finalist stage (final three candidates) -Chancellor did not develop rapport with candidates -Candidates did not get experience of knowing who their supervisor would be	One on one meetings with Chancellor and candidate in process (with Vice Chancellor for HR); includes behavioral based interview questions	Chancellor gets to know candidates better Candidates get to know their future supervisor better Interview questions designed to elicit better decision-making information	Time constraints during interview day	Implemented for FY 2010 searches and ongoing
Inadequate interview data to make valid decisions	Structured interview format; behavioral based implemented consistently for all candidates; more conversational	Consistency and fairness Better decision-making information available		Implemented for FY 2010 searches and ongoing
Insufficient candidate information at finalist stage -Did not use best practices in executive assessment	Utilize executive assessment instrument designed around system leadership competencies	Additional data to be considered in selection process Designed to specifically address leadership competencies deemed essential to success in this system Forms the basis of professional development plans for the new hire	Newer concept; feels like psychological testing to some Cost ($2,000 per candidate) Candidate reaction	Implemented for FY 2010 searches and ongoing
Lack of consistent web presence	Update web site; create new Executive Search web page	Better communication with consultants/candidates/ Campuses	Resources	Implemented for FY 2010
Number of searches increases because of demographics; need to dedicate resources to improve and manage the processes	Hire Director of Talent Acquisition	Better communication/coordination Ability to staff more searches Better coordination of campus level work on searches	Resources	Implemented for FY 2010

Concern	Potential Remedy	Pros	Cons	Implementation
Under consideration for 2011				
Lack of diversity in finalist pools and in ultimate hiring decision -Campus committees do not adequately reflect diverse interests/needs	Ensure diversity is represented on search committees	More diversity on committee may encourage more diversity in finalist recommendations	Lack of campus autonomy	Implement for FY 2011
Lack of diversity in finalist pools and in ultimate hiring decision -Too much authority at campus level to eliminate diversity (not only cultural but also in nontraditional background and experience)	Conduct initial screening at the Office of the Chancellor with well trained screening committee that consists of appropriate and qualified campus experts; refer to campus the short list for initial interview and campus interviews	Better assurance that diversity and affirmative action obligations are being given appropriate consideration Better quality candidates in finalist pools Time saving for committee/campus resources	Lack of campus autonomy and involvement in the process	Conduct pilot in FY 2011
Lack of appropriate community consultation and buy-in	Thorough consultation on community representation	More community buy- in		Implement for FY 2011
Lack of appropriate input by trustees in final decision	Require a trustee to sit on search committee	One additional trustee involved (three trustees already involved under Board policy)	Time consideration for trustees Campus may feel its role/voice is diminished Chancellor's role is diminished	Do Not Implement
Lack of appropriate input by trustees in final decision	Require finalists to interview in front of full Board	Additional trustee involvement	Time consideration at Board meetings Chancellor's role is diminished Candidates discouraged from applying because of public nature of final interviews	Do Not Implement
Current system presidents face difficulty in applying for positions within the system	Create process for sitting presidents to apply outside of normal search procedure	Mobility of existing presidents Retention of existing presidents	Failure to do national search Failure to obtain appropriate campus buy-in Does not solve issue that candidacy is public	Do Not Implement

Concern	Potential Remedy	Pros	Cons	Implementation
Increased costs of conducting searches	Use one search firm for more than one search (e.g. for two community college searches)	Better assessment of fit with institutions and candidate Candidates can easily apply for more than one position Process efficiencies Candidates have better experience Better and more consistent branding/messaging of system as an employer Reduction in cost	Depending on firm, may not get as many candidates to choose from	Conduct pilot in FY 2011
Increased costs of conducting searches	Use videoconferencing for initial interviews (interviews are only 1 hour or 1 ½ hours)	Save travel costs of approximately $25,000 per search (paid by campus) More flexibility for candidates results in easier scheduling, more streamlined process for both sides, and not losing strong candidates during the search process. Demonstrates using current best practices in interviewing	Technical issues Quality issues Experience of candidates is not "face to face" (committee will need training)	Conducted pilot in FY 2010; conduct further pilots in FY 2011
Lack of Information for candidates on Process	Develop "what to expect" tool for candidates	Candidates get better information sooner Less confusion at end of process	Resources	Implement in FY 2011

3