



CDFHI

UNIVERSITY OF Miami FACULTY SENATE MEMORANDUM



To: Donna E. Shalala, President
From: Steven Green, Chair, Faculty Senate
Date: 06 February 2002

Subject: Faculty Senate Legislation #2001-12(A) – Establishment of Search Committees for Provost, Deans, and Chairs

The Faculty Senate, at its 30 January 2002 meeting, voted unanimously to approve the establishment of a Search Committee to assist the Consultative Committee in recruiting candidates for Provost, Dean, or Chair. Search Committees have been appointed but their nature, composition, and reporting authority have been ad hoc. This addition to the Faculty Manual is intended to authorize the existence of Search Committees and hence regularize the process as well as clarify the relationship between Search and Consultative Committee. The text of the legislation is as follows:

A Search Committee may be established to assist the Consultative Committee in recruiting candidates for Chair, Dean or Provost. A Search Committee will report regularly and on a timely basis to the Consultative Committee and to the appointing authority.

The composition of a Search Committee for a department Chair will normally be specified by the Bylaws of the School. In the absence of such a Bylaw, the membership of the Search Committee shall be determined jointly by the Dean of the School in consultation with the School Faculty Council and the Regular Faculty in the Department.

A search committee for Dean or Provost shall consist of at least four members. At least half of the membership shall be selected from and by the Consultative Committee. The other members shall be selected by the appointing authority.

The appointing authority shall convene the first meeting of the Search Committee and charge its membership with their task. The committee will then elect its own Chair.

Should you approve, we will forward it to the faculty for its vote as an amendment to the Charter section of the Faculty Manual.

This legislation is now forwarded to you for your action.

SG/kl

cc: Luis Glaser, Executive Vice President and Provost
325 Ashe-Admin. Bldg.
Coral Gables, Florida 33124-4634
305-284-3721
Fax 305-284-5515

CAPSULE: Faculty Senate Legislation #2001-12(A) – Establishment of Search Committees for Provost, Deans, and Chairs

PRESIDENT'S RESPONSE

APPROVED: _____ DATE: _____
(President's Signature)

OFFICE OR INDIVIDUAL TO IMPLEMENT: _____

EFFECTIVE DATE OF LEGISLATION: _____
(if other than June 1 next following)

NOT APPROVED AND REFERRED TO: President Shelle

REMARKS (IF NOT APPROVED): Come see me - I don't understand this proposal -
Just give me a memo explaining what the difference between current situation and new

Consultative & Search Committees

The Consultative Committee is the Faculty group or representatives of the Faculty group the candidate will be appointed to (Faculty Manual A.13.2). As such, it is an indispensable part of the appointment process and recommends candidates to the appointing authority. The Search Committee is not defined anywhere.

Given these facts there are only three options.

- a. Use the Consultative Committee and subcommittee's of the Consultative Committee to carry out the search
- b. Use a separate Search Committee, but such committees are not mentioned in the Faculty Manual and there is no structure for their composition, role, and relationship with Consultative Committee
- c. Adopt new legislation filling this lacuna in the Faculty Manual.

The Consultative Committee only, option can be impractical in many situations, e.g. lack of input from the broader University community.

Since in current situation the search committees operate outside the formal structure, they sometimes create resentment and negative responses to them and their actions.

Also since there is no structure for the relationship with the Consultative Committee the desired coordination and cooperation are often impeded. The process is less smooth which makes

Search Committees Legislation: Talking Points

- I. Current rule:
Faculty Manual A.13.2 discusses the role and composition of Consultative Committees; the Faculty Manual has no mention of Search Committees.
- II. Given that, there are only three options
 - a. Use only Consultative Committee in carrying out search and generating candidate recommendations
 - b. Use Search Committee as well, but such committees are not mentioned in the Faculty Manual and there is no structure for their composition, role, and relationship with Consultative Committee
 - c. Adopt new legislation filling this lacuna in the Faculty Manual
- III. Consultative Committee only option
This has proved impractical in many situations, e.g. because of size, lack of input from the broader University community
- IV. Current situation
 - a. The Search Committees operate outside the formal structure, which can create resentment and a flashpoint for negative responses to the committees and their actions
 - b. The structure and relationship are ad hoc, which creates confusion and inhibits a learning curve
 - c. There is no structure for relationship with Consultative Committee, which means that the desired coordination and cooperation are often impeded the process is less smooth, and the results less acceptable because of perceptions of lack of adequate consultation with the relevant faculty or its representatives
- V. Situation after adoption of new legislation
 - a. The Consultative Committee and its members have an adequate role
 - i. They can provide necessary local knowledge regarding the problems of and issues confronting the relevant department or school
 - ii. They can provide necessary local knowledge regarding the aspirations of the relevant department or school
 - b. They can help insure the acceptability of the process (and, ordinarily, the result) to the relevant faculty, the primary constituency of a chair or dean
 - c. Simultaneously, the Search Committee can, by its smaller size, help ensure an efficient process with the needed degree of confidentiality at each stage
 - d. The Search Committee can also provide a means of obtaining input from representatives of other relevant constituencies, such as fellow chairs or deans
- VI. Analysis of Proposed Legislation
 - a. 1st ¶: There is authorization, but no requirement for a Search Committee. In each case, the appointing authority can determine if a Search Committee is a useful element of the process

- b. 2nd ¶: The structure and composition of a Search Committee is not uniform, but can be determined by each department or school to meet its particular needs, either in advance, through bylaws, or at the time of a particular search.
- c. 3rd ¶: The Search Committee will have both “outside” membership, appointed by the appointing authority, and “inside” membership, chosen by the Consultative Committee. This insures that the two Committees will work together, with the “inside” members serving as a bridge, to keep each body aware of the interests and concerns of the other, and the information developed by it. This should reduce the likelihood of different recommendations of each body, facilitating the decisions of the appointing authority.
- d. 4th ¶: By having the Search Committee choose its own chair, the likelihood that the Chair can obtain the needed level of time and energy commitment by the Committee members is enhanced. Furthermore, Committee members, recognizing the Chair’s role, will surely choose a person who will adequately devote him or herself to the task.

We hope this is of assistance to you. Please feel free to speak further to the Faculty Senate leadership if you have remaining questions or concerns.

2nd ¶: The structure and composition of a Search Committee is not uniform, but can be determined by each department or school to meet its particular needs, either in advance, through bylaws, or at the time of a particular search.

3rd ¶: The Search Committee will have both "outside" membership, appointed by the appointing authority, and "inside" membership, chosen by the Consultative Committee. This insures that the two Committees will work together, with the "inside" members serving as a bridge, to keep each body aware of the interests and concerns of the other, and the information developed by it. This should reduce the likelihood of different recommendations of each body, facilitating decisions of the appointing authority.

4th ¶: By having the Search Committee choose its own chair, the likelihood that the Chair can obtain the needed level of time and energy commitment by the Committee members is enhanced. Furthermore, Committee members, recognizing the Chair's role, will surely choose a person who will adequately devote him or herself to the task.

the results less acceptable because of perceptions for lack of adequate consultation with the relevant faculty or its representatives.

If the new legislation is adopted several benefits will accrue:

1. The Consultative Committee and its members can provide the necessary local knowledge regarding the problems and issues confronting the relevant department or school and express its aspirations.
2. They can help insure the acceptability of the process (and, ordinarily, the result) to the relevant Faculty, the primary constituency of a chair or dean.
3. Simultaneously, the Search Committee can, by its smaller size, help ensure an efficient process with the needed degree of confidentiality at each stage.
4. The Search Committee can also provide a means of obtaining input from representatives of other relevant constituencies, such as fellow chairs or deans.

The Proposed Legislation addresses all the issues above.

1st ¶: There is authorization, but no requirement for a Search Committee . In each case, the appointing

authority can be determine if a Search Committee is a useful element of the process.

We hope this is of assistance to you. Please feel free to speak further to the Faculty Senate leadership if you have remaining questions or concerns.



UNIVERSITY OF Miami

FACULTY SENATE

MEMORANDUM

To: Donna E. Shalala, President

From: Steven Green
Chair, Faculty Senate

Date: 6 August 2002

Subject: Response to your feedback on establishing Search Committees

I have prepared a draft of legislation (enclosed) that takes account of your views regarding membership from outside the school when a search for a new dean is undertaken.

Your concerns also included the size of the group and that only a single committee should be required, replacing the separate Search and Consultative Committees.

Before introducing this to the Senate, I want to be sure that we are in substantial agreement so that we do not go through the exercise of passing legislation that will then be rejected.

I would appreciate the opportunity to discuss this with you in the near future and have asked the Senate Office to call for an appointment. Since I would be seeing you as the author/initiator of this draft, the meeting could be scheduled for a time after 15 August when I am no longer Chair, but it would be most advantageous to confer with you prior to the meeting of the General Welfare Committee on 21 August when I would ask for it to be reviewed for placing on the Senate's agenda.

Thank you for your consideration.

SG/kl

Faculty Senate
325 Ashe Admin. Bldg.
Coral Gables, Florida 33124

Phone: (305) 284-3721 Fax: (305) 284-5515

<http://www.miami.edu/FacultySenate>

e-mail: facsen@miami.edu

DRAFT FOR DISCUSSION

When it is time to appoint the Dean of a School (including the University Librarian), a Search and Consultative Committee shall be established to identify and recommend candidates. It is responsible to the appointing authority and to the faculty of the school and shall regularly inform the appointing authority of its progress and it shall confer with the faculty of the school to the fullest extent possible consistent with conducting a successful search.

This Committee shall consist of three groups of equal size with the total number of members determined by the appointing authority.

Appointment to this Committee for each of the three groups is as follows:

- i) Faculty members selected from and by the Regular Faculty of the school
- ii) Regular Faculty members of that school selected by the school's Council. If a School does not have a sufficient number of Regular Faculty to complete this group, the Council may select full-time Educator or Librarian faculty.

Note: Regular Faculty members selected for these two groups may include those with administrative appointments including department chairs. For the School of Continuing Studies, the Regular Faculty who may be selected are those who have taught in that School within the past two years.

- iii) Other members selected by the appointing authority from the University community

The appointing authority shall convene the first meeting of the Search and Consultative Committee to give the charge to the Committee and to indicate any special considerations of which the Committee should be aware. The committee will then elect its own chair. At the conclusion of its process, the Committee shall inform the appointing authority of its recommendations and its ranking of suitable candidates if there is more than one.

F



MEMORANDUM

To: Donna E. Shalala, President

From: Steven Green
Chair, Faculty Senate

Date: 26 April 2002

Subject: Reconsideration of Legislation #2001-12(A) – Establishment of Search Committees for Provost, Deans, and Chairs

Donna, pursuant to our conversation of 5 April 2002, the Senate is reconsidering legislation #2001-12(A) regarding Search Committees sent to you on 6 February 2002.

I believe that we can fashion legislation that meets the reasonable goal of a single committee of workable size that has effective consultative membership from the relevant faculty while authorizing the administration to appoint others from outside the area who will bring valuable perspectives to the appointment process. We will begin by looking at the process involved in appointing deans and then use it as a basis for the other positions (Provost and department chairs).

I will ask next year's Senate officers and two former Senate Chairs to join me in preparing ideas for the Senate to consider and we will consult with you and the Provost during the process.

SG/kl

cc: Luis Glaser, Provost

Faculty Senate
325 Ashe Admin. Bldg.
Coral Gables, Florida 33124

Phone: (305) 284-3721 Fax: (305) 284-5515

<http://www.miami.edu/FacultySenate>

e-mail: facsen@miami.edu

MEMORANDUM

To: Donna E. Shalala, President

From: Steven Green
Chair, Faculty Senate

Date: 03 April 2002

Subject: Rationale for Faculty Senate Legislation #2001-12(A) – Establishment of Search Committees for Provost, Deans, and Chairs

Sorry for the delay in responding to your request for additional information regarding the background on the rationale for legislation on Search Committees [#2001-12(A)].

The role and composition of Consultative Committees in appointing Chairs, Deans, and the Provost are described in Section A13.2 of the Faculty Manual, but there is no mention anywhere in the Manual of Search Committees.

Nevertheless, as a matter of custom and practice, Search Committees have been appointed at various times to assist Consultative Committees by active recruiting and initial screening of applicants. This practice has often worked well, but on occasion there has been little or no communication between these two bodies, no clear delineation of the role of the Search Committee and, even worse, there have been substantive disagreements between these two bodies that have not facilitated the process.

With Search Committees operating outside any formal structure, without defined authority, responsibility, or criteria for membership, and with no mandated communication with the Consultative Committee, the following have occurred:

- a) resentment by the Consultative Committee and/or by the faculty group which the new person will lead such that even a wise and popular choice is greeted without enthusiasm because of the perception of lack of adequate consultation with the relevant faculty or its representatives
- b) coordination and cooperation with the Consultative Committee has been impeded, creating a very uneven and unprofessional process

There are at least three options for ameliorating this situation.

- 1) Follow the process as described in the Faculty Manual using strict construction so that only the Consultative Committee is involved (although it may use a sub committee as its own Search Committee).
- 2) Continue to use Search Committees as well, but risk suffering from the problems that have emerged with significant regularity.
- 3) Adopt new legislation filling this lacuna in the Faculty Manual.

[continued]

Memorandum

Rationale - Legislation #2001-12(A)

Page two

We have rejected #1 because the Consultative Committees acting alone may lack input from the broader University community and may not facilitate getting new leadership with new ideas. We have seen sufficient problems with the current situation that we want to improve #2. Our approach and the intent of this legislation is to regularize the process by following #3 -- using the opportunity to enhance our ability to search beyond the current Manual while eliminating many of the problems associated with uneven mandates and other non-collegial irregularities that have been associated with Search Committees.

The legislation provides for Consultative Committees and their members to have an adequate role including providing necessary local knowledge regarding the problems of and issues confronting the relevant department or school.

They can help insure the acceptability of the process (and, ordinarily, the result) to the relevant faculty, the primary constituency of a chair or dean.

Simultaneously, the Search Committee can, by its smaller size, help ensure an efficient process with the needed degree of confidentiality at each stage.

The Search Committee can also provide a means for obtaining input from representatives of other relevant constituencies, such as fellow chairs or deans.

In summary, the proposed legislation will yield:

1st -- authorization, but no requirement for a Search Committee. In each case, the appointing authority can determine if a Search Committee is a useful element of the process.

2nd -- structure and composition of a Search Committee determined by each department or school to meet its particular needs, either in advance, through bylaws, or at the time of a particular search.

3rd -- Search Committees with both "outside" membership, appointed by the appointing authority, and "inside" membership, chosen by the Consultative Committee. This insures that the two Committees will work together, with the "inside" members serving as a bridge so to keep each body aware of the interests and concerns of the other and the information developed by it. This should reduce the likelihood of different recommendations of each body, facilitating the decisions of the appointing authority.

4th -- Search Committee Chairs who are responsible to the committee that elected them. Committee members, recognizing the Chair's role, would be expected to choose a person with the time and energy to devote to the task and the commitment by the Committee members to respond to the request for work is likely to be enhanced when the members elected that chair.

I hope this is of assistance to you. We can discuss it at our meeting on Friday 5 April or at a later time that could also include the Vice Chairs of the Senate.

cc: William Awad, 1st Vice Chair
Christopher Harrison, 2nd Vice Chair

President's Remarks

Incoming freshman SAT scores are expected to surpass 1200 without sacrificing our diversity while increasing our geographical distribution. The message is being sent to those young people who were not admitted, encouraging reapplication as a transfer student after two years at another institution. We are becoming more competitive.

The Faculty Club Committee has met and the decisions have been made about menus and decor. There will be two sittings starting at 11:30. As we gain experience with the new facility, improvements will be considered with the expectation of completion by September 2002.

President Shalala asked the Senate to survey the post-tenure review practices of comparable institutions and report within a year if any measures should be introduced here. The Chair of the Senate will form a committee to examine the issues and to report to the Senate.

The President recommended and the Trustees have decided to include a student representative on the Board. That individual will not participate in certain types of meetings (e.g., tenure decisions). This decision has a sunset clause in that the practice will be reviewed by the trustees after three years. The student will be identified by the Vice President for Student Affairs and will serve for one year with the appointment alternating between graduate and undergraduate students.

Approval of agenda

The meeting agenda *passed unanimously*.

Approval of minutes for 28 November 2001 and 12 December 2001

The minutes of 28 November 2001 *were approved unanimously*. The minutes of 12 December 2001 *were approved by a majority* with the addition of a short statement under the Neuroscience proposal to reflect remarks made at the meeting as follows: One faculty member noted his view that the requirements for the Undergraduate Neuroscience Program should include more quantitative courses.

Quadrennial review of the Executive Vice President and Provost

The Senate voted unanimously to approve a proposal for the quadrennial review of the Executive Vice President and Provost by the REGULAR FACULTY in a fashion parallel to the existing reviews of Deans and Chairs. [See "Other Business" for a later question asking for clarification.]

Search Committee for Provost, Deans, and Chairs

The Senate unanimously passed legislation regularizing the establishment of Search Committees in assisting Consultative Committees in recruiting candidates for Provost, Dean, or Chair. If approved, this addition to the Faculty Manual would authorize the existence of Search Committees and establish their composition while prescribing the relationship between Search and Consultative Committees.

Faculty-Administration Employees' Retirement Plan Review Committee

Eugene Clasby, member of the Employee Benefits Committee, explained that the administration informed the Employee Benefits Committee that it would not supply information regarding Employee Retirement Plan benefits to the Employee Benefits Committee because that Committee is was not charged with examining that Plan, only with other non-retirement benefits. The Board of Trustees committee and the oversight committee that review and help implement

UNIVERSITY OF
Miami
FACULTY SENATE
MEMORANDUM

To: Donna E. Shalala, President

From: Steven Green
Chair, Faculty Senate

Date: 04 February 2002

Subject: Faculty Senate Legislation #2001-12(A) – Establishment of Search Committees for
Provost, Deans, and Chairs

The Faculty Senate, at its 30 January 2002 meeting, voted unanimously to approve the establishment of a Search Committee to assist the Consultative Committee in recruiting candidates for Provost, Dean, or Chair. Search Committees have been appointed but their nature, composition, and reporting authority have been *ad hoc*. This addition to the Faculty Manual is intended to authorize the existence of Search Committees and hence regularize the process as well as clarify the relationship between Search and Consultative Committee. The text of the legislation is as follows:

A Search Committee may be established to assist the Consultative Committee in recruiting candidates for Chair, Dean or Provost. A Search Committee will report regularly and on a timely basis to the Consultative Committee and to the appointing authority.

The composition of a Search Committee for a department Chair will normally be specified by the Bylaws of the School. In the absence of such a Bylaw, the membership of the Search Committee shall be determined jointly by the Dean of the School in consultation with the School Faculty Council and the Regular Faculty in the Department.

A search committee for Dean or Provost shall consist of at least four members. At least half of the membership shall be selected from and by the Consultative Committee. The other members shall be selected by the appointing authority.

The appointing authority shall convene the first meeting of the Search Committee and charge its membership with their task. The committee will then elect its own Chair.

Should you approve, we will forward it to the faculty for its vote as an amendment to the Charter section of the Faculty Manual.

This legislation is now forwarded to you for your action.

SG/kl

cc: Luis Glaser, Executive Vice President and Provost
325 Ashe-Admin. Bldg.
Coral Gables, Florida 33124-4634
305-284-3721
Fax 305-284-5515

Ⓡ
Search Center
Log.

Faculty Senate Office

From: Steven Green; Dept. of Biology [Steven.Green@miami.edu]
Sent: Wednesday, February 20, 2002 11:48 AM
To: Yacoub, Kamal; Faculty Senate Office
Cc: Awad, William M.; Harrison, Christopher George Alick
Subject: Re: information needed

I appreciate it, Kamal. Since she doesn't want to hear about "past history", I intend to cleanse the specifics from the information I've received and then reply to her questions as to when/where problems occurred if she asks.

-Steve

----- Original Message -----

From: "Yacoub, Kamal" <kyacoub@miami.edu>
To: "Green, Steven M." <steven.green@miami.edu>; "Faculty Senate Office" <facsen@miami.edu>
Cc: "Awad, William M." <w.awad.jr@miami.edu>; "Harrison, Christopher George Alick" <cgharrison@miami.edu>
Sent: Wednesday, February 20, 2002 11:40
Subject: RE: information needed

>
> Steve: This is all I can do today Please make the necessary corrections
> before forwarding:
>
> The recruitment for Dean of Engineering in 1990, was conducted by a
search
> committee completely insulated from the consultative committee. The search
> committee announced the position invited candidates and ranked ordered the
> candidates. When the provost decided on whome he wants, he telephoned the
> members of the consultive committee individually to confirm their
agreement
> with his choice. As a member of the consultive committee, I raised the
issue
> that the Candidate has not had an experience as a Department Chair. The
> Provost checked the resueme and agreed with amazement " You know you are
> right" but went ahead and made the appointment of Dean Becker without an
> official vote of the Consultive Committee. Few years later, in 1993, Dr.
> Becker was asked to resign by the administration, but stay on as interim
> Dean until a new Dean is appointed.
>
> In the Spring of 1994, after six months of the announcement of Dean
Becker's
> intended resignation, President Foote called a special meeting of the
> Engineering Faculty and announced his intention to appoint Lew Temares as
> the new Dean of Engineering. When I as then Faculty Senate Chair pointed
to
> him that Lew Temaris is neither an Engineer nor a Scientist or a Scholar
or
> Researcher, he countered that Engineering has had Deans who are Physicist
> like Lew Temares but not Engineers, I asured him that Dr. Temares' degree
is
> not in Physics. Later he checked with the Provost office and learned that
> his Degree was not in Physics but went with the appointment regardless.
> Later when some faculty asked for consultation with the appropriate
> committee, he countered by asking the Associate Dean to Call a Faculty
> Meeting and ask for a vote of the Faculty the next day and without
> distributing a resueme It turned out that the urgency was to make the
> announcement that week at the meeting of the B.O.T.
>
>
>

> -----Original Message-----

> From: Steven Green; Dept. of Biology [mailto:Steven.Green@miami.edu]
> Sent: Wednesday, February 20, 2002 10:21 AM
> To: Yacoub, Kamal
> Cc: Faculty Senate Office; Alexandrakis, Alexandros Plato; 'Awad, Jr.,
> William'; CLASBY, EUGENE S; Harrison, Christopher George Alick
> Subject: Re: information needed
>
>

> Kamal - I'm responding to a written request from the President and an
> additional oral request from Aileen Ugalde for the information NOW. As
> you
> know the President usually wants things yesterday! The real problem is
> that
> she is not present at the Senate meetings to hear the arguments; since I
> urged her not to reject legislation when the Provost so recommends, she is
> now asking me to reproduce the rationale for her.
>

> -Steve

> ----- Original Message -----

> From: "Yacoub, Kamal" <kyacoub@miami.edu>
> To: "Green, Steven M." <steven.green@miami.edu>
> Cc: "Faculty Senate Office" <facsen@miami.edu>; "Alexandrakis, Alexandros
> Plato" <a.alexandrakis@umiami.edu>; "'Awad, Jr., William'"
> <wawad@mednet.med.miami.edu>; "CLASBY, EUGENE S" <gclasby@miami.edu>;
> "Harrison, Christopher George Alick" <cgharrison@miami.edu>
> Sent: Wednesday, February 20, 2002 08:05
> Subject: RE: information needed
>
>

> > I can give you information on at least two cases relating to the
> appointment
> > of Dean Becker in 1990/91 and Lew Temares in 1994. Possibly others if I
> have
> > time to set and recollect my thoughts. I would like to write a good case
> for
> > each, but I do not have the time now.
> >

> > Please note that this Search Legislation and the that of the Provost
> > evaluation are a make-or-brake milestone and should be coached
> carefully.
> > Putting a deadline for this morning is not thoughtful to say the least.
> We

> > need this information collected then double checked at least at the
> level

> > of
> > the GWC and supplied in writing in a report endorsed by the GWC.
> Otherwise

> > it would be refuted as hear-say. Please extend the deadline for at least
> > another week and collate and discuss with GWC to nail this for good.
> > Remember, this is going to be the highlite of your term in office.
> >

> > -----Original Message-----

> > From: Steven Green; Dept. of Biology [mailto:Steven.Green@miami.edu]
> > Sent: Monday, February 18, 2002 11:49 AM
> > To: Whelan, William J.; SG; Mary Ann Fletcher; Lydia DeSantis; JUNE;
> > Jane Connolly; Harrison, Christopher George Alick; GENE; DAVID; Coombs,
> > Mary I.; Awad, Jr., William M.; Alexandrakis, George C.; KAMAL
> > Cc: Faculty Senate Office
> > Subject: information needed
> >
> >

> > The President has not signed our legislation establishing Search
> Committees
> > and identifying their membership. She has asked for more information.
> >
> > Please send to me specific examples of chair, dean, or Provost searches

> that.
> > were difficult, unsuccessful, or handicapped in any way by the lack of
> > clarity of the relationship between Search and Consultative Committees,
> > duplication of function or disagreements, absence of liaison members, or
> > lack of collegiality in appointing a Search Committee or selecting its
> > members.
> >
> > Also, please describe any success stories wherein a search was
> > successfully
> > concluded ONLY BECAUSE the Search Committee was quite autonomous from
> > the
> > Consultative Committee.
> >
> > Kindly reply by Wednesday 20 February evening.
> >
> > Thanks,
> > -Steve
> >
>

Faculty Senate Office

From: Steven Green; Dept. of Biology [Steven.Green@miami.edu]
Sent: Monday, March 25, 2002 7:43 AM
To: Faculty Senate Office
Subject: Monday morning stuff

10:45 - Tues

1) I need a meeting with the Provost in the near future. Subject: medical benefits. Just before my 1100 meeting with him tomorrow would be good -- needs only about 15 minutes.

2) Please remind the chairs of these 3 committees that I am expecting reports IN THE VERY NEAR FUTURE:

- a) ombudsman
- b) CRSCE
- c) Search Committee legislation

Thanks,
-Steve

email WA ee: TW

↑ verbal 3/25/02

McCombes

GA

CH

Faculty Senate Office

From: Chris Harrison [charrison@rsmas.miami.edu]
Sent: Monday, March 25, 2002 11:41 AM
To: Faculty Senate Office
Subject: Re: Search committee document



Search Committees
Legislation....



ATT201430.txt (308 B)

Dear George and Mary

I have made some small changes in the document. They have been tracked. Chris Harrison

(Robyn - could you pass this on to George and Mary. Thanks - Chris)

At 10:31 AM 03/25/2002 -0500, you wrote:

> <<>> Faculty Senate Office 325 Ashe Building, 4634
> (305)284-3721 (office) (305)284-5515 (fax) facsen@miami.edu
> www.miami.edu/FacultySenate Attachment Converted:
> "C:\EUDORA\Attach\Search Committees Legislation.doc"

Search Committees Legislation: Talking Points

- I. Current rule:
Faculty Manual A.13.2 discusses the role and composition of Consultative Committees; the Faculty Manual has no mention of Search Committees.
- II. Given that, there are only three options
 - a. Use only Consultative Committee in carrying out search and generating candidate recommendations
 - b. Use Search Committee, as well, but such committees are not mentioned in the Faculty Manual and there is no structure for their composition, role, and relationship with Consultative Committee, Deleted: s
Deleted: unauthorized by
Deleted: s
 - c. Adopt new legislation filling this lacuna in the Faculty Manual
- III. Consultative Committee only option
This has proved impractical in many situations, e.g. because of size, lack of input from the broader University community
- IV. Current situation
 - a. The Search Committees operate outside the legal structure, which can create resentment and a flashpoint for negative responses to the committees and their actions
 - b. The structure and relationship are ad hoc, which creates confusion and inhibits a learning curve
 - c. There is no structure for relationship with Consultative Committee, which means that the desired coordination and cooperation are often impeded the process is less smooth, and the results less acceptable because of perceptions of lack of adequate consultation with the relevant faculty or its representatives Deleted: and
- V. Situation after adoption of new legislation
 - a. The Consultative Committee and its members have an adequate role
 - i. They can provide necessary local knowledge regarding the problems of and issues confronting the relevant department or school
 - ii. They can provide necessary local knowledge regarding the aspirations of the relevant department or school
 - b. They can help insure the acceptability of the process (and, ordinarily, the result) to the relevant faculty, the primary constituency of a chair or dean
 - c. Simultaneously, the Search Committee can, by its smaller size, help ensure an efficient process with the needed degree of confidentiality at each stage
 - d. The Search Committee can also provide a means of obtaining input from representatives of other relevant constituencies, such as fellow chairs or deans
- VI. Analysis of Proposed Legislation
 - a. 1st ¶: There is authorization, but no requirement for a Search Committee. In each case, the appointing authority can determine if a Search Committee is a useful element of the process

- b. 2nd ¶: The structure and composition of a Search Committee is not uniform, but can be determined by each department or school to meet its particular needs, either in advance, through bylaws, or at the time of a particular search.
- c. 3rd ¶: The Search Committee will have both “outside” membership, appointed by the appointing authority, and “inside” membership, chosen by the Consultative Committee. This insures that the two Committees will work together, with the “inside” members serving as a bridge, to keep each body aware of the interests and concerns of the other, and the information developed by it. This should reduce the likelihood of different recommendations of each body, facilitating the decisions of the appointing authority.
- d. 4th ¶: By having the Search Committee choose its own chair, the likelihood that the Chair can obtain the needed level of time and energy commitment by the Committee members is enhanced. Furthermore, Committee members, recognizing the Chair’s role, will surely choose a person who will adequately devote him or herself to the task.

We hope this is of assistance to you. Please feel free to speak further to the Faculty Senate leadership if you have remaining questions or concerns.

Faculty Senate Office

From: Chair, Faculty Senate [steven.green@miami.edu]
Sent: Tuesday, May 21, 2002 12:25 PM
To: PROVOST
Cc: Faculty Senate Office
Subject: Pending legislation

Luis, as per your request, I reviewed our legislation history and find there are only three pending items.

- 1) 2001-12(A) Search Committees. No action necessary since we are revising the legislation in light of the President's comments to me.
- 2) 2001-14(C) and the interrelated 2001-15(B) University Curriculum Committee. I responded by memo to the President's view that deferral is appropriate and have not received a response. It would be especially helpful in light of the current discussions of curriculum reform if these could be signed as soon as reasonably practicable. In addition, it was part of our understanding and your undertaking to the Senate regarding the disestablishment of SIS that you would so recommend to the President.
- 3) 2001-18(B) Tenure at two institutions in exceptional cases. The President indicated at a meeting earlier this academic year that if she were considering not signing legislation, I would have the opportunity to explain the Senate's reasoning to her. Since you have indicated that you don't support this item, I would appreciate it if you could facilitate my speaking with her about the Senate's discussions and reasoning prior to any decision.

Thanks,

-Steve

Steven Green
Chairman, Faculty Senate
<http://www.miami.edu/FacultySenate>
(305) 284-3721

Tracking Sheet

Provost.

Subject: After Search Committee Legislation Signed by the President and Approved by Faculty and Board of Trustees, Chair to Contact President re: New Provost

History of action taken

DATE	ACTION TAKEN
9-8-04	<p>E-mail from M. Coombs to officers: Once legislation is in place for the Provost search and we are near the point when the Search Committee will be chosen, send the President the following message:</p> <p>As we begin the process of choosing a new Provost, who will implement the University's vision of its future and continue to move forward on strategic plans for the University and its various units, we thought it might be useful to look back at the Faculty Senate's analysis and proposals that were presented to you at the time you arrived, as embodied in the 8 Dec 2001 memo to you from the Faculty Senate Chair [hyperlink to document].</p> <p>We note with pleasure that many of the actions that have been taken under your leadership have moved the University forward significantly toward meeting some of these goals. The changes in the building, collections and support systems for students and faculty under Bill Walker have meant significant improvements in the library, which was one of our major goals and concerns. We applaud these changes and look forward to a continued commitment to meet the short-term and long-term needs for the library.</p> <p>Another major concern was to "improve undergraduate quality and the undergraduate experience." This was clearly a central goal for you as well and we are delighted at the improvement in measures of student quality and at the range of changes, such as commitments to adequate, convenient student living space on campus, which have happened and are happening.</p> <p>There are, however, some of the goals that seem not as yet to have been as clearly addressed. There continues to be a need for more support for our graduate students. Without such support we cannot get the quantity and quality of graduate students that we need to become a world-class institution. We need to devote more attention and resources to "developing stronger academic culture of excellence," by hiring the best faculty and providing them with the support they need for their research. This is an issue across the campus, including at the medical school where clinical faculty need the encouragement, resources, and expectations to engage in those activities that make them part of an academic institution. Finally, the University needs to make the hard decisions that ensure that all our programs are of high quality, by providing sufficient resources for those which are currently too small to meet that goal or, if necessary, by cutting back where we are not realistically able to reach the minimum quality we require.</p> <p>We urge you to take these concerns, as well as the continued success in moving forward in the other areas the Senate had highlighted, as key parts of the commitment of the University and of its new Provost, whoever that may be.</p>

1/24/05 - at our weekly staff meeting, I asked MC if it would be helpful to Dennis Lynch, chair of Provost Search Cmte to review this document. I can't recall if this was ever sent to president (I think it was) but MC said she would cc her on the e-mail that she sends to DL.

(continued) - MC e-mailed DH w/ cc to DES

Faculty Senate Office

From: Faculty Senate Office
Sent: Monday, January 24, 2005 11:30 AM
To: Coombs, Mary I.



four reports
memo-summary to p.

Mary: Copied below is the info you asked that I send to you re: Senate's hopes for the new Provost.

E-mail from M. Coombs to officers from 9/8/04:

Once legislation is in place for the Provost search and we are near the point when the Search Committee will be chosen, send the President the following message:

As we begin the process of choosing a new Provost, who will implement the University's vision of its future and continue to move forward on strategic plans for the University and its various units, we thought it might be useful to look back at the Faculty Senate's analysis and proposals that were presented to you at the time you arrived, as embodied in the 28 Dec 2001 memo to you from the Faculty Senate Chair (attached to this e-mail for your reference).

We note with pleasure that many of the actions that have been taken under your leadership have moved the University forward significantly toward meeting some of these goals. The changes in the building, collections and support systems for students and faculty under Bill Walker have meant significant improvements in the library, which was one of our major goals and concerns. We applaud these changes and look forward to a continued commitment to meet the short-term and long-term needs for the library.

Another major concern was to "improve undergraduate quality and the undergraduate experience." This was clearly a central goal for you as well and we are delighted at the improvement in measures of student quality and at the range of changes, such as commitments to adequate, convenient student living space on campus, which have happened and are happening. There are, however, some of the goals that seem not as yet to have been as clearly addressed. There continues to be a need for more support for our graduate students. Without such support we cannot get the quantity and quality of graduate students that we need to become a world-class institution. We need to devote more attention and resources to "developing stronger academic culture of excellence," by hiring the best faculty and providing them with the support they need for their research. This is an issue across the campus, including at the medical school where clinical faculty need the encouragement, resources, and expectations to engage in those activities that make them part of an academic institution.

Finally, the University needs to make the hard decisions that ensure that all our programs are of high quality, by providing sufficient resources for those which are currently too small to meet that goal or, if necessary, by cutting back where we are not realistically able to reach the minimum quality we require.

We urge you to take these concerns, as well as the continued success in moving forward in the other areas the Senate had highlighted, as key parts of the commitment of the University and of its new Provost, whoever that may be.

Faculty Senate Office
325 Ashe Admin. Bldg.
Loc 4634
(305)284-3721 (office)
(305)284-5515 (fax)
<http://www.miami.edu/FacultySenate>

Faculty Senate Office

*Reminders Fickler
Set for 9/30/04
(after FS mtg)*

From: Mary I. Coombs [mcoombs@law.miami.edu]
Sent: Thursday, September 09, 2004 10:12 AM
To: Sapp, Stephen; Thurer, Richard J
Cc: Faculty Senate Office
Subject: RE:

Ok. Thanks both. I'll send message one today and message two immediately after the fs meeting (as written it would sound strange before we know that we can be moving forward promptly on the provost search process!!)
 Mary

-----Original Message-----

From: Sapp, Stephen [mailto:ssapp@miami.edu]
Sent: Wednesday, September 08, 2004 10:04 PM
To: Mary I. Coombs; Thurer, Richard J
Cc: Faculty Senate Office
Subject: RE:

I think both are fine as they stand. You've captured our conversation yesterday quite well.

From: Mary I. Coombs [mailto:mcoombs@law.miami.edu]
Sent: Wednesday, September 08, 2004 3:36 PM
To: Thurer, Richard J; Sapp, Stephen
Cc: Faculty Senate Office
Subject:

Here are drafts of the two messages to DES we discussed. I propose to send the first one out as soon as we've reached consensus on its language, but to reserve the second until we have the legislation in place for provost search and we are near the point when the search committee will be chosen.

1.

At the August Senate meeting, it was agreed that the ordinary process for provost evaluation need not take place. There was then a question whether you thought it would be helpful to have a procedure to obtain input from the faculty about their views relative to the provost's office for use in the choice of a new provost. You indicated that you would work with the Senate officers to develop a process for feedback that would be "both confidential and professional."

We would be happy to provide you with whatever input you might find useful in designing the process you would use and/or structuring the questions to be asked of faculty to elicit their views. Please let us know what you would like us to do.

2.

As we begin the process of choosing a new Provost, who will implement the University's vision of its future and continue to move forward on strategic plans for the University and its various units, we thought it might be useful to look back at the Faculty Senate's analysis and proposals that were presented to you at the time you arrived, as embodied in the 28 Dec 2001 memo to you from the Faculty Senate chair. [hyperlink to document].

We note with pleasure that many of the actions that have been taken under your leadership have moved the University forward significantly toward meeting some of these goals. The changes in the building, collections and support systems for students and faculty under Bill Walker have meant significant improvements in the library, which was one of our major goals and concerns. We applaud these changes and look forward to a continued commitment to meet the short-term and long-term needs for the library.

Another major concern was to "improve undergraduate quality and the undergraduate experience." This was clearly a central goal for you as well and we are delighted at the improvement in measures of student quality and at the range of changes, such as commitments to adequate, convenient student living space on campus, which have happened and are happening.

There are, however, some of the goals that seem not as yet to have been as clearly addressed. There continues to be a need for more support for our graduate students. Without such support we cannot get the quantity and

quality of graduate students that we need to become a world-class institution. We need to devote more attention and resources to "developing a stronger academic culture of excellence," by hiring the best faculty and providing them with the support they need for their research. This is an issue across the campus, including at the medical school where clinical faculty need the encouragement, resources and expectations to engage in those activities that make them part of an academic institution. Finally, the University needs to make the hard decisions that ensure that all our programs are of high quality, by providing sufficient resources for those which are currently too small to meet that goal or, if necessary, by cutting back where we are not realistically able to reach the minimum quality we require.

We urge you to take these concerns, as well as the continued success in moving forward in the other areas the Senate had highlighted, as key parts of the commitment of the University and of its new provost, whoever that may be.

Your comments requested.

Thanks

Mary

*Follow up letter
sent for 6/18/04*

Faculty Senate Office

From: Faculty Senate Office
Sent: Friday, June 18, 2004 10:18 AM
To: Coombs, Mary I.; Thurer, Richard J.; Sapp, Stephen
Cc: Balotro, Marilene
Subject: Officers meeting to discuss the reccs sent to the President in 2001 re: the 4 reports (Institutional Priorities, University Governance, STLTF, LTLTF)

I need to set up a meeting with the officers to discuss the memo that was sent to the President back in December 2001 that summarized and combined recommendations derived from reports from Institutional Priorities, University Governance, and the Short-Term and Long-Term Library Task Forces. A little history: Last year, the GWC decided that the memo to the Pres (referenced above) should be updated, revised and reviewed again the GWC. This was put on hold pending the outcome of the President's decision regarding reincarnating the Strategic Plan since much of the information included in the report to the President could have ended up in the final SP, if it happened. Those plans are still up in the air, so at our weekly staff meeting, Mary suggested that I set a meeting with the officers to discuss accomplishments (referring to the reccs) since the memo was sent to the President and to come up with a plan on the next step. Note: a short version of a Strategic Plan was sent out in the recent past but plans for the larger, more inclusive Strategic Plan (by unit) is still on hold.

Reminder tickler set for September 3rd

I am looking to set the meeting for Tuesday, September 7th directly following your officers agenda meeting scheduled for 4:30. Please let me know if that is o.k. with you. If so, about three weeks prior to that meeting, I will send you all a copy of the memo sent to the President in Dec. 2001 and a copy of the short version of the most recent publication of the Strategic Plan so that you can review them prior to the meeting and make a preliminary assessment as to whether the recommendations were addressed and what the next plan of action will be.

Let me know.

Reminder tickler set for 8/17/03 - Give hardcopies of material to officers at their 8/3/04 officers mtg.

Thanks, Kim

Faculty Senate Office
325 Ashe Admin. Bldg.
Loc 4634
(305)284-3721 (office)
(305)284-5515 (fax)
<http://www.miami.edu/FacultySenate>

YES NO
SS
RT
MC

F
Date



MEMORANDUM

To: Donna E. Shalala, President
From: Steven Green
Chair, Faculty Senate *[Signature]*
Date: 28 December 2001

Subject: Recommendations derived from reports from Institutional Priorities, University Governance, and the Short-Term and Long-Term Library Task Forces.

As I indicated in my cover memorandum of 13 June 2001, the Faculty Senate had received but not taken any position on the four reports given you at that time. At the Faculty Senate's meeting on 12 December 2001, we voted unanimously to send a set of simple summary recommendations that represent our position on those reports and that are to be interpreted in light of the details contained in those reports. The text embodying that summary follows.

The Senate now looks forward to hearing your thoughts on the reports as well as discussing with you your response to these recommendations. As we discussed at our meeting on 10 December 2001, the Senate meeting that you host on 27 February 2002 would be an ideal opportunity. I am fairly confident that questions from the floor would come at that time related to some of the specific items in the reports as well.

Our summary recommendations in light of the reports are generated understanding that every great university requires adequate resources to move towards distinction. Our principal needs are for more income, new leadership, and enhanced academic goals and expectations. Despite significant improvement in our endowment in the last two decades, we are still seriously undercapitalized nor have we maximized our spendable income by appropriate utilization of existing resources, including diminishing expenses in many ancillary and some academically weak areas where necessary.

New leadership is needed throughout the academic areas of the University. This next generation of academic leaders of the University under your Presidency must be academically outstanding and with the requisite talents required to take the University to higher levels of excellence. To recruit such academic leaders with the vision needed to achieve distinction, we must provide them with substantial resources to carry out their plans. Thus this issue is closely tied to that of income and capitalization. In addition, we cannot fail to recognize that the faculty at large has not escaped the culture of diminished expectations that follows naturally in an institution faced with chronically inadequate resources. The limitations of the library, a lack of essential equipment, a shortage of graduate students of high quality, and relatively large teaching expectations compared with those at other major research institutions have combined to diminish the likelihood that some faculty will achieve their research potential. They also have contributed to an attenuation of the spirit in some individuals and hindered the full expression of intellectual ferment that should be present at our university.

We believe, however, that the stage is now set for us to overcome these limitations and achieve our goals; your energy, wisdom, experience, and appreciation of the realities of the institution have encouraged us to expect rapid movement towards a significant improvement in the quality of the University.

At the end of the last academic year, four ad hoc committees of the Faculty Senate addressed important issues regarding the future of the University and submitted reports with specific recommendations for Institutional Priorities, University Governance, and Short-Term and Long-Term Planning for the Library. As noted previously, these four reports outlined challenges and opportunities and were accepted by the Faculty Senate, but no action has been taken on them apart from the report on University Governance. This set of overall recommendations has been prepared by the General Welfare Committee in response to the charge from the Senate to coalesce and prune the recommendations in the four reports so as to present a coherent set of specific items to the Senate combining the essentials of all four reports. The recommendations of the four reports can be broken down into three different areas.

- (I). Recommendations without significant cost but that require a change in thinking among faculty and/or administrators.
- (II). Recommendations that require capital improvements or an increase in annual operating costs. These could be funded by reallocation of current resources, annual giving, or increased endowment income or other income streams.
- (III). Recommendations that require changes in the way the Faculty Senate does its business as covered in the University Governance report. The Senate has considered and acted on them; no administrative action is requested.

I

A reconsideration of how we approach the academic enterprise is suggested by the reports on Institutional Priorities and University Governance. The following topics listed in their Executive Summaries derive from these reports:

- (a) Strengthen academic quality by nurturing current faculty, especially junior faculty, requiring faculty and administrators to establish formal mentoring programs in each school.
- (b) Infusion of academically-focused leadership at all levels of the institution.
- (c) Appointment of Trustees with academic backgrounds in higher education, and appointment of Trustees to make the Board more national in membership.
- (d) Enhanced efforts for graduates' career placement.
- (e) Enhanced support of efforts to obtain extramural research grants.
- (f) Commitment to faculty research in the clinical departments.
- (g) Increased research and teaching collaborations across departments and campuses.
- (h) Willingness to review, strengthen or when necessary, cut back programs now in place.
- (i) Recommitment to the ideals of diversity and equal opportunity among faculty and administration both with regard to new hires and internal assignments and promotions.

The Faculty Senate has now unanimously endorsed all of these goals and recommends that the faculty and our administration effect suitable actions to achieve them.

II

An increase in the operating budgets of various parts of the University is required to meet the needs identified in the report on Institutional Priorities as well as those in the Short Term Library and Long Term Library Task Forces. The priority given to these recommendations will vary from one academic area, department, program or school to another, but they are all important for the University as a whole.

Develop a stronger academic culture of excellence. Each school faculty and administration should develop and implement a strategic plan for appointing new faculty and nurturing the development of all faculty, consistent with our goal of substantially increasing the quality of research and teaching. This objective requires that significant funds be made available to provide new faculty with the necessary start-up funds and other resources so that they may carry out top-quality creative work. Although most faculty should be brought in at the junior or intermediate level, occasionally appointing senior distinguished scholars may be the best strategy.

Upgrade the infrastructure that supports teaching and research. Investment in the entire range of facilities necessary for productive scholarly activity, encompassing classrooms, meeting rooms, research laboratories and equipment, traditional libraries, and information technology is called for. Wise investment will pay off in better teaching that helps to raise academic standards and in more productive research with greater funding from extramural support. It will reinforce efforts to recruit more highly qualified students and innovative new faculty who can strengthen existing academic programs or establish new ones. Parallel investments in infrastructure and recruitment will both contribute significantly to the development of a stronger and more stimulating academic culture.

Improve the funding and the physical resources for the library to improve our status with respect to our peer institutions significantly and to meet the current and future needs of faculty and students. Presently the library's physical environment and holdings are inadequate to provide necessary resources for academic and intellectual requirements in many disciplines. This situation is reflected in our ARL ranking (one widely accepted measure of our status compared to other universities) that has been steadily declining over the past decade. In the short term, the library calls for an immediate infusion of operating funds to meet the urgent needs outlined in the Short Term Library Task Force report. For the long term, we endorse the report of the Long Term Library Task Force regarding physical facilities; it calls for the construction of a University of Miami Library Center attached to the Richter Library. Such a facility would nearly double the floor space of the current library and provide additional room for study, research and intellectual exchange. Accompanying these improvements and additions to the physical plant, there should be an increase in the library's annual budget. Taken together, these actions will yield a significant improvement that will be reflected by an increase in ARL ranking before the end of the decade.

Improve undergraduate quality and the undergraduate experience. It is heartening that our strategy for improvement, one which the Faculty Senate strongly supported by agreeing to take lower salary increases than would otherwise have been available, has again been successful in recruiting the latest entering class. But we need to go much further in improving student quality, and we also need to improve the educational experience for our undergraduates so that the University of Miami is known as an institution with an excellent undergraduate program, one that is an exciting and interesting place to study. We are an institution of national and international scope. We also need to become a

residential rather than a commuter university. The addition of high quality living space, competitively priced, with the appropriate support facilities, which will attract more undergraduate students to live on campus, should be a high priority of the University.

Upgrade support for graduate education. Currently, many of our graduate students do not receive competitive stipends; more resources must be devoted to remediating this situation so that we can attract better graduate students. The numbers of graduate students in several programs are well below that needed to make the programs competitive nationally. Affordable housing on campus for graduate students must be a high priority for the University to increase both its research efficiency and its intellectual atmosphere.

Increase the size of some academic programs. Many of our academic programs are too small to compete broadly at the national level. As we try to advance to the next state of distinction, we must establish priorities for strengthening our programs and then proceed with their development.

We propose that all of these plans be incorporated into the new fund raising campaign of the university so that resources can be developed for their implementation.

We also recommend that the administration engage with the Faculty Senate's Budget and Compensation Committee in a fundamental examination of our current expenditures to determine how to begin significant improvements immediately. We must reallocate current resources so that we can initiate an ambitious program of improvement long before the fruits of the next successful fund raising campaign are available.

We look forward to your response.