

**Immediately following President Jamienne Studley's resignation announcement on October 23, 2002, the Nominations Committee of the Board of Trustees presented a list of trustees for the Presidential Search Committee (PSC) to the full Board, which was subsequently ratified by the Board. The eight trustees were Bill Dake, John Howley, Beverly Miller, Sara Schupf, Oscar Tang, Sue Thomas, Linda Toohey, and Janet Whitman. On November 8th, Gove Effinger (representing CFG) met with Sue Thomas and John Howley and on the basis of the principle of equal representation agreed upon a sixteen-person search committee to be comprised of eight trustees, four faculty, two administrative staff and two students. On the same date, John Howley was appointed chair of the search committee by Sue Thomas, Chair of the Board.**

**As in the previous search, the trustees acknowledged the right of the faculty to determine the process by which their representatives to the search committee would be selected. Consequently, it fell to CFG and CAPT to oversee faculty participation in the presidential search process. Convened on October 29th by CFG, the Committee of Committees drafted a proposal to establish the procedure for selecting the faculty representatives to the search committee. The proposal, which was ratified by the faculty at its November 1st meeting, stipulated the same procedure used in the 1997-98 search. As a result, CFG and CAPT oversaw a selection procedure that combined elective and appointed phases to ensure both a democratic voting process as well as an appropriate balance of disciplinary affiliation, experience, and gender. On November 12, nominations and expressions of willingness to serve were sent to all eligible faculty by CFG. Eight finalists were chosen and their names announced to the community. After extensive interviews by CAPT four faculty were selected: Carolyn Anderson (Theater), Terry Diggory (English), Mark Hofmann (Mathematics and Computer Science), and Jeff Segrave (Exercise Science, Dance, and Athletics). The same discretionary authority was granted to SGA and the administrative staff in the selection of their respective representatives. The two members of the administrative staff selected were Ann Henderson (Registrar) and Tracy Barlok (Advancement), and the two students selected by SGA were Rachael Beard '05 and Evan Flath '04.**

**While the faculty, administrative staff, and student representatives were being selected, three trustee members of the PSC (John Howley, Sue Thomas, and Janet Whitman), Gove Effinger (CFG Chair), and**



**preparation for the on-campus visits by the two candidates Bret Ingerman, Director for the Center for Information Technologies, installed FuseTalk, a software program that permitted employees and students to have separate discussions about the candidates (only the PSC had access to both sites). On April 29th-May 1st, the first candidate, Dr. Philip A. Glotzbach, visited campus. Materials for the second candidate were distributed to the community on May 2nd, and on May 4th-6th, the second candidate, Dr. Elaine Maimon, visited campus. The itineraries for both candidates' visits are included in the full 2002-03 PSC Report. Although some faculty requested time on the itineraries for a faculty-only meeting with each**

bodies in the early stages of the search. Accordingly, our first recommendations address the selection process for representation on the PSC. As noted in the PSC report, faculty representatives are chosen in two steps: a CFG-run election, followed by a final selection by CAPT. The names of those elected in the first step should be made public immediately. CAPT should also continue its policy of a personal conversation with each finalist as part of its selection process. Faculty comments in feedback and in informal discussion suggest that this two-tiered process is widely accepted and that it contributes to confidence in the faculty's representation in the search. We would also recommend that the means of selection for other constituencies of the community be published so that they can be better and more widely understood. This will also contribute to better sharing of information about the progress of the search in the community at large. It is both sensible and fair to expect that the quality of reporting the faculty experienced will be available to all members of the community.

Early in the process, members of the PSC established "on the road roundtables," where input of alumni and other stakeholders in Skidmore's future could be solicited, and where those stakeholders could be regularly apprised of the progress of the search. The success of these roundtables suggests that they should form a part of any future search.

Once the search reaches the point where candidates are invited to campus, the rhythm accelerates and sometimes planning suffers. It was the broadly shared conviction in feedback and general discussion that candidates should speak in the same venue and that the faculty should have a meeting to itself with each candidate. The reasons for both these recommendations are obvious: there should be no external factors that could in any way contribute to a sense that one candidate has had an advantage over another; and the faculty needs to see and hear a President in our equivalent of the well of the senate, for that space in Gannett is where the President appears before the faculty in the open conduct of our affairs. The fact that neither could be managed was unfortunate, and argues for more detailed planning for the final stages of the search. The meeting conducted by CFG for faculty discussion of the candidate also suffered from the time squeeze: the question of whether the administration should participate in that meeting needs to be settled well enough in advance so that confusion and unhappiness can be avoided.

CFG is also concerned that the inclusion of candidates' spouses in the open community meeting confuses the purpose of the meeting. There are few if any relevant questions that the community needs to ask of a candidate's spouse in a necessarily brief informational meeting. And it would be awkward were a candidate to be single or to come without a partner to the interview, when other candidates had been accompanied. Should a future search committee wish to include spouses in the process, we recommend that a better defined social gathering be arranged where interested parties could meet a candidate's partner.

The question of the number of finalists who would be brought to campus—a question that had carried over from the previous search—resulted in lengthy

discussions with Tobie van der Vorm and with John Howley and Sue Thomas. Their pledge to make every effort to present a choice to the community reflected their understanding of the desirability of allowing the community to participate meaningfully in the vetting of finalists. In the event, two candidates did come to campus and there was no residual concern expressed that additional finalists should have been invited. CFG recommends that future Presidential searches continue the practice of community exposure to more than one candidate.

Finally, as CAPT remains the faculty committee charged with the vetting of appointments, it is important that it continue to have direct interviews with the candidates, and that its recommendations or reactions be forwarded to the PSC in a timely fashion.

**It remains only for CFG to thank the PSC for an excellent process, and in particular our faculty colleagues on the committee—Carolyn Anderson, Terry Diggory, Mark Hofmann and Jeffrey Segrave—for their willingness to serve in this important capacity. The**