

BOARD OF TRUSTEES OF UNIVERSITY OF MASSACHUSETTS
MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE PRESIDENTIAL SEARCH FIRM
SUBCOMMITTEE

February 24, 2015
Lowell Room, UMass Club,
33rd floor, 225 Franklin St., Boston MA

The meeting convened in open session at 10:10 a.m.

Members present:

Trustee Johnston, Peters; Senior Vice President Williams and Mr. Manning

Witt/Kieffer Search Firm:

John K. Thornburg, Senior Partner

Isaacson, Miller Search Firm:

Monroe "Bud" Moseley, Vice President
Anita Tien PhD, Vice President

Korn Ferry Search Firm:

Kenneth Kring, Senior Client Partner
David Mead-Fox, Senior Client Partner
Robert Sullivan, Senior Client Partner

Staff:

General Counsel Heatwole; Executive Vice President Julian; Director Healey; Ms. Kelly; Ms. Scales

Documents Used: Search Firm Executive Summaries and Pricing Quotes

Chair Manning thanked Senior Vice President Williams and Mr. Healey for their efforts in the procurement process and introduced the members of the committee and the note takers.

The Chair summarized the process of the search, stating that picking the next President for the UMass system is critically important. He stated the need for the next President to understand the scale of the system as an important part of its survival and mentioned some of the key qualifications candidates should possess if they wish to pursue the role of the President for the system.

The Chair then asked Mr. Healey to introduce himself and provide a summary of the procurement process used by the University. Mr. Healey described his position in the President's Office and described the public process for securing RFP's from pre-qualified firms that met the minimum standards for the contract. Eight firms submitted material that met the minimum standards and were prequalified on that basis. The firms were then presented with the compensation package which documented that the fee would be a fixed fee; six firms responded to that regard, and three were selected to present to the Search Firm subcommittee today.

Chair Manning stated that each firm representative had been informed that they had 30 minutes to present their proposal and to answer questions from the subcommittee members.

John Thornburgh of Witt/Kieffer noted that UMass would benefit greatly from advancing with his firm for the Presidential Search. He highlighted the firm's experience and the relationship with UMass. Witt/Kieffer led the search for the Amherst Chancellor and has familiarity with conducting nationwide system searches in Higher Education. Mr. Thornburgh stated that his personal experience in participating on a governing board and being a trustee also makes him uniquely qualified to lead the search if UMass chooses to advance with Witt/Kieffer. He spoke about what his firm believes UMass needs in a new leader for their system.

Monroe "Bud" Moseley and Dr. Anita Tien briefly introduced themselves and noted why their search firm; Isaacson, Miller, differs from other search firms and how UMass will benefit should they chose to advance with their firm. Dr. Tien went on to say Isaacson, Miller has lead more system searches than any other search firm (by their record). Additionally, they've led the recruitment efforts for both large and small systems and have a rapport with UMass. They've led the search efforts for the Dean at UMass Lowell and believe they understand the difference in skill set required for a system leadership role vs a campus leadership role; as they've worked with many campuses nationwide. She also mentioned that she is leading the Higher Education Commissioner for Massachusetts search. Chair Manning asked her about a potential conflict of interest. She responded that the Commissioner position is more outward facing and that if UMass advances with Isaacson, Miller the pool of candidates for the search will be unrelated because of the difference in skillset they will seek in candidates for the Presidential role in the UMass system. Mr. Moseley went on to express his experience working with the search for the Provost at UMass Boston and other campuses. He also spoke about his knowledge of understanding the mission and distinctions of each campus.

Kenneth Kring, David Mead-Fox, and Robert Sullivan briefly introduced themselves and expressed the benefits of Korn Ferry leading the Presidential Search of the UMass system. Ken informed the subcommittee that he would lead the project if UMass decided to advance with their firm. Ken leads the global education projects at Korn Ferry and spoke of his experience in recruiting for Higher Education. Mr. Kring also informed the subcommittee that David Mead Fox would be partnering with him on this project should UMass choose to work with Korn Ferry. Mr. Mead Fox spoke briefly about his 18 years of experience in working with Higher Education searches. He went on to say that Robert Sullivan would consult with them on this project should the committee choose to advance with their firm. Mr. Sullivan has over 20 years of experience on searches for nonacademic positions including some extremely high profile searches. Mr. Kring stated that the UMass system would benefit greatly from the wide range of expertise in both corporate and higher education searches should they select the Korn Ferry team.

Chair Manning advised each of the firms about the challenges of conducting a search with Open Meeting Law regulations.

Mr. Thornburgh stated the commitment of his firm would be to adhere to the policy of Open Meeting Law and that it would be achieved through guidance from the system's counsel. The firm would also make a conscious effort to manage the expectations of the candidates, by

providing a high level of transparency. He also expressed how important it is to choreograph each step of the search process and how important it is to avoid making assumptions.

Mr. Moseley spoke to his experience with leading a search by referencing the CUNY and UC search. He mentioned that the CUNY search had similar obstacles with Open Meeting Law and that their firm assured a highly regimented and aggressive search. He used Janet Napolitano of UC as an example of a nontraditional high profile candidate that participated in a search regulated by Open Meeting Law. He went on to say that UC had a legislated procedure and wanted continued support for emerging minority population and wanted the incoming leadership to understand those realities.

Mr. Kring expressed the need for transparency and that best practices would require the team to talk to the candidates early to make certain the role is designed for their best attributes and strengths. He went on to say that Open Meeting Law can be an issue if they are open too early. The team will not circumnavigate the law. He assured the subcommittee that the team is very capable of managing the search under Open Meeting Law.

Chair Manning asked Mr. Kring to discuss the firm's project with the Suffolk University search and to speak about potential conflict of interest.

Mr. Mead Fox assured the committee that Mr. Kring would lead the UMass search should they decide to advance with their team and that Mr. Sullivan is leading the Suffolk project. Mr. Sullivan will only provide consultation to this project should Mr. Kring and/or Mr. Mead Fox request it. Mr. Fox also assured the subcommittee that the searches are entirely different because of Suffolk's business profile. UMass has distinguished campuses of research and the applicant pool they recommend will be reflective of that.

Trustee Johnston informed the representatives of each firm of the importance of diversity for the system. He asked how they identify candidates with a keen eye in diversity or how they identify candidates with diverse backgrounds.

Mr. Thornburgh answered by noting that his firm has a method for tracking candidates with diverse backgrounds and that beyond a database, the firm also expands to a network of programs geared toward mentoring and fostering diversity in emerging leaders. He also mentioned the firm's affiliation with the National Association of Diversity Officers in Higher Education.

Mr. Moseley informed Trustee Johnston that the element of diversity is a practice his firm highly values. He mentioned the firm's strong relationship with leaders and emerging leaders. He continued by saying they approach diversity systematically with regard to the needs of their clients; the client candidates trust that they will be taken care of. He went on to say that they've recruited 42% women into leadership/board position and that 23% of the candidates that they recruit into the leadership/board positions are considered under represented.

Mr. Kring stated that diversity is a part of everything that they do. An important aspect of assuring diversity is to establish the need early and to be respectful of the candidacy and the board. Candidates will need assurance that their candidacy will be taken seriously. Mr. Sullivan informed the subcommittee that Korn Ferry is the only firm that has acquired a local diversity inclusion firm.

Trustee Johnston asked the representatives of Korn Ferry to describe how close they can get to identifying a candidate of Robert Caret's caliber.

Mr. Kring stated that President Caret was an unusual talent but that the firm has lead searches that have analogous candidates in the past year. Those searches include Texas A & M and Penn State. Each of those searches had a lot of candidates that had a lot talent they were fortunate to hire the #1 candidate for their institutions. Mr. Sullivan believes their firm can come close to identifying a candidate similar to President Caret.

Trustee Peters asked the representatives of each firm for their opinion on whether or not a search takes a different tenor with or without internal candidates.

Mr. Thornburgh stated only if an internal candidate is seen as a strong contender. Otherwise, it might have an effect but it's relatively the same.

Dr. Tien mentioned that internal candidates require the search process to be transparent.

Mr. Kring answered, in his personal opinion; internal candidates did not make a difference to the process.

Trustee Peters asked about the timeline for having a finalist in the position by July 1st.

Mr. Thornburgh encouraged the committee to be flexible. He stated that the timeline was aggressive and that his firm would want to be thorough in conducting the search efficiently and accurately.

Mr. Mosely stated that they would need to get started immediately. The timeframe is doable but aggressive. They would need time to engage and embrace expectations of the search committee to identify the best candidates in the pool.

Mr. Kring stated that the deadline is doable and that the date is a good date. He mentioned that the firm will require a lot of engagement. He encouraged the search committee not to sacrifice the front end of the process and that the description documentation of the process will be important for staying on time.

Senior Vice President Williams mentioned the need for fluency in different kinds of systems. She asked the representatives of each firm to speak more about their experience in refinement of campuses and systems; what differentiates leadership candidates for a campus and a system.

Mr. Thornburgh listed what he believed differentiated candidates qualified to lead a system vs a campus is ego, aspiration, and advocacy.

Senior Vice President Williams asked Mr. Moseley and Dr. Tien to elaborate more on the search process for UC because of its similarity to the UMass system and because it was completed in 4 months; a similar need for the search for UMass.

Mr. Moseley stated that the team would stress the need for a unified vision about the needs of the system going forward. Dr. Tien added that each campus of UC is different and placed strategically to promote socialization and social mobility and that's what they used to select the candidate pool for UC.

Mr. Kring spoke about his expertise in identifying candidates that are qualified to lead systems and candidates qualifies to lead a campus. Mr. Kring stated the biggest difference is the political leadership and the ability to be successful on the legislative and gubernatorial level.

Trustee Johnston asked for thoughts about nontraditional candidates and candidates with no academia background.

Mr. Thornburgh suggested that the search encourages everyone to apply. He stated that the UMass system requires a lot more from a candidate than an academic background.

Dr. Tien stated that it will depend on the preference of the search committee and the needs of the role to advance the system going forward and in the future.

Mr. Mead Fox stated that the search pool would be easier to produce if the candidates were academician.

Chair Manning asked how the candidate pool will be developed for the search and to comment on the importance of candidates with academic background vs nontraditional candidates.

Mr. Kring answered that the team has had a lot of discussion about the needs of the role. He added that it's likely that the candidates will come from Higher Education but encouraged the subcommittee to avoid limiting themselves due to the nature of the leadership role for this search.

Chair Manning asked about the difficulty for a candidate from another state to land this position.

Mr. Kring suggested that the search committee has a robust list of candidates to choose from for this role. Mr Kring added that candidates with transferable political skills are incredibly important to this role. He went on to say that if you limit the search to individuals' native of Massachusetts, you risk limiting the candidate pool.

Chair Manning asked for the thoughts of the subcommittee on the firms that presented.

Trustee Johnston mentioned that he has worked with all three firms and that given the presentations he heard; he supports recommending Korn Ferry to the search committee.

Trustee Peters spoke briefly about the importance of political leadership. He went on to say that he fully supported Korn Ferry being recommended to the search committee.

Senior Vice President Williams enjoyed all three presentations. She recommended Korn Ferry to the search committee.

Chair Manning stated that time is of the essence and that although the Open Meeting Laws may create constraints, the system will recommend a local firm of heft that will think of the search in a broad and global scope and thinks Korn Ferry is the best for this search.

The Chair asked for a motion to hire Korn Ferry for the Presidential Search, it was moved and seconded to recommend the Search Committee retain the services of Korn Ferry for this search.

The motion passed unanimously.

Chair Manning thanked Trustee Peters for his willingness to report out to the Board on Friday, Feb. 27 at the search committee meeting.

There being no other business, the meeting adjourned at 12:08 p.m.

Christina Kelley
Assistant Secretary