

GALLAUDET UNIVERSITY

Open Session with Community
October 6, 2005

The changing of a president is an historic moment for a university. Gallaudet is fortunate to have had the outstanding leadership of President King Jordan for the past 17 years, and that makes the upcoming search a moment of opportunity for this university, as well. Candidates will be considering an institution where there is positive momentum, and a solid base from which to build for the future.

It has been my privilege to talk with the Board of Trustees this morning about the Best Practices in launching a presidential search. We have discussed the importance of the search process being inclusive and transparent, and the Gallaudet Board is now ready to begin their planning for this important effort.

I will outline briefly the next steps to be taken:

- 1) RFP to search firms
- 2) Appointment of Committee – to include representatives from all constituencies of the university
- 3) Selection of search firm by Search Committee
- 4) Search begins

Search Process:

Five or six formal meetings of the search committee -- meetings last 3-6 hours depending on the tasks to be accomplished, plus two full days for semi-final interviews. Each committee member will be expected to be present for these meetings and interviews.

Presearch Study -- The search consultant will spend several days on campus talking with all constituencies of the university community about the future of the Gallaudet, the agenda for a new president, and the preferred qualities in the next leader.

Position Profile -- A written document is then drafted and finalized by the search committee. This document will be placed on the Gallaudet website so the campus community and prospective candidates can review it there.

Recruitment -- Individuals will be invited to make nominations for the search, including all of you and those you may recommend be contacted for networking (associations, leaders at other schools, alumni, etc.) Advertising, extensive mailings to targeted individuals and organizations, and extensive phone calls and personal visits will be made to reach out to prospective candidates.

Reference Checking – Committee members and consultant will speak with others about the candidates.

Preliminary interviews – The committee will conduct interviews with semi-finalists away from campus, with the goal of identifying several finalists to be invited to campus.

Final interviews – Final candidates will be invited to campus. This is an opportunity for the community to meet them and help them to understand what a special institution Gallaudet really is. As community members, you will also be invited to share your observations with the search committee regarding each candidate's assets

and/or any reservations you may have about them. The committee will add that information to their deliberations as they prepare recommendations for the Board of Trustees.

Appointment -- The appointment will be made by the Gallaudet Board of Trustees. A transition plan will be put into place for the outgoing and incoming presidents to provide continuous leadership for the university.

Throughout the search there will be updates to the campus community. However, these updates will not include the names of candidates until the finalists are identified for campus visits. It is extremely important to protect candidates in their current positions, and Gallaudet will want top candidates to be willing to enter the search with the understanding that confidentiality will be protected. Each finalist agrees to move to that stage with the understanding his/her name will be shared with the Gallaudet University community.

ATTACHMENT B

Questions for the Board of Trustees

1. Describe the process by which a presidential search consulting firm was chosen in terms of criteria, advertisement, response to the request for proposals, and how a final decision was made to hire the Academic Search Consultation Service.
2. On a scale from 1 (very poorly) – 5 (very well), how well was the Academic Search Consultation Service able to ensure that the search and selection process was “managed effectively and that we (the Board of Trustees) achieve our goal of securing the best possible president for Gallaudet University?” (From Board of Trustees to the Campus Community, January 18, 2006).
3. Would you recommend the Academic Search Consultation Service or another firm to assist in the process of the next presidential search? Why or why not?
4. What were the criteria for selecting the Presidential Search Committee chairperson and its committee’s members?
 - a. Should changes be made with that process? Yes or No
 - b. If yes, what would you suggest be done differently?
5. “The Presidential Search Committee carefully reviewed analyzed, and categorized all feedback received on the forms, via emails, letters, and polls. All this information was summarized and shared during a meeting with the full Board of Trustees. (From Board of Trustees to the Campus Community May 5, 2006)” It is unclear what forms were reviewed or where the emails, letters, and polls read by the Board of Trustees were from. Please describe, as best you can, these materials reviewed by the Board of Trustees.
6. On a scale from 1 (inadequate) – 5 (more than adequate) how adequate was the process to provide information to the Board of Trustees on all final candidates by the Presidential Search Committee? Please explain your score.
7. What information from the Presidential Search Committee concerning the final candidates would most benefit the Board of Trustees in making their final selection for a future Gallaudet University president?
8. Did you feel you were able to vote and speak freely without fear of reprisal during meetings concerning the presidential search? If no, please explain.
9. Did anyone from the President’s office express views to you on the different candidates before or during the Presidential Search Committee selection process? Please explain.
10. Was there ever a time during the search process that you believed the correct procedures were not being followed? If yes, please explain your answer.
11. Do you think that adequate time was allowed for all phases of the presidential search process? Please explain.

12. Was the requirement for the candidate to have a terminal degree made clear to Presidential Selection Committee? Yes or No

a. Did this requirement change during the selection process?

b. If yes, how did this requirement change and indicate who you believe influenced the change in the terminal degree requirement.

13. Why do you believe that none of the finalists were people of color?

14. Some individuals involved in the Middle States Commission on Higher Education (MSCHE) believe that the Board of Trustees was out of touch with the community during the 2006 Presidential Search. Do you agree with their assessment? Yes or No

a. If you responded “yes,” what changes do you recommend to minimize this perception with future searches?”

15. The search process did not successfully select a ninth president of Gallaudet University. Identify specific area(s) in the search process that you believe could be improved upon.

16. In looking back on the presidential search process, do you believe there was additional information that could have been shared publicly? If so, what could have been shared more publicly?

17. The process used by the Interim Presidential Search Committee successfully chose an interim president. What do you believe was different in the interim search process that made it more successful than the first search?

18. Do you have any additional comments or suggestions you would like to share with our Task Force about improving the process of the presidential search?

Would those Board of Trustee Members who were also members of the PRESIDENTIAL SEARCH COMMITTEE respond to questions 19 and 20 below. The following responses will be aggregated with the responses of the other Presidential Search Committee members.

19. Did you have a clear understanding of your charge from the Board of Trustees for this Presidential Search Committee?

19a. Please explain your response to number 19.

20. “The Presidential Search Committee carefully reviewed analyzed, and categorized all feedback received on the forms, via emails, letters, and polls. All this information was summarized and shared during a meeting with the full Board of Trustees. (From Board of Trustees to the Campus Community May 5, 2006)” Do you think the Board of Trustees used the information about the candidates that you provided them?

20a. Please explain your response to number 20 above.

Questions for the Presidential Search Committee

1. Describe the process by which a presidential search consulting firm was chosen in terms of criteria, advertisement, response to the request for proposals, and how a final decision was made to hire the Academic Search Consultation Service.

2. On a scale from 1 (very poorly) – 5 (very well), how well was the Academic Search Consultation Service able to ensure that the search and selection process was “managed effectively and that (the Board of Trustees) achieve the goal of securing the best possible president for Gallaudet University?” (From Board of Trustees to the Campus Community, January 18, 2006).
3. Would you recommend the Academic Search Consultation Service or another firm to assist in the process of the next presidential search? Why or why not?
4. What were the criteria for selecting the Presidential Search Committee chairperson and its committee’s members?
 - a. Should changes be made with that process? Yes or No
 - b. If yes, what would you suggest be done differently?
5. Did you have a clear understanding of your charge from the Board of Trustees for this Presidential Search Committee? Please explain.
6. “The Presidential Search Committee carefully reviewed analyzed, and categorized all feedback received on the forms, via emails, letters, and polls. All this information was summarized and shared during a meeting with the full Board of Trustees. (From Board of Trustees to the Campus Community May 5, 2006)” Do you think the Board of Trustees used the information about the candidates that you provided them? Please explain.
7. Was the requirement for the candidate to have a terminal degree made clear to Presidential Selection Committee? Yes or No.
 - a. Did this requirement change during the selection process?
 - b. If yes, how did this requirement change and indicate who you believe influenced the change in the terminal degree requirement.
8. Why do you believe that none of the finalists were people of color?
9. Did anyone from the President’s Office express views to you on the different candidates before or during the Presidential Search Committee selection process? Please explain.
10. Did you feel you were able to vote and speak freely without fear of reprisal during meetings concerning the presidential search? If no, please explain.
11. Was there ever a time during the search process that you believed the correct procedures were not being followed? If yes, please explain your answer.
12. The search process did not successfully select a ninth president of Gallaudet University. Identify specific area(s) in the search process that you believe could be improved upon.
13. Some individuals involved in the Middle States Commission on Higher Education (MSCHE) believe that the Board of Trustees was out of touch with the community during the 2006 Presidential Search. Do you agree with their assessment? Yes or No

14. If you responded “yes” to number 13, for future Presidential searches, what changes do you recommend to minimize the perception that the Board of Trustees is out of touch with the community?

15. The process used by the Interim Presidential Search Committee successfully chose an interim president. What do you believe was different in the interim search process that made it more successful than the first search?

16. Do you believe the presidential search process allowed the Presidential Search Committee and the Board of Trustees adequate time to complete its task? Please explain.

17. In looking back on the presidential search process, do you believe there was additional information that could have been shared publicly? If so, what could have been shared more publicly?

18. Are there any additional comments you’d like to share with the Task Force that you think would help improve the next Presidential Search Committee or improve the process of selecting the next presidential?

ATTACHMENT C

IPSAC Members' Survey

1. The process used by the Interim Presidential Search Committee successfully chose an interim president. What do you believe was different in the interim search process that made it more successful than the first search?

2. Do you have any additional comments you would like to share with the Task Force?
Please return to amy.wilson@gallaudet.edu before Sunday, November 11 at 5pm.
Thank you.

ATTACHMENT D

Campus Community Survey

1. From list the below, please choose your role in the Gallaudet University community:

___ Administrator

___ Alumni

___ Clerc Center

___ Faculty

___ Staff

___ Student

___ Other, please explain. _____

2. Were you a member of the Gallaudet community and on campus during the January - May 2006 Presidential Search? Yes or No

3. On a scale from 1 (inadequate) – 5 (adequate), do you believe that the amount of information provided throughout the first presidential search process to the campus community was adequate?

1	2	3	4	5
Inadequate	Somewhat Inadequate	Neutral	Somewhat Adequate	Adequate
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

a. Please explain why you rated the search with this number.

4. The presidential search process did not successfully select a ninth president of Gallaudet University. Identify specific area (s) of the search process where you believe the process could be improved upon.

5. Why do you believe that none of the finalists were people of color?

6. The process used by the Interim Presidential Search Committee successfully chose an interim president. What do you believe was different in the interim search process that made it more successful than the first search?

7. What other suggestion(s) do you have for the process of selecting the next president of Gallaudet University?

8. Do you have any additional comments you would like to share with our Task Force about the process of the presidential search?

Results of Board and PSC Responses

Results from the Board (8 responses) and PSC (6 responses) surveys show that the next presidential search process should have:

I. Changes which could be made

1. Clear detailed definitions.

- which define a “terminal degree”
- of rules for service on the PSC committee
- on how meetings are to be run and votes taken
- of the authority of PSC Chair
- of confidentiality
- of what decision/authority each group have

2. Understand roles and responsibilities and expectations each group: Board, PSC, Consultant, general Gallaudet Community. (i.e., in what format is the Board looking for material to submitted to them; define interaction between the PSC and Board; what role does the campus community/alumni play in the search process?)

3. At beginning of process, chart out a clear timeline, with parameters, which allows moderate flexibility for adjustments. So, as the process unfolds if additional time is needed along the way, PSC & Board is not forced to rush decisions solely to meet deadlines. This would give community greater sense of awareness of the complete process

4. Complete transparency on how decisions are made. If a subgroup goes to work on an issue/decision/research they must come back and fully disclose how they came to their conclusion

5. With consulting firm, include cost of service

6. Use consulting firm with the process and clarify the role the Consultant will play, how they will be selected

7. Discuss beforehand how decisions will be made, what authority does chair have, how to make final resolution to issues of disagreement (follow Robert’s Rules of Order?)

8. Initial Planning is so, so very important, spend a decent amount of time discussing and deliberating process in the beginning, the old builder’s adage, “Measure twice and cut once”

9. Use co-chairs, preferably one faculty with tenure, & one BOT; may prevent any one individual for having too much control or ability to lead or sway discussion

10. Composition of PSC seemed representative, but probably no larger than 17 is good

11. Identify areas of ambiguity and give very detailed descriptions, ie terminal degree (at what stage in the process is it acceptable to earn the degree, or is it needed at time of application?) For thoughts, if terminal degree is due at time of application, ex. April 1, what happens to candidate defending PhD in May? Can you agree to some flexibility or discussion later to clarify?
12. Define roles, responsibilities and expectations of BoT & PSC, and **support** staff
13. How the two bodies communicate throughout the process (through common members both BoT & PSC, through Co-Chairs, through combined meetings)
14. Education and training for BoT & PSC regarding Presidential Search Processes, following best practices model include proper protocol regarding discussions during deliberations
15. Educate the General Gallaudet Community on Presidential Search Process, including educating each group on how it is to be involved in the process
16. Continue to inform and involve the community through forums, as appropriate, before/during/after the Presidential Search Process
17. Discussion of confidentiality, ethics, civility, and at the conclusion of the process, one unified message, which lends itself to the issue of confidentiality
18. Identify appropriate staff support person that would prove that the person was beyond reproach and define their role in the process – clearly set parameters
19. Discussion of how to have a committee environment open and free with respective discussion and debate, and with the ability to come to consensus and unified decision
20. Figure out the role of the consultant, and what training/education would be necessary to give them adequate understanding of the deaf community so that they can complete their contracted with questions
21. Document the advice given from consultant on specific questions so as to not allow such advice to change mid-process
22. Use of co-chairs may prevent any one individual for having too much control or ability to lead or sway discussion

II. Pitfalls to avoid

1. Don't allow qualifications alone to dictate successful applicants, identify match of qualifications and persona represents the Gallaudet community as a whole
2. Leaks of process, clearly at several junctures of the process information had been leaked
3. All activities should be beyond reproach

4. Any interactions from President's office about potential applicants, process, etc
5. President should be careful with remarks at all times about possible presidential candidates before, during, and after the process
6. Note advice given from consultant on specific questions so as to not allow such advice to change mid-process
7. Complete transparency on how decisions are made. If a subgroup goes to work on an issue/decision/research they must come back and fully disclose how they came to their conclusion.
8. Staff support does not become an active involved member of the committee
9. Do not rush the process, allow due diligence to occur in all phases of the process
10. Board needs to be engaged at a greater level throughout the community and not to rely only one source for their information
11. *"I hope that Gallaudet does not return to its earlier history of considering itself so unique that we feel that best practices in higher education do not apply to us."* (PSC quote)

II. Positives from initial search

1. Overall the general process was a good one
2. There was diversity on the PSC committee
3. They did not feel that any issues of diversity of the applicants, adversely influenced the process, applicants continued to move forward based on qualifications alone
4. No comments were made that racism adversely impacted the process
5. Important to use outside consultancy and to rely on their expertise

Results of Alumni Responses

Stakeholders	Number Surveys Distributed	Responses	Percentage
Alumni	5778	483	8.4%
Viewed by 790 people			

Since the Alumni are not on campus, we analyzed their results separately from the Gallaudet campus community. Also, the Alumni representative on the committee, Mike Kaika, believed only four questions were necessary to ask the Alumni rather than the eight questions we asked the campus community.

After each question we have written the most common themes found throughout the responses and the number of people who wrote a response which fits in that theme. Also, the most representative quotes have been selected to illustrate the most often mentioned issues within each theme. On an overall note, the alumni felt left out of the first presidential search process.

1. The first presidential search process failed in selecting Gallaudet University’s ninth president. Why do you believe the search process failed?

Interference by the President’s Office (56):

- *“The transparency of the whole process was thrown into question when it was acknowledged that former president I. King Jordan either conversed or interviewed all three finalists, which at the time hadn’t been disclosed as part of the search process.”*
- *“Dr. Jordan was overly involved and invested in the process and I feel he manipulated the finalist list so that only his selectee had a Ph.D. out of the final three, ensuring her selection.”*
- *“Dr. King Jordan basically pushed his preferred candidate through the process prematurely; also he provided filtered information from the Deaf community to the Board of Directors and very little access to the Board by the Deaf community.”*

Lack of Community Involvement (51):

- *“The lack of consultation with the faculty and staff members, students and alumni on how the presidential search committee should be set up, developed, and processed is another reason (the process was not successful).”*
- *“They did not listen to the community's feedback on presidential candidates regarding their strengths and weaknesses.”*

- *“Similar to the Zinser fiasco: an individual was chosen who was perceived as unpalatable to the campus community. Both times the Board selected someone they knew would be a good business leader but not a leader for the community. Both times the Board compounded the situation by seemingly doing an about face. I no longer trust the Board to make the right decision. As well, last year's fiasco was initially begun with the extremely short open period of acceptance of applicants. From the beginning there was already much discontent at the short period and the universal immediate reaction was that the only reason this happened is because the Board already had someone in mind for the position and they did! Calm and collected leadership was not apparent during this period. I am also concerned that Gallaudet didn't properly support or develop a supportive environment for this change in the past couple years leading up to the selection committee.”*

Foul play (48)

- *“The process was not sufficiently transparent to allay stakeholder concerns regarding the possibility of a 'fix'.”*
- *The decision was made far too quickly- so quickly that people felt that there was a decision made all along... the various constituencies (fac, staff and students) did not feel their opinion and input counted.*

Criteria (28): The criteria weren't clear, or the criteria that were initially established weren't used for the process.

- *“The process failed because the university needed to clearly communicate frequently with the community regarding the process and qualification criteria. If the qualification criteria is not clearly specified then confusion will reign.”*
- *“Clearly define the qualification criteria and make sure the Deaf Community accepts the criteria prior to selecting the next candidate. Stating this is the 'Best' candidate isn't enough. It has to be clear how the candidate match up with each criteria.”*

Communication was poor (28):

- *“(needed) more announcements directly from the committee to all alumni across the country...really should be the whole world. The last one was terrible...as an outsider, I got many many versions from people in D.C. but none directly from the President's Office and I did not know whom I should trust with all the information, etc. Now with Davila's blog...maybe the search committee should have its own blog...for a limited period of time.”*
- *“The logical half of me says that the BOT simply did not listen to the feelings of the community and wished to appoint (the person who) couldn't lead the community. It should have taken in consideration that the president cannot lead without the community.”*
- *“The search committee and Board of Trustees did not get the general pulse/feel of the campus community at large for feedback on who would be the best final candidates.”*

The Presidential Search Process Was Successful (19):

- *“I don't think the process itself failed. I think some people failed the process.”*
- *“The search process didn't fail. A President was chosen. The university allowed some staff members and students to ignite 'deaf pride passions' - and to fan disobedience and noncompliance with university and legal rules/laws.”*
- *“I didn't have a problem with the process, I have a problem with how easily the search committee was manipulated by both the administration and the community (faculty, staff, students, and alumni).”*
- *I do not know the inner details of the search process. But my understanding, as an outsider looking in, is that the search process found a few hearing impaired candidates. Two of these became finalists. At this point I believe the candidate who was less popular with the student population was selected for the position. The University's Board of Directors then simply crumbled under the resulting student protests. The Board itself taught students that decisions which affect Gallaudet can be entirely controlled by the students through extreme protests. That was why the search process ultimately failed.*

BOT bias toward Dr. Fernandes (18):

- *“I. King Jordan made it too crystal clear that he wanted Jane Fernandes to have his job, so the search process didn't seem to be *that* neutral, and it lost credibility with people.”*
- *“I think the search process failed because the BOT and the Jordan Administration failed to listen to the majority of community's voice and feelings. They were so set on hearing ONE side which was Jordan's. It was as if nobody else mattered, but Jordan.”*

Search Process was too fast (16):

- *“The timeline of Presidential Search Process were too short, for example, the Presidential Search Committee advertise the position of President for around 3 to 4 weeks. So need to more extend time (2 to 3 months)to get this advertisement for position of President to entire higher education and Deaf community. The timeline of Presidential Search Process should be range of one year and half to two years.”*

Community Interference (13)

- *The process allowed too much 'voice' from faculty and students. You can't please everyone.*
- *“I believe by allowing students' involvement in the search process created a problematic for the Board of Trustees. We should have left this search process to the BoTs whom we, the deaf community, have invested in. We did not give the BoTs opportunity to use their lawful authority to select, hire and dismiss the president.”*
- *“I do know that the students did not like the candidate and that the faculty supported the students' choice to protest. Does that mean that the search process failed? Because the students did not like the candidate? Would the search process have succeeded if a lesser qualified candidate had been found originally that the students *did* like?”*

Process flawed (10)

- *It was a combination of extremely poor planning and lack of input from all parties.*

PSC (9)

- *The Search Committee did not represent the views and concerns of various stakeholders (i.e. Gallaudet students, Alumnus, Staff and Faculty)*
- *The Board of Trustees decided not to take the recommendations in the report of the presidential search. They relied on 'confidential' information they got from somewhere else to select Jane Fernandes.*

Lack of Transparency (8)

- *Process was closed and no information shared. leading to speculation of racism, especially in choosing someone who did not meet the minimum degree requirements as a finalist*
- *Lack of transparency. A perception of cronyism. A perception of interference from the outgoing president (staff member from the President's office controlling all information).*
- *Lack of transparency between the campus community, the Office of President and the Board.*

Racism (3)

- *"Institutional Racism cannot be ruled out. However, given that the position is highly specialized the reality of the situation is that there may not be many candidates of color with adequate credentials. That being said, it is the responsibility of the institution to provide an atmosphere and the resources necessary to build such leaders now and in the future. "*

2. The interim presidential search committee successfully chose an interim president. What was different in the interim search process that made it more successful than the first search?

Community involvement (78)

- *The interim presidential search committee was more successful because they heeded the feelings/opinions of faculty, alumni and students.*
- *The interim presidential search committee is clearly transparent process and represented accurately views and concerns of various stakeholders, including Faculty, Staff, Students and Alumnus.*
- *I think the involvement of core protesters in the selection made it more successful, also the university was going through a crisis and people were eager to 'fix' it.*
- *It was certainly handled differently in the sense that the Gallaudet community was more clear in what they wanted than they were the first time around.*
- *I presume it was more visible to the Gallaudet community involved. Communication took place at all avenues whereas the first one was a bit vague and too quick.*

Communication was better (24)

- *Stakeholders were assured again and again that their input was valued. There were regular updates on the process. I think this should have been done with the first search to assure stakeholders that the search committee was following through.*

Criteria for Presidential Candidate were clear (19)

- *It succeeded because the environment on campus made it clear as to what their expectations were and I believe as a result the BOT was aware of the needs and how it can be met.*
- *It appears that qualifications were looked at more closely and weighed heavily.*

Need to get someone in the President's Office quickly (15)

- *I think this was more of a 'quickie' appointment to please the deaf community, so the university can be reopened.*

Qualified available candidate (13)

- *It's not like we had that many good candidates to choose from. Davila was the older, 'wiser,' person who had a background in the US Dept of Ed. That didn't make him the best candidate, but it was guaranteed to arouse the least protest.*

3. What suggestions do you have for the future selection process for the next President of Gallaudet University?

Involve Community (104)

- *Gain the support of enough leaders among the stakeholders for all of the candidates so that whichever one is nominated will be acceptable.*
- *Equal representation from the board, faculty and elected student representatives,*
- *Include feedback from the campus community and alumni in the decision-making process*
- *Board needs to be more involved with the community and gather input from the major stakeholders (faculty, students, alumni, nation-wide and world-wide leaders of Deaf-related organizations, etc) before making their decisions.*
- *Develop criteria with the campus community and must be followed (69)*
- *Develop criteria developed by community's inputs*
- *“Clearly define the qualification criteria and make sure the Deaf Community accepts the criteria prior to selecting the next candidate.”*

- *“Establish qualifications, stick with them.”*

Make it transparent (39)

- *Minimize the 'secrecy' but at same time respect the privacy of those who are under consideration by having clear guidelines that are acceptable by all - the committee and the applicants.*

Communication (27)

- *“There should be public information on a monthly basis on the process (not necessarily covering private dialogue) but at least keeping people informed of what is what and who is who.”*
- *Use all media venues to communicate with us including blogs and vlogs which Gallaudet failed miserably during the 9th President selection process and aftermaths.*
- *Create an open public process and be sure to communicate often and clearly with the campus community about what is happening along the way.*

Take time(16)

- *The future selection process should not be operated on short time frame. It should be able to continue the process until the committee is confident that they have highly qualified candidates lined up and ready for the final interview. I think that these selected candidates should have an opportunity to introduce him/herself to the Gallaudet Community and share their visions for Gallaudet before the Board Trustees meet them as well as to review the comments from the campus.*

Gather information and/or guidance from outside resources (14)

- *Need a neutral third party to monitor the process that would give the process an instant creditability in the eyes of the stake-holders.*
- *Look at other minority type university's on their process. i.e. Howard University does their selection process.*

President’s Office stays out of process (12)

- *The former President can not be involved in president search committee or vouching for the new President.*

BOT stick to the process (12)

4. Do you have any additional comments you would like to share with our Task Force that concerned you about the process of the presidential search?

- *Also it failed to work with various of diversity people as Deaf, Hard of Hearing, Cochlea, and Hearing to listen their input of their expression*

- *Gallaudet University TO PRACTICE their statements on every applications where it says that Gallaudet University wouldn't discriminate against race, gender, age, color, hearing status.*

Results of Campus Community Responses

After each question we have written the most common themes found throughout the responses and the number of people who wrote a response which fits in that theme. Also, the most representative quotes have been selected to illustrate the most often mentioned issues within each theme.

1. From list the below, please choose your role in the Gallaudet University community:

Role	Count
Administrator	15
Clerc Center	27
Faculty	78
Staff	100
Student	137
Other, please explain. Staff/Faculty, online student, Staff/Administration	4
Total	398

Viewed by 669 people Completed by 398
--

2. Were you a member of the Gallaudet community and on campus during the January - May 2006 Presidential Search?

Yes	71%	
No	29%	
	Students nonmembers	70 %
	Staff nonmember	10%
	Faculty nonmembers	9%

3. On a scale from 1 (inadequate) – 5 (adequate), do you believe that the amount of information provided throughout the first presidential search process to the campus community was adequate?

Mean 2.716 (neutral)

Answer	Count	Percent
Inadequate	80	22%
Somewhat Inadequate	91	26%
Neutral	92	26%
Somewhat adequate	36	10%
Adequate	57	16%

Please explain why you rated the search with this number.

Information was inadequate (83)

- *Very little information was shared with the community and short notice given for attending the few opportunities to meet the candidates.*
- *The majority of the student body did not feel satisfied with the information that was available. Not much information was given due to 'reasons of confidentiality.'*
- *Regardless of the reality of the process, the perception was that strings were being pulled from behind the scenes and that information was being managed to protect a pre-ordained result.*
- *Some of us are online students who never visit the campus, therefore we are 'invisible students'. We were not 'active participants' because we were unable to attend presentations or any forums in person. In addition, we were not given opportunity to ask questions or give our opinions/ratings.*

Information was adequate (45)

- *The process was as open and aboveboard as possible, given the obvious confidentiality issues in any presidential search.*
- *I feel that the information was more than adequate. I was surprised at how much information was shared; usually on at least a weekly basis. I put my trust in the search committee to find a qualified candidate for the position and was pleased how the process was handled.*
- *the qualifications, background, and history of all candidates were provided to the community and the most helpful was the open forum and presentations to the community in the KCC where each candidate had an opportunity to represent themselves and speak their vision for the future of Gallaudet as well as take questions from the community.*

4. The presidential search process did not successfully select a ninth president of Gallaudet University. Identify specific area (s) of the search process where you believe the process could be improved upon.

More community involvement (68)

- *Buy-in from the various important constituencies needed to be established at the outset.*
- *The board of trustees seemed entirely disconnected from the reality of the climate and needs of Gallaudet University. They appeared to be making a business decision, and did not take into account the candidate's ability to lead the student body, faculty and staff to a more successful and cohesive community. The Board seemed unaware of mounting tensions that had existed between the student body, faculty and staff and the candidate they ultimately selected. Their lack of understanding in this matter suggests that blame for the protests cannot solely rest on the shoulders of the students.*
- *I somewhat felt that the search process was fine, there was one area that could have been improved is the importance of community feedback for each of the three candidate's public presentation. The committee and some of the members of the Board of Trustees emphasized that the evaluation was extremely important and that the comments would be seriously considered. I*

felt that they over inflated the value of the evaluations in the decision process to select the final candidate out of the three.

No interference by Presidential Office (44)

- *The president's office should have NO involvement in the search whatsoever.*
- *The search process should be more impartial and separate from any of the university offices. In other words, using Gallaudet personnel as staff support probably causes the process to be 'colored.'*

Improved Communication (35)

- *Regular reports of the process and sharing of the minutes of the meetings. Of course, confidentiality is necessary regarding candidates so a general overview of what is happening is sufficient. I know the first search process DID all of this ... the fact that members of the community were apathetic and did not pay attention until the final candidates were announced was a problem. Therefore the committee needs to have multiple methods of communicating i.e. a website with all the info posted, links in the Daily Digest, regular updates on email announcements, and perhaps vlog or town hall updates.*
- *More information about how the information collected throughout the process is utilized*
- *More information up front, before the whole process started about what the community could expect to see happening- what would be shared and what would not be shared as well as rationale why certain aspects of the search would be kept confidential*
- *More transparency during all stages of search process (34)*
- *Continue to have Gallaudet EEO involved in the process to be sure everything is done in a neutral sense.*
- *Greater transparency is needed*

5. Why do you believe that none of the finalists were people of color?

Difficulty of finding people of color for the job (39)

- *There are not that many Deaf people, not to mention Deaf people of color who are qualified for the position.*
- *However, given that the position is highly specialized the reality of the situation is that there may not be many candidates of color with adequate credentials*
- *Because there is a paucity of people of color qualified for president of a university, his poor interview performance resulted in an outcry from students of color that there was discrimination in the process.*

Bias (30)

- *It was not a question of picking a person of color, more of already have a specific candidate in mind. The other candidates were afterthoughts.*

- *I don't think this had to do with racism. I believe it was simply the result of a flawed/fixed process. In order to ensure that the president will get his candidate to be selected, it was necessary on the one hand to blow out of proportion her qualifications and dismiss any of her negatives, and on the other hand to blow out of proportion the negatives of all the other candidates, including those of color.*
- *Gallaudet has historically suppressed the promotion of people of color and hearing people as well who are clearly qualified*

Racism (23)

- *Institutional Racism cannot be ruled out. However, given that the position is highly specialized the reality of the situation is that there may not be many candidates of color with adequate credentials. That being said, it is the responsibility of the institution to provide an atmosphere and the resources necessary to build such leaders now and in the future.*
- *The answer is too complex and lies in a tradition of family and institutional structures in our country that perpetuate racism and dysfunction.*
- *there is racism at Gallaudet as well as in the society as a whole, and people of color are often not given the same consideration.*
- *I believe that there are people of color who are qualified to be President, why none of the candidates made it into the final three, I do not know. But still today there are underlying areas of racism and also oppression of deaf people across campus. Until we can rid campus of these problem areas, the perception of bias toward people of color or those who are deaf will linger.*

6. The process used by the Interim Presidential Search Committee successfully chose an interim president. What do you believe was different in the interim search process that made it more successful than the first search?

Community was involved (37)

- *It was most transparent and involved heavily on the opinions and representation of the campus community as a whole.*
- *They asked the community about their opinions and wanted responses from the community.*
- *(a few comments disagreed)I didn't see as much community involvement and in interaction with the candidates in the interim search than the original search- with is ironic.*

Interim Factor (33)

- *Interim means temporary. I think the community doesn't give as much weight to temporary as it does permanent. After the protests there was so much distaste people were sick of unrest and just happy to have someone in there as long as the protesters stopped giving Gallaudet negative publicity in the news.*
- *I think people wanted the whole thing over and done, The current president was someone people knew, and specifically trusted.*

Transparent (24)

- *The process was more transparent and publicly scrutinized...thus they had to uphold standards.*

Interim Process no more successful (23)

- *It wasn't more successful. Both processes ended up with candidates acceptable to the Board. The difference had nothing whatever to do with the process.*
- *It wasn't more successful. Desperation led to the selection of Dr. Davila. The fact that he is supposed to be interim lowers the stakes and permits his acceptance. If it had been another search for a permanent president, it is unlikely that his selection would have been viewed with equal acceptance.*

Improved communication with Gallaudet community (22)

- *Weekly emails (which explained) clarity of the steps and what steps were being taken, deadlines, the use of time-line, mentioning the diverse people involved in the process, also increased accountability and transparency helped a lot.*

President's Office not involved (17)

- *The President's office was not involved in working with the search committee. There was no perceived conflict of interest.*

7. What other suggestion(s) do you have for the process of selecting the next president of Gallaudet University?

Suggestion	Count
Community Involvement	90
Increased/Improved communication	41
Transparency	37
Candidate Criteria established with Gallaudet community and not change during search process	25
BOT changes (educate itself about Gallaudet Community & follow through on final decision)	21
Many suggestions were made on the process itself	20
President's Office out of process	17
Various Suggestions for PSC	17

8. Do you have any additional comments you would like to share with our Task Force about the process of the presidential search?

All varied.

ATTACHMENT H

Subject:Academic Search

Date:Thu, 8 Nov 2007 15:46:37 -0500

From:James P. Ferrare <James.Ferrare@academic-search.com>

To:<william.sloboda@gallaudet.edu>

Mr. Sloboda,

Thank you for your letter requesting a conversation with Tobie van der Vorm about the process used in the search for a president at Gallaudet. All of us are disappointed at the outcome of what was believed to be a successful search and appreciate your efforts to learn from the experience.

As president of Academic Search, I serve as first among equals but haven't the authority to command the availability of a consultant. While I oversee marketing and contracts, senior consultants make decisions about communicating with search committees and client institutions independently.

As you may know, Tobie lost her mother and brother to cancer in recent weeks and has been away from the office for long periods of time attending to family matters. In addition to search work, Tobie is dealing with legal matters as the executor of both wills and attempting to care for her brothers' surviving children.

Tom Gerrety decided at the conclusion of the spring '07 semester to return to the classroom and now teaches at NYU. He is no longer affiliated with Academic Search and would have to be contacted separately if you seek his input.

I wish you and the committee well as you pursue this important work.

Respectfully,

Jamie

Jamie Ferrare, Ph.D.
President
Academic Search, Inc.
1825 K Street NW - Suite 705
Washington, DC 20006
202-263-7472 (direct)
202-332-4049 (Main)
202-234-7640 (Fax)
jpf@academic-search.com
www.academic-search.com

Academic Search: Three decades of dedication to strengthening leadership in higher education through searches for college and university presidents and senior administrators.

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

Subject:Letter for Dr. Ferrare

Date:Tue, 06 Nov 2007 11:46:23 -0500

From:William Sloboda <William.Sloboda@Gallaudet.edu>

To:info@academic-search.com

CC:zHEPPNER, CHERYL <CHheppner@nvrc.org>

Dear Dr. Ferrare,

I am contacting you as Co Chair on behalf of Gallaudet's Task Force to Review the Presidential Search, a search that was instituted in 2006 under the guidance of your firm.

We really need to meet with Dr. van der Vorm in order to ask questions about the search process because the presentation on best practice that was sent to us is next to useless for our needs. It is only a general guide and does not provide any answers to the questions that we would like to ask.

We are only talking about an hour of her time, and considering the amount of time that your firm had previously invested in Gallaudet, I do not think that this is too much to ask.

Our review has both the support of the campus community and is being done under the auspices of the current Board of Trustees , a number of whom were involved in the 2006 search process.

If you cannot make Dr van der Vorm available, could you put us in touch with the other consultant, Tom Gerety ?

Time of the essence here, so I would be in your debt for this assistance with our review.

Sincerely,
Bill Sloboda

William Sloboda, MBA, CPA
Associate Professor of Accounting and
Accounting Program Coordinator
Department of Business
Gallaudet University
800 Florida Ave. NE
Washington, D C 20002-3695
202-651-5312