7-17-1982 10:20 AM

1982-07-17

Board of Regents, Murray State University

Follow this and additional works at: https://digitalcommons.murraystate.edu/borminutes

Recommended Citation
Board of Regents, Murray State University, "1982-07-17" (1982). Board of Regents Meeting Minutes. 600.
https://digitalcommons.murraystate.edu/borminutes/600

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by the Digitized Collections at Murray State’s Digital Commons. It has been accepted for inclusion in Board of Regents Meeting Minutes by an authorized administrator of Murray State’s Digital Commons. For more information, please contact msu.digitalcommons@murraystate.edu.
MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE BOARD OF REGENTS
MURRAY STATE UNIVERSITY
July 17, 1982

The Board of Regents of Murray State University met July 17, 1982, at
10:20 a.m. in the Board Room, Third Floor, Wells Hall, on the campus of the
University. The following members were present: Mr. J. W. Carneal,
Dr. Charles E. Howard, Mr. George N. King, Sr., Mr. Jere McCuiston,
Mr. Bill Morgan, Mrs. Sara L. Page, Mr. Steve West, Mr. Alan Whitehouse,
Mr. Jerry Woodall, and Mr. Ron Christopher, Chairman, presiding.

Present also for the meeting were Mrs. Patsy R. Dyer, Secretary of the
Board; Mr. Jim Hall, Vice President for Administrative Services and Treasurer
of the Board; Mr. James Overby, University Attorney; Mr. George Stockton,
Director of Personnel Services; Mr. Dwain McIntosh, Acting Director of
Information and Public Services; Faculty Members: Drs. Ken Winters,
Terry Foreman, S. M. Matarazzo, Ken Wolf, Wayne Bell, Tom Posey; and members
of the news media and visitors.

Chairman Christopher called the meeting to order and presented the
following letters requesting a special meeting of the Board of Regents:

July 1, 1982
Mr. Ronald Christopher, Esquire
205 S. 6th Street
Murray, KY 42071
Dear Mr. Christopher:

I request that a meeting of the Board of Regents be called for
the purpose of receiving the report of the Committee to determine
the presidential selection process.

Sincerely,

/s/ Steven L. West

P. S. July 17, at 10:00 a.m. would be acceptable.

SLW

July 6, 1982
Mr. Ron Christopher, Chairman
Board of Regents
Murray State University
Murray, KY 42071
Dear Chairman Christopher

I request that a meeting of the Board of Regents be called for the
purpose of receiving the report of the Committee to determine the
presidential selection process.

I suggest that the meeting be called for Saturday, July 17, 1982.

Respectfully

/s/ Billy B. Morgan, Regent
Murray State University

Agenda

The following agenda was presented for the meeting:

AGENDA
for
Meeting of the Board of Regents
Murray State University
July 17, 1982
1. Oath of Office administered to Alan Whitehouse

2. Report and Recommendations of the Committee to Determine Presidential Search Procedures
   A. Scope
   B. Timetable
   C. Advisors
   D. Advisory Committee
      (1) composition
      (2) function
      (3) timetable
   E. Search and Coordinating Committee
      (1) composition
      (2) function
   F. Financial aspects of search, screening, and selection, including housing and staffing

3. Delegation of Ministerial functions together with procedures and guidelines

4. Designation of Spokesman

5. Informational Items
   A. Suggested advertisement
   B. Suggested guidelines/responsibilities for Search & Coordinating Committee
   C. Suggested guidelines for Board of Regents for screening process
   D. Sample guideline for finalists' visits to campus
   E. Duties of Presidential Search Office

Oath of Office administered to Alan Whitehouse

Mr. Christopher: We have a new member of the Board, who has been elected President of the Student Government Association. Congratulations to you, Alan, on your victory. You were here at the last meeting, but because of the enactment of the new law that was passed the last session of the Legislature, we are following the intent of that law, which states that the student regent will take office on July 1, and your term will run through June 30, 1983. So, Alan, if you will come forward, Mrs. Dyer will administer the Oath of Office, and I think Mr. Sanders of the Ledger & Times wants to get a picture.

The Oath of Office was administered to Mr. Alan Whitehouse by Mrs. Patsy R. Dyer, Notary Public.

Reorganization

Mr. Christopher: The law requires us to follow the admission of a new member with reorganization, so at this time may we hear nominations for the office of Vice-Chairman?

Mrs. Page: I nominate Mr. Carneal.

Mr. Christopher: Are there other nominations?

Mr. McQuiston: I make a motion that nominations cease.

Mr. Christopher: There being no other nominations, do I hear a motion that he be elected by acclamation?

Mr. Morgan: So moved.

Mr. Christopher: All those in favor of the motion say, aye; opposed, nay. Motion passes.
The floor is now open for nominations for the position of Secretary.

Mr. McCuiston: I nominate Patsy Dyer.

Mr. Christopher: Any other nominations? There being none, is there a motion that we accept Mrs. Dyer's nomination by acclamation?

Mrs. Page: I so move.

Mr. Christopher: All those in favor say, aye; opposed, nay. Show that Mrs. Dyer was unanimously elected.

The office of Board Treasurer, and that person cannot be a member of the Board.

Mr. Morgan: I nominate Jim Hall.

Mr. Christopher: Mr. Morgan nominates Jim Hall, are there any other nominations?

All in favor say aye; opposed, nay. Please show that Mr. Hall was unanimously elected Treasurer of the Board.

I suppose we should get into the record the minutes of the meeting that the committee had on June 24 in Bowling Green. Did everyone receive a copy of the minutes of that meeting? Let me ask those members of that committee, including members present, Mrs. Page was also present. Does anybody have any additions or deletions that they would like to make to those minutes? Is there a motion that these minutes be accepted and be incorporated in the minutes of the Board of Regents of Murray State University?

Mr. Carneal: So moved.

Mr. McCuiston: Second.

Mr. Christopher: Motion made and seconded. All in favor say aye; opposed, nay. Those minutes will be adopted.

(See Attachment #1)

If you had an opportunity to read through those minutes, you saw we had a very good meeting in Bowling Green. Everyone was present, and Sara Page also was able to make it. We had two members of the press present; Mr. Overby came as University attorney, and Mrs. Dyer as Secretary of the Board.

Basically, let me just outline the recommendations of the committee. First, that the search be national in scope. Secondly, that the search, screening, and selection process be conducted exclusively by members of the Board of Regents of Murray State University. Thirdly, that the search be conducted by a committee made up of as many Board members as can volunteer their time to that process, and this committee suggests that the Search Committee be empowered to a) employ necessary office personnel and establish such an office, b) consider the assistance of professional consulting services and employ such services if feasible, c) to include the Treasurer of the Board, the Affirmative Action Officer, and the Director of Personnel, as advisers to the Search Committee.

Four, that an Advisory Committee be appointed for the purpose of defining the University's goals, objectives, and missions for the next decade in order to give the Board of Regents suggested criteria to measure the final candidates for the presidency, that the Advisory Committee submit its report to the Board of Regents by September 24, 1982, and that the Advisory Committee be composed of the following: a) President of Faculty Senate, b) Vice-President of Student Government Association, c) President of the Murray State University Alumni Association, d) a representative of the non-academic personnel or the University staff, e) a representative of regional elementary and secondary educators, f) a minority representative, g) a female representative, and h) a community representative. Also the committee proposed that the following time-table be established:
The Search Committee begins advertising immediately after the meeting of the Board of Regents as a whole.

Deadline for taking applications.

The Board of Regents selects the top ten candidates.

The Board reduces the top ten candidates to the top five candidates.

The Board of Regents announces its selection for a new president.

Since the committee met, Mrs. Dyer, Mr. Overby, and myself have met twice for at least four hours each session, plus they've put countless hours beyond that into the agenda that is before you. So, what I would like to suggest is that your packet has been broken down, and we have taken each of the committee recommendations and put into a form of a motion. I think we could expedite our meeting by taking each recommendation one at a time, and if there's any discussion needed, we can discuss them one at a time.

So, if you'll go to your packet, let's take the first item, and that is the committee's recommendation that the search be national in scope. Is there any discussion about that?

Mr. Carneal: Ron, exactly what do you mean by "national in scope"?

Advertising and certain media?

Mr. Christopher: Yes, and that we assure the public and the friends of Murray State University, the Alumni, the faculty, students, everyone, that we are going for the best possible candidate, whether he be on campus, in this state, California, New York, from border to border, from coast to coast, is basically what the feeling of the committee was.

Mr. McCuiston: I make the motion that the presidential search be national in scope; its search, screening, and selection process be conducted exclusively by the members of the Board of Regents of Murray State University.

Mr. Carneal: Second the motion.

Mr. Christopher: We spent considerable time discussing how the process should be conducted and by whom. In this motion, we have also included that it be conducted exclusively by the members of this Board. We talked about representation from various groups, and we got to the fact that there are other groups that would like to be represented in a search and selection process; and as soon as we got to this point, we did not know where to end.

Mrs. Page: Does this rule out a paid consultant?

Mr. Christopher: No, I'm talking about the search process.

Mrs. Page: The way it's worded, to me, rules out a paid consultant. It rules out anybody but Board members.

Mr. Christopher: What's the word, "conducted"?

Mrs. Page: That the search, screening, and selection process be conducted exclusively by members of the Board.

Dr. Howard: I think the word "exclusively" is the word they're having problems with.

Mrs. Page: I don't know that we want a paid consultant, but I hate to see us limit ourselves.

Mr. West: That goes to a question I had as well, under the University's Governance Document there are several internal groups that would have an advising function, and the word "exclusively" might indicate that we're leaving that out too.
Dr. Howard: Would it change the rotation to leave the word out?

Mr. Christopher: Mr. Overby, have you some suggestions?

Mr. Overby: The provision is made in other places for an Advisory Committee and for input in an advisory capacity. Taking all of these together and considering them together, I think would mean that the decisional aspects that are made would be made by this Board, and it was precipitated by advisory members from outside the Board, voting in the initial screening process, which was suggested. If you do that, the Board has given up, and you've given rise to a cause of action on the part of some 150 to 200 people that might be taken out in the first elimination, to say that they were not selected or eliminated by the Board but were eliminated by other people. When you look at all of these together, you will find that they are consistent and that as any function of the Board, you can have the advise and consultation with other people. So, it is designed to insure the integrity of the Board's action, not to preclude you from obtaining advise from other sources.

Mr. Christopher: Why don't you just take a seat here, because you're going to be involved in these discussions. Does that help clarify anything?

Mrs. Page: It doesn't to me. It still says to me that we can't let anyone...

Mr. Overby: Well, you could enclose it there in parentheses. This does not exclude advise from varied sources. To me, the word "exclusively" means that the Board is the one that is going to make the decision, but it doesn't limit the Board and to whom they may go to get advise.

Mrs Page: It says "exclusively search." What if you hire somebody to bring in someone?

Dr. Howard: Does it change the motion just to leave the word "exclusively" out?

Mr. Overby: That would be acceptable to me.

Mr. Carneal: The point you were making though, Jim, was in the final analysis, it would be only members of the Board who made that final decision.

Mr. Overby: Make these decisions all the way down the line. For example, if somebody else is screening out people, I'm thinking in terms of advisors to the Board, then they are effectively eliminated. If they are effectively eliminated it seems to me that they have grounds to complain, that they were eliminated by someone other than members of the Board. We can get advise from anyone you want to. It could be conducted by members of the Board of Regents. I was just emphasizing that point.

Dr. Howard: That satisfies the Statutes, though?

Mrs. Page: What if you put "exclusively" on the screening and selection, and not on the search?

Mr. Overby: Well, again, I think when you take these others in consideration, you can get nominations from other sources. The integrity of the process, I think, Mrs. Page, would best be served by indicating that it is to the Board. Then if a search committee wants to get advise from other sources, more power to it. I think that is the whole purpose of this—that it be nationwide in scope, that we not only be fair, but that we give indications that we are fair.

Mr. Christopher: I think obviously that would do it. If anyone has a problem with this when we get through all this and wants to come back and change it, we can but we can leave the word "exclusively" out. Won't you feel comfortable with that?

Mrs. Page: Yes, I will feel better.

Mr. Christopher: So, Jerry, do you mind showing that your motion left that word out?
Mr. Woodall: My motion is to leave the word "exclusively" out.

Mr. Christopher: The motion is as you stated it, but you didn't say exclusively. The motion is "that the search, screening, and selection process be conducted by members of the Board of Regents of Murray State University."

Mr. Carneal, you seconded that motion, is that correct?

Mr. Carneal: Right.

Mr. Christopher: All those in favor, say aye; opposed, nay. Motion passes.

We'll let everyone have a chance to read 2 b.

We have varied from the recommendation of the committee on the date for deadline for receiving applications. After our Bowling Green meeting, and in talking with Drs. Ken Wolf and Terry Foreman, they both suggested that the date be changed because they called to my attention that a good many faculty from across the country might not be coming back to school and wouldn't see the Chronicle on Higher Education or other academic publications until sometime into the month of September. So, our suggestion was that we move that to October 1, instead of September 15.

Steve, I think you had commented that you were concerned that the fifteenth may have been too early. Any other comments?

Mrs. Page: What if we moved it to even later than that? We could still begin to screen, couldn't we? Say, we put it October 15.

Mr. Christopher: Might be unless people feel like they don't need to start looking at them. That's only going to give you a month.

Mrs. Page: But, we could start with the ones we had, couldn't we?

Mr. Christopher: Sure.

Mr. Carneal: Ron, have you received any applications already?

Mr. Christopher: No, because we have to do this today before we can start.

Mr. Carneal: I understand, but somebody in California could have read about it and communicated with somebody that they are interested but as far as you know, there haven't been any?

Mr. Christopher: No.

Dr. Terry Foreman: If I may clarify the point that we had made, we know of campuses that do not actually get under way in the fall until very late September. Often times, folks who have administrative responsibilities, who might be looking to obtain larger ones and are in the market for a job such as the one intended to be advertised here, might take care of clearing off desks during the first part of the summer, and then postpone their leisure time until the last part. So they would not really reach their own post until very late in the month and would have very little time to apply for even an October 1 deadline.

Dr. Howard: If I might comment, Ron. The last time we did this the large volume of applications came in fairly early, and then tapered off, until toward the end there were very few. I think that wouldn't be a big problem based on the experience of the last go-round.

Dr. Foreman: If I may make just one comment. I don't know when you began advertising the last time. In this case, this Board intends to begin advertising in the low ebb of communication of the whole year.

Dr. Howard: I think we began advertising in February, right in the middle of the school year.

Dr. Foreman: Whatever applications come in, you could begin examining in a preliminary way as soon as they begin to arrive so there would not be an enormous amount of work to be done at the very end. As you indicated, flow tends to taper off.

Mr. Christopher: What is your opinion, Charles?
Dr. Howard: I think that's a good idea, leaving that out.

Mr. Christopher: Do you think we need to go beyond that?

Dr. Howard: I don't know, he made an interesting point. I know in the East in some of the schools, it is late September before they start registration.

Mr. Carneal: Ron, how inflexible do you think that date should be? If it is October 1st, what if we have one come in on the 10th?

Mr. Christopher: The date will be put in the advertisement, and then the legal ramifications, Jim, I guess you have considered that, haven't you?

Mr. Overby: It would seem to me, that if we advertise it, obviously, the final date, that we are going to have to conform to it.

Mr. Carneal: Unless, you modify the way you advertise. Say that the Board hopes to have all applications in, or give some leeway, by a certain date, and then if they didn't meet...

Mr. Christopher: I believe you need to have an absolute cutoff. If in the process, it comes down that you can't select anybody, then you just start all over again. But, I believe we would have to have some recognized this-is-it. Otherwise, Bill, we could cut it to ten, then all of a sudden, here comes someone out of the blue, and says I'm interested, and maybe six are impressed with that person and would want to go with them, and I think then we'd create a state of unfairness.

Mr. Carneal: Well, if we are going to be inflexible, let's give enough time to get them in. What do you go by, Jim, the date the application is postmarked or the date it is stamped "received" here?

Mr. Christopher: Postmarked, I would think.

Mr. Overby: Well, if you're talking in terms of legal notice, that would be true, I think the advertisement said "received," I would have to double check.

Mr. Carneal: It does say that. "Deadline for receiving applications" would indicate to me they would have to be received by this office on that particular date. If we're going to be that inflexible about it, I'd sure hate to have on the 3rd or 4th of October somebody apply that would seem to us to be outstanding.

Mr. Overby: My only concern is this. I think Dr. Howard mentioned last time that he felt it was to the advantage of the University that the process move as expeditious as possible, consistent with principles of fairness. If that's true, the further along you push the thing, the more difficulties you have. The tension is on the Board, in terms of pressures and getting nominations and what have you, so I would say that you extended it once, from one date to October 1, and to extend it beyond that to me would seem unnecessary. To me, people that are in the field of higher education that might be interested are probably working not only in terms of two semesters, but on a twelve month basis. The Chronicle is the magazine in higher education, so it seems to me that people would get the message.

Mr. Woodall: Anyone who is interested in the job is going to know.

Dr. Foreman: The National Endowment of the Humanities, the Natural Science Foundation, and the National Institute of Health have adopted a policy that establishes deadline dates for funding applications that regard postmark. Those seem to be accepted as reasonably fairer than what other deadlines are.

Mr. Christopher: I think, Jim, if you agree, deadline for mailing or delivering applications.

Mr. McCuiston: Be postmarked by the first or be delivered by the first? Which are you saying?

Mr. Christopher: I suppose the postmarked.
Mr. Overby: Should be postmarked no later than.

Mr. Christopher: Well, there may be a hand delivery. So, postmarked or delivery of applications.

Mr. Overby: Yes, I think that would be okay.

Mr. Morgan: If you are going to get technical about them, you had better clear up the postmark, because these postage machines can be made to read anything you want.

Mr. Christopher: I don't think that will be a problem.

Mr. Overby: You can say must be filed with the office, which means regardless of when it was postmarked, because we know when it was filed here, because we will be filing them in, just like filing with a clerk.

Mr. Christopher: Well, that goes back to deadline for receiving applications.

Mr. Overby: As evidence by the filing.

Mr. Christopher: Well, what's the pleasure of the Board?

Mr. Woodall: I approve the notion be adopted.

that the following time table be established in the search, screening, and selection process for the new President of Murray State University:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>July 17, 1982</td>
<td>The Search and Coordinating Committee to begin advertising immediately</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October 1, 1982</td>
<td>Deadline for receiving applications</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November 13, 1982</td>
<td>The Board of Regents narrows the applicants to the top ten candidates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January 15, 1983</td>
<td>The Board of Regents reduces the top ten candidates to the top five candidates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February 26, 1983</td>
<td>The Board of Regents announces its selection for President</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mr. McQuiston: October 1st be the cutoff date, and that's it? I second.

Mr. Christopher: Is there any further discussion? Does anybody have any questions about what we did as far as establishing those dates?

The committee had two excellent advisors, Dr. Charles Howard, who had gone through this process at Murray State, and Mr. Cole, from Western came to talk to us. It was Charlie's feeling—you took 9 months before—that was just too long. The reason we shot for February 26, was 1) keep the process in as short a period of time as we could and 2) because of the date of July 1, and because we would be going into the start of a new year people would need that much time to give notice if they were currently employed in a situation where they had to give notice. Any further discussion? All those in favor of the motion say aye; opposed, nay. Motion passes.

Mr. Carneal: Ron, let me ask you another question about this. All of these dates that we are establishing here, the fact that we are passing this schedule, that doesn't mean it's inflexible, does it? There may be extenuating circumstances, and no way to cut it to five by January 15.

Mr. Christopher: This gives an opportunity for you to mark your schedule. These dates are Saturdays. We considered Thanksgiving and Christmas, and we realize the fifteenth to the twenty-sixth is going to make it a very busy time for everybody. There are going to have to be visits to campus, but we had to set something for some certainty with an appreciation that it is not cast in stone.
Dr. Howard: Do you feel, Bill, that from January 15 to February 26 is too short a time to select someone from five people, is that your point?

Mr. Carneal: Well, Charlie, I don't know. I've never been through this sort of thing before. I just don't know whether it's enough time or not. On November 13, I won't be here; I have a meeting. But, whatever date you select, you are going to have some conflicts.

Mr. Christopher: Yes, that is going to be the problem. There will be notices sent out ahead of time, and Patsy will be checking with people to be sure that they can be here.

Mr. Carneal: I would think, Charlie, in answer to your question, that the biggest problem you are going to have is the timeframe between October 1 and November 13th. If you have 200 applications, on the 13th you are reducing it to ten, and then you have got an even longer time to reduce it to five. You could have 200 applications to take out in that first timeframe.

Mr. McCuiston: But, you can start looking at them before October 1st.

Mr. Christopher: We hope to start getting those to you as soon as they start coming in.

Dr. Howard: The way we did that before, Bill, is we had a check list we used. You go through these, and last time we had 206 as I recall. There is going to be a goodly number that aren't going to be exactly what you are looking for in terms of experience and background. I think that individually we all know what we are looking for, and what we are trying to do is find someone that we can all be satisfied with. In that period of time, what is going to happen is when you get down to ten candidates you are going to be subjected to intense lobbying from various sources because all those people are going to know somebody who knows somebody who knows you. The shorter that period of time, the less trauma I think it is. By that time, people are getting exhausted with the process and that is still enough time that you can divide up. For example, last time the Board members divided, and two members went to New York. I think it is a good time table. That's just my opinion.

Mr. Christopher: Well, Bill, the reason the time period between the 13th of November and January 15, is we considered the holidays and the difficulty that would bring in getting everyone together for a meeting.

that the following University and Board officials be designated as advisors to the Search and Coordinating Committee and to the Board of Regents as a whole, and to any employees of the Board engaged in the search, screening, and selection process for the new President, namely: Vice President for Administrative Services, and Treasurer of the Board; Director of Personnel; Affirmative Action Officer; and Director of Information and Public Services.

Mr. Christopher: The thought there was all would be critical in advising the Board and the committee: Mr. Hall, Mr. Stockton, Mr. Stinchfield is Affirmative Action Officer, and Dwain McIntosh is serving as Acting Director of Information and Public Services. We need Jim's expertise on the financial end of it, as well the other input that he can give. George, of course, is very familiar with the Affirmative Action, as well as the other federal laws that would have to be complied with, plus his expertise in devising evaluation forms, and the overall general process. Certainly, we have to comply with the Affirmative Action laws and that's why we thought we needed Mr. Stinchfield. One area that is going to be critical throughout this whole process is we have got to have good press or public relations as far as keeping the public informed as to how the process is conducted at every stage. So, there may be other positions or personnel that come to mind; and if so, we need to include them in this motion. Any other comments about committee members?

Mr. King: When you say George, which George are you talking about?

Mr. Christopher: George Stockton.

Any questions about this proposed motion? Is there a motion?
Mr. Whitehouse: I so move.

Dr. Howard: Second.

Mr. Christopher: Alan moves and Dr. Howard seconds that the motion as presented be adopted. All those in favor say aye; opposed, nay. Motion is adopted.

This resolution establishes an Advisory Committee that would have as its primary purpose to make the recommendations to the Board of Regents as to the University's goals, objectives, and missions, for the next decade. The Committee felt that if we were not going to have people from outside of the Board to be directly involved in the search, screening, and selection process, that it would be essential that we have input from those that are directly affected by the University to look at the goals, objectives, and missions. Once received, we use that to establish criteria in our selection process. There again, we had the same problem of how vast or broad the make-up of the committee would be, and we came up with the eight selections as you see in the resolution. We felt that faculty should be represented, and we felt that the obvious selection would be the person that has been elected by the faculty beyond their Board member and that would be the President of the Faculty Senate. We felt there should be student representation, and since they have student representation on the Board, and that person is also the President of the Student Government Association, we felt we should go to the Vice President of the Student Government Association. To allow Alumni representation, we went to the President of the Alumni Association. We felt that the staff or non-academic personnel should be represented. Patsy, James and I, I think, went beyond what the committee proposed. What we have included here is that it is our understanding that there is a Non-Academic Personnel Committee. I'm not real clear on how that committee is recognized by the Board of Regents. But, do we formerly recognize that committee?

Mrs. Dyer: That reports to Jim, he probably can answer that.

Mr. Hall: Yes, that committee is part of the University Committee Governance System. It was established by the Board as part of the Committee Governance System, so I would say it is a very fair representative of the staff. They are elected by different groupings within the staff organization of the University.

Mr. Carneal: How many people are on it, Jim?

Mr. Hall: Twelve, I believe.

Mr. Christopher: So, we have suggested that this committee elect their representative to this advisory committee. Then the process committee felt because of the history of the University and the fact that at one time we were a Teachers' College and we have strong roots in the educational system in West Kentucky that a representative of elementary and secondary education be a part of the committee. We understand that there is a group of superintendents who have an organization called the West Kentucky Educational Cooperative. They have an office here on campus and a director, and they have written asking that they be included in the selection process. So, that was the only conclusion that the committee came up with that perhaps we look to that group to provide a representative on this advisory committee. Any other input or suggestions that you have, let's make them. Then, we felt we should provide definite female representation, and we need to address that right now in terms of how that person should be selected. As well as a community representative and that would be the local Murray-Calloway community. There again the selection of that person needs to be addressed.

Mr. McCuiston: Are we going to pick the persons, and they will select someone else to do it or select themselves or what?

Mr. Christopher: That is what we need to do today. We need to either hire somebody to do it or let's do it or say a position or something because we didn't get that far, and that's going to have to be done.
Mr. Carneal: Is there such a organization as a West Kentucky Business and Professional Women's Association?

Mrs. Page: May I say something? I said this at the committee meeting. I don't see any purpose in putting a female member on there unless they have something to contribute and the same way with a minority member. I would prefer to see two more faculty members put on the committee because the faculty has a real role to play in this. To put a woman and a minority member just so when people look at it they will say well, they're on there.

Mr. King: Let me tell you how this got started. We were trying to keep that down to as few people as we could; and when somebody mentioned one of the Chambers in one of the communities, somebody said well what about this other community. I said if we don't look out we are going to be looking for a woman and a minority then a Catholic and a Protestant. I go along with Sara.

Mrs. Page: In the first place, you are assuming that one of these other people is not going to be a female or a minority which is more sexist than to put one on there.

Mr. Christopher: Is the Vice-President of the Student Government male or female?

Mr. Whitehouse: Male.

Mr. Christopher: The first three positions are male.

Mrs. Page: Well, what about putting two more faculty members on there instead of the female and minority members?

Mr. West: I'm going to agree. I don't know whether you would want to say a female representative selected from the faculty or just leave it open?

Mrs. Page: I would. This is my own personal opinion. You all don't have to agree with me.

Mr. West: The Executive Committee of Faculty Senate had some concern and still has some concern that there is not more faculty representation. As you said, Sara, they feel like, and I agree, that they have a large stake. I like the suggestion, but the concern in Bowling Green was that if you put two or three faculty then immediately everyone else wants two or three.

Mrs. Page: But the faculty has a legitimate reason to be there, and these other people we welcome their advise, but they don't have that much direct role.

Mr. Whitehouse: But, don't the students and staff also have an equal direct role to play?

Mrs. Page: In my mind, the faculty is different.

Mr. Christopher: This is where we got to before.

Mr. Carneal: One thing that I note is that there is not any representative of the agricultural community, and certainly that's a tremendously important part of the mission of this University.

Mr. Christopher: You are right, Bill. We got to this same problem before. The first time we got to it was when we said who all should be involved in the selection process. And that's why we said it's best to keep it in the Board of Regents.

Mr. Carneal: How much enthusiasm are you going to get out of an advisory committee anyway?

Mr. Christopher: Well, if they are sure that we are going to take their work as important considerations to be criteria that will be used in selecting the President, then I would hope that they would be very enthusiastic about this. I think it would be important that the Board assure the committee that it is going to consider its work. Our thought was that at
this point when you are going through this process, and you are bringing a new captain to steer the ship where is the ship going?

Mr. Carneal: You all have gone through some of this and I haven't, so I apologize if I ask too many questions. But in addition to the agriculture community and the role that this University serves in agriculture, then you have commerce and industry. We have the educational group represented here, but our graduates are going into the fields of agriculture outside of our academic world, and they are going into business and professional groups and so forth. Let AIK appoint somebody, and Rayburn Watkins certainly has an interest in this University. I think he is a graduate of this University and has been President of AIK for 25 years. Sara, if you wanted to, let the Kentucky Business and Professional Women's Association appoint somebody. But, just in thinking about the groups that this University serves, certainly you've got agriculture and you've got business and commerce as well as the educational people. If you had somebody from industry, let's say AIK, they should be able to give input to the direction that they see the University ought to be going for the needs of business and industry in the future.

Mr. Christopher: I think there is a great deal of merit to what you're saying, Bill, but let's step back a minute. First of all, do we think this concept of an advisory committee is good? Is there any negative reaction to that?

Mr. Carneal: I think it's good and I hope we can get an enthusiastic committee, but one thing that concerns me is the very thing we were talking about before this meeting started and that is the mission for the next decade. You've said a mouthful right then.

Mr. Christopher: We talked about that.

Mr. King: I don't think we should have anybody on this committee that is just going to be window dressing.

Mr. Carneal: Well, I agree with that.

Mrs. Page: What about the accreditation process that we are in now? Aren't there some studies involved in that?

Mr. Christopher: But hopefully your faculty representative as well as the student representative would be getting that input to this committee because they will be going through that process this year.

Mr. McCuiston: Now, on the community, that's the Murray and Calloway community, the local area?

Mr. Carneal: That's what I'm saying. I don't think you should confine it to local. That was my original thought, and I backed off from that. This University serves not only Murray and Calloway County, but it serves all of Kentucky. There is no reason if we are looking to Kentucky Farm Bureau, for example, that it has to be the Murray and Calloway County Farm Bureau.

Mrs. Page: Presumably, they would appoint somebody who had some interest in us.

Mr. McCuiston: But, you don't want to get someone out of Ashland to come over here; you have got to get within reasonable distance.

Mr. Carneal: That's right. And certainly they should take those things into consideration. But, if we are going to say that we want on this committee somebody from the elementary and secondary educators, I think we should have somebody who represents the agricultural interest of the University. I think we ought to have somebody on there that represents business and commerce in the state of Kentucky. AIK would be a way, the Kentucky Chamber of Commerce could be a way—selected by the Executive Committee of either one—but I do think those areas of interests need to be expanded. I think it's too limited though. If Sara and George agree that you drop the female and a minority unless they happen to have something to bring...
Mr. King: If they can make a contribution, I think they both should be on it; but I don't think we should have them for a window dressing.

Mr. Carneal: That's right. In order not to make it too big, you can drop any mention of those; and you can drop a community representative.

Mr. Christopher: Briefly, let's go around the table and get some input. Charlie, do you want to comment?

Dr. Howard: I agree with George and Sara on the female and the minority. I liked the idea Sara had of perhaps having more than one faculty member on there. I like the idea of a community representative, but I'm not sure what the community is. Maybe it needs to be a bigger circle than Murray-Calloway County. I agree with that.

Mr. Carneal: Do you think there is any merit in having somebody from business and industry? And also from the agricultural interest?

Dr. Howard: Sure. I don't have any problems with that.

Mr. Carneal: You try to get representatives of the groups that this University serves.

Mr. West: I agree; I especially like Sara's idea of a couple more faculty members, selected by the Faculty Senate. I have had a lot of communication concerning that. The committee in Bowling Green was concerned that the committee was going to get too large. If we are going to drop anyway, then that would work out.

Mr. Woodall: I feel strongly about the community representative, not just an area representative. We might want to talk about it. I think they certainly voiced their opinions—pros and cons—when we were involved in the other situation. If there is a Western Kentucky Chamber of Commerce organization of some type, maybe they could select someone.

Mr. Christopher: We talked about letting PADD (Purchase Area Development District) select this person; then we decided that this really wasn't representative. You might just get somebody that was named and then they wouldn't care. We talked about this community problem for a good 30 minutes and had a heck of a time coming up with any real answer. There were some strong feelings that since the University is here, and Murray-Calloway County are directly involved on a day-to-day process that probably out of fairness they should have a representative. I'm just sharing the discussion that went on because we tried to think of some way to represent the entire Purchase area and maybe even expand that, but we just couldn't come up with a way to name that person.

Mr. Carneal: It may be completely improbable, what about the mayor?

Mr. Christopher: What about the county judge executive? That's what we got into there.

Mr. McCuiston: Your county judge takes in your mayor.

Mr. Woodall: Do you have a Chamber of Commerce here?

Mr. Christopher: We discussed letting the Chamber of Commerce name that.

Mr. Woodall: Do they have an executive director?

Mr. Christopher: Yes, but then you're limiting it to commerce, and you get into that same problem with what about the agriculture people. Of course, theoretically, they can be members of the Chamber of Commerce, which a good many of them are.

Mr. Woodall: They are just usually represented by all segments of the community. I definitely feel like representing the community or maybe the Jackson Purchase, whatever you want to call it. I think probably the faculty should be a little more represented because they are the ones that have to work with the man every day.
Mr. Christopher: Bill, anything further?

Mr. Carneal: No.

Mr. McCulston: In doing this, I come up with three different things. One is industry and whatever group Bill mentioned awhile ago. The second thing is on the community and I had County Judges and Mayors' Association. I don't know whether it is a County Judges' Association or a Mayors' Association. But, your County Judge takes in the city and county here, and, of course, he would have contact with different counties. I think Bill said Weaks is County Judge. The other thing is that we are a teacher-oriented college or were, and you've got your Future Farmers Association or whatever it is called. You've got a selection of teachers that are cut in the communities, and they are education and farm-oriented. This might be a way of going to a group like that and getting them to select one.

Mr. Morgan: We have spent a lot of time discussing this, and it looks like we're getting back to where we were originally. This could become a very unwieldy thing. I think people that have an interest, whoever they may be and from whatever segment of society they come, ought to have input into this group. We ought to have input from everyone that is interested, not limit it to anyone. There ought to be an opportunity to have input by anyone that has an interest in Murray State University and in the region which we serve. I was sitting here thinking, Bill, business and commerce, sure. Really, I think as far as educators are concerned, we didn't select those primarily because they are teachers or administrators but because they would be interested in the total University environment as far as sending students here whether it be commerce, industry, agriculture, or education. So, I was not looking at educators as representing education only, but representing the total curriculum as far as the University is concerned. If we're going to look at it as representing educational interest, then we probably do need to bring in business and commerce. Then we'll get into talking about community; we're talking about government, really, not community. And we're talking about local, regional government. After all those are the people who are going to be serving Murray State University on a day-to-day basis, as far as various services that a community provides—streets, roads, police protection, fire protection which have the input from one individual from each one of these organizations on the advisory board instead of trying to get this thing so big. There is no limit to the thing as it is.

Mr. Carneal: The way it reads, Bill, is a representative of elementary and secondary education.

Mr. Morgan: Right, but their interest would be broader than just education or education department. So, if we are limiting it to that, then we ought to bring business, commerce, and government in, and industry.

Mr. Whitehouse: I agree with bringing business and commerce in and educators. There is no need for a female or minority if it is going to be for purely window dressing. If we are going to go with the idea that we need more faculty because they have direct interest, I think we ought to have more students.

Mr. King: I am for bringing in anybody in business or the mayor or the county judge or whatever, but I do feel we need to be very sure if we put more than one person from the faculty because then we are showing pretty much favoritism.

Mr. Christopher: Do you think that is fair or good?

Mr. King: No, I think that is bad to put more than one faculty on it.

Mr. Christopher: It has been called to my attention that if we go AIX, what about labor? One other approach would be to drop number 5 and then leave it solely within direct elements of the University: faculty, students, alumni, and staff. The problem arises when you start going beyond that.

Mr. King: Why couldn't you take these four and put two of each on the committee? That would be eight members.
Dr. Ken Wolf: I am a member of the Executive Committee of the Faculty Senate and participated in the drafting of the letter that I believe you received, asking for a more substantial and significant role for faculty in the search process. I think, just for the record, it needs to be said that many faculty are not particularly satisfied with the Advisory Committee. They would like and were led to believe that we would have a process more like that at Western which did involve the faculty in the actual search and selection process. It was done, I believe by reading in the papers, without an illegal problem. I say that with all respect to the work you are doing, the difficulty of your job, and the work that our faculty regent is doing. I'm not trying to demean or imply anything derisive on any of your parts, but I think that needs to be said for the record—that some faculty wanted a larger role, and you do have a letter to that fact. Secondly, and as part of that same argument, I would urge you, if you are not going to have a separate or add faculty to the search committee, to at least increase the role of faculty on the Advisory Committee as Mrs. Page had suggested. I think the bases for saying these things are the same. With all due respect to Mr. Overby, the faculty does not consider itself a pressure group. All that, and I understand why and I understand how that works, but the faculty considers itself, along with the students, to be the University; and if you wish to include the staff, I think that would be quite appropriate. faculty, staff, and students are not groups affected by this University as are local agricultural interests or business interests or high school principals. Speaking as a faculty member and letting Alan and others speak for the students, there is a serious morale problem at this University; and if we are made equivalent to some representative of the Purchase Area Development Board or local superintendent or others from the school board, it will make the morale problem for the faculty even more serious. As I said, please understand, with great respect for all you have to do and the difficulty of the job, we just wanted to put you on notice that not all the faculty are happy with exactly what is being proposed here. Thank you.

Mr. Christopher: Thank you, Ken.

Mr. Overby: Mr. Christopher, two or three things if I may. Number one, I think we all must remember that the faculty does have representation on this Board, not in an advisory capacity but in a voting, participating capacity. You also have representation on the advisory board that goes to your Faculty Senate, so this body here is purely an advisory body. Now secondly, with reference to the female and minority representatives—I think I mentioned that when we were in Bowling Green—I would agree with someone that no one should be put on for purposes of window dressing or tokenism. I would caution, however, that there are people who feel very strongly in each of these areas; and I happen to be one of them, not that that's important, but there are people who feel deeply about it. Secondly, there are laws that mandate participation in this area. The only way that I would advise you to leave them out would be to take into consideration that this is purely an advisory body. I think that would save it from a legal standpoint. But, anyone that you select, whether it is a representative of agriculture, commerce, or trade, I would hope would give it their undivided attention and that it would be a worthwhile contribution that they would make. I'm not willing to assume that there would not be a worthwhile contribution made from either of these groups. I think I can live with the elimination of it in view of the fact that it is an advisory body only, but I never pretended to let this body come to the conclusion that my suggestion was to the effect that you have a non-participating person or a person that was merely window dressing or tokenism for this. I was talking about an active, viable, interested, contributing member that would be selected; and I think there are many contributions that could be made. Now, it is possible to add one other thing. The fact that not only is it advisory but that there may be an overlap in terms of some of these may be acting in a dual sort of capacity. And then when I look at the fact that the actual board itself, the deciding body, this would be a total impact on the thing because I think that would meet requirements. But, I wanted to make that explanation to you.

Mr. Woodall: I would like to make some recommendations and changes to this. Number one, that the President of Faculty Senate be represented, along with one other representative of the faculty selected by the Senate, that a female representative by selected by the West Kentucky Chapter of the
Business and Professional Women's Club, that a community representative be selected by the Murray Chamber of Commerce, and that a minority representative be selected by the Western Kentucky chapter of the NAACP, if there is such an organization. We can talk about it all day, but we're coming back to the same things.

Mr. King: Let me just ask this question, what I was saying earlier, if you pick more than one faculty person, then what about down to five, two in each group. Why not just pick two from each group and forget it. That gives you ten people; you're still not that crowded.

Mr. Christopher: Two from the faculty, two from the student body, two from the staff?

Mr. King: Yes, and if one of them happens to be black...

Mr. Christopher: So in other words, you are suggesting we eliminate a community representative and educators?

Mr. King: From six through eight eliminated, I said at that meeting at Bowling Green that we should try to go no more than twelve people. You could still have one community person or a female.

Mr. Christopher: Bill, that puts two educators on there and no ag, business, or whatever.

Mr. Carneal: I still think it is a mistake not to have somebody representing business and industry.

Mr. McCuiston: Well, ag needs to be represented too.

Mrs. Page: Melba Casey is Director of West Kentucky Educational Cooperative; there's your woman.

Mr. Christopher: Make it the Director instead of a representative?

Mrs. Page: If she doesn't want to do it herself, she can appoint somebody.

Mr. Carneal: Well, I'll tell you one thing, Ron, we've heard quite a bit in the last year from groups, the educators in West Kentucky and that was the reason I certainly had no problem of having somebody on this thing, and if they share some of the responsibility with the Board, the people that say our school relations are weak, just all the complaints that come from elementary and secondary education.

Mrs. Page: But, this thing in industry, those people over in Calvert City are vitally interested in the graduates from Murray.

Mr. Carneal: That's right. That's the reason I felt very strongly about that. When you start developing a mission, I think you need the input of business and industry. Where are you going? These people that represent business and industry, they've got to be looking down the road as far as they can and it's difficult to do today. But, when you start talking about the mission of this University ten years from now, you need to know what those people are thinking, what they see for Kentucky and this area.

Mr. Christopher: Well, let's go this way. President of Faculty Senate, is there a Vice-President of Faculty Senate?

Mr. West: Yes.

Mrs. Page: Excuse me. Does all the faculty consider themselves represented by the Faculty Senate?

Mr. West: Every department on campus elects one representative.

Mr. Christopher: Is there a female or black officer of the Student Government?

Mr. Whitehouse: The Secretary is female and the Treasurer is black. Both of them are good people.

Mr. Woodall: I would rather pick somebody that is going to want to do something and put them on there and not try to wishy-washy around about
I move that the resolution be adopted with the changes I made a while ago.

Mr. West: Second.

Mr. Carneal: Without a representative from commerce and industry?

Mr. Woodall: Yes, the Chamber of Commerce.

Mr. McCuiston: What about the farmers?

Mr. West: I thought the West Kentucky Business Women were going to elect a representative.

Mr. Carneal: There may not be such a group. I don't know, there probably isn't; but you can leave it to the Kentucky Business and Professional Women. I know there is a Kentucky chapter. They met in Owensboro just recently.

Mr. Christopher: If we went Vice-President, what would be the third officer in the SGA.

Mr. Whitehouse: Treasurer.

Mr. Christopher: Then, if we went vice in the Alumni Association, and let the staff elect two, then we could go to the Director of the West Kentucky Educational Cooperative, we could go to the director of AIK.

Mr. Carneal: Well, he's president, that's Rayburn Watkins, a graduate of this University.

Mr. Morgan: Rayburn would probably serve on it.

Mr. Carneal: He would be that interested.

Mr. Christopher: The President of AIK; what's a good farmers' personal representative.

Mr. Carneal: Kentucky Farm Bureau.

Mr. Christopher: President, or let him designate somebody in this area? Selected by the Kentucky Farm Bureau. Bill Powell, what's a representative group of labor?

Mr. Powell: West Kentucky Construction and Building Trades Council.

Mr. Carneal: Of course, AIK represents business and industry and labor too. You don't have business without labor.

Mr. Christopher: Okay, how would this be: President and Vice-President of Faculty Senate, the Vice-President and Treasurer of Student Government Association, the President and Vice-President of the Alumni Association, let the Non-Academic Personnel Committee select two by vote of that Committee, the Director of the West Kentucky Educational Cooperative, the President of Associated Industries of Kentucky, a representative of the Kentucky Farm Bureau, and a representative of the West Kentucky Construction and Building Trades Council?

Mrs. Page: I suggest we take off one of the Alumni members; everybody on here is an Alumnus.

Mr. Carneal: I agree with that, I think the President is sufficient.

Mr. Christopher: Fine.

Mr. Morgan: This is an advisory board, this is not a voting board anyway. You really only need one from each group; one gives the representation from all the people.

Mr. Christopher: We have two from all the direct groups that are on campus and one from the others is the reason I said two.
Mr. McCuiston: Just because these other people can put input into them the other groups around can put input into these, and they can represent the whole area.

Mr. Christopher: Let me ask you this. I think it would be wise if one member from this board were appointed to be Chairman of this committee and I'm inclined, Bill, because you are here, to see if you would do that.

Mr. Morgan: I would prefer not to right now for personal reasons.

Mr. Christopher: Is there somebody, Sara, Charlie?

Mrs. Page: I'm sorry, I think I missed what you said.

Mr. Christopher: I think it would be wise in this resolution that one member of this Board be Chairman of this committee. That way you could assure if other groups are interested, as Bill Morgan suggested, and want to come forward and give input, they can. Is there someone who would volunteer?

Mr. McCuiston: Suits me. I'll do it if you want me to.

Mr. Christopher: Don't you think that would be better? Jerry, do you want to make that motion again?

Mrs. Page: While we are stopped, I have one more suggestion. Instead of AIK, the Paducah Chamber of Commerce; Charlie Woods, from Calvert City, is the past president; and Clay Serby, from Carbide, is the current president; and Andrew Woods, from Calvert City, is the president-elect, which would cover industry.

Mr. Carneal: Sara, my thought is two things about Rayburn Watkins. One, he is a graduate of this University. Two, he represents business and industry in the entire State. What you are doing is narrowing it again to where we have a big problem—too much local participation and not being broad enough.

Mr. Morgan: The point I'm trying to make is that we go out here, and we select two or three from each one of these. Rayburn Watkins from AIK can get input from those people and a faculty representative could get input from the rest of the faculty and the student representative could get input from the rest of the students, and we start two or three people on these we got such an unwieldy situation here, it's ridiculous. I think we are making a big mistake in not just going with one individual representing each of these various interest groups and let them represent those people that come and present their information and ideas to them.

Mr. Christopher: All right, let's go back to business here. Jerry, do you want to keep your motion as it is?

Mr. Woodall: I don't know. They say there's not a Western Kentucky Chapter of the Business and Professional Women's Club, but I know there's one of those clubs around.

Mr. Christopher: Which way are you suggesting that we go?

Mr. Woodall: I'm just going by what Mr. Overby said. Obviously, somebody has thought about all of this and we've got it down, and now we're chipping it all apart.

Mr. Christopher: We got into this same thing in Bowling Green.

Dr. Howard: We spent more time on this than anything else.

Mr. Carneal: It's pretty important to the people. You look at the function of the committee; they've got a job to do; and they've got a deadline of September 22.

Mr. Christopher: The reason for that deadline is we have a retreat meeting scheduled for September 26, and there's not very many days, but we're going to need some time to get an evaluation sheet drawn up. Hopefully,
what this committee comes up with will be included in the drafting of that evaluation sheet which we would like to get to you at that retreat-meeting.

Mr. West: I would like to second Jerry's motion and just echo what Ken Wolf said earlier. When you talk about interest groups, I know it is very easy for the Board to look at the faculty and sometimes the students and maybe even staff as interest groups. I know the faculty, one of the reasons that they work on matters that come before the Board is because all of those things effect what they can do in their classroom and effects them very directly. From money-type issues to taking money out of the academic area. There is a very practical reason for giving the faculty another worker, so to speak, because the faculty will be here on the campus; they will have access to secretarial help; and I suspect the faculty members on this group will be asked to go and take whatever the committee comes up with and put it in to context of some of the policies we already have, some of the missions we already have and just from getting the work done standpoint, it might help to have another faculty member as well. So, I want to second Jerry's motion.

Mr. Christopher: So, Jerry, your composition is one other faculty member selected by the Faculty Senate and leave the female representative on there. I don't know, I guess by selection process, apparently there is no Western Kentucky Chapter of Business and Professional Women's Club. Could be a Kentucky Chapter.

Mr. Woodall: Kentucky chapter, then, with that person coming from Western Kentucky.

Mr. Christopher: Do you want the community representative selected by the local Chamber of Commerce? And you want your minority representative selected by...

Mr. Woodall: Western Kentucky chapter of NAACP.

Mr. Christopher: I don't know that there is one, so I believe I would make that Kentucky.

Mr. Morgan: NAACP doesn't represent all of the black minority, does it?

Mr. King: I don't know about here, but in Louisville, it doesn't.

Mr. Morgan: No, that is a very splintered group there.

Mr. King: They have a chapter in Hopkinsville.

Mr. Christopher: For discussion, we've got the motion and second. Based on what all I've heard, my suggestion is to go back and put two faculty, two students. In the student representation, I understand what Alan is saying, is that if the Treasurer is included, he is black.

Mr. Whitehouse: Yes.

Mr. Christopher: And that we put one Alumni, increase the staff to two, have the Director of West Kentucky Educational Coop., president of AIK, a member selected by Kentucky Farm Bureau Association, and a member selected by West Kentucky Building and Trades Council. That would eliminated 6, 7, and 8.

Mr. Whitehouse: How many would that leave us to total?

Mr. Christopher: Eleven plus a member of the Board to make it twelve.

Mr. Woodall: If everybody can live with that, I'll withdraw my motion.

Dr. Howard: I move we accept Mr. Christopher's recommendation.

WHEREAS, MURRAY STATE UNIVERSITY is now engaged in the process of search, screening, and selection for a new President of Murray State University, and

WHEREAS, the Board of Regents feels that an advisory committee should be caused to be formed for the purpose of making recommendations as to the University's goals, objectives, and missions for the next decade, and
WHEREAS, the Board feels that these recommendations will be helpful in the selection process,

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that an Advisory Committee be formed along the following lines:

A. Composition

1. President and Vice President of the Faculty Senate
2. Vice President and Treasurer of the Student Government Association
3. President of the Murray State University Alumni Association
4. Two representatives of the non-academic personnel/University staff to be selected by a vote of the Non-Academic Personnel Committee
5. Director of the West Kentucky Educational Cooperative
6. President of Associated Industries of Kentucky
7. A representative of the Kentucky Farm Bureau selected by the Kentucky Farm Bureau
8. A representative of Labor selected by the West Kentucky Buildings and Construction Trade Council - AFL-CIO
9. A member of the Board of Regents to be Chairman of the Committee.

B. Function

To make recommendations as to the University's goals, objectives, and missions for the next decade.

C. Deadline for Report

The report must be received by the Board of Regents on or before September 22, 1982.

Mr. Carneal: I'll second that.

Mr. Christopher: Any further discussion? All those in favor, say aye; opposed, nay. Motion passes, good luck, Jerry. The resolution includes that the deadline is September 22.

Let's move on to 2 e. The blank there will be this committee, and is confined to members of the Board, all ten hopefully; but we are looking for everyone on the Board who is willing to say that I will meet at least, I would think a minimum of once a week and can devote, depending on your driving time, 3 to 5 hours, whatever time it takes to get the job done.

Mr. McCuiston: Are these going to afternoon meetings, or time-to-be-determined?

Mr. Christopher: Well, what I would like to do is, those that volunteer to serve, to meet right after this meeting and hopefully set up a weekly time and of course our place would be here.

Mr. Carneal: You are thinking that this is only members of the Board.

Mr. Christopher: Yes.

Mr. McCuiston: Everybody should be on it if you can make it.

Mr. Christopher: Well, here's the thought, Jere, is that if we just put everybody on it; and then if we don't have a quorum, we can't meet.
Mr. McCuiston: Well, I want to be on it, but I don't know that I can be here every week.

Mr. Christopher: Well, don't volunteer and then come when we have the meeting if you want to have input, and that's fine, but we want to be able to set up the committee structure so that hopefully it is more than two or three but that we know who is saying we will be here.

Mr. McCuiston: I would say that you pick three of the closest, and that would form your committee, and there is bound to be two of them here each time.

Mr. Carneal: You're thinking about once a week?

Mr. Christopher: It is going to take every bit of that.

Dr. Howard: We had some volunteers in Bowling Green, Sara Page, Bill Morgan, Steve West and I said I was sure that Alan would, and Ron, here in town. I didn't feel like the time element would permit me to be here every week, but I would like to come when I can. That's five people right there, assuming Alan, I volunteered him.

Mr. McCuiston: I make a motion that we do that.

Mr. Christopher: What we need here is the composition of that committee, so that...

Mr. McCuiston: You've got five right there.

Mr. Carneal: Ron, are you going to be able be here?

Mr. Christopher: I'm going to do the best I can.

Mr. West: What the committee discussed in Bowling Green was giving everybody, that wanted to, an opportunity to volunteer and then that would be the composition of the committee. I think all Ron was saying was that he wanted everyone to know what they were volunteering for.

Mr. Christopher: The problem is that this is going to take quite a bit of time. And we need to get underway immediately, and what will be envisioned is that there is a room that we have opened across the hall, in that room is where the secretary will be. There is a Xerox room right across from that. This committee would pass on where to advertise, how much to advertise, each element, or each bit of minutiae that is going to have to be decided in keeping this process rolling on a day-to-day basis.

Mrs. Page: I volunteer.

Mr. Christopher: Sara Page, Steve West, Alan Whitehouse, Bill Morgan, and I will include myself. Anyone else? After the adoption, what we're saying is that those five which means that if three of us can get together will constitute a quorum; and the committee can do its work. We'll let everybody know the time we set up that we plan on regular meetings, and if you want to come, please do. Any questions?

Is there a motion that we adopt this as presented?

that a Search and Coordinating Committee be formed to be composed of the following members:

and that the Search and Coordinating Committee be authorized and directed by the Board:

1. To commence the search process immediately for a new President for Murray State University. This search process shall include such advertising as the Committee feels appropriate together with the receipt of nominations for the position. The search shall be national in scope and shall conform to all federal and state Statutes with respect to Equal Employment and Affirmative Action guidelines.

2. To consider obtaining the assistance of professional consultants in the search process and to direct the Chairman of the Board of Regents to cause same to be employed if in its judgment it is necessary.
3. To draft a suggested evaluation and rating form.

Mr. Whitehouse: So moved.

Mr. McCuiston: Second.

Mr. Christopher: Any further discussion. All in favor, say aye; opposed, nay. Motion passes.

(2F) This is a motion that the Board of Regents establish an office out of which the search, screening, and selection process will function, and that the office be furnished with the necessary furniture and equipment, that the Chairman of the Board of Regents, with the advice of the Secretary, be authorized and directed to employ or cause to be employed a secretary for the presidential search office, and that a sum of money not to exceed $35,000 be authorized to be expended for the purpose of conducting the presidential search, screening, and selection process. The Chairman or his designate shall authorize all expenditures. There shall be periodic reports to the Board of all funds expended. I have asked Jim to give us a proposed budget.

PROPOSED BUDGET

PERSONNEL EXPENSE

Secretary $10,000
Consultants 10,000
TRAVEL 20,000
ADVERTISING & INTERVIEW EXPENSE 5,000
TELEPHONE 1,500
OFFICE SUPPLIES 500
PRINTING 1,000
EQUIPMENT RENTAL 1,250

TOTAL $49,250

Mr. Jim Hall: I have based this budget on what two or three other universities expended in presidential searches. I have gotten the records from two universities and talked to a third. I think all the items are in order and clear with the exception of a couple of things. First of all, I think the consultant is highly variable, depending on what the Board chooses. One other explanation, and that is on the thing I have labeled as interview expense, probably more appropriately labeled advertising and interview expense. My suggestion would be this. Based on what I have seen at these other universities after this checking, I would propose to modify the resolution to read $40,000 plus any consulting fees. I think that would cover it, and that is my suggestion.

Mr. McCuiston: $40,000 plus...

Mr. Morgan: plus authorized consultant fees.

Mr Hall: Right, it would be $40,000 plus authorized consultant fees would be in addition to that.

Mr. Christopher: Jim Overby, what would your suggestion be on how to word that as far as consultant fees. Jim Hall is saying he thinks we ought to say $40,000 plus consultant fees if the search and coordinating committee decides to hire a professional consultant.

Mr. Carneal: Why don’t you leave any discussion of a consultant out and just establish $50,000.

Mr. Christopher: Well, we talked about that, and I’ve talked to one firm that is interested; they wanted to come and talk to us today. George King had been contacted by these people, and they work on a percentage basis. So, there is no way to know what the cost would be, and it’s going to be a process of, if we decide we want to look into that, getting those people
to come and talk to us and say and then that committee to decide whether it is worth spending those dollars to do it. And the problem to confining it to ten, it may take twelve.

Mr. Carneal: I'm not confining it to ten; I'm just saying set your budget at $50,000.

Mr. Christopher: Overall, to include everything?

Mr. Carneal: Yes.

Mr. Christopher: You could always amend it if you need to, couldn't you?

Mr. King: I think Bowling Green said theirs was 50,000 or 55,000, didn't they?

Mr. Christopher: That is what he said that day.

Mr. King: These figures that you have just showed, do they have the inflation factors in there?

Mr. Hall: Yes, theirs was less than $50,000, but it was done in 1978 and 1979, so what we did was several of us took those figures and inflated them. That is how we came up with these.

Mr. Carneal: Well, if it isn't enough, you have to amend it; and if it is more than you need and you spend it, then somebody will be run off.

Mr. Hall: In my opinion, if you've got a full consulting service of these that go through the whole process with you, it is my judgment that a reasonable budget exclusive of that of about $40,000. Those fees for the consulting services, if you've got the full blown thing that a lot of these people do, could run that over $50,000, that's my concern.

Mr. Carneal: You can always amend your budget. The Board can set it up and can undo it.

Mr. Hall: Those things run as much for the full services from what I've seen of like 30 percent of first year salary. Isn't that about what you found out?

Mr. Christopher: Yes.

Mr. Carneal: Ron, do you plan on talking to some consulting firms?

Mr. Christopher: If the committee is in favor of it.

Mr. Carneal: I would have no problem in talking to them. I have a lot of questions about how helpful they might be.

Mr. Christopher: Yes, as George found out, the University of Louisville started out with one and then terminated it.

Mr. King: That's correct.

Mrs. Page: Centre College started out with one but then ended up finding their own president.

Mr. Christopher: It's just a matter of us looking and deciding whether it is going to be that beneficial.

Mr. West: I move the adoption of the following motion with the figure of $50,000, rather than what's written.

that the Board of Regents establish an office out of which the search, screening, and selection process will function; that the office be furnished with the necessary furniture and equipment; that the Chairman of the Board of Regents, with the advice of the Secretary of the Board, be authorized and directed to employ or cause to be employed a secretary for the Presidential Search Office; and that a sum of money not to exceed FIFTY THOUSAND ($50,000) DOLLARS be authorized to be expended for the purpose of conducting the presidential search, screening, and selection
process. The Chairman of the Board, or his designate, shall authorize all expenditures. There shall be periodic reports to the Board of all funds expended.

Mr. King: I second.

Mr. Christopher: Motion made and seconded. Any further discussion? Patsy, will you call the roll, please.

Mr. Carneal, aye; Dr. Howard, aye; Mr. King, aye; Mr. McCuiston, aye; Mr. Morgan, aye; Mrs. Page, aye; Mr. West, aye; Mr. Whitehouse, aye; Mr. Woodall, aye; Mr. Christopher, aye. Motion passes.

Mr. Christopher: Item 3 on the agenda, this motion would for the delegation of ministerial function, together with procedures and guidelines and states "that the Chairman of the Board of Regents and Secretary of the Board of Regents be authorized to direct or perform any ministerial function incident to the work of the search, screening, and selection process, and the Chairman of the Board is authorized and directed to formulate procedures and guidelines to expedite the screening and selection process with the assistance of the Secretary of the Board and the University Attorney."

What we've got in mind there is that we know that on a day-to-day basis there are going to be little things that come up, like the person that is employed to run the office, there may be a question over postage or how much should she spend or are we going to have to get the locks changed on the door and these type of things, the ministerial duties. And somebody is going to have to do it.

Mr. Carneal: I don't really see why you need a motion.

Mr. Christopher: Well, we talked about it, and we felt like there needs to be authorization from somebody, and Jim said that it would be best if the Board authorized who was to perform these functions.

Mr. Morgan: I'll make the motion.

Mr. West: Second.

Mr. Christopher: Any further discussion? All those in favor, say aye; opposed, nay. Motion passes.

The next item was that, I would rather take my name out of there, and let's just have it read Chairman of the Board of Regents and we can change that if you like, but I think today we need to designate and decide among ourselves that one person will serve as spokesman throughout this entire process. Charlie, you or Mr. Cole emphasized the importance.

Dr. Howard: I think both of us did. I think Mr. Cole's statement was not only should it be approved, it ought to be a blood oath. I think some of the problems we had the last time were that somebody from the news media or an interested individual called you, and you made a statement—well, we're here—and somebody saying something else it caused a great furor among candidates and that kind of thing. My feeling is that we ought to have one spokesman, saying this is where we are right now. I think that's helpful to people like Mr. Powell and Mr. Bartleman, they will know who to contact to find out the word, where we are in our selection process, straight from the horse's mouth, and not a lot of rumors and that kind of thing because there will be enough of those anyway.

Dr. Christopher: Also, it would be anticipated that was one reason that we felt it would be important for the Director of Public Information be an advisor to the group was that if he will be in attendance at all meetings then a press release can be prepared. We will try to do this on a regular, routine basis so that the public will stay informed as to where in the process we stand at any one time.

Dr. Howard: I move the adoption of the following motion.

that the Chairman of the Board of Regents be designate as the single spokesman for all matters arising out of or in connection with the
search, screening, and selection process currently engaged in to select a new President of the University to take office on July 1, 1983.

Mr. Morgan: Second.

Mr. Carneal: Charlie, is the primary purpose in dealing with the media? What other areas are you talking about?

Dr. Howard: Confidentiality is mainly what I’m talking about. In our last process, there were a lot of rumors that got out that so-and-so had already gotten selected and I’m sure that will happen again that the Board already had somebody in mind. We had people that would tend to confirm some of these rumors. I’m not going to mention any names, but it happened and it made it very difficult for some us. We were saying to people, yes, we have integrity, and somebody else was saying, well, that is all cut and dried anyway. That's what I'm talking about. I think our process ought to be open from the beginning and try to keep it that way. Mr. Cole, at Western, said they had some of the same problems. And some of the problems got in the news media, as you may recall.

Mr. Christopher: Confidentiality is going to be extremely important in this search process because if you stop and think about some people that you know would make a fine candidate, they may well be in a position at this time and they wouldn't want that known. So if we don't watch our integrity and be aware of that throughout this, we can hurt the whole process.

Any further discussion? All in favor say, aye; opposed, nay. Motion passes.

Mr. West: While we're on that, just a question for general information. This motion as I read it would not preclude, Alan and me say, in going to the faculty or Student Senate and giving a general report in terms of the committee met, we are doing this and so forth. General reports like that will not be precluded, will they or should we get a general report from you that we could carry to those groups? Would that be the appropriate way to handle it?

Mr. Whitehouse: We do need to know.

Mr. Christopher: I think the general understanding would be that if you are going to make a statement about it, let's clear it.

Mr. West: Clear it through you, and then we can take it back?

Mr. Christopher: Yes.

The remaining parts on the agenda are suggestive items, and although we have to date empowered the Search and Coordinating Committee to proceed with the advertisement and to determine what they may be, let me ask you to look at 5 a; and if the full Board is in agreement, I think it would be good if the full Board adopted the advertisement if it is something we can do without spending a lot of time. Look at 5 a, and see if that meets with your approval.

The Board of Regents of Murray State University invites applications and nominations for the position of President at Murray State University. Murray State University is a four-year state supported institution located on a 238 acre main campus in Murray, Kentucky, with a teaching faculty of 360 and an enrollment of approximately 7500 students.

The president is the chief executive officer of the University and reports directly to its Board of Regents. The president works closely with the faculty, staff, students, alumni, and the Kentucky Council on Higher Education.

Murray State University is committed to academic excellence and to this end places a high value on academic freedom and its goal of providing programs and opportunities which reflect student needs.

The Board of Regents in making its selection will be guided by qualities reflecting both administrative and academic proficiency and experience.
An earned doctorate or equivalent professional degree together with significant administrative experience in higher education is desirable.

All applications whether made directly or pursuant to a nomination, must be received by no later than October 1, 1982. It is anticipated that the successful applicant will assume the duties of president on July 1, 1983.

Applications and nominations should be sent to:

M. Ronald Christopher, Chairman
Board of Regents
Murray State University
P. O. Box (and we'll establish a box)
University Station
Murray, Ky 42071.

Equal Opportunity, Affirmative Action Employer.

Mr. McCuiston: I make the motion that it be adopted.

Mr. Christopher: Will you include in your motion, subject to the powers of the committee? Wouldn't that be appropriate? The committee might want to change the form of it or something. But at least this is the basic idea.

Mr. West: Second.

Mr. Christopher: Any further discussion? All those in favor, say, aye; opposed, nay. Motion passes.

Five b, c, d, and e, are items that Patsy took a great deal of time, stopping and thinking about all the headaches she's had in the past, and all the little things that had to be done, so I asked her to go ahead and prepare this for all of you, so we can begin thinking about the process and days that lie ahead. Five b are suggestive guidelines and responsibilities of the Search and Coordinating Committee. Five c would be items that the Board as a whole in conducting the screening process will be concerned with. Five d is a sample of the guidelines for when the finalists visit our campus. Five e will be some things that Patsy thought of will be involved in conducting the Presidential Search office. I think that if you will keep those and look at them, you will find them helpful.

(See Attachments 2, 3, 4, 5)

Two other items, and I think we can conclude our business. First of all, let me ask, is there anything that you think we haven't covered as far as the search, screening, and selection process.

Mr. Carneal: Somebody has done a terrific amount of work, Ron.

Mr. Christopher: Well, Patsy and Jim Overby need to be patted on the back. I spent some time with them too, but they have done the bulk of it.

Mr. Carneal: A tremendous amount of work, thought, and effort has gone into this.

Mr. Christopher: Okay, the next thing I've got is a letter from Don Chamberlain. It says:

Dear Mr. Christopher:

As you are probably aware the Council on Higher Education will be on campus next Thursday to conduct an institutional hearing on the development of the funding formula for 1984-1986.

During this hearing, we will have the opportunity to express our views on all aspects of the development of an appropriate funding methodology.

The hearing is scheduled for 9 a.m. on the third level of the University Center. The two hours allotted for the hearing have been selected as follows:
Thirty minutes—Administration representatives
Fifteen minutes—Faculty representatives
Fifteen minutes—Student representatives
One hour—Open to faculty, staff, student body, and public comments. (Those wishing to speak are asked to register and hold their comments to five minutes.)

Attendance and participation by all facets of the University and local community are being encouraged. I am serving as the institution's coordinator and will be happy to include any special arrangements you or other Board members might deem appropriate.

Sincerely,

/s/Don Chamberlain
Director of the Budget

As far as I know at the present, it is going to be impossible for me to make it on Thursday. I have asked Sara, Sara said that she thinks she can be present if she would make some official comments on behalf of the Board; and I think she has very graciously accepted. But I think it would be very nice if as many Board members could come as would be possible and if you would talk to Sara and coordinate a time; and she should coordinate that with Don Chamberlain. Sara, I will give you the letter. Any questions on that?

Mr. Carneal: Yes, Is the purpose of this visit for the Council to gather information on which they will base their recommendations for State appropriations?

Mr. Hall: The legislature pretty much mandates that the Council have public hearings.

Mr. Carneal: Are they going to tell us what they...

Mr. Hall: No, they are here to listen. It's a hearing-type situation.

Mr. Carneal: Well it seems to me that it could turn out to be pretty important as to how much revenues or what percent of our revenues we have had in the past or what we might get in the future. Are they going to reduce them? Or increase them? They come down here and then go to Morehead and say, "Well Morehead ought to have an increase of 20 percent and Murray ought to be cut 20."

Mr. Hall: Bill, I don't think they are going to come at it from the standpoint the individual universities but the types of universities based on their mission statements, where we will fall in the category with the other regional universities. I don't think they are going to be looking at specific things unique to Murray State.

Mr. Carneal: As far as the Council is concerned, the regional universities all have the same mission. Do they not? This Board has never adopted a mission. Have we? I don't think we did. I think they sent one down—a suggested format—or we might have.

Mr. Hall: I think we did.

Mr. Carneal: But if we did, it was so broad that...

Mrs. Page: We put a disclaimer on it, didn't we? we said that we didn't necessarily agree that this was our mission or something like that.

Mr. Carneal: I think so, and it was a real broad statement.

Mr. Hall: They are very broad statements.

Mrs. Page: Ron, under the circumstances, I envy the ones who can get up and make off-the-cuff remarks. Perhaps it would be better if the Board had a formal statement to be read, if you can't be here.
Mr. Christopher: Well, Dr. Curris will be back tonight, won't he? Why don't you give it to him.

Mrs. Page: But that's not a Board statement.

Mr. Christopher: Well, he can tell you whether or not there's been an official position taken, and it couldn't be done between now and then anyway as far as there being a new document. Patsy, do you know whether there has been a mission statement adopted? We never did comply with what the Council asked us to do. I know we didn't do that.

Mrs. Dyer: What the Board has is a mission statement and goals that were adopted about '74 or '75 and that's what's on the Board's records. The Board never did adopt what the Council came up with as the mission for Murray State.

Mr. Hall: That came along in about...

Mrs. Dyer: '77 or '78.

Mr. Christopher: We talked about that at Bowling Green because Western was saying that they were sorry that they responded to the Council. But we do have a mission statement, Patsy?

Mrs. Dyer: Yes.

Mr. West: In talking with some of the Council staff, I think one of the big reasons for them coming is the formula funding idea. I think they are specifically interested in problems that we have with formula funding. They, of course, have tied their formula into what they say our mission should be. So, that might be a good point to make—that this Board recognizes a different mission than the one you have established, which I think is our prerogative. I know the faculty is going to respond to some of the formula issues and how it affects funding, and I think the students probably will too.

Mr. Whitehouse: The tuition schedule for the next two years. I met with Don Chamberlain for about two hours because I was not familiar with the formula. It is a pretty complicated little piece of information. He was a big help to me in preparing my statement.

Mrs. Page: Are we through with that?

Mr. Christopher: Yes, we're going on.

Mrs. Page: I want to move that we go into executive session to discuss an individual personnel matter.

Mr. Christopher: Okay, if you can hold off, let me get these things cleared up.

Mr. Carneal: Here is this. The Faculty Handbook says that the Board of Regents adopted a mission on February 14, 1975. Then the next item on the same date is the Ten Year Objectives of the Board of Regents, and Jim says that the two tie together.

Mr. Christopher: Dr. Curris has asked for the regularly quarterly meeting on July 30. Is everyone going to be able to make that?

Mr. Carneal: That's Commencement.

Mr. Christopher: I think that he has asked that we meet at 9:30 in the morning. It's Friday, July 30, with Commencement being that afternoon at 2:00.

The next item is on our retreat meeting. Mr. George Janik, who is the Branch Manager of IBM in Cleveland, Ohio and a member, as well as former chairman, of Kent State University Trustees, has consented to come and participate as our mentor. He had suggested that we start our meeting coming in on Friday evening and break up by noon on Sunday, but we have problems with getting a place to meet. We can get Barkley Lodge on Sunday night and Monday night which will be September 26 and 27. We would break up on Tuesday by
noon. To fulfill the guidelines set up by AGB, and it will help Mr. Janik; they asked that we each fill out a self-study brochure and ask that you return this to Patsy on the 30th. Don't you think that will be plenty of time?

Mrs. Dyer: They ask that we have the tally of the self-study to Mr. Janik three weeks prior to the date. I was saying September 1, but if you finish by the 30th.

Mr. Christopher: Let's do it by the 30th. The second item is the instruction sheet.

Patsy has arranged a luncheon for us, and Sara would like to make a motion that we have an executive session. Let's break for lunch in the Commonwealth Room of the University Center, and let's come back by 1:30.

The meeting reconvened at 1:40 p.m. Mrs. Page moved that the Board go into executive session to discuss an individual personnel item. Mr. Whitehouse seconded and upon call for the vote the motion passed.

The executive session began at 1:42 p.m. and ended at 2:25 p.m.

The meeting reconvened in public session at 2:25 p.m. Mr. McQuiston moved the meeting be adjourned. Mr. Carneal seconded and the motion passed. The meeting adjourned at 2:27 p.m.

[Signatures]
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Minutes of Meeting of Committee on Procedures for Presidential Selection, June 24, 1982

The Committee met in Bowling Green, Kentucky, at the Holiday Inn, on June 24, 1982. The meeting was called to order by Chairman of the Board of Regents Ron Christopher at 1:45 p.m.

The following were present:

Board of Regents and Committee members:

Ron Christopher
Charles Howard
George King
Bill Morgan
Steve West

Board of Regents

Sara L. Page

Board Secretary

Patsy R. Dyer

University Attorney

James O. Overby

Members of the News Media:

Bill Bartleman, Paducah Sun
Hunter Reigler, Park City Daily News

Mr. Christopher: Let's keep this as informal as is comfortable. If Charlie Howard comes I think it will be beneficial to give him an opportunity to discuss what sort of process was adopted before. He is the only member of the Board that was here when Dr. Curris was selected. There is a possibility that John David Cole who is former Chairman of the WKU Board of Regents may be present and share with us some of the things they did in the process of selecting Dr. Zacharias.

To start us off, I guess the first thing we need to determine is scope. Are we all in agreement that it will be national in scope? Does anyone take issue with that? So, the selection process will be national in search.

Secondly, I think we need to talk about what sort of committee process we will recommend to the full Board. There are four suggestions in the AGB book, "Presidential Search" by John Nason. Let's go around the table and do you have any preference?

Mr. Morgan: I have not had an opportunity to read this.

Mr. Christopher: In the back of the book, it compiles a checklist. The discussion is on Page 14. They suggest here that Trustees have four options:

1. To constitute themselves as a committee of the whole
2. To appoint a single search and selection committee
3. To establish two committees: one a search committee and one a screening committee, and
4. To appoint a Trustee committee with one or more advisory committees of faculty, students, and others.
One thought I had on it was Patsy informed me that since she's been around the Board has always kept it within the Board, and I can see a lot of advantages to that. I ask Jim for his opinion as to what sort of problems might be created if we expanded beyond the Board. Do you want to share with us your thoughts?

Mr. Overby: It is suggested in the handbook that you take various members of the community and put them on a committee that would do the selecting or recommending process. It is my opinion that the Board has this responsibility and it should be retained by you, and that any assistance that you have should be not as a committee member and purely advisory in nature. In other words, you could not have someone with voting power on a committee safely in my judgment because if they do have the right to vote on the committee then you have problems. If it is your desire, you can get them to recommend to you and use it in that fashion.

Mr. Morgan: That would be advisory only?

Mr. Overby: Yes.

Mr. Morgan: My opinion is that the Board has the ultimate responsibility for conducting this and bringing it about to fruition any goals that would be set out. Certainly, I am not opposed to any advisory group, but I think it needs to be kept within the framework of the Board. It can become so large as to become unwieldy and end up with every interest group in the country in it. Then you would never arrive at a solution within the timeframe we will want to.

Mr. Christopher: (To the press), please understand the function of this Committee is to recommend to the full Board what we think would be best for the full Board to adopt by way of process.

Would it not be best that we recommend to the Board that the Board itself conduct its own search and of course make its own selection? But that we ask and we can decide today what sort of make-up we would have and advisory committee with representatives of concerned areas that would have direct benefit or input into the University to come up with what they might see as the objectives, concerns, missions, etc. of the University over the next decade. Once they establish what in their opinion that might be, perhaps come up with some criteria that they think the Board should consider in making its final selection. For instance, it is obvious that money will be critical throughout the 80s, and with that important issue, obviously the person finally selected should indicate the ability to deal with those kinds of issues.

Say, you have a faculty representative, a non-faculty representative, perhaps someone who represents either school boards— I am not sure how broad you make that—but the education system below public higher education.

Dr. Howard entered the meeting at 2:00 p.m. and Mr. Christopher brought him up-to-date.

Mr. Christopher: Let us backtrack and ask you to fill us in on the process used previously.

Dr. Howard: I'll do the best I can. It has been 10 years. A lot of the things you found in the book, "Presidential Search," we did. We did have a nationwide search. As I recall, Mrs. Dyer was there at the time, it took us about eight months. We did not have any kind of advisory committee; it was simply a committee of the Board. At that time Mr. Glenn Doran was chairman of the Board and he really ran this process out of his office, and in that the central place for receiving was in his office at the bank in Murray. It required considerable secretarial help and this was done in his office until the final selections were made and then Mrs. Dyer assisted with some of the arrangements. He felt having it in his
office, confidentiality would be better. The process involved receiving applications and I believe the number was 216 people applying for the position. Through numerous meetings, eventually through the process of elimination, we weeded that down to about 10 people. We brought about 10 people in for interviews, some 6 for a second interview, and 1 candidate back for three. Of the final 5 or 6, one or two members of the Board visited the candidate wherever they might have been on their campus or in their community. The final selection process when it was narrowed down to 5 or 6 people was by the Board as a whole. Each candidate was interviewed by the whole Board or as many members as could be there and I think most were, and a single candidate evolved from that. We endeavored to maintain confidentiality and it was very difficult because people would call and say I heard so and so was a finalist. It is especially difficult when it got down to the final 5 or 6 people; there is a lot of lobbying for various candidates, particularly if there are local candidates. There were many many visits from people—politicians and friends. We did pay the expenses of people who visited the campus, which I think it is accepted by most places that this is the way you do it.

Mr. Christopher: With the benefit of hindsight, is there anything you did before that you would have changed?

Dr. Howard: Yes. As far as the Search Committee was concerned, I feel we should have taken in maybe a member of the Alumni Association, perhaps faculty and students. You mentioned an advisory committee, and I think that is an excellent idea. I would like to see the Search Committee and the Selection Committee be different.

Mr. King: In your Search Committee, do you actually mean that we would go out and seek various candidates?

A friend of mine is a member of the Board of Trustees at U of L, and his comment was that he and other Trustees would never want to go through that again because of all the various things you mentioned that happened to them; however, he feels they made a good decision in the President they currently have. I called a friend of mine that was involved at first as a consultant with a consulting company. I talked with him about it and I brought some literature for us to read. I have no ties with this person or his company. This company was the company U. of L chose to do the search, and right in the middle of it— I don’t know if due to politics or what the problem was—they decided to do it themselves. I just feel with all of us being affiliated with businesses and professions, isn’t it going to be kind of hard. I’m not saying take this company; there are many consultants you could get. Will we really have the time?

Mr. Christopher: I guess it depends on how necessary we feel we need to broaden the definition of search. For instance, I would have no idea how many applicants. Perhaps an ad in the Wall Street Journal and the Education Section of the New York Times. Is that about the way you advertised?

Dr. Howard: Yes. We did not advertise in the local papers. I would be willing to you will get 300 applicants.

Mr. West: When you narrowed it down to 10, the entire Board did that themselves?

Dr. Howard: The Search Committee, a subcommittee of the Board, narrowed it down to that group and that consisted of the Chairman, the Vice Chairman, and 2 or 3 other people. About 5 people, isn’t that right, Patsy?

Mrs. Dyer: That’s right. I think I told Ron the Board, but there was 5 or 6 members who served on the Search Committee.

Dr. Howard: Right. But all members got all the resumes and were invited to give our
Input to the Committee if we saw a candidate we thought was particularly promising based on the resume. Everybody had input but that was essentially their job. Mr. King is definitely right; it was very time consuming, particularly for the Chairman, and that probably will be the case again, which brings up one of the pros for a professional consultant. There are some cons that I can see. I don't know what happened at the University of Louisville, but some of the cons are that sometimes the Board maybe felt they were being left out of the selection process. I don't know.

Mr. Morgan: Regarding these professional firms for chief executive officers nationwide, I assume they serve as a search committee or you could ask them to provide you with the 10 best people and then the Board make the final decisions. That would take some of the day-to-day wear out of it. Could we employ a firm to do the search, to do the advertising, and then limited a certain number they present to the Board for consideration?

Mr. King: We could even look at various search organizations and see if we liked what they presented to us.

Mr. Morgan: Does anyone have any idea of cost?

Dr. Howard: I've used a few and sometimes, Bill, it is pretty steep. In my profession, they demand a certain percentage of the successful applicant's first year salary as a fee. I don't know in this case, but their services alone to the individual might amount to $20,000 - $25,000.

Mr. Morgan: Do we know of any universities in the region that have used them for search?

Mr. Christopher: 10 years ago, how did you go about getting your candidates?

Dr. Howard: Through advertisements. When it becomes widely known that you are looking for a president, there are going to be people who will write you and suggest candidates who do not themselves apply, and we had several of those. I don't recall our going out; most people came to us.

Mr. Morgan: In the search for an alumni director, we had 50-60 applicants, and our concern there was getting quality people. We had numbers but we didn't have quality, and I suspect we will run into that here unless we have a good way to search and that's why this interest me.

Dr. Howard: There's a lot of truth in that. If you can use an organization to get it down to 10, there's merit in that.

Mr. Morgan: I'm thinking about search, not selection. Some screening.

Dr. Howard: Out of the 216 applicants, I would say we had about 150 who were not really viable candidates.

Mr. West: To get down to 10, did you do that mainly of just the documents they submitted?

Dr. Howard: I think the Committee contacted references of maybe 20 or so before coming up with 10. Some 5 or 6 members were involved in that. I can't emphasize enough how much time that takes to go through each application and give it the proper consideration.
Mrs. Page: But you said each Board member actually got a copy of each resume, so I presume every Board member read every resume.

Dr. Howard: I did. I assume everyone did which takes a lot of time.

Mr. Overby: One word of caution in the narrowing down process, I would recommend you get approval of the full Board in the narrowing down. In other words, whoever recommends it, it is a recommendation; it is their advice, but the full Board approves it. Otherwise you have eliminated say 150 without full Board approval, and I don't want those people to have causes for action. I would assume the Board would be impressed with the outside studies and recommendations or with the recommendations of a committee of the Board.

Mr. King: The thing I discussed with Ed Schwartz of Fleming & Associates, they are very sensitive to our makeup here in Kentucky. They understand the politics; they understand their State. I think they have been unique from the standpoint that they have various consultants in various regions. They wouldn't necessarily take the consultant in Kentucky to work in New England, maybe for some preliminary work, but he wouldn't be in on the decision making of the person because he's not sensitive to the atmosphere of New England. I'm just using that, say West Coast, whatever, and I thought that was a very good point that was brought out. Here are some pamphlets.

Mr. Christopher: Did he indicate, George, how they based their cost?

Mr. King: No; I did not ask. I really met this man, Ed Schwartz, through Wilkinson and Associates, which is a consulting company, but Wilkinson realized that their exposure wasn't to the depth these people have, and that's how I got to meet this Ed Schwartz. They have been rated in the top ten in the country, and I was pleased that he was a Kentucky consultant, yet he wasn't doing a search for me; Wilkinson was doing a search for me. They all know each other just as I know members of my trade.

Mr. Christopher: Let's go around the table and see what the feeling is as far as the search and what should be involved. What would you recommend? Do you see the necessity for/outside help? And if so, what dollar figure impresses you. If not, say so. Professional

Dr. Howard: I do not think it is absolutely necessary if we've got people on the Board who have the time to spend in the process. I seriously question whether we have. From that standpoint, I think it might be worthwhile to use a consultant for a screening process if for nothing else.

I can't think of any more important task that the Board would have than the one we have right now. I don't know what dollar figure to put on it. I certainly think it would be worthwhile if we spent as much a salary as we expect to pay. Assuming a salary of $50,000, I would be willing to spend that much on a search and selection process.

Mr. King: My experience has been much smaller than the University. When they work for me it is either $50 or $100 per hour. This is a smaller scope than what you are talking about.

Mr. Christopher: Then you would feel comfortable in recommending a $50,000 for a total search and selection process?

Dr. Howard: That doesn't sound good, but it might take that much. Based on what I read in here that's more than the average. I think I read on up to $25,000 for the process. Things have changed a lot in 10 years, and we may find we will be swamped with outstanding applicants. After all, higher education business is not exactly booming right now. There are a lot of cutbacks and people being
laid off, and declining enrollments. There might be a lot of greatly qualified people out there who will show up at our door.

Mr. Christopher: Many things indicate that it would be a buyer's market.

Mr. Morgan: I am not interested in forming a committee that would include a multiplicity of people. We as the Board have that responsibility and it is our responsibility to determine the best way to search, screen, and select. We are representative; we are lay persons appointed with the responsibility of finding the person for the management of Murray State University, and I think it will be one of the most important decisions we will make in our lifetimes. So, it is crucial that we give it the time that is needed, expend the funds that are necessary. I don't know what the cost will be, but if it costs $25,000 or $50,000, I am certainly willing to spend whatever is necessary to find the right person for Murray State University. We don't want to make a mistake. Since we are not professionals—at least I'm not—I think we need to seek out that help that can be of benefit to the Board and ultimately to the University and the area. I am of the opinion that we ought to consider or evaluate at least a consulting firm for a nationwide search and for a certain defined screening. I think we as a Board would need to establish certain criteria, certain desires—whether we do it ourselves or whether we seek professional assistance—we need to define to some degree, if we can as a Board, the type of manager we are looking for. I suspect we all have certain ideas of a chief executive and what we think he ought to be at Murray State University. If we could assimilate those and come up with certain broad guidelines as we endeavor in this activity, that might then help ourselves or a professional firm if we were to so choose one to avoid spending money and doing a lot of work that that's not going to be necessary because it's something that's not going to be acceptable to start with. I think all of us have certain philosophies, certain desires for Murray State University, and after we pool our thoughts, maybe we ought to do that. What are we looking for? Once we've drawn a circle and we've said this person has got to fit in this circle and we've got to enlarge the circle so that it encompasses the thinking of the Board. It can't be a restricted circle; it can't be my circle or your circle, it's got to be a circle big enough to encompass the thinking of the Board. Once we've got that circle, then the consulting firm or our search committee, if it's ourselves, can then focus in on that particular target. Then later, we as a Board are going to hit the bull's eye in that target. Right now, I might know just the type of person I'm looking for, but that might not be the same person you're looking for.

Mr. Christopher: First of all, I think it is critical that we know where we as a Board want Murray State to go.

Mr. Morgan: I think if we do it or a consulting firm does it as long as they understand what our thinking is as a Board then it would make it a much easier job to go out in the service to find the people we are considering.

Dr. Howard: And then in the end you probably wind up doing some compromising because that person is really not out there, but certainly there are a lot of those qualities that you're looking for are there.

Mr. Morgan: We as a Board set limitations and then we can zero in.

Mr. Christopher: Maybe that's where we get people outside the Board and they have the opportunity to have...

Mr. Morgan: Input as advisers to us. That would be fine as far as advisory is concerned. It's got to be advisory and understood it is advisory.
Just to open up a search and say, hey, through Fleming Associates, find us a president, go out and bring us names, I think that would be a mistake whoever the consulting firm is. Let's spend some time thinking about what we as individuals and then let's draw our thinking together as to what we think is best for Murray State University and reduce it down to that and then say here's what we are looking for, these are the qualities we're looking for. Go out and find us people that fit these particular attributes and abilities. Bring those to us and you can screen those, rather than having a broad advertising and being unindated with all these applications. I think it would be a waste of time myself.

Mr. King: I think Bill has said practically everything I would normally have said, but I do want to reiterate when you look at the cost and money is high today, we need to put down what we are looking for in the future president. Since I brought these brochures, I would suggest, if you want to, that we consider this company plus one more because how do we know if we don't take bids or talk to more than one consulting firm that we have what we are really looking for in the consulting firm.

I would also go one step further and say to any consulting firm that couldn't come down to Murray and spend a couple of days there to see what a committee that this Board would choose would think of the consulting firm first. Those that live close; I'd come if I could. Because if we go consulting firm, we want to pick one that can do the job. We don't want to spend the money, sign an agreement, and find out two months later that there was another one that was better. I'm a little selfish because I really don't have a lot of time. I know what it is to look for good people and I always like to have the right to blame the consulting firm. I would want to at least talk to more than one consulting firm.

Mr. Morgan: Whoever we do end up selecting, I hope it is a person—as Charlie said, we're going to compromise—let's identify those qualities in an individual we are looking for—but I hope when this process is through that we can through interaction among ourselves and certain compromises that we can come up with a person that is going to be suitable to this entire Board. I think that is essential.

Dr. Howard: Well, that's ideal if you can have a unanimous choice.

Mr. Morgan: I want us to strive for that. It is my hope that we can do that.

Mr. West: I wasn't too sure about consultants before I came in here, but I think what I like about it is that it probably guarantees that your search will be national in scope. In the brochure from the consulting firm, it says that one of the first things they do is to get with you and do what you're talking about—draw the circle and see what you want. In that regard, I like your suggestion about getting an advisory group outside the Board working on that to come back to the Board and then the Board can take what they do and throw it away, add to it, or whatever. That group could even take what we have now as a mission statement which is pretty broad and maybe prioritize it or put what definitions on what's in there.

Mrs. Page: I have nothing to add; everything sounds all right.
Dr. Howard: I think one thing you might want to do is to make sure that everybody, all the constituencies feel like they have had input--faculty, the student body, community, alumni. Everybody feels better. We tried to do that last time and I think it was fairly successful.

Mr. King: Does the president of Murray work also with the business world, such as the Chamber of Commerce, in the community?

Mr. Christopher: Marshall Gordon was President of the Chamber of Commerce last year; he just went out of office. There has been, frequently, someone connected with the University on the Board of Directors.

Mrs. Dyer: All three presidents that I have worked for at some time have served on the Chamber Board of Directors.

Mr. Christopher: And other vice-presidents have, too.

Mr. Overby: The Advisory Committee to which you have referred in the formulation of criteria or suggestions to aid the Board, it seems to me that you want to establish it in such a way that your advertising at least could be done prior to that time. It could be broad enough you wouldn't want to await that to put your specifications for the advertising. It would be in the selection as you come down, but not await their results before you start in your advertising.

Secondly, and I hate to bring this up, but there is one thing that you are going to have to confront in connection with an independent consulting firm, and that is it will probably have to go through a special service contract situation. If you do, that's going to mean the Legislative Research Commission is going to get a crack at it. Now, the Commissioner of Finance doesn't have to approve that; you can go ahead and do it if it's not, but what I was wondering it seems to me if you want to take that as a route, or we've got a little time to pursue it, but that's my advance thinking that it would have to be. Then, if it's approved and that is the route you have to go, well and good. If it's not approved, then you can fall back on the second plan, but I did want to alert you to that because you may be confronted with that.

Mr. Morgan: If that was not approved or we decided not to go that route for funding, what would prevent the Board from funding it internally?

Mr. Overby: It is my understanding that there would be problems. It would certainly need some thought.

You've got a new bill that just went through the Legislature, House Bill 622, that as you know will enable you to do some delegation, and this Board is going to have to be confronted with that in terms of allegation of authority internally, I think by September. I am not saying that this is not a feasible way; you might run into an adverse reaction from the Legislative Research Commission. If you do, you just do.

Mr. Morgan: We are going to have expenditures regardless of how we go. Now, what would prevent us from using agency account money if we decided. We are going to have expenditures bringing people in. We are going to be using outside sources whether it be this firm or another firm or whether we advertise in the CASE Chronicle or otherwise. We are going to be expending funds, so I guess you need to check that out and see where we are on that. We don't want to make a mistake on that.

Dr. Howard: Last time, the way I remember, we didn't use a consulting firm, but the expenditures came out of our reserves.
Mr. Overby: You even have a search committee fund now that is set up for faculty members. I am of the opinion that could be used, but you start talking in terms of $50,000 - $60,000, you are talking about a different ballgame.

Dr. Howard: I was talking about the total sum of expenses.

Mr. Morgan: We want to be right.

Mr. Overby: If you want an outside consulting firm, I would just make my mind if you decided you wanted to take that route, if they approved it fine; if not, we'd look at other alternatives.

Mr. Christopher: At this point the consensus I hear—and correct me if I'm wrong—is we would recommend to the full Board that we seek bids from search consultants, and I suppose that would best be done through the Treasurer of the Board.

Mr. Overby: I don't know that you have to go through any bidding process.

Mr. Christopher: I think we are going to have to find out who provides this service and what the cost is, and I don't know of any other way but to invite bids on what their services might cost.

Mr. Overby: If you're talking about a formal bidding process, I don't think that is necessary.

Mr. King: I'm afraid you'd be getting something you don't want.

Mr. Christopher: Well, how do you see approaching it? Contacting several firms?

Mr. King: In other words, whatever the law is. Like in my field, and I hate to keep referring to that, but each agency has to take at least three bids. Maybe you need three, I don't know. Maybe you pick a firm that you know about and just suggest it to the Board; I don't know.

Mr. Morgan: There are all kinds of these firms. If we go on a low-bid basis, we could wind up with some organization we wouldn't be happy with at all. We really need to know who we are dealing with.

Mr. Overby: You have to have some sort of certificate of necessity; you have to have some sort of certification that Frankfort doesn't have the ability to do the job you're asking for, and thirdly, you've got to go through the process of getting the advice of the Legislative Research Commission, and then it's got to be signed by the Commissioner of Finance.

Mr. Morgan: There may be standards for these firms, and all meet a minimum standard, but I doubt it.

Mr. Christopher: But the fact still remains that the execution of that function to seek a consultant must be carried out by someone.

Mr. Morgan: It could be by invitation.

Mr. Christopher: But I'm saying, is it our recommendation that the Treasurer of the Board perform that function? We are going to have to have someone to coordinate.

Mr. King: Ron, I didn't hear your view regarding a consulting firm. Did you have another view?
Mr. Christopher: No, I think that sounds good under the circumstances because as I assess the Board everyone's time is limited. If someone on the Board wanted to volunteer to be the full time coordinator of all this...

Mr. Overby: Mr. Chairman, Mr. King mentioned something about taking this company and possibly one other to compare with it. Could you ask the Treasurer to contact this firm and to contact someone else he would suggest and bring it to the attention of the Board?

Mr. Morgan: We want to talk to these people first.

Mrs. Page: Mr. King, could you find out why U. of L. dropped their consultants?

Mr. King: I could find out, but if it doesn't seem right, then I wouldn't reveal that.

Mr. Morgan: I believe Transylvania is involved with a consulting firm; I'm not sure. I know they are in the process of selection.

Mrs. Page: They got down to three or four and threw them all out and started all over.

Mr. Christopher: If we decide a consulting firm will not work, what alternative would you like to suggest?

Dr. Howard: I think the only alternative you have then is appointing a search committee of the Board to screen applicants primarily.

Mr. Morgan: Let's not think we are abdicating our responsibility by appointing a professional search, we are still going to be doing a lot of work. We are not abdicating anything; what we are trying to do is enhance our abilities.

Mr. Overby: Would there be any advantage in having this outside firm working with a committee of the Board, Dr. Howard? If you have a committee of the Board that they work with, that makes sense to me.

Dr. Howard: I think it would.

Mr. King: I don't think we should have any consulting firm doing all our work. We would give them a platform of what we are looking for, and then I don't think we should step aside. I think we should be right in there.

Dr. Howard: I think you should have a timetable sort of thing and they meet with you and say, we've done this and this is what we plan on.

Mr. Morgan: I certainly don't want to pick up the Sun tomorrow and see the Board abdicated its responsibility and are going to turn it over to a professional organization. That's not the point at all; we are trying to enhance and make it a more enriching exercise rather than to abdicate anything. That's the way I am looking at it and perceive it to be.

Mr. Christopher: I think the consensus is that we are saying a search committee should be established regardless. Let's have suggestions now as to numbers and whether or not there should be any non-Board members participate on that committee. If so, what groups should they represent?

Mr. Morgan: I think the search committee should be comprised solely of Board members.
Mr. King: I have no problem with that.

Mr. West: I have no problem; I guess I am debating whether the search committee should not be the full Board because I suspect every Board member is going to be very interested in every step of the process. There may be some wisdom in that being the full Board because I can't think of any Board member that wouldn't want to be on it.

Dr. Howard: The only problem I see with that, Steve, is the search committee will meet many times. Because of our geographical location, Mr. King in Louisville, Mr. Woodall in Lexington and Mr. Carneal in Owensboro, it is going to be impossible for that group to have full membership there very much. I see no problem in having the whole Board, but what it is going to end up being, I think, just because of that, is the local members like you, Ron, the ones who live in and close to Murray are the ones who are going to get there most of the time. Mr. King can't take off from Louisville or some other city on short notice and Bill Carneal is in Washington half the time. I think the smaller the committee, the better it will work.

Mr. Morgan: I see your point. I think any Board member who wants to serve on that committee should serve on it and I suggest, Ron, that you appoint that committee and any others that say they want to be on the committee, put them on it.

Mr. Christopher: What I see is giving every Board member the opportunity to serve on that committee. I believe that is best. There are six of us that are right there--Charlie, Sara, Steve, Allan, Bill, and me--that are within an hour's drive of Murray. The other would take more than an hour's drive. As long as they understand we may call a meeting on short notice. Don't you think we ought to try it that way?

Mr. King: Looks like to me you could take like a three-person committee and then any of the rest of us that could attend due to our schedules would be free to come, but the responsibility would be with the three.

Dr. Howard: Well, Steve and Allan are on campus virtually all the time. Are you in Murray most of the time?

Mr. Christopher: Most of the time, but time is a problem for me. Sara has indicated she wants to.

Mrs. Page: Yes, I want to. I'm the only unemployed person on the Board.

Dr. Howard: I think Sara would make an excellent choice.

Mr. Morgan: I suggest those Ron mentioned be appointed to that committee and any others that want to serve be appointed likewise and anyone within an hour's drive that doesn't want to serve, let you know and they can drop off. That way anyone that wants to can be on that committee.

Mr. Christopher: That's the only problem, George, with the importance of the issue, to select three and then anyone that wants to be on it is left off. There is nothing more inefficient than a committee and the larger it gets the more inefficient it becomes, but I think ... 

Dr. Howard: Well, Allan said he definitely wanted to be on it, Sara said she did, and I expect Steve does.

Mr. West: Steve doesn't necessarily want to, but Steve has a group of people that expects him to be.
Mr. Morgan: I want to serve on it.

Mr. King: I do not.

Dr. Howard: I really do not think I do either. The time factor is really difficult.

Mrs. Page: Of course, any member of the Board would be free to come to any meeting and be free to say anything they wanted to say.

Mr. Christopher: Well, we will leave it that way and see who wants to volunteer to be on the committee, with the understanding if you volunteer to be on the committee you are saying I will be at the meetings unless there is an emergency to the contrary.

What about the advisory committee?

Dr. Howard: I think it is an excellent idea.

Mr. Morgan: What does this book say about advisory committees?

Mr. Christopher: Not much. As you said, Bill, I think the primary thing is that its foolish to just say we are going to hire a new president if we don't know what the aims, goals, objectives of the institution are and then what criteria comes from that that you would apply in making your selection.

Who should be represented on the advisory committee?

Dr. Howard: Faculty, staff, students, alumni, community.

Mr. Morgan: Faculty is already on the Board.

Mr. West: This is advisory committee, not Board.

Mr. Morgan: Chamber of Commerce.

Mr. Christopher: You're saying the representative from the community should be from the Chamber?

Mr. Morgan: I'm not saying should, but probably would be.

Mr. Christopher: That's a tough one. I agree with George you probably need to limit it to one from each group.

Mrs. Page: When you say community, what about Paducah, Mayfield, Benton?

Mr. Morgan: I'm going to say community and mean local. I think we need to think about regional community as well.

Mrs. Page: How are you going to pick someone like that. Someone from Paducah is not going to represent Benton or Mayfield.

Mr. West: I was going to say instead of community, you say leaders in the Purchase area, and I was going to suggest that the Chairman after consulting with the leaders of all these groups come back to the Board with his suggested appointments. And of course the Board members would have their input as to who they would like to see appointed.

Mr. Christopher: Oh, no.
Mr. Morgan: There is one other group and I've already been contacted by one of
the group and that is your schools.

Mr. Christopher: Education's, yes, but there again I don't know how...superintendents?

Mr. Morgan: The first district consists of 27 school districts.

Mr. King: Are you going to try to hold this group to no more than 10 or 12?

Mr. Morgan: Another group that will want to be on there is your athletic boosters--
your Racer Club.

Mrs. Page: Couldn't you consider that alumni?

Mr. Christopher: How are you going to justify that, Bill?

Mr. Morgan: They are a separate organization. I'm just saying they're going to want
to be on there.

Mr. Christopher: Let's see how specific we can be: the President of the Faculty
Senate, the Chairman of the Non-Academic Personnel Committee.

Mr. Morgan: Rather than do it that way, why not let these various organizations
select the person from that organization.

Mr. Christopher: Or their representative. The President of the Alumni Association--
or representative, we are saying that of all of them; the Vice President of the
Student Government Association.

Ok, the superintendents have an organization? The West Kentucky School
Administrators?

Mr. Morgan: They are the ones who have contacted me.

Mr. Christopher: Superintendents would be over the entire school systems. Their
president or chairman.

What about the community concept? Do you want to eliminate it? Is there
a broad organization?

Dr. Howard: I've heard ever since I've been on the Board that the people of Murray
thinkj the University belongs to them, and unless you stress a regional concept,
you're just going to hear the same old thing.

Mr. Christopher: Let's just eliminate it. What sort of organization covers the
region?

Mr. West: What about PADD (Purchase Area Development District)?

Mr. Morgan: That thing's in controversy now, though.

Mr. Overby: One thing to consider is the affirmative action concept. Now don't just
go out and leave it. You want some women. You want some blacks. Now you have
to do it.

Mr. Christopher: What is a good woman's organization that is representative of the
area? Business and Professional Women?
Mr. John David Cole entered the meeting and the Chairman introduced him to the members present and the members to him.

Mr. Christopher: We have been discussing the search committee seeking some sort of professional consultants. Did you all consider, weigh that?

Mr. Cole: Let me sort of outline and tell you my feelings about it.

I was appointed to Western's Board in 1976, and I was the first non-Western graduate on the Board. With the help of the Governor, we achieved a balance of 4 graduates and 4 non-Western graduates. Western had never had a President who was not a Western graduate. I am not saying whether that's good or bad, but whether business or whatever, it is important to have influx and new ideas. President Downing completely of his own accord, health and other, resigned. John Minton was Acting President. He was President. If you sit in that chair a year you should be president. To say Acting undermines you authority, especially in dealing with people.

It had been my view that all universities in this state, not just the one in Lexington, had been subjected to criticism for the type of search process they had, the feeling that the decision was really made beforehand and we would simply go through the motion and this was what was going to happen. We considered using an executive service which is what the University of Louisville did and Don Swain is a super person, so I think you can say that kind of employment service—for lack of a better word—certainly works.

Western, because of its alumni and personalities involved, decided to have a search process. It was a process that was developed by a committee and reported to the Board, and I think the first thing you have to do is make sure that the Board is committed to an open and independent search, and the Board itself adopts a process because presidential searches are a team sport, not an individual sport.

Bill Bivens will send to you, Ron, the criteria and guidelines we used.

You advertise in the Chronicle of Higher Education and other places. What we wanted was a person—you don't say man or woman, you say person—who had legitimate academic achievements as well as some demonstrated administrative ability. We talked about making it a requirement that the person have a terminal degree. We backed off of that making it a requirement because you might get someone who is just the person you want but did not have the Ph. D or the terminal degree in the area, so I think we used language saying someone with terminal degree would be given preference or extra weight. We then developed up front how the decision was going to be made, and as Chairman I concluded that the Board would serve as a Committee of the whole for the search procedure and we would add to the ten members of the Board someone elected by the faculty for that purpose, someone elected by the students, and someone elected by the administrators. In addition we had an alumnus. I think we used the President of the Alumni Association. We also had a community representative. I think we started off with 15 and ended up with 18 on the committee.

We had about 175 applicants. We hired a separate secretary for the search committee and we had a separate office. The applications came in—most of the time people would write and nominate someone—those stacks of materials were given to each of the 18 people and you had a form you went by when you went through them and you rated them. You had various cutoffs and you worked down. This large committee worked it down to 20 individuals and recommended, if you will, the top 20 to the Board. The Board then reduced it to 10. We then visited those 10 people where they worked, where they taught. We would send a team of 2 people—a Board member and a non-Board member. That is the preferable way of doing it. Bear in mind as you set this procedure up what these non-Board people want, particularly the non-Board faculty, student, and administrator. They want in some way to participate in the ultimate decision. You
have to bear in mind that the only body who can ultimately make this decision is your Board--nobody else. You want the insight, input, recommendations. Bottom line it is the Board's decision and you make a terrible mistake if you delegate to anyone else the right to make that decision, because if you delegate where do you stop--the community, the alumni. It can go on and on.

After we visited the 10, we came back and cut it to 5. Those five individuals were then invited to the campus and we had a schedule established. We asked them to bring their wives. Those five did the same thing; everyone was treated the same. They met with the Board; they met publicly with the students; they met publicly with the faculty; with the administrators; and publicly with the press. I for one believe that the press can be a very strong and supportive thing. Like anything else it can be good or bad depending on what kind of relationship you have, but I would tell you the press played a very strong role in our search process. You want these people to come in and talk publicly with students. They may talk 15 minutes and then let students ask questions. That person may sit in a room and tell you how he is doing and how great he is with students and faculty and administrators, but let's let him talk with students, and a student asks are we going to have birth-control devices at the clinic or boy/girl dorms, anybody has to have an answer to these questions; you have to react to it. If you're an administrator, you ask do you come by yourself or who do you bring with you, do you bring two vice-presidents. We're looking around to see whose job might be in jeopardy. If you're faculty, they want to know about salaries, research. You've got to meet and talk with them, and finally you meet and talk with the press. Have a press conference straight up, no written questions; you come and stand there and answer questions because if you are going to be President you are going to have to do that anyway.

As you know in cutting from the 10 to 5, there was a concerted effort among some people to influence who would be within that and that's fine; that is a legitimate interest within bounds and for the right reasons. When we got to the five, there was the same concerted effort to make decisions other than what was the criteria of the process. I don't say this critical of anyone but in our final five we had one person who was a Western graduate. You want to make the decision as to who the best person is. If it's a Murray or Western graduate, wonderful; but you ought to make it fair and objective.

Within the Board there was discussion or feel that maybe too much emphasis was being placed on the selection process and not enough attention being given to these individual characteristics. I don't share that feeling. I think you have to adopt a process that is fair to everybody and you follow that process right down to the line. And that process will do one of two things. It will come up with a President who you as a Board will elect and support or you'll say we can't agree within the bounds of the process and we'll start all over again. But either of those results is a better result than being totally fair to the very end and then subjecting yourself to the criticism that some other universities have had. I think the integrity of the process is very, very important. I think you have to be committed to it and everyone is treated the same, and whether the person you particularly support ends up the President or not isn't nearly as important as you're being able to say once it is over that we have had a process that is open and above board. What it does is serve as a basis to unite support behind that person.

When we sent people out to visit the 20, here is the evaluation criteria. One is the candidate's personal information. When we got to the 10, we sent them things about Bowling Green and the University. I will send you the documents as to how we went about selecting the committee. I felt there was some merit in being able to go to the faculty, students, and administrators, and tell each group that we want you to participate in the selection process by in some fashion sending to us a representative to serve on the search committee. You get every segment of the University involved. Same thing in terms of the alumni.
I don't know that I see any inconsistency about expressing a willingness to consider not only—I mean the search committee now—those people who are nominated or those people who apply—in other words, the person himself comes to you—but I don't know what placement service U. of L. used, but I don't see anything inconsistent about talking to a placement service like that and expressing to that group the willingness to consider anyone they might have. I don't know enough about executive placement to know whether or not they require some sort of exclusive right to do it.

Mr. Christopher: George King has brought us brochures from the service that U. of L. started with and he has talked with one of the managing partners, and has some insight as to what their service involves.

Mr. Cole: Did they in fact put U. of L. in contact with Don Swain?

Mr. King: No, they did not. I don't think that was the case.

Dr Howard: You said your Board considered this possibility, but apparently decided not to. Did you base that perhaps on abdicating the Board's responsibility?

Mr. Cole: I'll tell you my reasons for it. I wanted very much to have a presidential search process for a university in this state that was open, objective and hopefully would serve as a standard for others to follow or try to match. At Western I felt it was so important that this be open and above any criticism, and we simply felt we would rather do it this way. So I guess we did it for subjective reasons rather than for the other.

Mr. Morgan: We were discussing forming an advisory committee to the Board so that they would have input to us. We as the Board are certainly going to be responsible. We cannot delegate that to anyone or abdicate that. It seems what we were doing fits in with what you have done except you created yours just a little bit differently from what we were going about here. Let's think about that a minute. You said once you got the five finalists, you brought them to the campus along with their families, and you had them meet with the faculty, students, administrators, staff, and a press conference. You said your search committee consisted of the Board as well as community, school, alumni, and we were considering forming those as an advisory group to the ten rather than on the committee itself.

Mr. Cole: Are they going to rank them for you?

Mr. Christopher: No. An advisory committee to come up with goals, objectives, missions that they see the institution having over the next decade.

Mr. Morgan: They in themselves would not be selecting the 20 or the 10. They would be giving input into the Board as to what their interests are so that we could take those into consideration when we go looking for this particular person.

Mr. Cole: This advisory committee would be formed and actually complete its work before you commence the search process to give you a feeling of what to look for? I think that is a good idea.

Mr. Christopher: We might start gathering names because you've got to let everyone who wants to apply.

Mr. Cole: There will be some fun people apply.

Mr. Christopher: As you said, you have to know at the outset where it is you want to go.
Mr. Cole: I think you have to have a procedure in place as to how the names are going to be pared down, and then they come to five and you as a Board are going to select out of five. We had some turmoil. We had two people to withdraw. We had one person who didn't want to do it the way others did it. We had two dissenting votes and ultimately the two who dissented became the strongest supporters of Dr. Zacharias. We have always had Board meeting where we disagree openly.

Mr. Morgan: We don't do that at Murray.

Mr. Christopher: Did you as a Board stop and say this is where we think Western Kentucky University is today and this is where we would like for it to be 10 years from now?

Mr. Cole: I think we as a Board did that. You're suggesting a citizen group do that; that is probably a better suggestion. As to how we were going to choose from the final five, I don't know that we ever had any really objective criteria. You look at people in different respects, the strengths and weaknesses, and on balance. You know the wife is a very important factor. You consider any number of things.

Mr. Morgan: Did you bring children in and consider?

Mr. Cole: Yes, Sir.

Mr. King: How long did it take you for your search from start to finish and could you also tell us what your budget was for that?

Mr. Cole: Yes, we had a budget and we published every month or so how much because people are out there saying they're spending all this money. I have never been to California and I wanted to go, but I went to New Jersey. I knew that would be a mistake. It took about a year and cost about $50,000.

Mr. Christopher: Did you pay all the candidates' expenses?

Mr. Cole: Yes, the five that came to campus.

Mr. Morgan: As to the interest groups represented—you appointed them to your committee and we're considering them as an advisory group to the Board—do you remember the particular groups you added to your committee?

Mr. Cole: We let the students independently select a person to serve on the committee; the same thing for the faculty; the same thing for administrators. For the alumni, they took the President of the Association. We had the President of the Bowling Green Chamber of Commerce for the local input. We also had a couple more on there.

Mr. Morgan: As you know the most vocal interest group in a University is your Big Red or athletic, did you bring them in?

Mr. Cole: No, Sir.

Mr. Morgan: Did you run into problems selecting a person from Bowling Green, rather than from the area?

Mr. Cole: We selected Chamber President rather than a bank president because you've got two other banks. We did not get criticism from people on Chamber.

You have to make it very clear to these people that they participate in the screening process, but do not participate in the selection process.
Mr. Morgan: Our thinking was they would be advising us; they would not participate in the screening process as such.

The advisory group would give input as to what kind of president do you want, what should his philosophy be, so we can take it and come up with a general overall consensus.

Did you bring in the school people? Administrators?

Mr. Cole: No, it is hard to find any person to speak for those people if you get into athletics, teachers.

Mr. Morgan: We have already had inquiries from superintendents and school people saying they want to be on it.

Mr. Cole: You will have all kinds that will assure you...that is what you have to be so careful on. On your advisory committee, on your search committee, I think you have to agree to sign a blood oath that there is one spokesman and you have got to protect the integrity of the people. You have to only say the good.

You have these sheets and you make it out on each applicant. You turn them in and they total them up and that's what it is.

Mr. Christopher: Did you do that in executive session?

Mr. Cole: We would have meetings of the screening committee and all we would do there is we would have the stacks of materials and we would turn in the evaluation sheets as we went along without names and we would discuss when we would meet again, administrative type things. We very seldom ever went into executive session.

Mr. Christopher: How did you coordinate the confidentiality with the open meetings law?

Mr. Cole: We would turn these things into the Secretary of the Committee, who is a very competent lady and she would run the tallies and she would circulate the tallies.

Mr. Christopher: You used a number basis? When you talked about someone you talked about No. 1 and opposed to No. 17?

Mr. Cole: I'm not sure how we did it, but I think the more open it is the better it is. We did on occasion go into closed session to talk. We have a little card that had the magic words. At any board meeting, give someone that card who reads the magic words and you say in the record that you are going in for that purpose. Under our bylaws the Board Secretary always goes into closed session with the Board so she can come back out and raise her hand and say nobody voted on anything which is what the Statutes say.

Mrs. Page: Did the individual Board members have the resumes at home to read and study?

Mr. Cole: Yes. Every Board member had access to absolutely everything that went on and every resume.

Mr. Morgan: Because of confidentiality, you would not discuss individuals by name in open session?
Mr. Cole: No, we would not. We would meet in closed session to make the cuts.

Mr. Overby: I hear you saying two things. One, fundamental fairness and two, a procedure that is open and above board and is thorough. Basically when you do that then you've got a decision that you've made and a decision that has to be made by the Board.

Mr. Cole: And with that procedure if it turns out that you can't agree on a president then you stop and you start again.

Mr. Overby: At the time you were selecting, did you have a student voting member on the Board?

Mr. Cole: Yes, Sir.

Mr. Overby: The reason I was asking, then you had an extra person come on in addition to the student regent.

Mr. Christopher: Why did you do that?

Mr. Cole: Well, you want to get as many people involved. You have the Board, so we went out to the students and said you elect another student to serve as a member of the search committee. We had a faculty member and we went to the faculty and said you elect another faculty member. We went to the administrators who are the forgotten people of this world, who don't get to do anything, and they elected someone to participate. Then we got the alumni and the Chamber of Commerce and there might have been a couple of others. We did not go to athletics. We did not go to the school superintendents.

Mr. West: Did you go to the staff?

Mr. Cole: The administrative staff. You either go to school, teach school, or are someone who helps keep the doors open.

Mr. Christopher: Administrators includes all non-academic personnel?

Mr. Cole: Yes, Sir.

Mr. King: Did you get into having race, sex, or anything like that as far as your committee. We were discussing that when you came in.


Mrs. Page: But you did say the wife was very important.

Mr. Cole: We did not on any application materials was there mention of race or religion at all.

Mr. King: My question was on your selection committee or search committee.

Mr. Cole: What we did and I can't think of the name, but he is the principal of the middle school in Russellville, a black man and very qualified, and we appointed him as a member of the search committee and we appointed another lady who not only was a lady but she was Oriental. We rang the bell twice there. That's where I got my two other people.
Mr. Overby: When you screen down to your level, did the Board approve that screening. I am just thinking if it were given to an advisory body outside.

Mr. Cole: Bear in mind that the Board could participate and attend these meetings, but most of the Board did not get actively involved until it got to 20. When it got to 20, then the Board participated to get it to 10, the visitation, and then to 5.

Mr. Overby: Would you see any objections to the Board formally approving what had been done by way of cutting it down?

Mr. Cole: No, Sir. Every Board member had all the resumes; every Board member had the opportunity to do it.

Mr. Overby: Here's my thinking. If you cut out 150 people and they were cut out by non-Board members, then those people would have standing to say I was eliminated by non-Board process.

Mr. Cole: But you see that is why we had the Board serving as part of the search process, and had Board members who were active in the screening. I was active in the screening. I know what you are saying and I think that's why you have to keep some Board involvement, but by like reason it is really pretty easy in three months you can get it down to 20. The ones written in crayon go out first.

Dr. Howard: In retrospect, are you satisfied with the process you used and was there anything you did that you would change?

Mr. Cole: I am satisfied with the process; I am satisfied very much with the openness of the process. I think the openness of the process has to be there and following our procedures was the success of the project. I see nothing wrong and probably it is a good idea that George has come up with. Whether or not a service like this...if they would be interested in submitting you names, there is no reason why your committee couldn't consider names from that source as well as the other. I think in retrospect, I would do that. I do not want you to think what I was saying is tokenism; that is not at all what I am saying. We were looking to the constituencies of the University. We have the students, faculty, administrators, alumni, community; we have black students, foreign students, white students; we are all here together. We did it in a positive way and it was a positive input. I mean that very sincerely.

Mr. King: How it started here was we were beginning to name different representatives of groups and I said we ought to hold it to 10, or no more than 12. I said eventually we would get into women and minorities and things like that if we don't stop, not that one of those 10 couldn't be.

Mr. Cole: But I think the other side of that argument is that you have to have credibility in your search committee. To have credibility you have to have legitimate and independent representatives not only of the students but also of the black community, of women, of minorities--people who are there and successful in their own right and have something to contribute. The busier people are the better committee members they will make because they will take the time to do it. It is a lot of work and you will take a lot of criticism for it. You don't ever want to place yourself in the position of where one Board member has a ringer--you know, well, we've done all this but that's who I'm for--and if you do that, that's wrong and you've got a fight then. You
have a process and if that person goes through that process and is success-
ful, super. But you can't get our here and somehow we are just floating
along and see somebody's name surfacing. I am not suggesting we had that,
but I am suggesting I took a lot of heat.

Mrs. Page: Well, we are already taking heat over that.

Mr. Cole: There wasn't one of the final five I didn't meet because we had it set up
that they come to campus and this is how we do it and everybody is treated the
same.

Doctor, I am very pleased with the process. I am sure there are better
processes, but I think it was good for Western.

Mr. Overby: As I look at this group, what I think they want is 1) they want it to
be fair, 2) they want the procedure to be accurate, 3) they want consideration
to be given to everybody equally as you have indicated, and I would want it
to be above any successful legal challenge. I want these other things, too, but
I've got my eye on that.

Mr. Cole: And I would suggest to you that at some point in time as you develop a
process, that you invite Dick Wilson of the Courier-Journal down and have
lunch with Dick and talk with Dick about it because Dick Wilson visits the
campuses, is a bright and capable man, who has good insight as to how these
things work and he is a reporter and he does his job. He will blast you in
the papers as well as anybody else, but he is knowledgeable. In my mind,
Dick Wilson is as knowledgeable a man as there is in Kentucky about these
things.

Mr. Overby: One other thing, we have talked about using these consultants to bring
additional names, is there any objection to them also participating in an
advisory capacity in this initial screening, advisable only?

Mr. Morgan: To get down to a usable 20.

Mr. Cole: I have never dealt with an executive placement service. I don't under-
stand. I know they get paid and paid-by-the-person assume they get paid by the person
who gets the job. My initial reaction to the suggestion that they participate
in the screening is negative because I think you subject yourself to criticism.
You've got some guy from Long Island who is down here telling the people of
Murray what they want in a president. If you are going to use them, don't use
them publicly. Call them a consultant; tell them to look at these things.
They can do a good service.

Our concept or my personal observation at least is at a school like
Western you don't want to get someone that this is the crowning point of
they career. That's been good in the past, but today—in 1980s—I think you
want a young person who will stay with you 5, 7, 8 years and who has a selfish
interest in doing a good job to go on to the Ohio States, or Texas, or Indiana.
It is the same selfish interest you have in that person doing a good job.

Mr. Christopher: On behalf of this group, I can't tell you how invaluable what
you've shared with us will be. Thank you very much.

In light of the things David shared with us, do you want to go back and
rehash anything?

Dr. Howard: Some of the things he said brought back some memories. I remember that
we had the same process of using numbers instead of names. We also had a
rating sheet we turned in by number rather than by name. Everyone sent those
Mr. Morgan: I think we have been moving in the same direction they moved. The only difference I see is they had the representative of the students, faculty, administrators/staff, alumni, community, blacks, women on the screening committee, where we prefer to have them on an advisory committee rather than screening committee.

Mr. Christopher: I see a great deal of benefit in taking the time to stop and say where are we and where do we want to go. Anyone who is hired for any job likes to know what is expected, and that is something that the Board hasn't done and I think it gives more credibility to the Board if we work out something.

Mrs. Page: Are you suggesting that we have the advisory committee give its recommendation first and then the Board sits down and makes the final decision.

Mr. Christopher: The Board's going to sort of do that anyway, but I think it forces the Board to stop and see what that group thinks—and I see us recommending to the Board what that group might be—you know, where is the University today, where do we want to go, from a broad picture, what do we want to be, where should our priorities be. I think if you get beyond a decade, you get so speculative and non-specific that it is hard to see.

Mr. Morgan: Back to the advisory committee, I think we as Board members represent the area pretty well and I think the area community leader ought to come out of Murray, Sara.

Mrs. Page: I don't object to having one out of Murray, I was just saying possibly having another one.

Mr. Morgan: You have the fire, police support. That doesn't effect Paducah or Benton.

Mrs. Page: I definitely think someone from Murray should be on there but..

Mr. Morgan: I don't think we need one from another community.

Mrs. Page: Of course, personally, I don't think we need a black and a woman either, unless Mr. Overby says we are going to run into legal problems.

Mr. Overby: I was just using an abundance of caution.

Dr. Howard: Of course, we have a woman on the Board and a black member of the Board.

Mr. Morgan: And one of these may be a woman or a black.

Dr. Howard: In fact, in our final 20, I think we had one woman. We did have, incidentally, open meeting with the faculty and with the students so they could ask them questions. We did not have them meet with the press, but it is a good idea.

Mr. Morgan: Don't you all agree that the community person ought to be from Murray? You have so many facets involved there as far as the community is concerned—streets, utilities.

Mr. Christopher: Ok, but how are you going to select that person?

Mr. Morgan: I don't know. The Chamber would be the place I would start probably.

Mrs. Page: How about the mayor?
Mr. Christopher: Then you overlook the county judge

Mrs. Page: There is no way to please everybody.

Mr. Christopher: We need to move along. Are we comfortable now with saying that the search committee will be open to all members of the Board? And then what I see is polling the Board and those members who say "you can count on me" as constituting the working search committee. As we said, there are six in the Murray area. Hopefully, we can get no less than three of those six. Sara has said we can count on her; I am sure Steve will be available; Alan wants to be on it; and Bill said he will be. Are we comfortable with doing that? We do want to appoint this advisory committee. To rehash that, we said a faculty member, staff, students, alumni, and on community, do you want to go to the Chamber of Commerce?

Mrs. Page: Why don't you just pick who you think, Ron.

Mr. Christopher: We had mentioned the superintendents, do you still want to stay with that; do you want to eliminate it?

Mr. West: He seemed to discourage that.

Mr. Christopher: Well, I think he was thinking of it in terms of a member of their selection committee. We ruled that our, and we're going to go with an advisory committee.

Mrs. Page: I don't think it can do any harm to let the education establishment have their say.

Mr. Christopher: Then we talked about someone representing the region. I think just as David came in we were talking about the Purchase Area Development District. Do you want to go with the chairman of that?

Mr. Morgan: The judges are on that so that's where you get your judges.

Dr. Howard: I'm going to agree with Bill, there's a lot of fighting among themselves.

Mr. Christopher: Ok. We've eliminated them. Who would you like to suggest? We're at six.

Mr. Morgan: We could put a minority on there.

Mrs. Page: I think that looks like tokenism. When people look at the list, they're going to say you've got a woman and a black.

Mr. Morgan: It could look that way, but you're going to be criticized if you don't.

Mrs. Page: 99% of the people in the region couldn't care less how we pick the president of Murray State, except people who are involved personally.

Mr. King: I would think if a black person--I can't speak for a woman--could make a real contribution and had the respect of the other people on that committee, ok; otherwise, I wouldn't be for putting him or her on there just to have them. If there is such a person in Murray, then do it.

Mrs. Page: That's my feeling, George.

Mr. Christopher: You're saying Murray, but there may be someone in Paducah or Mayfield.
A minority representative? Or are we saying a black representative? Are we saying a female representative? If so, I would prefer that we go on and say what organization. Sara, I think you have a better understanding of that than anyone else.

Mrs. Page: I am not a feminist. What women's group has any legitimate interest in the president of Murray State?

Mr. Christopher: We are just saying a female representative then.

Mr. West: You laughed when I said it earlier, but I was serious. I think this group can identify the constitutencies. I think you as Chairman—you may want to come back and say the president of the Faculty Senate, chairman of this committee or whatever—can come back and find that outstanding female, or that outstanding minority member, or that outstanding community leader.

Mr. Christopher: We are not looking for names specifically, but who should be represented on this advisory committee.

Mr. West: But I am saying in terms of who it is, I think you can come back to the Board with some names.

Mr. Morgan: I don't think you ought to reduce it to one particular group because you really get into it.

Mr. Christopher: We will just assure that there will be at least one female representative. What about personnel to help the search committee do its work: How did you set that up before?

Dr. Howard: The Chairman—Mr. Doran's—secretary, Annie Nance, did it. In our case I think we should employ somebody. I am sure Patsy could help us with that, someone who would be a good secretary, confidential, and establish an office— I don't know whether or or off campus is appropriate.

Mr. Morgan: Are we going to get into adopting these bylaws where we are going to have a secretary for the Board anyhow?

Mr. Christopher: Probably not.

Dr. Howard: I think this would be a full-time job for the length of the search.

Mr. Christopher: Do you see any merit in also seeking the services of George Stockton to advise the committee. He is the Personnel Director.

Dr. Howard: In what terms? I am not sure I understand.

Mr. Christopher: To help the secretary in terms of day to day carrying out and who's...

Mr. West: You say he's to do that instead of you? Assigning numbers to eac?

Mrs. Page: Why can't the secretary do that?

Mr. Christopher: It could be, but I heard Charlie saying trying to find someone who can type, isn't that right?

Dr. Howard: That's essential, I think.

Mr. Christopher: I just see someone overseeing them. I don't know. It might be that Patsy may have time to do that.
Mr. Morgan: George Stockton can do it; that's right in his jurisdiction, his area.

Mr. Overby: He has about three secretaries over there, for what it is worth.

Mr. Morgan: We might could even get an inhouse secretary.

Mr. Christopher: Confidentiality is extremely important.

Mr. Morgan: But if we go hire someone, they're going to be an employee just like we've got.

Mr. Christopher: I envisioned when Charlie said that, someone coming in and I think they need to be supervised on a daily basis is what I was saying.

Mr. Morgan: What I'm saying is in the budget we have certain positions identified as not filled that show as a surplus right now and we might fill one of those positions.

Mr. Christopher: Let me back up a little. Before, Glenn Doran kept it all right there at the bank and he was able to control it all, oversee it all, and that way they were assured of confidentiality. I don't have that kind of facilities, so I envision someone to do secretarial work and somebody to oversee that person on a day to day basis, to answer their questions, etc.

Mrs. Dyer: You are going to need someone who makes sure this material is sent to this person and you have everything and the affirmative action cards go. It will not be the person necessarily that needs to type up the response, but it will have to be somebody who can set up the filing system and check it out.

Mr. Christopher: It strikes me that whoever is doing personnel work should be familiar with affirmative action type criteria. George is a very competent individual, and has always impressed me that way in church work and that's the only place I know him.

Dr. Howard: I think that would be fine. As Mr. Cole said, I bet I couldn't get all the material I had on this table. It was literally a closet full of folders and papers. If you get a couple of hundred of them, it is unbelievable.

Mrs. Page: He said they set up a separate office, didn't he?

Dr. Howard: Yes, he did; essentially, that is what we had. Ours was off-campus rather than on. I don't know why it couldn't be on.

Mr. Christopher: Let's say George Stockton. Are his responsibilities such that say someone else in his office could come in and sort of divide his time for a year? In other words, if he were taken off his job on a half time basis, is there someone there who could step in for him to do his normal regular duties?

Mrs. Dyer: I don't know. Each person in the office has different functions. You have a wage and salary analyst in there, but whether she can take care of what George does, I don't know. I think he would be the only one who could tell you that or Jim as his supervisor.

Mr. Christopher: Jim Hall? Those details can be worked out then by the Search Committee, don't you think?

Dr. Howard: I'll say one thing about that. I think if it becomes too lengthy, it becomes exhaustive for everybody and our last search, I think, was a little too
long. By the end of the 8/9 month everyone was worn out. I would like to see us compress that into maybe six months.

Mr. King: He said a year.

Dr. Howard: Right. That's a long time.

Mr. Christopher: It is going to take a meeting of the Board to present this to the full Board, and I guess we can work on that as soon as we get back, but let's say the full Board meets and approves all this by the middle of July, that would be the beginning date.

Mr. West: I threw this out to the Executive Committee of the Faculty Senate, and several of those people have been involved in searches, not for President, but chairmen and deans. They said in terms of reasonable dates, say July 15 in terms of getting started. They said running ads July, August, and maybe part of September, cutting off applicants around October 1, getting it down to 10...

Mr. Christopher: Let's take it one at a time. How long do you advertise?

Dr. Howard: It seems to me we advertised about 8 weeks.

Mrs. Dyer: The Chronicle is not published every week in August and September.

Mr. West: We've discussed also the New York Times, the Wall Street Journal. They were also saying getting it down to 10/20 or your big list by November 1.

Mr. Christopher: You're going to ask your Search and Screening Committee to reduce it to what?

Mr. West: Whatever number you decide on.

Mr. Christopher: within 30 days. Is that operable?

Dr. Howard: That going to be tough. I'd rather see us cut our advertising from 10 weeks to 8 weeks and give that committee 6 weeks.

Mr. Christopher: We could go to a September 15 cutoff and have a November 1 deadline for the Search and Screening Committee. After that you start getting into the holiday season. What did you have after that, Steve?

Mr. West: They had two months to get it down to 5/6 your short list.

Mr. Christopher: What was your first cut before?

Dr. Howard: As I recall, the first cut was to 10; then we cut one more time to six. That was our final list.

Mr. Christopher: You invited that six to campus?

Dr. Howard: Yes, and also visited that six on their campuses.

Mr. Morgan: 10 would be a lot more manageable than 20.

Dr. Howard: Let me interject while it is on my mind one thing he said that is very important, and that is a blood oath that there is one spokesman because you have people calling you wanting you to comment on so and so and you say well we speak through the chairman of the committee; I can't comment publicly on that; there's all kinds especially after you get down to 5. We had 216 applicants and I used to tell Fran I can't believe 215 of them knew someone I knew or who knew me.
I think that's good the search and screening committee gets down to 10 by Nov. 1

Mr. Christopher: Is 10 a good representative number?

Dr. Howard: It is to me. Morgan: Yes King: Agreed

Mrs. Page: If you got down to it and had 11 equally good, you could change that, couldn't you?

Mr. Morgan: This is a guideline we're talking about. Right.

Mr. Christopher: What do you have after that?

Mr. West: After that you take a couple of months to get it down to 5, that's when you start going out to visit and...

Dr. Howard: The problems are as you mentioned the holidays coming in there; maybe if you had it February 1 for the final 5 recommendations, and then give yourself another six weeks or two months for the final five, you should be able to name someone by April 1.

Mr. King: How much notice does the average president have to give to the school he is currently at? If we take a person that's active and more than likely we would, how much notice do they need? When you start talking about final 5 you may want more than one visit with some of those people.

Mr. Morgan: You almost need to make that decision in March, it would be even better.

Dr. Howard: From the standpoint of the candidates, the earlier the better.

Mr. Christopher: We could shoot for Jan. 15 for cut to final five, that's two and a half months to pare down from 10 to 5.

Dr. Howard: You should be able, I think, to visit and have visits with five people within six weeks period of time. Certainly by March 15

Mr. Christopher: We could say by March 1 to have completed visits and then have a selection by March 15.

Mrs. Page: I hope none of us have anything to do between Jan 1 and Mar 15.

Mr. Morgan: Let's check the calendar and get a date around the 15th that would be a meeting date for us. March 12 is a saturday. That would be a good date.

Mrs. Dyer: I believe spring break at the University is the week of March 13.

Mr. Morgan: They would have already been interviewed by them.

Mrs. Page: What she's saying is if we schedule a Board meeting and announce and the faculty is gone.

Mr. Christopher: We could make our visit, divide up the Board for visits and have that by March 1.

Mr. Morgan: March 1 is on Tuesday; the saturday before that will be Feb. 26
Mr. West: Charlie, in terms of what I heard you say earlier, you prefer just getting the work done and...

Dr. Howard: What I prefer, Steve, is when you start cutting it down to 5 people and you've got that running over three or four months, you are going to be besieged by... I think you want to shorten the process toward the end rather than the beginning.

Mr. West: By that time, you will have been over those people's files 7 or 8 times.

Mr. Morgan: Let's shoot for February 26. We could make our visits between January 15 and February 12.

Mrs. Dyer: Charles, didn't you all have a board meeting nearly every time we had a candidate on campus?

Dr. Howard: I don't think every member was there every time, but everyone who wanted to speak to the finalists and could, we had a meeting.

Mr. West: You at least went through the process of calling a special meeting?

Mr. Christopher: Can you visit them and them visit you in that time period?

Dr. Howard: That could be a problem.

Mr. King: I'll take the one in Hawaii.

Mr. Christopher: July 17 is a Saturday; let's shoot for that. Patsy, if you will call and see if we can at least get a quorum there for the 17th. Our cutoff for advertising is September 15 and that does not require a meeting. The search committee will cut to 10 and we'll try to meet on September 26. The search committee can report to the Board on the 26th. We're going to meet the 26th and 27th on that Mentor Program.

Mr. Morgan: May I make a suggestion? Patsy, when you get back, send a memo on these dates to all of us.

Mr. Christopher: Do you want to coordinate the meeting where the search committee announces its 10 with a football game? There's a home game on November 13, do you want to go with the 13th? Ok, the search committee will report its final 10 on November 13.

Mrs. Dyer: And January 15 is a Board Meeting with a report on the final five?

Mr. Christopher: Yes. What did you do with the 10?

Dr. Howard: I don't think we interviewed but six, isn't that right, Patsy?

Mrs. Dyer: Yes. I think you check references very carefully on the 10, and

Dr. Howard: and talked to people they did not give as references, maybe people who worked for them. I am sure we only brought six people to the campus.

Mr. Christopher: So in that period of time you get a pretty good idea about who are the strongest candidates?

Dr. Howard: I think so.
Mr. West: We talked about cutting off the advertising deadline. Do you envision that some kind of ad will be prepared and distributed at this next meeting?

Mr. Christopher: No. I think we'll leave that to the search committee because they will have to be sure they comply with all the laws and Jim's going to have to work closely with them.

Mr. Overby: The full Board could authorize the search committee to do it according to law.

Mr. Christopher: You need to think through this. We are going to say the full Board constitutes the search committee, but I need to know whether the mechanics of less than a quorum can do that work...you understand what I'm saying. We have said that we are going to leave that open to the full Board, and we're going to ask of the full Board for all people who say, "I will make the commitment to be at the meetings," and those people will be empowered to make the final 10. So, I guess, what we need to know is, do they have to be appointed as a committee. Look at that and think through that.

Mr. Overby: I have until the next Board meeting to work on that. Is that what you are saying?

Mr. Christopher: Right. Let's do this and vote to make sure we all understand.

As I understand, this Committee's recommendation is going to be:

1. That we have a search that is national in scope,

2. That the search and screening committee will be limited to the members of the Board of Regents of Murray State University,

3. That we will give each member an opportunity to make a commitment of time to that work and that group will then constitute the committee that conducts that business,

Mr. Christopher: If all ten say, yes, I want to do that.

Mr. Overby: But if all ten do not say that, then those that do will constitute the committee?

Mr. Christopher: And that is what I want you to be sure that we don't have any problems with.

This committee will say to the Board that we recommend that the search and screening committee be made up of Board members only, for which each person will be asked to volunteer. If they do not volunteer, then the group of volunteers will constitute the committee that will be empowered to conduct that business.

Mr. Overby: And the business you are talking about is cutting it down to 10?

Mr. Christopher: Yes. That committee will also be empowered to hire whatever personnel and what we are recommending is that it have a secretary and as a suggestion perhaps the Director of Personnel to assist it in its work as well as the Affirmative Action Officer and whomever else, and, Jim, you may want to straighten this up for us, as personnel of the committee.

What about costs? We never did address that. Do we want to make a recommendation as to the dollars that may be spent in this process?
Dr. Howard: I don't think so. I think the recommendation to the Board is that funds sufficient to do the job will be committed and that periodic reports to the Board will be made on funds expended.

Mr. Christopher: We will also recommend to the full Board that the Board appoint an advisory committee with the purpose of defining the University's goals, objectives, missions, etc. over the next decade for the purpose of giving the full Board essential criteria to measure the final candidates. That advisory committee will be composed of a representative from the faculty, from the non-academic personnel, from the alumni, from the students, of educators, of black people, and of females.

Dr. Howard: Do you think maybe you should say regional educators?

Mr. Morgan: Regional elementary and secondary educators. That will define it.

Mr. Overby: You mentioned the study of this advisory committee would be to give the Board criteria upon which to do the selection. Would it be proper to say to give the Board advice as to their feeling. What I am thinking is, suppose they come out with some very narrow criteria that the Board doesn't agree with. In other words, it is advisory to you, but you are not bound by the criteria they come up with. You want to look at it carefully. If they come up with something that you wouldn't agree with, then it's going to harm you rather than help you. You need flexibility, I think.

Mr. Christopher: And that criteria will be used from November 13 on, so we would ask that committee to report to the Board no later than November 13.

Mr. Morgan: To give us time to evaluate it and review it before we go into that meeting, they need to get that to us before November 13.

Mr. Christopher: We have our retreat meeting on the 26th of September, so let's have it to us on the Friday before, which is the 24th.

Then our recommended timetable will be

--recommend the search and screening committee begin advertising immediately after the next meeting of the Board of Regents as a whole,

--deadline for taking applications will be September 15, 1982,

--deadline for the search and screening committee to report to the full Board will be November 13, 1982 (they will make their recommendations as to the top 10 candidates),

--that the full Board reduce the top 10 candidates to the top 5 candidates by January 15, 1982, and

--that the full Board make its announcement as to its selection by February 26, 1983.

Mr. Christopher: Is there anything that has been left out? Does anyone move that these recommendations be made to the full Board?

Mr. Morgan: I so move.

Dr. Howard: I'll second Mr. Morgan's motion.

Mr. Christopher: All those in favor, say aye; opposed, nay. Motion passes.
Mr. Morgan: Regarding a consulting firm, who's going to...

Mr. Christopher: The search and screening committee. We recommend that the search and screening committee consider that.

Mr. Morgan: What I was thinking about was George would be in Louisville and somebody be contacting them so we'd have some information.

Mr. Christopher: Right. That would be good. If you'll talk to Mr. Schwartz.

Anything else? We will be adjourned then.
Suggested Guidelines/Responsibilities for Search & Coordinating Committee

1. Determine publications in which advertisement appears and length of run.
2. If desired, draft letter inviting nominations.
3. If desired, prepare list of institutions/agencies inviting nominations.
4. Draft letter inviting applicants as result of referral.
5. Determine if outside consulting firm desired
   If so, a) secure proposals
   b) determine cost
   c) authorize special services contract
   d) meet with firm(s)
6. Draft suggested evaluation/rating form
7. Draft letter informing unsuccessful applicants
Suggested Guidelines for Board of Regents for screening process

1. Receive report from Advisory Committee and develop criteria for selection
2. Select top ten candidates
3. Determine method(s) of investigating candidates
   A. set of questions to ask
   B. telephone/letter for inquiries
   C. determine who will visit who
   D. anticipated questions and information for answers
4. Share results of visit with other members
5. Reduce number being considered to five
6. Five candidates
   A. determine applicant's 2-day schedule, including activity for spouse
   B. determine who will host each applicant while on campus
   C. set up schedule
6. After visits on campus
   A. assess campus reaction
   B. determine if candidate is still actively interested in position
7. Selection
   A. determine voting procedure
   B. determine terms of appointment and by whom conveyed
   C. inform other candidates before announcement, if possible
8. Appoint transition team
Sample Guidelines for finalists visits to campus

Arrival Thursday evening

Friday

Breakfast with VP-1 1 - 1½ hrs
Tour campus 1½ - 2 "
Meeting w/staff 1 - 1½ "
Lunch with Dean/Chairman 1 - 1½ "
Meeting w/faculty 1½ - 2 "
Meeting w/students 1½ - 2 "
Dinner/Entertainment with VP-2

Saturday

Breakfast with VP-3 & 4 1 - 1½ hrs
Tour community 2 - 2½ "
Meeting w/press 1 "
Lunch with Board of Regents 1½ "
Meeting with Board of Regents 2 - 3 "
Depart late afternoon/evening

also spouse schedule as it varies from this
Presidential Search Office - Duties

1. Set up office and secure supplies
2. Mail advertisement to designated publications w/instructions on length of run and billing arrangements
3. Upon receipt of statements, process Purchase Requisition for payment
4. Type and mail letters inviting nominations
5. Type and mail letters inviting applications of referrals
6. As applications are received
   a. acknowledge w/AA card
   b. assign numbers
   c. log
   d. duplicate and mail to Board members with evaluation sheets
7. If consulting firms utilized, PSC paperwork
8. Minutes of Search & Coordinating Committee
9. Minutes of Board re: screening process
   a. tally evaluations
10. Report on expenditures to Search & Coordinating Committee/Board/others ? monthly ?
11. Make travel arrangements of Board members to visit candidates
   a. reservations - airline/hotel/rent-a-car
   b. out of state requests filed
   c. upon return, travel voucher for reimbursement
12. Type and mail letters to unsuccessful applicants
13. Type and mail letters to five invited to campus
14. Send University and community materials to five
15. Set up schedule for each of five
   a. coordinate travel arrangements
   b. University Center/motel reservations
   c. make luncheon/dinner arrangements
   d. coordinate in-town transportation
   e. coordinate host/hostess
   f. schedule rooms for meetings
   g. arrange guide(s) for tour(s)
   h. assist with vouchers for reimbursing travel expenses
   i. prepare and distribute notice of meetings/schedules to faculty, students, staff, press
16. Type and mail letters to five unsuccessful applicants

17. Type and mail letters to four unsuccessful applicants

18. Follow-up
   a. draft, print, and mail announcement to area institutions/groups
      name, date of president
   b. tabulate statistics for files and AA