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JOINT MEETING
BOARD OF REGENTS* and its ad hoc UNR PRESIDENT SEARCH COMMITTEE and INSTITUTIONAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
NEVADA SYSTEM OF HIGHER EDUCATION
Lawlor Events Center
Silver and Blue Room
University of Nevada, Reno
1664 North Virginia Street
Reno, Nevada 89557
Friday, December 9, 2011, 1:00 p.m.

Members Present: REGENTS’ COMMITTEE
Mr. James Dean Leavitt, Chairman
Mr. Cedric Crear
Dr. Jason Geddes
Mr. Kevin C. Melcher
Mr. Rick Trachok
Mr. Kevin J. Page

Members Present: ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Dr. W. (Pat) Arnott, Faculty Senate
Dr. Bill Follette, Faculty Senate
Dr. Stephen Lafer, Faculty Senate
Dr. Donica Mensing, Faculty Senate
Mr. Chuck Price, Faculty Senate
Mr. Casey Stiteler, ASUN President
Mr. James Beattie, GSA President
Dr. Rita Laden, Administrator
Dr. Emma Sepulveda Pulvirenti, Administrator {via telephone}
Mr. Bruce Shively, Administrator
Mr. Erik Williams, Staff Employment Council
Ms. Denise Cordova, Affirmative Action
Mr. Alfredo Alonso, Community Member
Mr. Joe Bradley, Community Member
Mr. Kirk Clausen, Community Member
Mr. Bob Davidson, Community Member
Mr. Rick Hsu, Community Member
Dr. Jeane Jones, Community Member
Mr. Mark Knobel, Community Member
Dr. Angie Taylor, Community Member
Mr. Harvey Whittemore, Community Member
Members Absent: Dr. Lisa Lyons, Community Member  
               Ms. Mary Simmons, Community Member  

Others Present: Mr. Dave Brackett, GSA Representative  
               Mr. Daniel J. Klaich, Chancellor  
               Mr. Scott G. Wasserman, Chief of Staff and Special Counsel to the Board of Regents  

Chairman Leavitt called the meeting to order on Friday, December 9, 2011, at 1:07 p.m. with all members of the Regents’ ad hoc UNR President Search Committee present.

1. **Information Only - Public Comment (Agenda Item #1)** – None.

2. **Approved - Minutes (Agenda Item #2)** – The Committee recommended approval of the October 14, 2011, meeting minutes (Ref. UNR PSC-1 on file in the Board office).

   Regent Geddes moved approval of the minutes from the October 14, 2011. Regent Crear seconded. Motion carried.

3. **Information Only - Search Firm Presentations and Interviews (Agenda Item #4)** – The Committees heard presentations and conducted interviews of search firm consultants for the possible engagement of a search firm to assist in the selection of candidates for the President of the University of Nevada, Reno.

   Mr. Wasserman, Chief of Staff and Special Counsel to the Board of Regents, related that on October 14, 2011, an RFP (Request for Proposal) was sent out to all known higher education search firms, including known Nevada search firms that could be identified. Responses to the RFP were due by 5:00 p.m. on November 10, 2011. Ten responses were received from search firms that primarily focused on higher education. Mr. Wasserman noted that none of the Nevada executive search firms included in the mailing had responded. The ten responses received were reviewed and the top five proposals were identified that met the criteria and concerns expressed by the committees.

   Mr. Wasserman reported that of the top five identified, all had initially indicated their availability to attend the already scheduled committee meetings on December 9, 2011, and December 16, 2011, as specified in the RFP. However, over the course of the last week, three of the five had withdrawn their proposals. The primary reason given for those withdrawals was the large number of president searches currently being conducted in the United States. Mr. Wasserman felt that positively impacted the committees’ selection since those three firms recognized they did not have the sufficient resources to devote to UNR’s search.
3. **Information Only - Search Firm Presentations and Interviews (Agenda Item #4) – (Cont’d.)**

Chairman Leavitt related that at its October 21, 2011, meeting, the Board of Regents determined to invite all search firms to make separate proposals for each search. In addition, the Board felt that it was appropriate for each search committee to select its own search firm.

Mr. Wasserman noted that since the RFP encouraged all search firms to submit proposals for the three concurrent president searches, he asked that the committees not penalize any search firm for applying for more than one search. However, he felt that it was a fair question for the committees to ask if a search firm has sufficient resources to conduct more than one search concurrently.

Mr. Wasserman related that a list of questions previously asked during the search firm interview stage has been provided to the committees (on file in the Board office).

Chancellor Klaich thanked Chairman Leavitt and Mr. Wasserman for analyzing the ten lengthy proposals.

Chairman Leavitt added that the analysis was compiled separately but when compared, both reflected nearly identical answers.

Regent Crear asked if the committees would have an opportunity to comment on the presidential leadership prospectus that had been distributed earlier that morning (on file in the Board office). Mr. Wasserman replied that the Committees will further discuss the draft presidential leadership statement under agenda item #6. He emphasized that the presidential leadership statement will be provided to the search firm that is selected and will be further discussed at the December 16, 2011, meeting.

Regent Crear requested clarification that comments would not be accepted on the presidential leadership statement at the meeting that day but at the meeting on December 16, 2011. Chairman Leavitt clarified that if time allowed, the statement would be discussed after selection of a search firm that day and would be finalized at the December 16, 2011, meeting.

Mr. Kirk Clausen asked if there was a budget that needed to be taken into consideration. Mr. Wasserman explained that the budget is determined by the Board Chair in consultation with Chancellor and himself. The Board Chair was aware of the pricing structure being brought forward by the search firms being interviewed that day.

Chairman Leavitt related that the bids were approximately $100,000 and within current accepted market practices. He added that further negotiation of the budget would be between the search firm, Mr. Wasserman, the Board Chair and the Chancellor.

Mr. Harvey Whittemore appreciated that enough money needed to be spent to get the job done but felt that it was important to place spending caps on expenses. Chairman Leavitt understood Mr. Whittemore’s concern adding the budget would be market-driven but austere.
3. **Information Only - Search Firm Presentations and Interviews (Agenda Item #4)**  
   *(Cont’d.)*

Mr. Wasserman cautioned that price would not be negotiated with the search firms that day as that would be unfair to the other responses received to the RFP. However, he felt that Mr. Whittemore’s point was that direct and indirect expenses needed to be clarified in the contract.

Mr. Chuck Price asked if a fair question in that day’s interviews would be what the perception in the national marketplace is for Nevada and how the search firm would address potentially negative perceptions. Chairman Leavitt felt that would be an appropriate question.

**R. William Funk & Associates** *(proposal on file in the Board office)*

Mr. William Funk, R. William Funk & Associates, related that he has been in the business of recruiting presidents for 30 years and has conducted approximately 335 presidential searches. Since January of 2010, he has been involved in president searches at the University of Virginia, University of Minnesota, University of Washington, University of Southern California, Florida Atlantic University, Purdue University, Rutgers University and the University of Tulsa.

Mr. Funk related that the current average tenure for public university presidents, depending on the source of the study, is between six and eight years. Over the last twelve to eighteen months, a shortening of that tenure has been seen primarily due to the immense challenges that presidents face in the current economy. The average age of presidents of four-year universities, despite what the Chronicle of Higher Education recently reported as being 61, is actually estimated to be approximately 63. It is expected that there will continue to be turnover among presidents moving forward. At any given point in time, a university will be competing with five or ten institutions of similar size and vision. Search firms are now somewhat in demand as they act as a proactive agent in seeking out those candidates that otherwise may not be candidates. He felt that the best candidates are not necessarily those that respond to an advertisement or letter, but rather are those that the search firm seeks out proactively. He welcomed the opportunity to play that role for UNR.

Mr. Funk related that his firm was particularly proud that they have recruited more presidents to land grant universities than any collection of other firms. They understand the mission of a land grant university; the importance of teaching, research and service; and what an agricultural extension is.

Mr. Funk related that his firm focuses on searches at major public research universities. He referred to his proposal that states that his firm has conducted searches for two-thirds of the public institutions in the Association of American Universities *(AAU)* in the last twelve to thirteen years. His firm has recruited presidents to more than half of the thirty largest national universities that US News and Reports includes in its list of the top 30 national universities.
3. **Information Only - Search Firm Presentations and Interviews (Agenda Item #4) – (Cont’d.)**

**R. William Funk & Associates – (Cont’d.)**

Mr. Funk felt that R. William Funk & Associates has developed over time nuances to their profession that work. He could not tell the committees of a single failed search in which they had been engaged in the last decade. The proposal includes a guarantee that if the person recruited leaves within two years for any reason, whether for performance, ill health or unexpected death, his firm would return and conduct another search for out of pocket expenses, not for a retainer. He added that guarantee had only been invoked one time in his career and that was for a situation out of the candidate’s control.

Mr. Funk felt that R. William Funk & Associates has a reputation among sitting presidents and rising provosts that is such that when calls are placed to potential candidates those individuals will usually talk to them. Those people know the types of institutions that R. William Funk & Associates represents. He related that his firm has an incredible network of contacts around the country and that the firm’s track record lends itself to credibility. Mr. Funk indicated that 70 percent of presidential searches come to his firm through direct referral and the other 30 percent are identified through the competitive proposal process.

Dr. Bill Follette observed from his experience over several searches that Nevada’s Open Meeting Law does not work well for recruiting personnel which makes the search firm vetting process critical. He asked Mr. Funk to elaborate on his experience with open meeting laws and the vetting process. Mr. Funk related that his firm has conducted searches in Florida which also has an open meeting law. He explained that in Florida, the institutions are obligated to post on a public website all of the candidates and their associated materials. He felt that Florida may be even more open than Nevada and their firm has found a way to work within those statutes. He assured the committees that all laws will be abided by. However, whenever possible, he would prefer that the search committee review the active candidate files and narrow that list down to its top ten.

Mr. Wasserman provided a summary of Nevada’s Open Meeting Law. He explained that in Nevada, committees subject to the open meeting law can only act in an open public meeting. All materials shared with the committee are a matter of public record. In terms of a search, the process used allows the consultant to initially receive applications and the candidates are notified that if they become a semifinalist their name will become part of the public record. However, up to that point of identification, the search consultant is responsible for vetting all candidates.

Mr. Funk stated that at the beginning of the search, he would spend time on the UNR campus and in the community in order to meet with the various constituent groups. That process is necessary so that he can be a better
3. **Information Only - Search Firm Presentations and Interviews (Agenda Item #4) – (Cont’d.)**

**R. William Funk & Associates – (Cont’d.)**

steward and can use what he will learn to distill the candidates down to the list of semifinalists. He would want to make those decisions fully informed and would apply the information he receives from the constituent groups to a matrix.

Regent Geddes asked if there was a process for determining a candidate’s best fit to the University. Mr. Funk related that at the beginning of the search, he would immerse himself on the campus and spend time with the president’s cabinet and other direct reports, the deans’ council, faculty senate representatives, student body leadership, and perhaps a breakfast or lunch with local alumni and community leaders.

Regent Geddes asked Mr. Funk to define the difference between indirect costs, direct costs and the fee indicated in the proposal. Mr. Funk explained that theoretically those costs can be combined to be called the “fee.” However, there was a time when a charge was assigned for each phone call or piece of paper generated. Now most major search firms apply a flat percentage of the retainer fee for those costs. That percentage is fairly consistent in the industry so that itemization of expenses is not necessary.

Regent Geddes related that typically the NSHE would pay the search firm at the beginning, middle and end of the process. However, the proposal requests payment on the first, second and third month. He asked Mr. Funk if there was flexibility in that payment schedule. Mr. Funk stated that there was flexibility in the final payment but he would like to adhere to the first and second month payments.

Ms. Denise Cordova asked Mr. Funk if he wanted to immerse himself not only on the UNR campus but also in the community and how he planned to do that. Mr. Funk explained that he would essentially come to Reno and meet with the various constituent groups over the course of two days. Each group would be asked three questions: 1) what they felt were the major challenges and opportunities that the next president would inherent both in the immediate future and longer term; 2) given those challenges and opportunities, what kind of person would be best prepared to address those challenges and exploit the opportunities (management style, world view, personality, leadership style); and 3) what is there about the University of Nevada, Reno that would make a potential candidate become an active candidate. He felt that those three encompassing questions would allow him to gain the information needed by the end of two days. As the search moves forward, Mr. Funk related that he would return for several more visits to the campus. He emphasized that he would like to do several breakfasts, lunches, or receptions with the community, adding that the community and alumni groups lend themselves better to a breakfast or luncheon and that was also a good way to let the public know that the search is underway.
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**R. William Funk & Associates – (Cont’d.)**

Mr. Whittemore noted that Mr. Funk’s land grant and long-time experience would be beneficial. He noted that Reno is known as the “Biggest Little City” and that UNR is a big fish in a small pond. He asked Mr. Funk if he already had potential candidates in mind that may have been passed over at other institutions but that are significant catches and would fit this type of extraordinary institution. Mr. Funk related that although it is difficult not to immediately start thinking of potential candidates, he does try to resist that temptation until he finds out more from the constituents. He related that his firm had a remarkable network of people and that every search starts at a base point and he does not take anything for granted.

Regent Crear felt that Mr. Funk’s long-term experience cut both ways and that he hoped there was a broad based network of persons from which to find the right president for the institution. He noted that search consultants are in a powerful position and asked Mr. Funk how he would insure that the candidates he brings forward are not just those that were not selected elsewhere that he wanted to put into a president’s position. Mr. Funk replied that is why he resists the temptation to target people before visiting the campus. He will meet with his researchers to discuss the kind of person being sought, the titles of positions and types of institutions where those candidates are likely to currently be and will look at previous searches. They will target and approach between 35 and 60 people. Advertisement will also be placed in the Chronicle of Higher Education, Diversity Issues in Education, Women in Higher Education and the Hispanic Outlook in Education which are intended to broaden the pool. They will correspond with and seek out possible suggestions from all major higher education associations such as the American Council on Education’s Offices of Women and of Minority Affairs and the Association of Public and Land Grant Universities as well as others. A personal letter will be sent to individuals on his proprietary mailing list to seek out best recommendations and nominations. He also stated that the members of the search committees are encouraged to be proactive in making nominations. The campus will also be encouraged to publish articles in its publications about the search, including information on how nominations can be made. He emphasized that the candidate pool is not developed based solely on those that the firm targets but includes a broader base.

Regent Crear felt that Mr. Funk’s response addressed his second concern that diversity be a priority.

Regent Crear asked how many personnel were employed by R. William Funk & Associates. Mr. Funk replied that the firm had 13 staff members in Dallas, Texas and two in Boston, Massachusetts. He indicated that they try not to conduct two searches of the same type simultaneously. A statement is included in his contracts with AAU institutions that another AAU presidential search will not be initiated for three months or until the search committee narrows its pool to ten or fifteen candidates. R. William Funk & Associates is nearing completion of three other president searches at Rutgers, Purdue and the University of Tulsa. A president search is being conducting for a school of osteopathic medicine in Missouri. Two other searches, Wichita State
3. **Information Only - Search Firm Presentations and Interviews (Agenda Item #4)**

(Cont’d.)

**R. William Funk & Associates** – (Cont’d.)

University and the University of Redlands, are currently in the early stages. At any given time, R. William Funk & Associates may have 20 searches underway that include vice presidents and business officers. Mr. Funk stated that he personally conducts most of the president level searches.

Mr. Bruce Shively asked what could reasonably be expected in terms of direct costs charged to the search. Mr. Funk explained that direct costs for him would be travel and hotel expenses.

Mr. Shively clarified that he was interested in a range of potential costs. Mr. Funk recommended that a budget for direct costs be $10,000, adding that much may not entirely be spent.

Mr. Clausen asked if there was such thing as a non-traditional candidate. Mr. Funk related that he had been a corporate recruiter before focusing on higher education. He stated that boards are asking more and more about nontraditional candidates due to the magnitude of the budgets involved.

Regent Trachok asked Mr. Funk what information he reviewed and how he prepared for the presentation that day. Mr. Funk related that he had visited UNR’s website, its president search page and had looked at the committee members and their biographies. He had also visited the Chronicle of Higher Education’s last issue of salaries paid to the highest paid people and had consulted with the Association of Governing Boards (AGB) directory in terms of enrollment numbers and top officials. He indicated that he had also reviewed local newspapers and UNR’s student newspaper but found no mention of the search or the meeting that day. He indicated that if his firm was retained, he would like to obtain a summary of UNR’s budget, its last accreditation report, strategic plan, course catalog and other various marketing materials.

Acknowledging that Mr. Funk has not yet reviewed UNR’s strategic plan or its catalog, Regent Trachok asked what specific challenges he would expect to confront in finding the best candidates for UNR. Mr. Funk related that the biggest factor is still location, adding that every institution attracts differently. He stated that higher education is very hierarchical and that presidents and provosts do not make moves to what they may consider a lesser institution. Thinking from the perspective of a potential candidate, it will be asked why the position is open; are there any internal candidates including any acting presidents; what does the board want its next president to accomplish over the next five years; are there resources available to meet those desired accomplishments; is the board cohesive and of one mind in supporting presidents; what kind of team is being inherited; current vacancies; what the funding climate is in the state legislature; are there any anticipated capital campaigns in the near future.
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**R. William Funk & Associates – (Cont’d.)**

Regent Page asked Mr. Funk what had intrigued him and what challenged him to submit a proposal for this search. Mr. Funk stated that he has never conducted a search in Nevada before and is intrigued with the state and with the western United States.

Dr. Angie Taylor asked, as an institution, what are the three biggest mistakes that could hinder successful completion of a search. Mr. Funk replied that although Nevada’s open meeting law creates a process that increases the need for confidentiality, a leak of information too soon in the process can be a liability that the committees need to be aware of. A second factor would be if the institution had a history of instability. A third would be not treating potential candidates professionally, adding that every candidate needed to receive a response and follow up so that even the most disappointed candidate still has a positive experience.

Dr. Pat Arnott asked Mr. Funk to elaborate on what some of the challenges are in the search firm business. Mr. Funk explained that executive search is an ever changing business. There are many factors such as the current trend to increase the percentage of incoming freshman who are international students. Since those international students pay out-of-state tuition and additional stipends, those numbers are starting to factor into the financial model. The use of technology to reach students in non-traditional ways is also changing the higher education landscape.

Mr. Joe Bradley asked Mr. Funk how he familiarizes himself with the unique challenges currently facing any particular university and how that uniqueness is conveyed to potential candidates. Mr. Funk replied that he relies upon what the committees and the constituent groups tell him. He also felt that it was important to honestly communicate those challenges to potential candidates.

Mr. Casey Stiteler asked Mr. Funk if he had experience in recruiting candidates that held a deep understanding or preparedness for statewide issues or commitments. Mr. Funk replied that almost every land grant institution for which they have conducted a president search places a high priority on statewide engagement. A potential president needs to be sensitive and passionate about statewide engagement as it can affect fundraising as well as other factors.

Mr. James Beattie asked Mr. Funk to elaborate on how steps are taken to address the fears associated when an internal candidate is involved. Mr. Funk stated that the best way to address that question is to assure the potential candidates that it is a great university and internal candidates are expected but it was certain that the board would not have retained a search firm and paid the exorbitant fees if it was already known who the next president would be. It was also important for potential candidates to see that there is rigor within the search process.
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**R. William Funk & Associates** – (Cont’d.)

Chairman Leavitt asked Mr. Funk if an offer to engage with R. William Funk & Associates was received that day, would he accept and would he be available to return for the meeting on December 16, 2011. Mr. Funk replied yes to both questions.

Regent Trachok asked Mr. Funk how long a search is typically anticipated to last. Mr. Funk indicated that it will take approximately six months, adding that it should be possible to make an announcement by April 2012.

The meeting recessed at 2:44 p.m. and reconvened at 2:59 p.m. on Friday, December 9, 2011, with all members present.

3. Information Only - Search Firm Presentations and Interviews (Agenda Item #4) – (Cont’d.)

**Academic Search, Inc.**

Mr. Ray Hoops and Mr. John Hicks related that Academic Search, Inc. began 35 years ago, that it currently has over 1,000 clients, and has conducted 177 presidential searches since 2004. Mr. Hoops related that Academic Search, Inc. established the principles by which presidential searches are conducted. The principle task of a search firm is to get the search committee in a situation to do its important work of deciding which candidate is of the best quality and fit for the institution. Academic Search, Inc. has support staff that work behind the scenes. Each search is not conducted in a boiler plate fashion and each step is tailored to the specific institution by listening to that institution’s objectives, concerns and desired results. The support staff is also familiar with various open meeting law requirements, will handle internal campus communication, will develop a protocol for each step of the process and conduct a compensation analysis. Mr. Hoops stated that he and Mr. Hicks would be the consultants to work with the committees throughout the search.

Mr. Hoops related that the Academic Search, Inc. consultants have lengthy experience in higher education. The consultants do not work full-time and limit the number of searches that they are working on at any given time in order to provide the institution with their full attention.

Mr. Hicks related that during his 29 years of experience as a staff member of a major state university system, he had participated in several searches. His experience with every major academic search firm led him to want to work with Academic Search, Inc. Mr. Hicks felt that their firm tries very hard to understand what the institution’s expectations are of the next president and to become knowledgeable with the institution’s work and communication style in order to develop the candidate pool.
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**Academic Search, Inc.**

Mr. Hicks related that of the 177 presidential searches conducted since 2004, 85 percent of the presidents are still on the job. He felt that was a good indication of their success, particularly when the average president’s tenure is under 5.5 years.

Mr. Hicks stated that in order for Academic Search, Inc. to cultivate a candidate pool, they will need to understand the minds and hearts of every constituent group, including students, staff, faculty, regents, general public, donors, alumni and legislators. They will spend much time up front talking with individuals and groups to develop a list of opportunities, challenges, and issues that need to be resolved. Mr. Hicks felt that UNR has a wonderful trajectory that needed to be continued. He indicated that successful presidents are those that have already achieved what UNR is looking to do. He emphasized that there should be no surprises for the search committee or for the candidate.

Mr. Hicks indicated that Academic Search, Inc. is intimately involved in working with the candidates. He felt that potential candidates want to work with their firm because they know that the consultants are focused on one search. Academic Search, Inc. communicates extensively with candidates. Mr. Hicks related that another differentiation between their firm and others is that Academic Search, Inc. understands the role of the president, the challenges and perspectives it presents and what it takes to stand up to the requirements needed to successfully lead the institution.

Mr. Hicks stated that Academic Search, Inc. is 100 percent committed to the success of a search. He felt that a search has not failed if the committees’ have to delay the schedule because they have not found the right candidate. A failed search is one in which the wrong candidate is hired, of which they have not had any failed searches.

Mr. Hicks stated that over half of new searches come to them through former clients or referrals from former clients. Academic Search, Inc. is not a large firm but has approximately 25 consultants that all have vast experience in higher education, including many that are past presidents.

Ms. Cordova referred to the literature provided by Academic Search, Inc. that indicates 44 percent of their clients have appointed women and/or minority candidates. She asked Mr. Hicks and Mr. Hoops to explain the process they employ in recruiting underrepresented individuals. Mr. Hicks replied that it was important to make sure that the search committees were sensitive to the need to listen to and consider candidates that are of a minority. There is the need to understand how the work record of a woman or minority may look different than a non-minority candidate.
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**Academic Search, Inc.**

Mr. Hicks continued that some people have a different career trajectory and they will work with the committees to make sure that it is open to those candidates. In his experience, minorities that reach the interview stage are on equal footing. The people that the committee will consider will also have been successful in the world of higher education or business. Mr. Hoops added that a good network of faculty and staff at the institution is also helpful in cultivating that candidate pool.

Regent Geddes noted the proposal includes all three NSHE searches (*UNR, GBC and NSC*). He asked what the cost would be just for UNR. Mr. Hicks replied that the cost would be $75,000 with an administrative fee of $10,000. There would be zero additional costs billed to the university throughout the search except for candidate and consultant travel and the cost of conducting due diligence (*background checks*).

Regent Geddes noted that Academic Search, Inc.’s proposal requests payment at the first, second and third month. He asked if payment at the beginning, middle and end of the search would be acceptable. Mr. Hicks replied that concession has been made in the past and would likely be available again.

Regent Page noted that Mr. Hicks began working for Academic Search, Inc. in September of 2011 and asked how many searches he had conducted. Mr. Hicks replied that although this potentially would be his first search, his experience in higher education was extensive and, if selected, he would be providing this search his full attention.

Mr. Hsu felt that “Academic Search” implies a specialty in academia. He asked what their strategies were to attract people outside of academia. Mr. Hicks replied that the strategy is somewhat dependent on what each client wants and what leadership skills are being sought. He stated that his firm has been successful in hiring nontraditional candidates on numerous occasions, adding that a nontraditional person can often bring knowledge of the state, the university, or some other level of rolodex or networking ability. Sometimes those individuals will come from alumni or donor bases.

Mr. Hoops added that he is a certified corporate director by the American Association of Corporate Directors and chairs two committees. He related that the AACC has a process by which candidates for a search are recommended from an extensive network of highly qualified people. He indicated that his firm would engage in that process and felt that it would be very productive for UNR’s search.

Mr. Price asked what the perception was in the national marketplace for Nevada, the Nevada System of Higher Education and the University of Nevada, Reno and how any potentially negative perceptions would be addressed. Mr. Hoops replied that the position of president for UNR is going to be a very appealing position, adding that the institution’s history and progress is also appealing. It is well known that Nevada, as well as most other states, are in a situation of fiscal difficulty.
3. **Information Only - Search Firm Presentations and Interviews (Agenda Item #4) – (Cont’d.)**

**Academic Search, Inc. – (Cont’d.)**

Mr. Whittemore asked Mr. Hicks and Mr. Hoops to elaborate on the ownership of Academic Search, Inc. and why the consultants are being presented as “senior consultants.” He also asked what the relationship was of the senior consultant with the firm and what guarantees will the institution be receiving. Mr. Hicks related that Academic Search, Inc. was started essentially by a group affiliated with the AGB that found that higher education leadership positions were critical to the success of an institution but there was no support available to help the institutions find that leadership. The organizational structure of Academic Search, Inc. is nearly flat with a president and senior consultants, of which all have an extensive background in higher education.

Mr. Whittemore requested clarification that the senior consultants are not employees of the firm, but rather independent contractors. Mr. Hoops felt Mr. Whittemore was asking what the legal ramifications were if the consultants decide not to follow through with the search. He stated that there would be legal recourse against the organization and assured the committees that both consultants would remain involved.

Mr. Whittemore expressed concern for the nature of the relationship between Academic Search, Inc. and its consultants. While Academic Search, Inc. has significant and broad exposure in the marketplace, it is done through an advisory and senior consultancy role rather than a structure associated with a particular firm. Mr. Hoops felt that contractual obligation was not mitigated by the consultancy role, adding that the consultants were still employees.

Regent Trachok noted that Mr. Hoops had indicated that Academic Search, Inc. limits the number of searches in a year and is not involved full-time. Mr. Hoops clarified that what he had said was that each consultant limits the number of searches that they are involved in at one time.

Regent Trachok asked what other endeavors the consultants were involved with when not conducting searches. Mr. Hicks clarified that the perception of working part-time was not necessarily true, adding that he works full-time at conducting searches. He related that he carried a workload of between seven and ten searches per year. Some consultants may choose to work only in various seasons and so forth. When an assignment is accepted, it is focused upon. If selected, he stated that he would not take on another presidential leadership search until this one was well along in the process.

Mr. Hoops stated that he will continue to work part-time, explaining that he retired after 15 years of service as the president of the University of Southern Indiana and continues to work with that institution part-time to assist in the transition of the president’s position and with fundraising.
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**Academic Search, Inc. – (Cont’d.)**

Regent Trachok asked how many searches each consultant was currently involved with. Mr. Hoops replied that he was currently not involved in any. Mr. Hicks replied that he currently was involved in three, of which two were entering the final stages of the search process and one was just beginning.

Regent Trachok asked Mr. Hicks if it would be a problem to have two searches begin at the same time. Mr. Hicks stated that they would be two different types of searches. When a proposal comes to their firm, he determines if he has the time to dedicate to it and is careful to not become overcommitted.

Regent Trachok asked how long a president search can be expected to last. Mr. Hicks indicated that although the average is five months, it can be done in four months but that required a real commitment from the search committee. He added that candidates like quick searches rather than long searches.

Dr. Taylor asked if after a new president is selected it is determined that person is not a good fit for the institution, is there any kind of recourse or guarantee. Mr. Hicks replied that the agreement includes that if a president position does not work out in the first year for reasons that are not of their fault, Academic Search, Inc. will conduct a search for the cost of expenses only. He added that to his knowledge that has never happened.

Dr. Taylor asked if either consultant had experience with land grant institutions. Mr. Hicks replied that both he and Mr. Hoops had attended Purdue and that he has extensive land grant institution experience. Mr. Hoops stated that he had been president of a land grant institution.

Mr. Hoops added that the fact that this position is for a land grant institution is a benefit to the search.

Mr. Bradley asked why being a land grant institution made the position particularly attractive. Mr. Hicks replied that land grant institutions often have a better defined mission and have disciplines that are needed to help the state become more economically viable and are more linked to the constituents. He added that land grant institutions are generally perceived to be more prestigious. Mr. Hoops agreed, adding that the focus of mission makes a land grant institution a good place to be a president because relatively speaking the bulk of the institution is pulling in the same direction.

Regent Geddes asked what three things would sell this position to potential candidates. Mr. Hicks replied that he would emphasize the institution’s trajectory. He related that it can be difficult to follow a failed presidency or an institution that is torn by conflict. However, he did not see that as the case for UNR. He saw a healthy institution that was marching forward with dreams of attaining the next level. He felt that would be appealing to potential candidates. Although Nevada is experiencing
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tough economic times, it has been an enormously fast growing state and has a future. He added that in some parts of the country that is not the case.

Dr. Stephen Lafer referred to an article addressing the stability and viability of Academic Search, Inc. due to problems within the organization, a large turnover of personnel recently and expressed concern that the firm may not be around for much longer. Mr. Hicks related that at the time the article was written, the firm had 35 consultants, several of them were new and a vast majority had been campus presidents. Academic Search, Inc. is an organization that contributes its profits to a foundation that supports and encourages development of talent for higher education. Some concern was expressed regarding the role of that foundation which led to diverging opinions within the organization. He felt that the firm was solid and viable.

Mr. Hoops added that he had conducted careful research before joining Academic Search, Inc. and in his judgment, the organization now had a better business model, is clearer in its practices and procedures will be. He felt that Academic Search, Inc. had a talented group of consultants.

Mr. Casey Stiteler asked the consultants to elaborate on their experience with candidates that need to understand statewide issues and statewide commitments in terms of land grant institutions and in working with the legislature. Mr. Hicks replied that it is an important part of job and part of the screening process to determine a good fit. He felt that it was also important to find a candidate who has effectively worked with legislatures in the past. He felt that charisma will not carry the day in leadership and that performance is a key factor.

Dr. Donica Mensing appreciated the fact that universities across the country were struggling with economic troubles. However, she felt that over the last two years UNR has had a particularly difficult time with the loss of 600 budgeted positions, no raises in the last three years, salaries have been cut and $75 million has been lost in its budget. She asked if those types of situations were considered normal for a new president to deal with. Mr. Hoops replied that it was the new normal, adding that every state is going through some level of difficulty. Most people with any length of history have been through times such as these. He felt that when a new president comes to an institution during a difficult period of time, he or she has the opportunity to bring people together and the right person will understand that.

Mr. Stiteler asked if there were specific questions that the consultants seek from students at the beginning of a president search. Mr. Hicks related that he generally asks the students what kind of characteristics or attributes would they like to see in the next president. Secondly, he will ask what achievements the new president should focus on in the next three to five years. Third, he will ask the students what would allow them to think that the right person was hired after five years.
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Chairman Leavitt asked, in terms of all the searches conducted by Academic Search, Inc., how many candidates succeeded as a result of direct contacts versus advertisement. Mr. Hoops related that the firm’s analysis has shown that a slight majority of candidates come from direct contact rather than advertisements. He added that in his experience, the best candidates came to him through his network of contacts rather than through the application process. Chairman Leavitt noted that, in essence, sometimes the best person is not even looking for a new position. Mr. Hicks agreed, adding that 80 to 90 percent were hired from personal recruiting with very few coming from advertisements.

Mr. Bradley asked if the fact that there may be an internal candidate will hinder the ability to attract qualified applicants. Mr. Hicks replied that there were often internal candidates but that if it is truly an open search than all candidates will be considered equally. He added that internal candidates should be handled exactly as external candidate.

Chairman Leavitt related that due to the need for transparency under Nevada’s open meeting law, it is only after a search firm is selected and conducts its due diligence that the committee members will know who the semifinalists will be. He asked the consultants if they agreed with that statement. Mr. Hicks replied that there will be rumors about every aspect.

The meeting recessed at 4:00 p.m. and reconvened at 4:07 p.m. on Friday, December 9, 2011, with all members present.

4. **Action Taken - Selection of Search Firm (Agenda Item #5) -** The committees selected R. William Funk & Associates as its search firm to conduct the UNR president search and authorized the negotiation of the final terms of an agreement.

Dr. Follette felt that Mr. Funk had more experience. He felt that both firms rightly indicated that presidential searches were not about who responds to advertisements, but who the search firms can interest in the position.

Regent Geddes felt that Mr. Funk was the best fit for the institution at this time.

Chairman Leavitt stated that because of the open meeting laws, it was of critical importance for the committees to reach consensus on the presidential leadership statement. If that statement is done correctly, he felt that the selected firm will follow the criteria that the committees have set. It will be the sole responsibility of the selected search firm to narrow the pool of candidates down to the semifinalists.
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Regent Crear indicated his preference for Mr. Funk. He felt that Mr. Funk exuded a level of confidence in being able to conduct a diversified and complete search. He also appreciated that it was a sign of commitment to have the owner and Chief Executive Officer of a company travel to represent his company.

Mr. Whittemore felt that Mr. Funk had made an extraordinarily responsive presentation. He respected the presentations made by both search firms but was concerned about the structure of Academic Search, Inc.

Mr. Bob Davidson expressed his support of Mr. Funk.

Dr. Rita Laden indicated her support of Mr. Funk feeling that he had more stability, depth and breadth of knowledge about the presidential role. She had been impressed that Mr. Funk wanted to hear from the campus before thinking of possible candidates.

Mr. Stiteler indicated that although he liked the responses received from Academic Search, Inc. regarding the nuances of recruiting for a land grant institution, he felt that Mr. Funk had more experience.

Dr. Taylor indicated her support of Mr. Funk, adding that she felt a higher level of confidence in his breadth of experience.

Mr. Clausen felt that either firm would get the job done. However, he felt that Mr. Funk’s firm was a more immersed and more stable organization.

Mr. Alfredo Alonso expressed more confidence in Mr. Funk’s experience, adding that because of the limitations imposed by the open meeting law, the committees will have to trust the consultant to select the short list of semi-finalists.

Dr. Arnott appreciated that Mr. Funk had a background in corporate recruiting. He felt that if Mr. Funk followed through as he presented, the search would result in the selection of a successful candidate.

Mr. Mark Knobel asked if reference checks had been conducted on either firm. Mr. Wasserman replied that each firm’s presentation was allowed to speak for itself and that additional reference checks had not been conducted.

Mr. Knobel felt that the rolodex of either firm would be similar. However, he liked Mr. Funk’s presentation better.

Mr. Bradley stated that his thoughts mirrored the comments made by others on the committees. He had been impressed by Mr. Funk’s resume, that he works with exceptional institutions and that he appeared to be connected to a high quality of candidate.

Mr. Beattie agreed with many of the comments. He appreciated Mr. Funk’s demonstrated level of confidence throughout his presentation. Overall, he felt that Mr. Funk was a better fit for the institution.
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Mr. Rick Hsu felt that either firm would serve the institution well but expressed support for Academic Search, Inc. He felt that Mr. Funk was not as prepared as he should have been. He related that Mr. Hicks and Mr. Hoops would have two sets of rolodexes as resources and felt that those two consultants were hungrier.

Ms. Cordova agreed with Mr. Hsu that the Academic Search, Inc. consultants were more prepared and she appreciated the percentage of minorities that have been placed by that firm.

Mr. Beattie felt that Mr. Funk’s two-year guarantee for recourse reflected more confidence in his ability to find the right candidate than the one-year guarantee offered by Academic Search, Inc.

Regent Melcher stated that he felt more confidence with Mr. Funk’s presentation and that he would be a better fit for the institution. He expressed concern that this search would possibly be the first for one of the Academic Search, Inc. consultants.

Regent Page felt that both firms provided excellent presentations. However, he expressed concern with the Academic Search, Inc.’s organizational structure and recent issues.

Regent Trachok appreciated the questions posed to each of the firms by the committees and expressed support for Mr. Funk.

Mr. Price related that when he works with salesman, he expects the company to have conducted its research. He felt that Academic Search, Inc. had been more prepared, were more comfortable talking about diversity and had come across as sincere. However, he would fully support the decision of the committees.

Mr. Davidson expressed support for Mr. Funk.

Regent Crear moved to approve the selection of R. William Funk & Associates to conduct the UNR presidential search and directed Mr. Scott Wasserman, Board Chair Geddes and Chancellor Klaich to negotiate the terms of the contract. Regent Geddes seconded.

Upon a roll call vote, Regents Crear, Geddes, Leavitt, Melcher Page, and Trachok voted yes. Motion carried unanimously.

5. **Deferred - President Leadership Profile** *(Agenda Item #6) – Discussion was deferred to the December 16, 2011, meeting.*
6. **Information Only - New Business (Agenda Item #7) – None.**

7. **Information Only - Public Comment (Agenda Item #8) – None.**

Mr. Wasserman clarified that all nominees will now be referred to Mr. Funk and that Mr. Funk’s contact information will be made available on the UNR Presidential Search website.

Chairman Leavitt asked Mr. Wasserman to again address the open meeting law. Mr. Wasserman referred to the more extensive conversation reflected in the minutes of the October 14, 2011, committee meeting. However, he briefly stated that all committee deliberations were required to take place in open public meetings. He encouraged the committee members to respond to any questions or comments with a statement that the public is invited to participate under public comment at any public meeting.

Chairman Leavitt reminded the committees that further meetings will not be scheduled until the semifinalists can be released.

The meeting adjourned at 4:35 p.m.
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