

# REPORT OF THE JOINT COMMITTEE ON THE REVIEW OF THE SEARCH AND REVIEW PROCEDURES FOR SENIOR ADMINISTRATORS

## Contents

---

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY .....	3
BACKGROUND.....	7
CONSULTATION.....	7
Survey .....	9
APPROACH .....	10
Rationale for those Senior Administrative Positions Subject to the Procedures .....	11
SPECIFIC ISSUES .....	12
Issues Common to Searches and Reviews .....	12
Committee Composition.....	12
Confidentiality.....	14
Communication of Process.....	14
Conflict of Interest.....	15
Inclusivity and Sensitivity .....	15
Search/Review Committee Report and Recommendation for	
Appointment/Reappointment .....	16
Failed Searches and Review and Subsequent Searches .....	16
Continuous Improvement .....	17
Issues Specific to Searches .....	17
Timing of Searches .....	17
Search Climate.....	18
Open Versus Closed Searches .....	18
Issues Specific to Reviews .....	19
Timing of reviews .....	20
Relationship of annual performance reviews, 360-degree reviews and	
end-of-term reviews.....	21
Feedback solicited during the review process.....	21
Informal feedback sought by incumbent prior to review .....	22
OVERALL RECOMMENDATIONS.....	23
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS.....	26
JOINT COMMITTEE MEMBERSHIP.....	26

## **SEARCH AND REVIEW PROCEDURES FOR SENIOR ADMINISTRATORS**

SEARCH AND REVIEW PROCEDURES FOR SENIOR ADMINISTRATORS .....	27
PREAMBLE .....	28
PRINCIPLES for SEARCHES .....	29
PRINCIPLES for REVIEWS.....	31
CRITERIA FOR INCLUSION IN THE SEARCH AND REVIEW PROCEDURES.....	33
GENERAL PROCEDURES FOR SEARCHES AND REVIEWS.....	34
GENERAL PROCEDURES FOR SEARCHES .....	34
Appointment Procedures.....	34

Search Procedures.....	34
GENERAL PROCEDURES FOR REVIEWS.....	37
Re-Appointment Procedures.....	37
Review Procedures.....	37
APPENDIX A: SEARCH AND REVIEW COMMITTEE COMPOSITION BY CATEGORY .....	39
APPENDIX B: TABLE OF SEARCH/REVIEW COMMITTEE COMPOSITION BY POSITION.....	44
APPENDIX C: LETTER OF UNDERSTANDING BETWEEN THE UNIVERSITY OF SASKATCHEWAN AND THE UNIVERSITY OF SASKATCHEWAN FACULTY ASSOCIATION .....	47

## EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

---

The appointment of outstanding senior administrators is central to the achievement of the University's vision. The University's search and review procedures are intended to support that goal. This report proposes an extensive reworking of the existing procedures for search and review, following consideration of procedures followed at other universities, input from across campus and extensive discussions by the committee.

Specific principles are enunciated to guide the search and review processes. The principles underlying searches discussed are: purpose; transparency; accountability; confidentiality; representation; consultation; timeliness; respect; equity; conflict of interest, and finite role of the committee. Principles underlying reviews are identical with the addition of the principle on disclosure. Criteria to determine if a position should fall under the procedures are: centrality of the position to the academic mission of the University; the academic decision making authority vested in the position; the level of academic experience required by the position; and the level of technical expertise required by the position.

The report contains 23 recommendations:

### **General:**

1. That the process and stage of the search or review be readily available and communicated to the University community and relevant external constituencies (page 14, 29, 31);
2. That the Board of Governors assume greater responsibility and oversight for the timeliness and progress of searches and reviews, and that at regular intervals senior administration provide to the Board a schedule of current and pending searches and reviews and progress towards completion (page 17);
3. That the University discuss with the Health Region the composition of the search committee for the Associate Vice-President Research (Health) and Vice-President Research and Innovation (Saskatoon Health Region) so that it closely parallels that of the Associate Vice-President Research while acknowledging that additional members will be necessary to represent the interests of the Health Region. Given that this is a joint appointment, the process leading to appointment and consideration for re-appointment may differ, but the Joint Committee recommends that the principles outlined in the "General Procedures for Search and Review" be respected (page 11);

4. That the search and end-of-term review be based upon an appropriate position profile (page 35, 37);
5. That both the professional associations related to the two professional academic programs in the College of Pharmacy and Nutrition be represented on the search/review committee for the Dean, Pharmacy and Nutrition (page 13);
6. That under unique circumstances, more than one professional association may be represented as determined by the Board following a formal request from the College Faculty Council (page 13);
7. That a representative from Huskie Athletics and a representative from Community Programs be added to the search/review committee for the Dean, Kinesiology (page 13, 42);
8. That the Vice-President Research or designate be added to the search committees for all Deans and to the review committee for the Dean of Dentistry (page 13, 41);
9. That a member of Senate be added to the search/review committee for the Vice-President Research (page 13);
10. That the undergraduate student representative selected by the USSU be removed from the search/review committees for the Dean, College of Graduate Studies and Research, and that one of the four faculty of the College selected by members of the College be replaced with a member of the General Academic Assembly, selected by Council who holds a senior administrative position in the University (page 13);
11. That an additional librarian, selected by the librarians be added to the search/review committees for the Dean, University Library, and that the Chair of the Academic Support Committee of Council be replaced with a member of the General Academic Assembly (page 13);
12. That subject to the approved principles and procedures for searches and reviews, the search and review committees will determine their own procedures (page 35, 37);
13. That the Provost's Office continue to gather feedback on best practices for searches and reviews. As part of that endeavor, conducting a brief survey of search and review committees immediately following the conclusion of their work is suggested as a means to gain insight into ways to continue to improve the search and review process (page 17);
14. That the positions of the Executive Directors and Associate Directors of the Interdisciplinary Schools (School of Public Health; Environment and Sustainability; Johnson-Shoyama Graduate School of Public Policy); Vice-Deans (Humanities and Fine Arts; Social Sciences, Science); the Vice-Provost Teaching and Learning; and the Associate Vice-President Research be subject to the procedures, in addition to the positions already named in the Letter of Understanding (page 11, Appendices A & B) [note that the Executive Director and the Associate Director of the Johnson-Shoyama Graduate School of Public Policy are joint appointments with the University of Regina. Provision for University of Regina representation will be necessary. This may involve either modest expansion of the search/review committee or sharing of positions between the universities or both];

15. That the positions of Associate Vice-President Human Resources; Chief Information Officer and Associate Vice-President Information and Communications Technology; and Associate Vice-President Student and Enrolment Services no longer be subject to the procedures (page 11, Appendices A & B);

### **Searches**

16. That searches for senior administrators commence in a timely manner, far enough in advance that an appointment can be made without the necessity for an intervening acting appointment, with the recognition that there will be occasions when an acting appointment is unavoidable or even helpful, given the unique circumstances related to the appointment (page 17, 36).
17. That when a short list of candidates has been established, the search committee determines whether the search will be confidential or open. The Joint Committee recognizes that the current expectation is for open decanal searches. For all searches, if there is evidence presented to the search committee that the search will be disadvantaged by requiring public presentations of the short-listed candidates the committee, at its discretion, may continue the search process in confidence. In the absence of such evidence, the committee is encouraged to make every effort to involve faculty and staff through such means as forums or seminar presentations (page 19, 29);
18. That the chair and the majority of the committee strive to come to agreement on the preferred candidate. If there are differing views on the preferred candidate, it is critical that there be agreement on acceptable candidates. If agreement is not possible, the search may be declared failed by the President or the Board. If the President declares a search failed, the search committee may be reconstituted and may or may not consist of new membership, as determined by the President. If the Board declares a search failed, the Board will decide how to proceed. (page 16, 36) ;
19. That if the President provides a recommendation from the short-listed candidates to the Board different from that of the search committee, he or she provide a rationale to the Board for the alternative recommendation, and that the search committee also be provided the rationale for the alternative recommendation for information (page 16, 34);

### **Reviews**

20. That the chair meet with the incumbent prior to and subsequent to the review to provide information and feedback about the process and outcome including the membership of the review committee once constituted, the timeline for the review, and expectations of the review process (page 37);
21. That assessment of the likelihood of the incumbent continuing to perform the responsibilities of his or her office at a high level should be based on the revised position profile if that profile is different from what was in effect during the incumbent's term (page 35, 37);
22. That the results of the University's 360-degree review process in their original form not be admitted to the review committee. Other formal periodic evaluations should be considered notwithstanding the fact that they may include some formative elements (page 21).

23. That the chair of the review committee ensures that submissions forwarded to the review committee and incumbent are respectful and professional (page 22, 38);

# **REPORT OF THE JOINT COMMITTEE ON THE REVIEW OF THE SEARCH AND REVIEW PROCEDURES FOR SENIOR ADMINISTRATORS**

## **BACKGROUND**

---

The University's search and review procedures were last revised and approved by the Board of Governors on December 17, 2004. The *Letter of Understanding on the Appointment and Reappointment of Senior Administrators (Appendix C)* states that from time to time, a Joint Committee of the Board of Governors and Council will be established to review the search procedures in respect of the appointment and reappointment of senior administrators and report their findings and any proposed amendments to the Board of Governors. Accordingly, a committee was constituted as shown on page 26.

The Joint Committee on the Review of the Search and Review Procedures for Senior Administrators (the Joint Committee) first met in April 2009, with the first task as outlined in the Letter of Understanding to consider and put forward a list of names for an independent chair to be appointed by the Board of Governors. On May 8, 2009, Professor John Rigby was appointed as Chair, and the Joint Committee subsequently held its first meeting as a full complement on September 18, 2009. Over the course of the year and following, the Joint Committee met on 16 occasions.

## **CONSULTATION**

---

The Joint Committee reviewed a summary of the search and review practices for senior appointments at other universities to gain a better understanding of the post-secondary landscape in relation to practices elsewhere. The following university websites were consulted: Carleton University; Concordia University; Memorial University; Northern British Columbia University;

University of Calgary; University of Alberta; University of Manitoba; University of Toronto; University of Victoria; Waterloo University; York University. In addition, interviews with the search consultants from two search firms employed by the University—Janet Wright and Associates, Inc. and the Geldart Group—were held to learn of current trends in searches for senior administrators and to invite comment on the University’s practices.

The Joint Committee met with the President, the Provost and Vice-President Academic, and former Provosts to engage in a discussion of their views on the University’s practices for the search and review of senior administrators and to hear first-hand the experience of these individuals as chairs or former chairs of search and review committees. Subsequently, a meeting was held with the Provost and Vice-President Academic to discuss issues related to the review process for senior administrators, including the timing and duration of the review process; the relationship of the University’s 360-degree review process to the end-of-term review process outlined in the search and review procedures; and the nature of the feedback obtained during the review process on the incumbent’s performance and the manner in which it is provided to incumbents. The Joint Committee also engaged in discussion with several female senior women administrators on challenges and barriers, specifically from the perspective of gender, which might affect the ability of the University to recruit and retain female senior administrators.

Broad consultation on the search and review procedures was initiated by the Joint Committee through a survey questionnaire sent to those who have served on search and review committees over the previous three years (see “Survey” below). The survey was also sent to Deans and senior administrators to learn of their experience of being recruited and reviewed under the existing procedures.

In addition, members of University Council and the University community at large were invited to submit their views on the existing procedures. A report was submitted to Senate on the process of the review and Senate’s role in ensuring appropriate representation and service on

search and review committees. The Joint Committee Chair was also interviewed by *On Campus News* regarding the mandate of the Joint Committee and impetus for review of the search and university procedures.

## **Survey**

---

To ensure broad feedback on the search and procedures from the university community and stakeholders, a survey questionnaire was submitted to those individuals who had participated in a search or review committee or had been reviewed or appointed to a position as a result of a search in the previous three years. Participants were asked to respond to 51 positively-worded questions on a 5-point Likert scale with responses ranging from strongly agree to strongly disagree. Questions posed related to the thoroughness of the search/review; confidentiality; process employed; and satisfaction with the search/review process and decision reached. Additionally, opportunity was given for written comments and observations and suggestions for ways in which the search/review process could be improved. Of 124 people invited to participate, 42 responded, with some respondents fitting into multiple categories: those who had participated in a search (37 respondents); those who had served on a review committee (22 participants); and those who had been reviewed or appointed to a position as a result of a search (15 participants). All questions received a positive response with between 75 to 80 percent of all participants indicating either “agree” or “strongly agree” with the statements.

Many respondents described the search process positively, citing the process as open, transparent, fair, extensive, inclusive and well conducted with input from many sources. Concerns by individuals were expressed regarding timeliness of searches; conflicts of interest; the influence of the chair upon the committee; systemic bias for internal candidates; the recommendation and report to the Board as a full expression of the committee’s view; and specific concerns regarding

representation on the committee. Views were expressed both in support of open searches and in support of closed searches.

In general, responses were more critical of the review process than the search process. However, positive responses spoke of the importance of the open dialogue with the incumbent regarding their performance and aspirations, and the inclusiveness of the process. Negative responses spoke of the questionable value gained, with the process described as difficult and insensitive towards the incumbent. Concerns were also expressed regarding the collection of feedback on performance and the timeliness of reviews.

The responses raised a number of issues and questions for the Joint Committee's consideration of the search and review procedures. Due to the small sample obtained, the Joint Committee was unable to conclude the views expressed in the response to the open-ended questions were widely held.

## **APPROACH**

---

The Joint Committee has identified explicit principles which do or should underpin the University's broad procedures. The committee considered the principles to be analogous to a policy document, with the principles providing the framework within which the procedures would be enacted. Rather than continue the existing specific lists of membership for each individual search or review committee, the Joint Committee has collapsed the membership into a summary document (*Appendix A*), with the specific membership by position for specific committees collated in a table (*Appendix B*).

## **Rationale for those Senior Administrative Positions Subject to the Procedures**

---

There are very significant financial and human resource expenditures implied by the application of the search and review procedures. It seems reasonable to try and ensure that the procedures are invoked only when there is benefit to the University in so doing. Articulating the criteria by which positions should be included in the procedures was considered consistent with the principle-based approach adopted by the Joint Committee and as such, would provide a means to identify which positions should be included in the procedures. The criteria are discussed in the “Principles for Searches and Reviews,” and the positions subject to the search and review procedures, based upon the application of these criteria, are listed in Appendices A and B. In addition to aiding in the classification of newly-created positions, application of the criteria resulted in recommending that three positions currently included in the procedures be removed: the Associate Vice-President Human Resources; Chief Information Officer and Associate Vice-President Information and Communications Technology; and Associate Vice-President Student and Enrolment Services. In submitting the positions subject to the procedures, the Joint Committee recognizes this is a determination which is also subject to the agreement of the University and the University of Saskatchewan Faculty Association.

In addition to those positions listed in Appendices A and B, the Joint Committee discussed the newly created position of Associate Vice-President Research (Health) and Vice-President Research and Innovation (Saskatoon Health Region). It was noted that the composition of the first search committee struck for this position differed significantly from search committees for similar positions in the University. It is recommended that the University discuss with the Health Region the composition of the search committee so that it closely parallels that of the Associate Vice President Research while acknowledging that additional members will be necessary to represent the interests of the Health Region. Given that this is a joint appointment, the process leading to appointment and consideration for re-appointment may differ, but the Joint Committee

recommends that the principles outlined in the “General Procedures for Searches and Reviews” be respected.

The Executive Director and the Associate Director of the Johnson-Shoyama Graduate School of Public Policy are joint appointments between the University of Saskatchewan and the University of Regina. The Operating Principles of the school state, “Procedures governing the search for both the Executive Director and the Associate Director positions will be those laid out in both universities’ search and review procedures as approved by their respective boards, but provision will be made to ensure appropriate membership from both universities” (p. 5). Accordingly the positions are included in these recommendations but the joint committee notes that provision for University of Regina representation will be necessary. This may involve either modest expansion of the search/review committee or sharing of positions between the universities or both.

## **SPECIFIC ISSUES**

---

In its review, the Joint Committee sought to explore issues identified through the committee’s consultation. The view of the Joint Committee in relation to issues and rationale for changing or not changing the procedures is outlined as follows.

### **Issues Common to Searches and Reviews**

---

#### **Committee Composition**

---

The composition of search committees and review committees are identical for each individual position. The search committee and the review committee are deliberative bodies. While individual members bring the perspective of those constituencies most directly affected by the incumbent, they are not explicitly representatives of those groups in the sense of a constituent assembly. The committee composition seeks to balance the desire for broad input against the

practical logistics associated with the size of the committee, related to the need to facilitate regular meetings and meaningful engagement with candidates, the University community, and external constituencies. To compensate for the necessary limitation of size, consultation must be undertaken by the search committee with the broader University community to attain a depth of knowledge of the position—its responsibilities and challenges—and those qualities necessary for the success of the appointee.

The Joint Committee recommended very few changes to the search and review committee composition. Changes to membership include increased flexibility to allow for more than one professional association to be represented based upon a representation from the College Faculty Council to the Board. Alternatively, the search committee may identify the manner by which it will elicit input from related professional associations not represented on the search committee. Presently, the following colleges—Education; Edwards School of Business; Pharmacy and Nutrition; Medicine—have more than one professional association associated with the college. In response to the request from the College of Pharmacy and Nutrition, the Joint Committee has modified the procedures to allow for the professional associations related to the two professional academic programs within the College to be represented on future search and review committees.

Other specific changes include the addition of the Vice-President Research or designate to all search committees for Deans and to the review committee for the Dean of Dentistry; a representative from Huskie Athletics and a representative from Community Programs to be added to the search and review committees for the Dean of Kinesiology, based upon a request from the College faculty; a member of Senate to be added to the search and review committees for the Vice-President Research; the replacement of the Chair of the Academic Support Committee of Council with a member of the General Academic Assembly on the search and review committees for the Dean, University Library; the removal of a student representative from the USSU for the search and review committees for the Dean of Graduate Studies and Research; and the replacement of one of

the faculty members on the search and review committees for the Dean of Graduate Studies and Research with a member of the General Academic Assembly.

The Joint Committee considered at length the question of staff representation beyond that which presently exists within the search committee composition, particularly for decanal searches. Given the broad range of responsibilities assigned to staff members within colleges and varying categories of appointment, the committee elected not to change the committee composition to add staff member representation, beyond where it presently exists. However, the importance of soliciting the views of staff members through the consultative processes outlined in the procedures is emphasized to search committees.

#### Confidentiality

---

Confidentiality is central to searches and reviews and many institutions require search and review committee members to sign statements of confidentiality. With respect to confidentiality, the Joint Committee recognizes explicitly that the discussions and documentation viewed by the search or review committee and the identity of candidates are confidential. The question of open versus closed searches and the confidentiality of candidates at the short-listed stage is considered separately within this report.

#### Communication of Process

---

In contrast to the confidentiality associated with the search or review committee's deliberations, information about the search and review process itself and the stage of the search or review should be readily available and communicated to the University community and relevant external constituencies. Likewise, during the review process, the incumbent under review should be advised of the membership of the review committee once it is constituted, the timeline for the review, and expectations of the review process.

## Conflict of Interest

---

Within the university's collegial environment, conflicts of interest or perceived conflicts of interest may exist, particularly in relation to internal candidates. Any conflict of interest or perceived conflict of interest by a member on a search and review committee, either at the time of appointment to the committee or arising during the course of the search or review, must be promptly disclosed to the committee chair so that it may be addressed by the committee. There are many possible relationships or interests that could constitute conflict of interest (see the University's Conflict of Interest policy for a more complete discussion) but in particular, a committee member is in conflict of interest if he or she is biased for or against a candidate. Additionally, some situations may arise that are not specifically defined by this policy, but must be reported and considered in order to determine whether a conflict of interest exists or may be seen to exist.

## Inclusivity and Sensitivity

---

One of the Joint Committee's goals was to ensure the revised search and review procedures do not represent a barrier related either to gender or culture, which would dissuade individuals from seeking or remaining in senior positions. All search and review committees are required to be fully aware of and proceed in accordance with the University's employment equity policies. As search and review committees are able to formulate their own procedures, the flexibility is afforded for committees to accommodate cultural and gender distinctions among candidates. In particular, the topic, format, venue and perhaps even the advisability of a formal presentation should be considered carefully by search committees. There may be alternative methods to assess a candidate's ability and to allow public input into a candidate's suitability for an administrative position.

## Search/Review Committee Report and Recommendation for Appointment/Reappointment

The Joint Committee discussed at some length the reporting of outcomes of search and review committee recommendations. Search and review committees report to the Board through the President. The report should provide a rationale for the committee's recommendation and include the majority and minority (if any) views held by committee members. Ideally, committee members would have an opportunity to review the report before it is submitted. It is useful to distinguish between preferred candidates and acceptable candidates. Ideally, the chair and the majority of the committee will come to agreement on the preferred candidate. If there are differing views between the chair and the majority of the committee on the preferred candidate, it is critical that there be agreement on acceptable candidates, and the chair may recommend any acceptable candidate to the President. The Joint Committee recognizes that the President must also be in agreement with the recommendation and that it is entirely within the purview of the President to make an alternative recommendation. Accordingly, if the President provides a recommendation from the short-listed candidates to the Board different from that of the committee, he or she should provide a rationale to the Board for the alternative recommendation, and the rationale for the alternative recommendation should be provided to the search committee for information.

## Failed Searches and Review and Subsequent Searches

Situations may arise when a search is considered failed. A search is declared failed by the President or Board. For example, a search may be declared failed if the chair and the search committee cannot come to an agreement on an acceptable candidate to recommend for appointment. If the President declares a search failed, the search committee may be reconstituted and may or may not consist of new membership, as determined by the President. If the Board declares a search failed, the Board will decide how to proceed.

If a review does not lead to a recommendation for reappointment, a search committee will be constituted. It is permissible but not required that members of the review committee could also serve on the subsequent search committee.

## **Continuous Improvement**

---

The Provost's Office is encouraged to continue to gather feedback on best practices for searches and reviews. As part of that endeavor, conducting a brief survey of search and review committees immediately following the conclusion of their work is suggested as a means to gain insight into ways to continue to improve the search and review process.

## **Issues Specific to Searches**

---

### **Timing of Searches**

---

The search for senior administrators is one of the highest priorities of the University. Searches should be well planned in advance and commence in a timely manner to provide for a smooth transition between leaders and ensure continued momentum towards the University's commitments and strategic goals. It is the view of the Joint Committee that acting appointments, including for newly-created positions, should be avoided with the recognition that there will be occasions when an acting appointment is unavoidable or even helpful, given the unique circumstances related to the appointment. The Joint Committee realizes that searches are complicated and can be protracted due to individual circumstances, unrelated to process. In these instances, the flexibility to appoint an acting administrator is necessary to ensure the continued vitality of the University while the search continues.

As the Board of Governors is responsible for the appointment and reappointment of the University's senior administrators, it is suggested that the Board should assume greater oversight for the timeliness and the progress of searches and reviews. At regular intervals, senior

administration should provide to the Board a schedule of current and pending searches and reviews and progress towards completion.

### Search Climate

---

The views of two senior search consultants from two firms commonly employed by the University—Janet Wright and Associates, and the Geldart Group—were sought. Both spoke of the increasingly competitive market for the recruitment of senior administrators. The University’s senior administrators, in their experience as chairs of search committees, supported this as an accurate assessment of the current post-secondary landscape. Search consultants are important contributors to the search process, both in their work with applicants to collect the information significant for their decision, and in providing information to the search committee not available through the formal interview process. Both consultants spoke of the difficulty of searches and the prolonged efforts often required, with search consultants speaking with hundreds of individuals to present two or three candidates to the committee. It was within this context that the Joint Committee considered the question of closed versus open searches, (see below) and the increasing desire for candidates, particularly at the vice-presidential and presidential levels, not to make their candidacy public until appointment. The competitiveness of the market and difficulty of concluding searches successfully also underscores the importance of the principle of timeliness related to searches.

### Open Versus Closed Searches

---

Open searches are defined as searches where the identity of the short-listed candidates is publicly known and there is the opportunity for feedback regarding the suitability of the candidates; closed searches are defined as searches where the identity of the short-listed candidates is not made public, and there is no opportunity for feedback from the community at large about the candidates prior to appointment. The Joint Committee discussed at length the

importance of balancing openness in the search process through the presentation of candidates to the broader University community against respect for the wishes of the candidates regarding confidentiality of their candidacy. Closed searches in particular highlight the importance of a search committee that represents and is trusted by those affected by the position.

In its consideration, the Joint Committee made the distinction between decanal searches where there are public presentations, as fitting for the academic head of an academic unit, and the different dynamic that exists in relation to presidential or vice-presidential searches. For decanal searches, it is widely understood by candidates that their candidacy will be public, and they will be expected to present themselves to the collegium. As prospective members of the University's senior executive, vice-presidential or presidential candidates are less likely to expect that their candidacy will involve being placed in front of the University community. In the context of a presidential or vice-presidential search, confidentiality until appointment is virtually required as candidates who are members of senior administration at other institutions are unwilling to let their candidacy be known until they are reasonably assured they will be offered the position. If this confidentiality is not assured, the University will potentially lose some of its most highly qualified and desired candidates. Although the procedures allow the search committee to determine its procedures, the Joint Committee has enunciated the principle that all searches be as open as possible unless the search committee determines it is to the advantage of the search, and therefore correspondingly the University's advantage, that the search be closed.

### **Issues Specific to Reviews**

---

Ensuring the end-of-term review process is based upon an objective measure of the incumbent against the identified competencies for the position is a key goal of the collegial review

process. The role of the review committee is to consider the assessments submitted objectively and consider these in light of the incumbent's capabilities and ability to lead their unit going forward.

### Timing of reviews

---

The Joint Committee concluded that outlining a prescriptive timeframe for the commencement of reviews was not realistic or plausible, given the unique circumstances or convergence of circumstances, such as multiple reviews, that can occur. However, ensuring the review occurs in a timely manner is an important principle and mirrors the priority associated with searches.

In this regard, the Joint Committee considered the effect of the timing and duration of the review upon the incumbent and the unit. From the viewpoint of the incumbent, a protracted review is stressful and places the incumbent under scrutiny. The senior administrators interviewed by the Joint Committee expressed the view that during the review period, and leading up to the review period, their authority and ability to enact change was diminished, pending the outcome of the review. This was a significant concern to the Joint Committee, due to the potential for the review process to limit growth within the unit and the University's strategic objectives. In this regard, the mistaken perception that the period of review starts with the announcement of the intended review created the sense that the review process was longer than it was in actuality.

The Joint Committee confirmed that the actual review normally occurred as intended within a six- to eight-week period starting from the date of the first meeting of the review committee. As the perception is that the process takes significantly longer, the Joint Committee considered this potentially to be due to the definition of the start point of the review. For incumbents being reviewed, the starting point may be perceived as the first meeting held with their reporting authority to consider whether the incumbent wishes to be considered for reappointment, or the date faculty members within the college are asked to select their faculty representatives to serve on

the review committee. Ensuring the incumbent and the unit understand the process and associated timelines will minimize the uncertainty that sometimes seems to be associated with the review process.

#### Relationship of annual performance reviews, 360-degree reviews and end-of-term reviews

The end-of-term review process consists of a review of the position profile in conjunction with college and unit plans, an open public meeting, and the solicitation of comments from the community on the performance of the incumbent in relation to stated goals. It is the responsibility of the review committee to consider the responses received in light of events and the organizational climate over the course of the incumbent's term.

Many administrative positions now have an annual 360-degree evaluation and feedback. As the 360-degree process is primarily intended as a formative process, it is the Joint Committee's view that the 360-degree reviews in their original form should not be admitted to review committees. Other formal periodic evaluations should be considered notwithstanding the fact that they may include some formative elements.

#### Feedback solicited during the review process

A strong theme that emerged in the committee's consultation and the survey was the need to balance the openness and transparency of the collegial review of senior administrators, against the potential for the process to be negative and damaging to the incumbent. Ensuring the incumbent and members of the review committee view the feedback received in the same format was supported as consistent with the principles for natural justice. No anonymous submissions are permitted; this supports the principle of transparency. Protecting the incumbent under review from unprofessional submissions upholds the principle of respect.

The University's practice has been to provide the comments as submitted, with the names and any other obvious identifying features removed. However, even with the distinguishing

features removed, the Joint Committee heard that comments are attributable. If the incumbent can identify the author, confidentiality as required in the previous procedures has not been upheld. The Joint Committee therefore considered that in order to be transparent, it must be clear to those making submissions that, even though their names will be removed from the submission, the confidentiality of their comments cannot be assured. The following process is recommended: Submissions received will be provided to the review committee and incumbent as submitted, other than with the removal of the author's name. The responsibility to ensure that a submission is not identifiable based on its contents rests on the individual making the submission.

Respect for all involved in the review process, including the incumbent, has been expressed as a foundational principle of the review process. Respect does not imply lack of critique. It implies critique focused on performance and ability as it relates to the position profile and decoupled from inappropriate emotional or personal attacks. The chair will first review the submissions to ensure their professionalism. If the chair believes any of the comments submitted are unprofessional, she or he will contact the author and provide him or her with the option of resubmitting. If the author declines to resubmit, the comments will not be provided to the review committee and incumbent. Without revealing their content, the chair shall report all exclusions to the committee.

#### Informal feedback sought by incumbent prior to review

At times, senior administrators have elected to informally poll faculty members within their college or colleagues regarding their performance to inform their decision on whether or not to stand for review. The Joint Committee recognizes that it is within the purview of the incumbent to seek feedback on performance prior to submitting to the end-of-term review process outlined in the review procedures, as desired, and that the search and review procedures have no bearing on this situation.

## OVERALL RECOMMENDATIONS

---

The following comprises a brief summary of the Joint Committee's recommendations as reflected within the committee's report and expressed in the principles and procedures:

### **General:**

1. That the process and stage of the search or review be readily available and communicated to the University community and relevant external constituencies (page 14, 29, 31);
2. That the Board of Governors assume greater responsibility and oversight for the timeliness and progress of searches and reviews, and that at regular intervals senior administration provide to the Board a schedule of current and pending searches and reviews and progress towards completion (page 17);
3. That the University discuss with the Health Region the composition of the search committee for the Associate Vice-President Research (Health) and Vice-President Research and Innovation (Saskatoon Health Region) so that it closely parallels that of the Associate Vice-President Research while acknowledging that additional members will be necessary to represent the interests of the Health Region. Given that this is a joint appointment, the process leading to appointment and consideration for re-appointment may differ, but the Joint Committee recommends that the principles outlined in the "General Procedures for Search and Review" be respected (page 11);
4. That the search and end-of-term review be based upon an appropriate position profile (page 35, 37);
5. That both the professional associations related to the two professional academic programs in the College of Pharmacy and Nutrition be represented on the search/review committee for the Dean, Pharmacy and Nutrition (page 13, 14);
6. That under unique circumstances, more than one professional association may be represented as determined by the Board following a formal request from the College Faculty Council (page 13);
7. That a representative from Huskie Athletics and a representative from Community Programs be added to the search/review committee for the Dean, Kinesiology (page 13, 42);
8. That the Vice-President Research or designate be added to the search committees for all Deans and to the review committee for the Dean of Dentistry (page 13, 41);
9. That a member of Senate be added to the search/review committee for the Vice-President Research (page 13);
10. That the undergraduate student representative selected by the USSU be removed from the search/review committees for the Dean, College of Graduate Studies and Research, and that one of the four faculty of the College selected by members of the College be replaced with a

member of the General Academic Assembly, selected by Council who holds a senior administrative position in the University (page 13);

11. That an additional librarian, selected by the librarians be added to the search/review committees for the Dean, University Library, and that the Chair of the Academic Support Committee of Council be replaced with a member of the General Academic Assembly (page 13);
12. That subject to the approved principles and procedures for searches and reviews, the search and review committees will determine their own procedures (page 35, 37);
13. That the Provost's Office continue to gather feedback on best practices for searches and reviews. As part of that endeavor conducting a brief survey of search and review committees immediately following the conclusion of their work is suggested as a means to gain insight into ways to continue to improve the search and review process (page 17);
14. That the positions of the Executive Directors and Associate Directors of the Interdisciplinary Schools (School of Public Health; Environment and Sustainability; Johnson-Shoyama Graduate School of Public Policy); Vice-Deans (Humanities and Fine Arts; Social Sciences, Science); the Vice-Provost Teaching and Learning; and the Associate Vice-President Research be subject to the procedures), in addition to the positions already named in the Letter of Understanding (page 11, Appendices A & B) [note that the Executive Director and Associate Director of the Johnson-Shoyama Graduate School of Public Policy are joint appointments with the University of Regina. Provision for University of Regina representation will be necessary. This may involve either modest expansion of the search/review committee or sharing of positions between the universities or both];
15. That the positions of Associate Vice-President Human Resources; Chief Information Officer and Associate Vice-President Information and Communications Technology; and Associate Vice-President Student and Enrolment Services no longer be subject to the procedures (page 11, Appendices A & B);

### **Searches**

16. That searches for senior administrators commence in a timely manner, far enough in advance that an appointment can be made without the necessity for an intervening acting appointment, with the recognition that there will be occasions when an acting appointment is unavoidable or even helpful, given the unique circumstances related to the appointment (page 17, 36);
17. That when a short list of candidates has been established, the search committee determines whether the search will be confidential or open. The Joint Committee recognizes that the current expectation is for open decanal searches. For all searches, if there is evidence presented to the search committee that the search will be disadvantaged by requiring public presentations of the short-listed candidates the committee, at its discretion, may continue the search process in confidence. In the absence of such evidence, the committee is encouraged to make every effort to involve faculty and staff through such means as forums or seminar presentations (page 19, 29);

18. That the chair and the majority of the committee strive to come to agreement on the preferred candidate. If there are differing views on the preferred candidate, it is critical that there be agreement on acceptable candidates. If agreement is not possible, the search may be declared failed by the President or the Board. If the President declares a search failed, the search committee may be reconstituted and may or may not consist of new membership, as determined by the President. If the Board declares a search failed, the Board will decide how to proceed (page 16, 36);
19. That if the President provides a recommendation from the short-listed candidates to the Board different from that of the search committee, he or she provide a rationale to the Board for the alternative recommendation, and that the search committee also be provided the rationale for the alternative recommendation for information (page 16, 34);

### **Reviews**

20. That the chair meet with the incumbent prior to and subsequent to the review to provide information and feedback about the process and outcome including the membership of the review committee once constituted, the timeline for the review, and expectations of the review process (page 37);
21. That assessment of the likelihood of the incumbent continuing to perform the responsibilities of his or her office at a high level should be based on the revised position profile if that profile is different from what was in effect during the incumbent's term (page 35, 37);
22. That the results of the University's 360-degree review process in their original form not be admitted to the review committee. Other formal periodic evaluations should be considered notwithstanding the fact that they may include some formative elements (page 21);
23. That the chair of the review committee ensures that submissions forwarded to the review committee and incumbent are respectful and professional (page 22, 38);

## **ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS**

---

The Joint Committee wishes to thank those who participated in the consultation undertaken by the committee, and to express appreciation for the frank and thoughtful approach taken by those interviewed by the committee.

## **JOINT COMMITTEE MEMBERSHIP**

---

### *Chair*

John Rigby                      Department of Management and Marketing

### *Members appointed from the General Academic Assembly*

Jim Cheesman                      Department of Psychology  
Bob Gander                      Department of Electrical and Computer Engineering  
Joan Sawatzky                      College of Nursing

### *Members appointed by the Board of Governors*

Jim Germida                      Vice-Provost Faculty Relations  
Nancy Hopkins                      Member, Board of Governors  
Lea Pennock                      University Secretary

---

### *Administrative Support*

Sandra Calver (Secretary)      Coordinator, University Governance  
University Secretariat

**SEARCH AND REVIEW PROCEDURES FOR SENIOR ADMINISTRATORS**

---

Approved March 4, 2011

## **PREAMBLE**

---

The University of Saskatchewan is committed to being a pre-eminent institution of higher learning. This can only be achieved with truly exceptional senior administrators leading, directing and equipping equally exceptional faculty and staff toward a shared vision of outstanding internationally recognized achievement. It is therefore critical that search and review procedures for senior administrators result in outstanding candidates being identified in the search process and retained and supported in the review process. It is likewise critical that recommended candidates are able to work with, support and complement the contributions of other senior administrators, faculty and staff. The goal of the Search and Review Procedures for Senior Administrators is to identify, recruit, support and retain such truly exceptional individuals.

## **PRINCIPLES for SEARCHES**

---

### **Purpose**

The purpose of the search process is to identify a number of outstanding candidates, based on the position profile, from which a recommendation for appointment shall be made.

### **Transparency**

The search process, procedures and composition of the search committee shall be readily available and accessible to all interested parties. The search committee shall ensure consistent and meaningful communications to the community and the candidates about the process as it unfolds.

The principle of transparency must be balanced against the requirements of the search. Accordingly, the initial list of candidates will not be made public. When a short list of candidates has been established it is the responsibility of the search committee to determine whether the search will be confidential or open. If there is evidence presented to the search committee that the search will be disadvantaged by requiring public presentations of the short-listed candidates, the committee, at its discretion, may continue the search process in confidence. In the absence of such evidence, the committee is encouraged to make every effort to involve faculty and staff through such means as forums or seminar presentations.

### **Accountability**

Search committees (except the Search Committee for the President) report to the Board of Governors through the President. The report shall provide a rationale for the committee's recommendation and include the majority and minority views (if any) held by committee members.

### **Confidentiality**

Information or documentation relating to any candidate will not be shared beyond the committee without the express permission of that candidate.

The deliberations and documentation of the committee will not be shared beyond the committee except for the purposes of accountability as described above.

### **Representation**

Those constituencies most directly affected by the position should be represented in the search process subject to reasonable limits on the size of the search committee.

### **Consultation**

The process shall include broad and extensive consultations with the University community and external constituencies regarding the University's strategic needs as they relate to the position and the attributes and skills required of candidates to meet those needs. It is critically important that all committee members are working from the same base of information and that the significance of that information is considered by the entire committee.

## **Timeliness**

Search committees should be formed expeditiously and begin work in a timely fashion to ensure the transition between academic administrators occurs as smoothly as possible. Acting appointments should be avoided whenever reasonably possible.

## **Respect**

The search process will be respectful of all groups and individuals involved in the process, including the candidates.

## **Equity**

The search committee will conduct its work in accordance with the University's employment equity policies.

## **Conflict of Interest**

Any real or perceived conflict of interest by a search committee member shall be identified and disclosed as soon as a committee member becomes aware of it so that it may be appropriately considered by the committee. There are many possible relationships or interests that could constitute conflict of interest (see the University's Conflict of Interest policy for a more complete discussion) but in particular, a committee member is in conflict of interest if he or she is biased for or against a candidate. If a committee member is considered by the committee to be, or to be seen to be, in conflict of interest, the committee member shall be excused.

## **Role of Individual Search Committee Members**

The search committee is a deliberative body. While individual members bring the perspective of those constituencies most directly affected by the incumbent they are not explicitly representatives of those groups in the sense of a constituent assembly. Rather, their role on the committee is to exercise their independent judgment to seek the best candidate for the position. Input or feedback to the committee from constituent groups or individuals should be provided to the chair for the benefit of the entire committee.

## **Finite Role of the Search Committee**

The work of the search committees is important but it is transitory: appointees and incumbents have no obligation to the search committee subsequent to their appointment. The accountability of positions is identified in the written profile of the position.

## **PRINCIPLES for REVIEWS**

---

### **Purpose**

The purpose of the review process is to assess whether an incumbent has performed and will continue to perform to a high standard the responsibilities expressed in the position profile and to arrive at a recommendation that either:

- a. an incumbent be reappointed, or
- b. an incumbent not be reappointed and a search be undertaken.

### **Transparency**

The review process, procedures and composition of the review committee shall be readily available and accessible to all interested parties. The review committee shall ensure consistent and meaningful communications to the community and the incumbent about the process as it unfolds.

### **Accountability**

Review committees (except the Review Committee for the President) report to the Board of Governors through the President. The report shall provide a rationale for the committee's recommendation and include the majority and minority views (if any) held by committee members.

### **Confidentiality of Responses on Performance**

Information or documentation relating to any incumbent will not be shared beyond the committee without the express permission of that incumbent.

The deliberations and documentation of the committee will not be shared beyond the committee except for the purposes of accountability as described above.

### **Disclosure**

Incumbents being reviewed must be aware of and have access to the materials that form the basis of their review.

### **Representation**

Those constituencies most directly affected by the position should be represented in the review process subject to reasonable limits on the size of the review committee.

### **Consultation**

The process shall include broad and extensive consultations with the University community and external constituencies regarding the University's strategic needs as they relate to the position, the attributes and skills required to meet those needs, and the performance of the incumbent in relation to those needs, attributes and skills. It is critically important that all committee members are working from the same base of information and that the significance of that information is considered by the entire committee.

## **Timeliness**

Review committees should be formed expeditiously and begin work in a timely fashion to ensure minimum possible disruption to the work of the incumbent, or in those situations where a search is recommended, to allow the search process itself to be undertaken in a timely fashion.

## **Respect**

The review process will be respectful of all groups and individuals involved in the process, including the incumbent.

## **Equity**

The review committee will conduct its work in accordance with the University's employment equity policies.

## **Conflict of Interest**

Any real or perceived conflict of interest by a review committee member shall be identified and disclosed as soon as a committee member becomes aware of it so that it may be appropriately considered by the committee. If a committee member is considered by the committee to be, or to be seen to be, in conflict of interest, the committee member shall be excused.

## **Role of Individual Review Committee Members**

The review committee is a deliberative body. While individual members bring the perspective of those constituencies most directly affected by the incumbent they are not explicitly representatives of those groups in the sense of a constituent assembly. Rather, their role on the committee is to exercise their independent judgment as to whether an incumbent should be reappointed. Input or feedback to the committee from constituent groups or individuals should be provided to the chair for the benefit of the entire committee.

## **Finite Role of the Review Committee**

The work of the review committees is important but it is transitory: if incumbents are reappointed they have no obligation to the review committee subsequent to their reappointment. The accountability of positions is identified in the written profile of the position.

## CRITERIA FOR INCLUSION IN THE SEARCH AND REVIEW PROCEDURES

---

The following criteria are applied to determine which senior positions should be subject to these provisions:

1. **Centrality of the position to the academic mission of the University.** The closer the responsibilities of the position lie to the centre of the University's academic mission the more imperative it is that the position is subject to the procedures.
2. **The academic decision making authority vested in the position.** If the incumbent in a position has the direct authority to decide academic outcomes and directions, the position should be subject to these provisions. Conversely, if the incumbent in a position primarily provides support and technical expertise, the position should not be subject to these procedures.
3. **The level of academic experience required by the position.** If a position clearly requires academic experience in teaching and research, then careful consideration should be given to including it within the scope of these procedures. If a position clearly does not require academic experience in teaching and research (notwithstanding the possibility that an incumbent may have such experience), the position probably should not be subject to these procedures.
4. **The level of technical expertise required by the position.** If a position has highly technical requirements, such that members of a search or review committee may not realistically be able to assess the quality or performance of a candidate or incumbent, the position should not be subject to these procedures.

Appendices A and B outline the positions to which these procedures apply based on the above criteria.

## **GENERAL PROCEDURES FOR SEARCHES AND REVIEWS**

---

### **GENERAL PROCEDURES FOR SEARCHES**

---

#### **APPOINTMENT PROCEDURES**

---

The Board of Governors appoints the University's senior administrators. Search committees report to the Board of Governors through the President (except the Search Committee for the President which reports directly to the Board). The report shall provide a rationale for the committee's recommendation and include the majority and minority views (if any) held by committee members. Ideally, committee members would have an opportunity to review the report before it is submitted. It is useful to distinguish between preferred candidates and acceptable candidates. Ideally, the chair and the majority of the committee will come to agreement on the preferred candidate. If there are differing views between the chair and the majority of the committee on the preferred candidate, it is critical that there be agreement on acceptable candidates, and the chair may recommend any acceptable candidate to the President. The President must also be in agreement with the recommendation, and it is within the purview of the President to make an alternative recommendation. The President will recommend one name to the Board of Governors from the short-listed candidates. If the President's recommendation differs from the majority view of the search committee, a rationale for the alternative recommendation shall be provided to the Board of Governors, and the rationale for the alternative recommendation should be provided to the search committee for information.

For the appointment of the President, the search committee will submit to the Board the name of the preferred candidate with a comprehensive report outlining the committee's assessment of the candidates. This report shall be presented for advice to the Board at a joint meeting of the search committee and the Board of Governors.

For Associate Deans and Associate Directors of Schools, the Board of Governors has empowered the Provost and Vice-President Academic to make the appointment.

Normally terms of office for all positions will not exceed five years. If the requirements of a position are such that the selected candidate comes from outside of the University community and would not have an academic appointment to return to, the appointment may be made with or without term.

#### **SEARCH PROCEDURES**

---

1. In the penultimate year of the term of the incumbent, a search committee shall be struck.
2. The committee will normally be chaired by the individual to whom the appointee will report.

3. The composition of the committee shall be made public.
4. If a committee member ceases to serve for any reason prior to interviews with candidates, a replacement shall be appointed by the same process and from the same constituency as the member withdrawing. If candidate interviews have commenced, the committee member will not be replaced.
5. Any conflict of interest or perceived conflict of interest of any member, as described in the University's Conflict of Interest Policy, will be promptly disclosed by the member to the committee, so that it may be appropriately considered by the committee to determine whether the member shall resign.
6. Subject to the approved principles and procedures for searches and reviews, the committee shall establish its own procedures. It is critically important that all committee members are working from the same base of information and that the significance of that information is considered by the entire committee. Accordingly at its first meeting the committee should establish such matters as quorum, attendance expectations, and information gathering procedures.
7. A search consultant, if retained, shall be advisory to the search committee. Search consultants are highly knowledgeable in their own right and if retained their services should be used in such a way that the committee receives maximum benefit from their expertise.
8. The committee shall review the position profile and may recommend revision. The search parameters for the position should be based on the position profile. If the search committee finds that it is seeking qualities in the applicants that are not implied by the position profile, the committee should either recommend revision of the position profile or adjust its expectations of applicants to match the profile.
9. For a Presidential search, the committee will provide the opportunity for interested members of the University community to provide written comments on the strategic goals and objectives of the University, and on the progress made or problems encountered in achieving those goals and objectives. All submissions must be written and signed and will be acknowledged and treated in confidence. Electronic submissions are acceptable with provisions made to confirm the authenticity of the author.
10. For Deans and Executive Directors, the committee shall hold a meeting open to all faculty members of the college or school and will also consult with staff to discuss the responsibilities, challenges and opportunities of the college or school in relation to its integrated plan and progress made towards meeting strategic goals expressed in the plan. Staff may attend the open meeting with faculty or may be consulted in a separate meeting as the search committee deems appropriate for a particular college or school.
11. For Associate Deans and Associate Directors of Schools, members of the University community will be advised that the position of Associate Dean or Associate Director will become vacant at a specific date and be invited to submit applications and nominations. Normally, Associate Deans and Associate Directors are recruited internally. The search committee chair shall advise University members when a new Associate Dean or Associate Director position will be created and the search process will commence.

12. For all senior administrative positions, excepting internal searches for Associate Deans and Associate Directors, the committee shall conduct an extensive search. Although the committee may determine the most appropriate means and methods of obtaining applications and nominations,
  - a) the position will be advertised in appropriate publications; and by appropriate electronic means
  - b) other institutions may be canvassed for nominations; and
  - c) nominations will be invited from faculty;
  - d) a search consultant may be employed.
13. Searches for senior administrators should commence in a timely manner. Whenever possible the search, including for newly-created positions, should begin far enough in advance that an appointment can be made without the necessity for an intervening acting appointment.
14. A report will accompany the search committee recommendation, which details the process followed and the majority and any minority views of members as described in the "Appointment Procedures" above.
15. Situations may arise when a search is considered failed. A search is declared failed by the President or Board. For example, a search may be declared failed if the chair and the search committee cannot come to an agreement on an acceptable candidate to recommend for appointment. If the President declares a search failed, the search committee may be reconstituted and may or may not consist of new membership, as determined by the President. If the Board declares a search failed, the Board will decide how to proceed.

## GENERAL PROCEDURES FOR REVIEWS

---

### RE-APPOINTMENT PROCEDURES

---

The Board of Governors re-appoints the University's senior administrators. Review committees report to the Board of Governors through the President (except the Review Committee for the President which reports directly to the Board). The report shall provide a rationale for the committee's recommendation and include the majority and minority views (if any) held by committee members. If the President's recommendation differs from the majority view of the review committee, a rationale for the alternative recommendation shall be provided to the Board of Governors, and the rationale for the alternative recommendation provided to the review committee for information. For the review of the President and the Provost and Vice-President Academic, the review committee's report shall be presented for advice to the Board of Governors at a joint meeting of the review committee and the Board.

Normally terms of office will not exceed five years, with the exception of the Vice-President Finance and Resources, who may be re-appointed with or without term. Senior administrators in without term appointments shall be reviewed every five years.

### REVIEW PROCEDURES

---

1. In the penultimate year of the term of the incumbent, a review committee shall be struck if the incumbent wishes to seek a further term.
2. The committee is normally chaired by the individual to whom the incumbent reports.
3. The composition of the committee shall be made public.
4. If a member ceases to serve for any reason prior to the interview with the incumbent, a replacement shall be appointed by the same process and from the same constituency as the member withdrawing. If the interview with the incumbent has occurred, the member will not be replaced.
5. Any conflict of interest or perceived conflict of interest of any member, as described in the University's Conflict of Interest Policy, will be promptly disclosed by the member to the committee, so that it may be appropriately considered by the committee to determine whether the member shall resign.
6. Subject to the approved principles and procedures for searches and reviews, the committee shall establish its own procedures. The chair will meet with the incumbent prior to and subsequent to the review to provide information and feedback about the process and outcome. The incumbent will normally have an opportunity to meet with the committee as a whole to discuss her or his performance. It is critically important that all committee members are working from the same base of information and that the significance of that information is considered by the entire committee. Accordingly, at its first meeting the committee should establish such matters as quorum, attendance expectations, and information gathering procedures.
7. The committee shall review the position profile and may recommend revision. Assessment of an incumbent's performance should be based on the position profile that applied during

the incumbent's term of office. Assessment of the likelihood of the incumbent continuing to perform the responsibilities of his or her office at a high level should be based on the revised position profile if that profile is different from what was in effect during the incumbent's term. If, in considering the likelihood of the incumbent performing at a high level in the future, the review committee finds that it is seeking qualities in incumbents that are not implied by the position profile, the committee should either recommend revision of the position profile or adjust its expectations of the incumbent to match the profile.

8. In conducting a review of the incumbent, the committee will review the performance and progress made toward stated goals which have been outlined as part of the annual appraisal and evaluation process conducted by the incumbent's supervisor. As the 360-degree review process is primarily intended as a formative process, the 360-degree reviews in their original form should not be admitted to review committees.

Written comment on the performance of the incumbent will be invited by the chair from members of the university community. All submissions must be written and signed and will be acknowledged. Electronic submissions will be accepted with provisions made to confirm the authenticity of the author.

Submissions received will be provided to the committee and incumbent as submitted, other than with the removal of the author's name. The chair will first review the submissions to ensure their professionalism. The chair will contact the author of any submissions considered by the chair to be unprofessional and provide the opportunity for the author to resubmit her or his comments. Unprofessional submissions will not be provided to the incumbent and committee. Without revealing their content, the chair shall report all exclusions to the committee

9. Reappointment of senior administrators will be recommended if the committee and the supervisor for the incumbent agree the incumbent has fulfilled all responsibilities at a high level and is making and is expected to continue to make significant contributions to the University as defined by their administrative responsibilities.

For Deans and Executive Directors, the committee will conduct a full review of the performance of the incumbent within the context of the position profile and strategic goals and objectives of the college or school as expressed within its integrated plan, and written comments received from members of the University community. Upon completion of its review, the committee shall recommend either that the incumbent be re-appointed to a subsequent term or that a search be conducted.

For Associate Deans and Associate Directors, the committee will conduct a full review of the performance of the incumbent within the context of the position profile and strategic goals and objectives of the college as expressed within its integrated plan. Upon completion of its review, the committee shall recommend either that the incumbent be appointed to a subsequent term or that a search be conducted.

10. If a review does not lead to a recommendation for reappointment, a search committee will be constituted. It is permissible but not required that members of the review committee could also serve on the subsequent search committee.
11. A report will accompany the review committee recommendation, which details the process followed and the majority and any minority views of members as described in "Re-appointment Procedures" above.

## **APPENDIX A: SEARCH AND REVIEW COMMITTEE COMPOSITION BY CATEGORY**

---

The search/review committee is intended to bring the perspective of constituent groups. The desire to provide broad perspective must be balanced against the desire to ensure the size of the committee is functional.

The individual to whom the incumbent will report will normally chair the search or review committee.

Staff representation will not normally be included except for those searches or reviews where the incumbent has a broad responsibility for oversight of large administrative units.

The search/review committee will normally include an undergraduate student and may include a graduate student. If no graduate student is included on the committee, the undergraduate student will be directed to consult with graduate students in the college respecting the needs of the position.

For those searches/reviews where the incumbent has significant interaction and impact upon the wider community and no professional organization represented on Senate is closely related to the college, representation will include a member of University Senate appointed by the Senate Nominations Committee. If a professional organization is closely associated with a college and is represented on University Senate, the search/review committee will include a member of the professional association, selected by the professional association, as a representative of the public at large. If more than one professional association is associated, the Senate Nominations Committee will select the association to be represented. Under unique circumstances, more than one professional association may be represented as determined by the Board following a formal request from the College Faculty Council.

Search/review committees shall ordinarily be composed of the following as members across the general categories of senior administrative appointments.

The following interpretations apply:

Board means the Board of Governors of the University of Saskatchewan

Council means the University of Saskatchewan Council

GAA means the General Academic Assembly of the University of Saskatchewan

GSA means the University of Saskatchewan Graduate Students' Association

Senate means the University of Saskatchewan Senate

USSU means the University of Saskatchewan Students' Union

## **SEARCH/REVIEW COMMITTEE COMPOSITION:**

### **PRESIDENT**

Chair - Chair of the Board

Two members of the Board selected by the Board

One member of the Senate selected by Senate Nominations Committee

Two Deans or Executive Directors of schools, appointed by the Deans

Four members of the GAA selected by Council

Two students, one who is President of the USSU and one who is President of the GSA

### **PROVOST AND VICE-PRESIDENT ACADEMIC**

Chair - the President

One member of the Board selected by the Board

One member of the Senate selected by the Senate Nominations Committee

Four members of the GAA selected by Council

One member of Council, selected by Council and who holds a senior administrative position in the University

Two members of Administration and/or Support Staff appointed by the President

One undergraduate student selected by the USSU

One graduate student selected by the GSA

### **VICE-PROVOSTS**

Chair – Provost and Vice-President Academic

One member of the Board selected by the Board (at the option of the Board)

One Dean or Executive Director of a school appointed by the Provost

One member of Council, selected by Council and who holds a senior administrative position in the University

Four members of the GAA selected by Council

One undergraduate student selected by the USSU

One graduate student selected by the GSA

### **VICE-PRESIDENTS**

Chair - the President

One member of the Board selected by the Board (at the option of the Board)

One member of Senate selected by the Senate Nominations Committee

The Provost and Vice-President Academic

Two members of Administration and/or Support Staff appointed by the President

Two members of the GAA selected by Council

One graduate student selected by the GSA

One undergraduate student selected by the USSU

For the Vice-President, Finance and Resources, an additional Board member;

For the Vice-President Research, two additional GAA members; the Dean, College of Graduate Studies and Research; and one member of Council, selected by Council who holds a senior administrative position in the University

### **ASSOCIATE VICE-PRESIDENTS**

Chair – the Vice-President to whom the position reports

One member of the Board selected by the Board (at the option of the Board)

One Dean, or Executive Director of school appointed by the Provost and Vice-President Academic

Three members of the GAA selected by Council

One student selected by the USSU

One graduate student selected by the GSA

### **DEANS AND EXECUTIVE DIRECTORS OF SCHOOLS**

Chair – Provost and Vice-President Academic or designate

One member of the Board selected by the Board (at the option of the Board)

Vice-President Research or designate

One Dean, Vice Dean, Associate Dean or Executive Director or Associate Director of a school appointed by the Provost and Vice-President Academic preferably from a cognate or closely-related college or school

One member of the GAA, selected by Council who is not a member of the faculty of the College and who holds a senior administrative position in the University

Three members of the faculty of the College or School selected by the faculty of the College or School

One undergraduate student selected by the College's student society [An undergraduate student is not included for colleges and schools that do not have an undergraduate program. At the time of the report, this applies to the Dean Graduate Studies and Research and the Executive Director of the School of Environment and Sustainability, the Johnson-Shoyama Graduate School of Public Policy, and the School of Public Health].

One graduate student from a discipline taught in the college or school, selected by the GSA [a graduate student is not included for the Dean of Dentistry]

One member of a related professional association selected by the professional association  
Unless otherwise indicated, if there is more than one association associated with the College, the Senate Nominations Committee will determine which association is represented [A member from a professional association is not included for colleges and schools for which no association has been identified, but a Senate member is appointed to ensure community representation. At the time of the report, this applies to the Dean Arts and Science, Dean Graduate Studies and Research, and Executive Directors of the School of Environment and Sustainability, the Johnson-Shoyama Graduate School of Public Policy, and the School of Public Health];

For Arts and Science, a member of Senate selected by the Senate Nominations Committee; an additional member of GAA who is not a member of the faculty of the College and who holds a senior administrative position in the University; and an additional faculty member; of the four faculty members of the College selected to serve, there should be one from each of the areas of fine arts; humanities; natural sciences; and social sciences;

For Graduate Studies and Research, a member of Senate selected by the Senate Nominations Committee [note: the member of GAA selected by Council may be a member of the faculty of the College];

For Kinesiology, a representative of Huskie Athletics and a representative of Community Programming;

For Medicine, a medical resident selected by the Residents and a representative of the Academic Health Sciences network;

For Pharmacy and Nutrition, an additional member from a related professional association selected by the Senate Nominations Committee to ensure each of the two academic areas is represented;

For the School of Environment and Sustainability, the Johnson-Shoyama Graduate School of Public Policy, and the School of Public Health a member of Senate appointed by the Senate nominations committee. [Although the Interdisciplinary schools have associated professional bodies, at the time of this report, none of those professional associations have membership on Senate. If the associations apply and are granted membership on Senate they would appoint a member to the Search/Review committee of the appropriate school. In the interim a member of Senate will serve to ensure community representation.] Additionally, the Executive Director of the Johnson-Shoyama Graduate School of Public Policy is a joint appointment with the University of Regina. Provision for University of Regina representation will be necessary. This may involve either modest expansion of the Search/Review committee or sharing of positions between the universities or both.

## **VICE-DEANS**

Chair - Dean of the College

One member appointed by the Provost and Vice-President Academic who holds a senior administrative position

Two members of the faculty of the College from the area of the College for which the Vice-Dean will be responsible

One undergraduate student selected by the College's student society from the area for which the Vice-Dean will be responsible

One graduate student selected by the GSA from the area for which the Vice-Dean will be responsible

## **ASSOCIATE DEANS AND ASSOCIATE DIRECTORS**

Chair - Dean of the College

One member appointed by the Provost and Vice-President Academic

Two members of the faculty of the College selected by the faculty of the College

One undergraduate student selected by the College's student society in cases where the Associate Dean is clearly involved in student affairs in the College

One graduate student selected by the GSA where the Associate Dean has responsibility for research

Note that the Associate Director of the Johnson-Shoyama Graduate School of Public Policy is a joint appointment with the University of Regina. Provision for University of Regina representation will be necessary. This may involve either modest expansion of the Search/Review committee or sharing of positions between the universities or both

**APPENDIX B: TABLE OF SEARCH/REVIEW COMMITTEE COMPOSITION BY POSITION**

---

**APPENDIX B: TABLE OF SEARCH/REVIEW COMMITTEE MEMBERSHIP BY POSITION<sup>1</sup>**

<b>Position<sup>2</sup></b>	<b>Chair</b>	<b>Board<sup>3</sup></b>	<b>Senate<sup>4</sup></b>	<b>GAA</b>	<b>Council</b>	<b>Deans/ Exec. Dir. Schools</b>	<b>GSA<sup>5</sup></b>	<b>USSU</b>	<b>Admin/ Support Staff</b>	<b>Prof Assoc.</b>	<b>Faculty<sup>6</sup></b>	<b>Other</b>	<b>Total</b>
President	Chair, Board	2	1	4 <sup>7</sup>		2 <sup>8</sup>	1 <sup>9</sup>	1 <sup>10</sup>					12
Provost & VP Academic	President	1	1	4 <sup>7</sup>	1 <sup>11</sup>		1	1 <sup>12</sup>	2 <sup>13</sup>				12
Vice-Provost Faculty Relations	Provost	1		4 <sup>7</sup>	1 <sup>11</sup>	1 <sup>14</sup>	1	1 <sup>12</sup>					10
Vice-Provost Teaching & Learning	Provost	1		4 <sup>7</sup>	1 <sup>11</sup>	1 <sup>14</sup>	1	1 <sup>12</sup>					10
VP Finance & Resources	President	2	1	2 <sup>7</sup>			1	1 <sup>12</sup>	2 <sup>13</sup>			1 -Provost	11
VP Research	President	1	1	4 <sup>7</sup>	1 <sup>11</sup>	1 <sup>15</sup>	1	1 <sup>12</sup>	2 <sup>13</sup>			1 - Provost	14
AVP Research	VP Research	1		3 <sup>7</sup>		1 <sup>14</sup>	1	1 <sup>12</sup>					8
Dean Agriculture & Bioresources	Provost or designate	1		1 <sup>16</sup>		1 <sup>14</sup>	1	1 <sup>17</sup>		1 <sup>18</sup>	3	1 - VP Research or designate	11
Dean Arts & Science	Provost or designate	1	1	1 <sup>16</sup>		1 <sup>14</sup>	1	1 <sup>17</sup>			4	1 - VP Research or designate	12
Dean Edwards School of Business	Provost or designate	1		1 <sup>16</sup>		1 <sup>14</sup>	1	1 <sup>17</sup>		1 <sup>18</sup>	3	1 - VP Research or designate	11
Dean Dentistry	Provost or designate	1		1 <sup>16</sup>		1 <sup>14</sup>		1 <sup>17</sup>		1 <sup>18</sup>	3	1 - VP Research or designate	10
Dean Education	Provost or designate	1		1 <sup>16</sup>		1 <sup>14</sup>	1	1 <sup>17</sup>		1 <sup>18</sup>	3	1 - VP Research or designate	11
Dean Engineering	Provost or designate	1		1 <sup>16</sup>		1 <sup>14</sup>	1	1 <sup>17</sup>		1 <sup>18</sup>	3	1 - VP Research or designate	11
Dean College of Graduate Studies & Research	Provost or designate	1	1	1 <sup>16</sup>		1 <sup>14</sup>	1				3	1 - VP Research or designate	10

Position <sup>2</sup>	Chair	Board <sup>3</sup>	Senate <sup>4</sup>	GAA	Council	Deans/ Exec. Dir. Schools	GSA <sup>5</sup>	USSU	Admin/ Support Staff	Prof Assoc.	Faculty <sup>6</sup>	Other	Total
Dean Kinesiology	Provost or designate	1		1 <sup>16</sup>		1 <sup>14</sup>	1	1 <sup>17</sup>		1 <sup>18</sup>	3	3 <sup>19</sup>	13
Dean Law	Provost or designate	1		1 <sup>16</sup>		1 <sup>14</sup>	1	1 <sup>17</sup>		1 <sup>18</sup>	3	1 - VP Research or designate	11
Dean Medicine	Provost or designate	1		1 <sup>16</sup>		1 <sup>14</sup>	1	1 <sup>17</sup>		1 <sup>18</sup>	3	3 <sup>20</sup>	13
Dean Nursing	Provost or designate	1		1 <sup>16</sup>		1 <sup>14</sup>	1	1 <sup>17</sup>		1 <sup>18</sup>	3	1 - VP Research or designate	11
Dean Pharmacy & Nutrition	Provost or designate	1		1 <sup>16</sup>		1 <sup>14</sup>	1	1 <sup>17</sup>		2 <sup>21</sup>	3	1 - VP Research or designate	12
Dean University Library	Provost or designate	1		1 <sup>16</sup>		1 <sup>14</sup>	1	1 <sup>12</sup>		1 <sup>18</sup>	3	1 - VP Research or designate	11
Dean Western College of Veterinary Medicine	Provost or designate	1		1 <sup>16</sup>		1 <sup>14</sup>	1	1 <sup>17</sup>		1 <sup>18</sup>	3	1 - VP Research or designate	11
Executive Director, School of Environment & Sustainability	Provost or designate	1	1 <sup>22</sup>	1 <sup>16</sup>		1 <sup>14</sup>	1				3	1 - VP Research or designate	10
Executive Director School of Public Health	Provost or designate	1	1 <sup>22</sup>	1 <sup>16</sup>		1 <sup>14</sup>	1				3	1 - VP Research or designate	10
Executive Director Johnson-Shoyama Graduate School of Public Policy <sup>23</sup>	Provost or designate	1	1 <sup>22</sup>	1 <sup>16</sup>		1 <sup>14</sup>	1				3	1 - VP Research or designate	10
Vice-Deans	College Dean						1	1 <sup>17</sup>			2	1 - appt. by Provost	6
Associate Deans and Associate Directors of Schools <sup>24</sup>	College Dean/Exec. Dir						1 <sup>25</sup>	1 <sup>26</sup>			2	1 - appt. by Provost	6

- 
- 1 Full details are found in Appendix A: Search and Review Committee Composition by Category
- 2 All appointments are with term, with the exception of the Vice-President Finance and Resources, who may be appointed with or without term
- 3 The Board at its discretion, may or may not assign a member to serve for search and review committees for Deans and Executive Directors of Schools
- 4 Appointed by the Senate Nominations Committee
- 5 All GSA appointments are made by the GSA
- 6 All faculty are members of the college or school and elected by the faculty of the college or school
- 7 Appointed by Council
- 8 Appointed by the Deans
- 9 Must be GSA President
- 10 Must be USSU President
- 11 Appointed by Council; must hold a senior administrative position
- 12 Appointed by USSU
- 13 Appointed by the President
- 14 Appointed by the Provost
- 15 Dean of the College of Graduate Studies and Research
- 16 Appointed by Council; must hold a senior administrative position; cannot be a faculty member of the college or school (the GAA member for the search/review committee for the Dean of Graduate Studies and Research may be a member of the college)
- 17 Appointed by the Student Society of the College/School
- 18 Appointed by the professional association; if there is more than one association associated with the College, the Senate Nominations Committee will determine which association is represented
- 19 A representative of Huskie Athletics; one representative of Community Programming; VP Research or designate
- 20 A medical resident selected by the residents; one representative of Academic Health Sciences Network; VP Research or designate
- 21 Appointed by the professional association
- 22 Although the Interdisciplinary schools have associated professional bodies, at the time of this report, none of those professional associations have membership on Senate. If the associations apply and are granted membership on Senate they would appoint a member to the Search/Review committee of the appropriate school. In the interim a member of Senate will serve to ensure community representation.
- 23 This is a joint appointment with the University of Regina. Provision for University of Regina representation will be necessary. This may involve either modest expansion of the committee or sharing of positions between the universities or both.
- 24 Note that the Associate Director of the Johnson-Shoyama Graduate School of Public Policy is a joint appointment with the University of Regina. Provision for University of Regina representation will be necessary. This may involve either modest expansion of the Search/Review committee or sharing of positions between the universities or both.
- 25 Where the Associate Dean is involved in research
- 26 Appointed by student society (where the Associate Dean is involved in student affairs)

## **APPENDIX C: LETTER OF UNDERSTANDING BETWEEN THE UNIVERSITY OF SASKATCHEWAN AND THE UNIVERSITY OF SASKATCHEWAN FACULTY ASSOCIATION**

---

In the interest of promoting harmonious relations and recognizing that the appointment and reappointment of senior Administrative officers has an impact on the working conditions of the Faculty, the University of Saskatchewan and the University of Saskatchewan Faculty Association agree that the following represents their understanding with respect to the appointment and reappointment of senior administrative officers of the University:

1. The University of Saskatchewan agrees that the search procedures outlined in the policy documents issued by the Board of Governors in 1997, and as amended from time to time, shall be interpreted to include Deans (including the Dean, University Library), Associate Deans (including the Associate Dean, University Library), the Associate Vice-President Human Resources, the Associate Vice-President Information and Communications Technology, the Associate Vice-President Student and Enrolment Services, the Vice-Provost, the Vice-President Finance and Resources, the Vice-President Research, the Provost and Vice-President Academic, the President and additional positions as deemed appropriate by the Joint Committee.
2. From time to time, a Joint Committee of the Board of Governors and Council will be established to review the search procedures in respect of the appointment and reappointment of the senior administrative officers noted above, and will report their findings and any proposed amendments to the Board of Governors. The appropriate number of faculty or Council members on the search committees and the appropriate methods for selection of faculty or Council members will be included in the review.
3. The Joint Committee shall be comprised of three (3) members appointed by the Board, and three (3) members drawn from the membership of the General Academic Assembly named by the Nominations Committee of Council and approved by Council, and an independent Chair appointed by the Board of Governors from a list of names put forward by the Joint Committee. The list shall be approved by a majority of the members of the Committee, including at least a majority of the Council appointees, and a majority of the Board appointees.
4. The University agrees to make the policy available on the University web site. Print copies of the policy shall also be available, upon request.
5. The University restates its commitment to follow the policies issued by the Board of Governors and to allow the full range and extent of consultation envisioned by these policies.

Robert E. Gander  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Signing for the Association  
Dated August 26, 2003

Mark Evered  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Signing for the University