

## CHHS Provost Search Survey Responses

### What qualifications should be necessary?

- If in-house then associate professor would suffice - the institutional knowledge is very valuable!
- I believe Prior administrative titles such as department chair or a dean are common pathways to the provost role; however, they are not the only pathways. The determining factor should not be the title previously held, but whether the candidate has exercised leadership at a scope and level commensurate with the responsibilities of the provost. What is essential is demonstrated experience in leading complex academic systems, managing faculty affairs and promotion processes, overseeing significant budgetary responsibilities, supporting accreditation and compliance efforts, and contributing meaningfully to institutional strategic planning. If a candidate can clearly demonstrate equivalent leadership experience across these domains, prior service in a specific administrative title should not be viewed as an absolute prerequisite. Full or Associate Professor: A more strategic question may be: "Does this candidate possess the level of leadership necessary to guide the institution forward?"
- Must have experience at the Dean level (and a minimum an extended time as a department chair). Full Professor. (Associate Professor not acceptable).
- I think the Provost should at least have had some level of administrative experience, such as a Dean. A Full Professor would demonstrate that the individual came up through the ranks and understands faculty needs. However, there might be circumstances where an Associate Professor might make sense - it would depend on the candidate and what occurred in their own career trajectory (for instance, circumstances that arose that gave them administrative experience, but took away opportunities for advancing to Full Professor).
- Yes, I think previous administrative experience is important. This would include Associate Provost experience. And, yes, I think the new Provost needs to be a full professor. That said, if an associate professor is eligible, a full professor review could be done prior. A provost will be making recommendations to the president for those going up for full professor. As such, I believe the new provost would need to be at the full professor rank to do so.
- I would like for the person to have had experience at previous levels of administration. Department Chair or Dean experience would be preferable. Associate Professor level would be sufficient as not everyone seeks to be a Full Professor, but could still have strong qualifications and abilities.
- I think this is highly dependent on the other qualifications. Ideally, full professor, but in the right candidate I think associate professor would be ok. I don't think they must have served in a department chair or dean role, but some type of position in addition to teaching faculty.
- Yes, should have experience as a dean, associate dean, or director. Not sure about department chair - would depend on the responsibilities and time in such role. They

should either be a full professor or at a level where they would be promotable to full professor.

- A new Provost who holds the rank of an Associate Professor is suitable, especially if they have experience in the position. Also, promotion from within is much more sustainable and budget-conscious than a national search.
- Associate Professor would suffice; must have proven track record of leadership experience but not necessarily a department chair or dean
- a provost needs to be able to do the job! faculty who meet the standards to become full can get special permission to apply and go through the process early. I think this should be considered for anyone who is an associate professor as this would best protect them and whatever department is their "home" which would need to "approve" the tenure of that candidate if we hired an outside person and they had the ability to move to faculty at a later time (which would follow the social norm of previous provosts at SU).
- Previous Dean required; previous Provost highly recommended Full Professor
- I think it is more important that the Provost has the respect of faculty and the President and possesses the necessary traits needed for the position.
- While experience is nice, this position is about advocating for the faculty. I want to know the provost has a history of supporting faculty, and is favored by the faculty. This is more valuable than serving as a chair or dean. I've had a few deans and chairs at SU that should NOT be a provost. They do not have the personality and characteristics that earned the trust and respect of the faculty.
- I think being an Associate Professor is sufficient, as long as they have other relevant experience, vision, leadership, and training for the position. It would be a loss to not hire an outstanding candidate if the only limitation was being an Associate Professor.
- Proven teaching expertise, experience at Dean level or associate provost.
- Full professor. At minimum, should have substantial leadership experience as the head of a department, school, or program; further experience as a dean or similar position is preferable.
- No to Dean and Associate Professor is fine

### **How should the search committee be structured?**

- The search committee should be structured to represent key institutional constituencies while maintaining balance and credibility across the campus community. Membership should include individuals with demonstrated institutional respect and experience, ensuring the committee's work is viewed as legitimate and trustworthy. Care must be taken to avoid dominance by any single group, division, or perspective. A balanced composition helps safeguard objectivity, supports thoughtful deliberation, and reinforces shared governance principles. The committee should also reflect diversity in discipline, academic rank, professional role, and demographic representation. Including varied perspectives strengthens decision-making and signals institutional commitment to equity and inclusion. Given that the Provost serves as the chief academic officer and has primary responsibility for faculty affairs—including promotion and tenure, academic

policy, curriculum oversight, and faculty development—the committee should be faculty-heavy. A strong faculty majority reinforces shared governance, strengthens legitimacy within the academic community, and ensures that those most directly affected by the Provost's leadership have meaningful input in the selection process

- The search committee should be smaller than the previous one, perhaps max of 10-11 individuals. Representatives on the committee should represent different units of the university, and in particular Academic Affairs. There is no need to include every single unit of Academic Affairs. What we need are individuals who will be working directly with the Provost and who understand the role of the provost. The faculty representation should only be a few members (3-4), and there needs to be representatives at Dept Chair/School Director level (that could be the faculty members), Dean level (more than 1), someone from Finance, someone from Student Affairs. There does not need to be a student rep on the committee. I think students should have an interview session with the candidates but do not need to serve on the committee. That way there are more voices from the students in the search, but not on the committee.
- Between 10-13 people would probably be fine. A good percentage should be faculty, since the Provost oversees the faculty. Perhaps between 2/3 and 3/4 of the group. There must be representation from at least one faculty member from each Unit on campus.
- I think faculty voice is quite important and would recommend that at least 1/3 of the committee be comprised by at least one faculty from each the respective schools (e.g., CHHS, Seidel, Fulton, Henson, Purdue). I also think it is important that both undergraduate and graduate faculty voices be on the committee. Regarding size, this is a tough one as the bigger the search committee, the harder it may be to find common times to convene it.
- In my experience, larger committees become unwieldy very quickly. Not completely sure who all "needs" to be involved by I would think 1/3 to 1/2 should be faculty as it seems like our roles are the ones most affected by the Provost's choices.
- I think about 10-12 people. Faculty should be about 60-70%
- no more than 10-12 individuals on the committee - should consist of deans, directors/chairs, faculty, and staff.
- Representatives from each major school/unit. A committee of 10 with 6 faculty members, 2 staff members, and 2 administrators
- 3 faculty, 3 leadership, 1 student, 1 faculty emeritus
- 10-12 with 70% faculty
- 70% faculty, 15% admin, 5% students, 10% staff 8-10
- I would love to see faculty representation from each College (or School, as applicable).
- Significant representation on committee of faculty at all levels not just deans and directors.
- No more than 20 people with 20% representation from faculty, 20% from dean level positions, 20% student affairs, 20% admin/finance/foundation, 20% staff
- 2 deans, 2 faculty from departments in colleges outside of the 2 deans, 2 staff and 2 students

**What personal characteristics do faculty want the new Provost to have, and how can we tailor the search or the interviews to find out if the candidates embody those characteristics? Additionally: Describe the candidate's experience in areas of Academic Affairs needed for this position.**

- Knowledge of SU would be very helpful - there are many new leaders in the university who do not have any institutional knowledge and I think continuity would be helpful if possible
- This is difficult as personal characteristics are inherently subjective. Faculty members will not agree on what “strong leadership,” “approachable,” “decisive,” or even “transparent” means. Without structure, evaluation quickly becomes preference-based rather than criteria-based.
- The provost must be able to work well with the President and the Deans. This is who the person reports to and gets direct reports from. Second, the provost would need to work well with the faculty, and understand the role of administration and faculty alike. Characteristics would include being personable, positive, resilient, and trustworthy. The candidate needs to have emotional intelligence clearly too.
- The candidate should have some level of experience in Academic Affairs. Someone who has never done any work at that level would not necessarily have the base knowledge for performing the duties required in the position. Someone with at least a couple of years of experience would be the minimum. I think the question also would be what are the end goals for the person? Are they using SU as a stepping stone to move up elsewhere? Or are they willing to stay for a while and invest in the campus and the people here? Do they value the work that faculty do here and can they understand the challenges that faculty face?
- In addition to what I expect is an existing job description for this position, I believe it is quite important that the new Provost advocates for faculty while balancing the realities of a tighter budget.
- I would like a Provost that is approachable. The last one did not seem like she really wanted to interact with faculty or have any sort of productive dialogue...or even just regular dialogue. Honestly, I think Jessica Clark embodies a lot of the qualities I would want to see. She understands the different roles that come with a campus (not just ours), she has been a faculty member so remembers what that is like, has leadership experiences that were successful, and is open to talking with faculty and others about what is going on. She's not afraid to say "let me learn more and get back to you". Not sure what level of experience in Academic Affairs the person needs. Familiarity with them, for sure, but not sure that they necessarily needed to have had the role.
- Approachability, accessibility, empathetic, knowledgeable, willingness to learn, and creative. This is hard to assess until you actually meet someone in person.
- People skills, integrity, collaboration, visionary, strategic, strong communication, problem solving ability. Should have experience in academic affairs. Otherwise this may result in a complete failure to move units forward.
- Honest

- Leader, high integrity, faculty advocate
- Must be willing and able to listen to faculty across programs, responsive and communicative, and understand that there are program options that are online and at regional sites.
- Has the strength and mental faculties to stand up against the president when necessary. Places the needs of the students and faculty above the needs of the administrators.
- Ability to work well in up managing and down managing. Being accessible and approachable to faculty. Show up at faculty led events.
- Personal characteristics: friendly and outgoing, excellent listening skills (listens more than speaks), ability to communicate with a wide variety of people, good public speaking skills, high standards and ability to motivate people to meet them, strong moral compass, out of the box thinker, thoughtful change agent, politically savvy. Experience needed: Record of successful leadership, experience with external accreditations, evidence of curriculum development and innovation, record of professional scholarship, track record of fundraising success through grant writing and funding and philanthropic endeavors, knowledge of public higher education systems, commitment to DEI no matter the political situation
- I would like this person to have experienced advising large numbers of students as faculty, have developed curriculum and dealt with curriculum, understand that if we don't fix the D,F,W pre-req courses our program outcomes are never going to improve, taught lecture and online, been involved with senate, worked closely with deans, has researched retention and student success strategies. Personal qualities are empathy with boundaries, ability to listen and understand with reactivity, integrity

### **What leadership qualities are you looking for in a future Provost?**

- Curiosity, humility and genuine belief that current faculty know their programs needs
- The leadership qualities I hope to see will demonstrate a combination of academic credibility faculty trust, strategic leadership, financial and operational literacy integrity and emotional intelligence. I believe Titles and rank matter, but character, competence, and capacity ultimately determine success.
- Leadership qualities should include honesty, trust, hard work ethic, integrity, communication skills, decisive/a good decision maker yet also flexible, experience in the position or a similar position, and have a vision of where SU is headed.
- Someone willing to listen and work with the faculty. Someone with experience, who has a vision, but also who can consider other viewpoints and collaborate with people who have been members of the campus community for a long time. Someone who stands up for the faculty and supports their needs, or who can come to the faculty and discuss the challenges and realities that the faculty may not be aware of. Real transparency and clear and direct communication.
- A provost who listens, is transparent, and takes shared governance seriously. I am not interested in a new provost that is performative and doesn't taken into account the faculty voice.

- Willingness to hear what units need and doing whatever possible to support that. Open communication.
- Similar to those described in the personal characteristics - I do not see how they should be different here.
- Qualifications should include management experience of a large budget; a strong record of scholarship (publications and presentations); experience with teaching and curriculum development; understanding of strategic planning; policy development; student success initiatives; understanding of hiring, tenure, and promotion; skills in conflict resolution; many years experience in higher ed/academia (12 plus years); someone who can work effectively with our President and even compliment her skills.
- Hard working Balanced Budget conscious Already familiar with SU culture
- communication on a small and large scale, articulate, willing to listen, decisive, action oriented after thorough consideration, experience with process evaluation and improvement, recognizes own weaknesses/humble, cares, opportunity oriented versus negative, recognizes there are problems in academia with workload, expectations, burnout and has desire to truly address
- Unbiased, troubleshooter, excellent communicator,
- Someone who is willing to listen and negotiate with faculty. Someone who is receptive to recommendations and responds in a timely manner.
- The ability to effectively socialize and effectively advocate to our legislators on behalf of SU. We need a person who knows the system and the angles needed to bring in money.
- I would love to see the Provost to be responsive and attentive to the unique needs and priorities of each College/School (e.g., permitting the hiring of faculty for vacant positions). Even more importantly, I would hope to see interest and investment in faculty opinion, insight, and leadership efforts (including investment and enthusiasm for working with the Faculty Senate).
- Strategic vision that aligns academic priorities and budgetary support; academic credibility; collaborative leadership and ability to engage wide range of stakeholders; clear, transparent and timely communication; thoughtful change agent; data informed decision maker; commitment to DEI; financial acumen; mentorship/succession planning that fosters talent development; ethical leadership - fair, accountable, and transparent
- Transparent, Persistent, Observant, Practical

### **How did Provost Couch's tenure at Salisbury University impact you?**

- I had no contact or interaction with her...which in itself is telling, it felt there was little interest from her end to priorities of academic units or faculty.
- The goal of the next search should not be to replicate a specific leadership style, but to carefully assess how prior leadership dynamics affected campus functionality, morale, and governance processes by focusing less on personalities and more on competencies, behaviors, and demonstrated leadership practices that would promote institutional stability, transparency, and collaborative decision-making.

- Negative impact - we did not move forward on any good initiatives during this time. Things were left undone. This trickled down to every level of Academic Affairs, and seemed particularly noticeable in the last 6 months. A vision was lacking and we could never hire faculty so all departments and schools were impacted. Faculty did not trust administration and that mistrust seemed to be felt at all levels of administration when in fact it should have just been at the Provost level. Very unfortunate situation. We can't let that happen again.
- Financial concerns at the University came down to the faculty and decreased financial support. There is currently a disparity between overload pay vs special session pay that is concerning. Additionally, there is unequal and perhaps inequitable compensation for Program Directors across Units. Although these things were happening prior to Provost Couch, there was not any attempt to correct these issues and in some cases they were made worse. Communication was also virtually non-existent so it was never clear what was actually happening at the Administrative level.
- Neutral impact.
- It didn't really, as far as I'm aware. Although I did not engage with her much due to not feeling like she was interested in hearing for faculty.
- I felt she was cold and distant. I felt this led to a climate where I felt unsupported and was anxiety-provoking. It felt like I was in constant competition with everyone else to justify my existence, rather than celebrating differences that helped us as a whole to grow and develop. I felt like I had to keep my guard up.
- Negative - decisions made without any discussion of the impact on our unit - i.e. decisions for freezing positions, removing coordinator work release, denying overload hours. Meetings with faculty during open hours that never resulted in any change. Positive - started this way with the meetings to gather data of our needs - not sure what happened after the initial meetings.
- Extremely negative - did not negotiate or include remote faculty in the decision making process whatsoever
- Non-existent. From my perspective, she did nothing, brought in no innovations or funding opportunities. Basically just checked a box for political reasons.
- General unease. Too much changing traditional things just to change them.
- Positive impact: support for grant-writing, commitment to DEI Negative impact: planned and acted without input from experienced leadership team; delayed and unclear communication; instituted initiatives without examining historical data; short-term planner rather than long-term visionary
- I saw no changes that she had eluded too. She listened but either did not choose to react or was not allow to react to promises made