

Library Feedback on Provost Search

Characteristics:

- Open, transparent, open-door policy
- Efficient decision maker who gets things done by helping folks see the merit in the idea/task/initiative rather than by blunt force
- Trust and partnership-builder
- Understands the value of contributions made by academic student success partners on campus such as the libraries, writing center, CSA, math emporium
- Communicative and understanding of different communication branches in academic affairs (via chairs, deans, shared governance, units, buildings)
- Open to feedback and willing to provide clarity around 'no'
- Commitment to working with shared governance
- Background in or commitment to working with and for all departments (building bridges)
- Grasp on the nuances of SU
- Values human expertise
- Values information literacy and the library beyond 'technology' and 'space'
- Nuanced understanding of AI – policy, what type and where and why, guardrails, AI literacy. What librarians DON'T want to see is a blanket mandate to use AI
- Visibility and active presence across campus and community
- Advocate on every academic affairs level from student to faculty to staff to unit
- Seeing assessment as evidence, willingness to work with offices such as UARA to figure out evidence in a local context

Qualifications:

- Debate on whether Full Professor was a necessity, leaned towards no BUT with a strong track record of these other things that often come with a Professor promotion
- Tenured – oversees tenure and promotion decisions. Represents the academic reputation of the institution. Established scholarly record.
- Proven leadership and administrative experience
- Experience in management of large budgets concurrent with academic planning
- Evidence of fostering a campus-wide culture of assessment
- Dean/equivalent management experience – people and budgets
- Faculty background
- Evidence of successful community relations

- Experience with gen ed, particularly assessment
- Preferred: experience in a provost's office as a Provost, VP, Assoc.
- Preferred: evidence of new academic initiatives
- Preferred: experience in a state system or consortium

Search Committee:

- Spirited debate related to search committee makeup – some were fine with the same larger committee structure, some wanted to consider alternative smaller committee models
- Want to see faculty librarian representative and academic affairs staff representative
- Search committee should be made of campus leaders
- Leaned toward no search firm, but it was pointed out the lack of firm could be a turn off for some candidates
- Feedback forms should be worth the time to do them – either with the understanding they will be reviewed by the committee OR a suggestion to solicit unit-level feedback forms instead

Interview Process:

- Conduct reference checks in-house and ensure committee gets that information
- Make resumes available to campus via email
- Q: How will you establish trust and transparency in your communication with faculty?
- Q: How would you approach your decision-making process related to X, Y, Z? (budget reallocation, cross-unit collaboration, gen ed assessment, etc.)