

Special Open Meeting Mount Greylock Regional School District School Committee

Location: Remote meeting via Zoom Date: Friday, July 17, 2020

Per Governor Baker's order suspending certain provisions of the Open Meeting Law, M.G.L. c. 30A sec. 2, the public will not be allowed to physically access this School Committee meeting.

In Attendance:

Committee Members: Jamie Art, Ali Carter, Christina Conry, Regina DiLegio, Carrie Greene, Steve Miller, Al Terranova

Others: Liz Lafond, MASC; Glenn Koocher, MASC; Adam Dupere

Call to Order. Meeting called to order at 3:06 pm.

1. Public Comment

- a. Public comments of Amy Hane, Amy Perry Mercier, and Matthew Hane, which were included in meeting packet, are read by Conry, Miller, and Art respectively.
 - i. Amy Hane raises concerns about "unorthodox decision to rush hiring," the length of contract, and the efforts to solicit community input.
 - ii. Amy Perry Mercier asks that a member of the Special Education Parents Advisory Council Board sit on the hiring committee for the new superintendent, and raises concerns about a rushed decision.
 - iii. Matthew Hane expresses his concerns that process is rushed, not transparency, and a distraction from the priority of reopening school

2. MASC Superintendent Search Orientation

- a. Christina introduces MASC representatives, also recommends MASC staff (not its board) take on role of screening process; solicits public comment; discusses timeline, and notes that if the abbreviated process does not yield a successful candidate, we can move to Option B, the lengthier, more protracted search
- b. MASC representative Lafond and Executive Director Glenn Koocher provide an overview of the Expedited Superintendent Search process
 - i. Notice of vacancy is posted. We have gotten significant interest in just a couple days.
 - ii. Applicants are notorious for procrastinating;
 - iii. MG is an attractive district, expects a significant pool, and a hard time deciding;
 - iv. Option B is always there, if we don't find someone
 1. Greene notes Option B requires a longer-term interim

2. Glenn notes that MRSD is lucky to have a talented interim, but he is only willing to stay through the beginning of school, and we are not guaranteed a good, experienced interim. They are few and far between.
- v. MASC representatives present orientation slides, which were included in meeting packet
 1. Outline of process.
 2. Purpose – MASC provides technical assistance, including initial review of candidates against district’s qualifications.
 3. Discussion of confidentiality of initial review process to ensure candidates not disclosed until become a finalist.
 4. Discussion of comparison to longer, more in-depth process with an ad hoc search committee.
 5. Open Meeting Law – importance of not having conversations outside of open posted public meetings, to avoid having a serial meeting.
 6. Review of Conflict of Interest Law, and duty to not participate if there is an actual conflict, or disclosure if an appearance of conflict, so there is a level of transparency.
 7. Review of questions not to ask, and prohibited topics to try elicit information about.
 - a. Can ask if superintendency is successful, will you be here in 7 years;
 - b. MASC can help with development of questions;
 - c. MASC is concerned about drive-through, short term superintendents.
 8. Role of the Chair
 - a. Ensure all members’ opinions are heard;
 - b. Chair has already indicated willingness to receive and consider input from public
 9. Review of Do’s and Don’t of Hiring Committee, and best practices for engagement in process.
 10. Review of Executive Session – applies if have preliminary screening committee, what’s being called Option B.
 11. Committee member questions.
 - a. Terranova expresses thanks to MASC for the support;
 - b. Art asks questions about ability to confidentiality of screening process
 - i. Glenn K. confirms, and importance confidentiality in protecting the applicant pool;
 - c. Greene asks about step by step screening process.
 - i. Glenn – would refer to us the strongest candidates that they think are the best fits; they would first have confidential conversations with them; will

- give the candidate an opportunity to disclose things the committee should know.
 - ii. After vetting candidates, Glenn would encourage us to talk to superior candidates;
 - iii. When they get to the school committee, everything needs to be public, except for narrow exceptions; not limited to the number of times we talk to them. Could have first round or second round.
 - iv. Is there public participation?
 - 1. Totally up to committee;
 - v. MASC screening = 5 field directors + Glenn; sharing what they know about candidates;
- 3. Determination of Interview Process
 - a. VOTE: Greene Moves to work with MASC on the candidate search process and to use their candidate screening process, bringing forward no more than 5 candidates to School Committee. Terranova seconds
 - i. Liz notes that 5 candidates would not be expected;
 - ii. Greene notes that we should not expect 5, but be happy with 2;
 - iii. Miller notes opportunity to take public comments into effect in questioning;
 - iv. DiLego notes she has worked with them in the past, and is comfortable with using them
 - b. Art, Aye: Carter, aye; Conry, aye; DiLego, aye; Greene, aye; Miller, aye; Terranova, aye.
 - c. Next Question: length of time interviewing each candidate;
 - i. DiLego: 45 minutes – to an hour makes sense
 - ii. Glenn 60– 75 minutes is common; wouldn't shortchange self on time of interview times; don't want to feel rushed
 - iii. Green asks whether chat feature on Zoom useful in interview process;
 - 1. DiLego notes importance of consistent questions for all candidates
 - 2. Glenn says, public questioning might be done through a preliminary meet and greet; MASC has discouraged public questioning at the interview phase.
 - 3. Greene: Can we try to facilitate meetings of constituent groups with candidates; If we start with 5, may be harder, but if we have a second round of 2, then maybe in between; but how do we get feed back?
 - a. Observation, survey, recorded;
 - 4. Discussion of timing, with application deadline of 7/28 and interviews on the 30th and 31st and vote on the 31st.

5. Liz Lafond: if have a community meet and greet, have a committee member and staff member monitor;
 6. If have 2 strong candidates, do you bring them back with a second round, and
 7. Discussion of availability and timing for scheduling;
 8. Question of having a community forum or meet & greet virtually before the interview, in the afternoon, for 30-45 minutes
 - a. Terranova asks who's going to be there – committee or community members? Greene is offering to represent committee, Liz L. will try to attend too.
 9. If monthly SC meeting can be moved to 7/29, we can possibly have agenda item to announce finalists.
 10. Next Question: how to proceed with developing questions;
 - a. Miller: develop questions to be asked in public meeting;
 - b. Art cautions against having too many questions, to allow time for thoughtful questions and follow up;
 - c. Lafond: 7 could be too few;
 - d. Greene– maybe shoot for 10 questions from the committee;
 - e. Terranova asks about questioning based on resume content; Glenn Koocher – give members opportunity to any other questions as time allows;
 - f. Carter asks about how to collect and integrate community questions; we should solicit beyond being listed on the website; send out email with update on the superintendent search
 - i. Greene endorses idea of update email from Chair.
 - g. Art asks about reference checks – when that would happen?
 - i. Liz Lafond recommends HR person perform that function on 29th – 31st;
4. No other business not anticipated by the Chair within 48 hours of the meeting
 5. Motion to adjourn. Terranova moves to adjourn; Miller seconds. Art, Aye; Carter, aye; Conry, aye; DiLego, aye; Greene, aye; Miller, aye; Terranova, aye.

Approved 8.6.20

Meeting Adjourned at 4:57.