A Human Resources Committee meeting was held on Tuesday, January 19, 2010, in the Board Room. Mr. Allen opened the meeting at 9:05 a.m. Committee members present were John C. Allen, IV, Jacques A. Conway, Terry Finnegan, Dr. Ralph H. Lee, Amy McCormack, Dr. Dietra D. Millard, and Sharon Patchak-Layman. Also present were: Dr. Attila J. Weninger, Superintendent; Jason Edgecombe, Assistant Superintendent for Human Resources; Nathaniel L. Rouse, Principal; Cheryl Witham, Chief Financial Officer; and Gail Kalmerton, Executive Assistant/Clerk of the Board.

Visitors: Kay Foran, Communications and Community Relations Coordinator and James Paul Hunter, FSEC Chair.

Approval of December 8, 2009 Human Resources Committee Meeting Minutes
It was the consensus of the Human Resources Committee members to accept the minutes of the December 8, 2009 Human Resources Committee meeting, as presented.

Administrative Search Committees Update
Mr. Edgecombe provided a written report on the status of the searches for the following positions:

- Director of Human Resources
- English Division Head
- Fine and Applied Arts Division Head
- Mathematics Division Head
- Special Education Division Head

Ms. Patchak-Layman questioned why the Director of Special Education Search Committee held another meeting to determine which candidates it would forward to DLT after the candidate forums had taken place and why Board of Education members were not notified of the forums so that they could have had the opportunity to meet the candidates. She had not seen forums a part of the process that the Board of Education had approved. Mr. Edgecombe explained the reason for the Committee meeting after the forum was that the forums were part of the first round interview process; any outstanding questions could then be addressed in the follow-up meeting. Dr. Weninger added that when the various steps were identified and approved by the Board of Education, it was made clear that there might be steps that the Division would take that would not be reflected in the document/process.
While the forums were open to the “public,” internal candidates did not participate in those for external candidates nor did internal candidates meet the external candidates.

**Superintendent Search Process Update**

Dr. Millard reviewed the timeline for the search.

**January**
- Conduct focus groups and complete survey

**February**
- Presentation of School Exec Connect’s executive summary of the results of the focus groups and survey on February 3.
- Collection and Vetting of applications.

**March**
- School Exec Connect will present their suggestions for 4 to 6 candidates in closed session
- A confidential interview team composed of 8 to 10 representative stakeholder groups will meet to interview the Board of Education’s final 3 candidates and will provide the Board of Education with their impressions.

**April**
- Announcement at the regular April 29 Board of Education meeting as to the new superintendent.

Dr. Millard explained how the new FOIA regulations could affect the search and noted that Dr. Hanson had worked effectively in other states with the same types of restrictions. In addition, OPRFHS had its own legal counsel offered an opinion on this matter. If the Board of Education members had any questions they were encouraged to speak with the attorney. Ms. McCormack noted that the Race to the Top information had built in some exceptions to the FOIA responsibilities for personnel matters related to evaluations and, thus, would support confidentiality.

Dr. Millard encouraged anyone with names of possible candidates or the names of those who might know possible candidates to give them to Dr. Hanson.

The confidential committee will be composed of people who are trust worthy, fair minded and with no specific agenda in mind. They will be asked to sign an affidavit of confidentiality. This will be a Board appointed committee. This committee will not meet during spring break.

The Committee will have the results of the focus groups and the survey and the Board of Education’s comments about what the District’s desires in a new superintendent to guide them in their assessment of the candidates.

It was decided that Dr. Hanson would be the media contact.

**Division Head Administrative Compensation Update**

This agenda item was deferred to the February HR Committee meeting.
Review of Proposed Nepotism Policy
Based on the conversations at the beginning of school year, the administration asked the school’s attorney to provide a draft nepotism policy, particularly as it related to supervisory positions. This policy would require that potential employees notify the District in writing if he/she had a familial relationship with an existing employee. Online applications require applicants to indicate whether they have a relative in the District.

Discussion ensued. Mr. Conway did not support this proposed policy. He felt the third paragraph was subjective and discriminatory and it was the result of a particular situation in the District. This is a small and intimate community and the District has been successful with family members of District employees working here. He could not support any policy that is discriminatory, as there is no basis for why the District is going to this level of hiring. Dr. Lee disagreed that this was a recent observation by the Board of Education, and he remembers this being the case 25 years ago, nothing has changed since then. He believed it was necessary to have this policy. Mr. Allen stated that this came to his attention when two positions were filled and it appeared that they were hired not because of superior qualifications, but because they were relatives. An institution supported by taxpayer must be above all scrutiny. Ms. Patchak-Layman noted that it was a matter of qualification of familiarity and how well the school is known. When someone has an understanding of the school via employment of a family member, it often gives him/her that edge. In New Jersey, no relative of the superintendent or a Board of Education member can be employed by the District. Legal cases have occurred in situations where a teacher is a relative of a Board of Education member relative to collective bargaining and/or negotiations. While the policy does not reflect that situation, Ms. McCormack felt it would be a clear conflict of interest. Dr. Weninger was asked to check with the District attorney about relatives involved with collective bargaining. Dr. Millard was conflicted because in her working world where there is a case of a family member supervisory another family member, agreements are made to have someone else do the evaluation. While she agreed with Mr. Conway, she did understand the need. Ms. McCormack agreed as well about having a policy for supervisory issues.

Mr. Hunter felt the policy was overarching. He asked why there was a need to cover all aspects of potential nepotism, with the exception of supervisory. Mr. Allen did not agree that it was overarching.

Dr. Lee questioned the openness of the hiring process when student teachers are hired as teachers.

The following changes will be made, advice will be sought from the attorney, and the policy will go forward to the PEG Committee on Thursday, January 21, 2010.

Delete paragraph 3.
Page 1, Para 7, 4 line: after the word shall, add “,” and delete the words “publicly and”
Page 1, Para 7, 5 line: Add “,” after the word “designee)"
Page 2, Para 3: Seek advice from counsel relative to incorporate “in-laws” into the policy.
Educational Technology Restructuring Proposal
As an informational item, Mr. Carioscio provided Committee with a proposal to restructure the Educational Technology Department. The proposal was based on an evaluation of the current structure and consisted of:

1) Do not fill the open position of Infrastructure Systems Group manager;
2) Outsource the technical management of the website to the entity that will redesign it; and
3) Hire a data systems analyst, a person to assess the OPRFHS system, Skyward, move the District toward a self service model and take over Mr. Lanenga’s position.

This proposal would be cost neutral to the District as the current salary budget that this proposal would replace is $154,000. While an updated organizational chart will be provided to the Board of Education, Mr. Carioscio reviewed the one attached. He outlined the job responsibilities of the positions noted. Ms. Patchak-Layman asked if the statistician job responsibilities would be lost. She also asked if Ms. Hill would assume those responsibilities. She also asked what the initiatives were and who was carrying them forward. Mr. Carioscio responded that the statistician would work with Ms. Hill, as the primary user, but he/she would be the facilitator who would provide the tools that would allow individuals to do the data mining themselves. Ms. Patchak-Layman noted that she has not seen the depths of reports since Dr. Spight left. Is that depth of information not what the school needs or will the District be able to duplicate that information with this person and staff. Mr. Carioscio stated that the reports that are regularly required will be available to those who are designed to have the information. This person will also help with ad hoc reporting and questions about the data. Mr. Carioscio stated that this person would have the expertise and time available to get the information that is wanted in a timely manner. The salary noted of $90,000 was the base and did not include benefits.

Employee Assistant Program Utilization Report
Mr. Edgecombe provided the Annual Utilization Report dated November 1, 2008 through October 31, 2009 created by Workplace Solutions, the District’s employee assistance provider. There was not much of a change from previous years and less than what other companies use. Any referrals are anonymous unless made by the administrator. Workplace Solutions provide for an initial intake and then short-term counseling (6 to 9 sessions). Additional counseling would be referred to someone else. Mr. Finnegan asked how effective was this service and how can the District make it as useful as possible. Mr. Edgecombe responded that the District distributes a monthly newsletter to all employees and once a semester a lunchtime table session is made available. Mr. Edgecombe noted that this service had been renewed last month and new benefits had been added, e.g., a work life piece and finance piece, etc.

Adjournment
The Human Resources Committee adjourned at 10:51 a.m.