

**MINUTES OF A JOINT SPECIAL MEETING
OF THE BOARDS OF EDUCATION
LAKE FOREST COMMUNITY HIGH SCHOOL DISTRICT 115
CITY OF LAKE FOREST SCHOOL DISTRICT 67**

January 28, 2021

Governor Pritzker recently extended the disaster declaration related to the COVID-19 pandemic for all Illinois counties to February 7, 2021. Based on the current public health concerns, the Board Presidents of Lake Forest School District 67 and Lake Forest High School District 115 as heads of the public body, have determined that it is neither practical nor prudent to hold an in-person meeting of the Boards of Education on January 28, 2021. The Board Presidents have further determined that it is not feasible for the public to be present at the public body's regular meeting location due to the health concerns related to COVID-19. This Board meeting will be remote and comply with the procedures set forth in Public Act 101-640 that Governor Pritzker signed on January 8, 2021.

Call to Order and Roll Call

The special meeting of the Board of Education was held virtually and called to order at 5:33 p.m. by Mr. Lane.

Board members present at roll call were:

Dewey Winebrenner, Member	John Noble, Member
Ted Moorman, Secretary	Jenny Zinser, Member
Sally Davis, Vice President	David Lane, President

Absent: Tom Nemickas, Member

Administration Present:

Ms. Melissa Oakley, Chief Communications Officer
Mr. Jordan Salus, Chief Technology Officer

Also Present: Dr. Glenn "Max" McGee, Hazard, Young, Attea and Associates
Dr. Jane Westerhold, Hazard, Young, Attea and Associates
Dr. Ken Arndt, Hazard, Young, Attea and Associates
Mr. Justin Engelland, District 67 Board of Education President
Dr. Rob Lemke, District 67 Board of Education Vice President
Mrs. Alice LeVert, District 67 Board of Education Secretary
Mr. Carl Kirar, District 67 Board of Education Member
Mr. Richard Chun, District 67 Board of Education Member
Mrs. Suzanne Sands, District 67 Board of Education Member
Mr. Jeff Folker, District 67 Board of Education Member
Ms. Julia Polszakiewicz, Board Clerk

Guests: None

Mr. Engelland stated that the purpose of the Board meeting was a kick-off call with Hazard, Young, Attea and Associates (HYA) who would be leading the Districts through the superintendent search process.

Reports:

Superintendent Search Process Discussion with Hazard, Young, Attea and Associates Team

The Hazard Young, Attea and Associates (HYA) representatives introduced themselves and provided an overview of the meeting.

Dr. McGee discussed the appointment of a Board liaison during the search process to discuss questions, issues or concerns with the entire Board and to share the Board's response relative to the issue with HYA. The Boards concluded that Mrs. Sands and Ms. Zinser would serve as the Board liaisons for each District's Board of Education.

A staff contact person, Ms. Polszakiewicz, was also confirmed to assist with scheduling meetings, stakeholder focus groups and community forums, distributing notices and invitations, and providing critical public information documents to assist with the search. Ms. Oakley would coordinate with Ms. Polszakiewicz in those efforts.

As one of the initial steps, the HYA team would schedule hour-long one-on-one interviews with individual Board members in early February to gather input for the Leadership Profile Report compiled by HYA. Focus groups would also be scheduled. Once the meetings were completed, the Profile Report would be presented to the Boards at a Board meeting. The report would be used for screening candidates, interviewing, and the transition process.

Dr. McGee reviewed the confidentiality of the search process and stated that this would have an impact on the quality and depth of the candidate pool. Board members would be asked to sign a confidentiality agreement to ensure confidentiality up to and through the first round of interviews. The Board confirmed that its preference was to ensure confidentiality through the first round of interviews and openness with the community throughout the final interviews.

Dr. Arndt reviewed the planning process and discussed the focus groups. The Board would be asked to weigh in on who would be considered an important stakeholder and as such, participate in the focus groups. These could potentially include the Board and current superintendent, central office and school administrators, direct reports to the superintendent, support staff leadership, teacher leadership, union leaders, teachers and staff, students, elected officials, former Board members and community service providers, general open meetings for all who would be interested, other community groups, the Lake Forest High School Foundation and Spirit of 67 Foundation, the Association of Parents and Teachers (APT), Boosters, Producers-at-Large, Applause, Lake Bluff groups, or Lake Forest College.

All of the feedback gathered in these meetings would feed into the Leadership Profile Report. The Board discussed the inclusion of several other school and community groups and

organizations and asked questions regarding confidentiality with such a large pool of stakeholders, how to include as many community stakeholders as possible and what other schools should be included. HYA assured the Board that there would be a variety of ways for the community to share their thoughts to inform the Leadership Profile Report.

Dr. Arndt discussed that HYA had developed an online research-based survey that they would recommend the Districts consider for use in the search process to solicit input from any individual who desired to share their perspectives with the Board relative to the search. The survey, which would be detailed and easily accessed by cell phone, would permit input from a broad range of constituents on the desired characteristics to be considered in the selection of the next superintendent.

The information could be disaggregated into eight subgroups, which the Board would be asked to identify. If it was decided to use this survey, it should be placed on the District website and all stakeholders should be invited to complete it. Generally, the online survey and the focus group meetings had been very well received as an opportunity to share thoughts, a symbol of the openness of the search, and a tool for communicating that the search was underway. The results of the survey would be tabulated and included as part of the Leadership Profile Report. Information gathered from the survey would be useful in defining the characteristics desired in the next superintendent. The Board felt strongly about the inclusion of taxpayers with no children in the District in the disaggregate groups. Board members asked questions regarding whether Board members should fill out the survey in addition to their individual interviews, whether the data could be disaggregated by District and what the benefits of that would be, whether to have parents of District 67 and District 115 students in the same group, and what the data would be used for. Board, Administration, teachers, support staff, students, community members without children, parents of District students, and parents of children attending other schools. Mrs. Sands and Ms. Zinser would align and get back to HYA.

A Board Portal would be made available to the Board of Education members to use for convenient electronic access. The Board Portal would only be accessible to the Board, unless directed otherwise, and documents developed for the search would be added to that portal. Board members asked questions about confidentiality regarding materials shared through the portal.

Regarding candidates, HYA advised that most boards request them to present a slate of five to eight pre-scheduled candidates for interviews that generally ran about 90-120 minutes.

Regarding internal candidates, if a current employee of the District was to apply, the Board agreed that HYA should proceed by treating internal candidates in the same manner as any other candidate and that they be presented to the Board as a recommended applicant only if they were competitive with the other candidates. HYA's practice was to provide pre-screening interviews, whenever possible and feasible, to all qualified internal candidates unless the Board desired otherwise. Board members asked questions regarding an interim candidate who would not be hired as the final candidate.

The Board members discussed restrictive qualifications for candidates including academic requirements and prior superintendent experience. They concluded that the District wanted the opportunity to interview talented candidates and that requiring a doctorate would be limiting. Regarding prior superintendent or central office experience, the Boards concluded that they should be open to a variety of professional experiences to cast a wider net but that central office experience would be preferred. The Board was asked to let HYA know at some point in the future if they would be willing to pay for candidate expenses related to traveling into the community for the search process.

The position description would be posted on the HYA website soon. The Board chose to select the second advertisement package that HYA provided that would gather more of a national profile. Candidates would be asked to submit a cover letter stating why they were interested in Lake Forest and the position and to submit a resume and transcripts. In addition, the Boards asked HYA to ensure candidates would also submit a one page response to a prompt related to academic and social emotional needs of elementary, middle and high school students to ensure the candidates could communicate succinctly and write well.

Once a Leadership Profile Report was compiled, the Board would be asked about salary and fringe benefits. Candidates presented to the Board for consideration by HYA would indicate their current salary, current benefits, the size of their current district, and how many years experience they had. HYA recommended that the Boards look at the current superintendent compensation to determine what would be a starting salary level for a final candidate. In addition, the Board would be asked whether they would be willing to pay for reasonable relocation expenses. If that should be the case, HYA would recommend that moving and any other one-time expenses incurred by the Boards be placed in a letter of understanding rather than the candidate's contract, since they were one-time expenditures for a specific purpose and should not be referenced in future contract deliberations. Board members asked questions regarding building incentive compensation into the compensation model and at what point it would need to be incorporated into the search process.

The Board determined that in regard to residency expectations, they would not mandate the final candidate reside in the communities served by the Districts.

HYA explained that many districts liked to host open community forums for their final candidates. They typically would present on a prompt and welcome questions from the community at large. At that meeting, the community would be reminded that it would be a Board decision and not a poll. The Board discussed how to test a candidate's presentation abilities and oral communication skills, assessing community interactions as part of the decision-making process, topics including board alignment, COVID-19, facilities for the high school, and whether or not there would be any in-person opportunities to meet with the candidates.

HYA discussed the website and recommended that there should be information regarding the superintendent search on the front page of the Districts' website. The website should also contain an invitation to an open forum to provide input to the consultants, the online survey,

the Leadership Profile Report, the desired Characteristics, which would be determined by the Board, and the search calendar among other items.

The Board preferred that media and press requests be directed to Ms. Oakley and then channeled to the two Board Presidents as needed.

Regarding background checks, HYA highly recommended that a third-party extensive due diligence check be completed by Baker-Eubanks. That would take a seven day turnaround and include comprehensive searches including media and social media and would cost approximately \$2,000 dollars. The information would then be sent to the Board Presidents to review with redlined areas of concern. The Boards preferred that the background checks be conducted for the finalists as opposed to the one final candidate. Board members asked questions regarding candidate consent for background checks and District background check firms.

HYA and the Boards reviewed a tentative draft timeline for the search process, the first date was for the public launch of the survey tentatively scheduled for February 4. Board members asked questions regarding the duration of the survey, the timing around Spring Break and whether the Board would be available to participate in the search process during that time, the timing of the process with regard to the Board elections on April 6, how Board candidates would be involved, whether it was possible to shorten the survey window, and how the holidays would also affect the timing of the selection process. Dr. Westerhold and Dr. Arndt would confer with their staff and return with an amended calendar.

Public Participation:

Patrick Patt, a community member, stated that the Board was embarking on the most important job for schools and would follow up with an email after listening to the meeting.

Jim Patyrak, a community member, asked that in putting the search together, and for all of the qualifications that the Districts were looking for, why did the Districts have one joint superintendent? He felt that there should be two separate superintendents for two separate student groups. In listening to the qualifications for the combined post, the Districts would be limiting the pool of candidates and would also be less likely to look at internal candidates in the future unless the job was split into two superintendent positions. Two superintendents would also mean a difference in style rather than a single approach to both Districts.

Paul Goldstein, a LFHS statistics teacher, stated that it would be the only and most important hire that the Boards would make. He felt that, as a statistics teacher, if one person was hired and one person was doing two jobs, the survey data should be disaggregated by District. That would lead to two different profiles which could be compared for similarities or differences. The number of people in District 67 outweighs the number of people in District 115. Combined together, the profile would be heavily skewed toward District 67. If it was not divided by District, the final candidate would not know which hot button issue belonged to which District. He also felt that it would be strange for a final candidate not to have a doctorate degree given that many of their subordinates would have doctorate degrees.

Adjournment:

Motion: Mr. Winebrenner moved, seconded by Ms. Zinser that the Lake Forest Community High School District 115, Lake Forest, Illinois, adjourn the meeting.

Votes were taken by roll call. Votes were cast as follows:

Ayes: Noble, Davis, Winebrenner, Zinser, Lane, Moorman

Nays:

Absent: Nemickas

The motion carried unanimously.

The regular meeting adjourned at 8:31 p.m.

David Lane, President

Date

Ted Moorman, Secretary

Date