

03 15 2016 Special Work Session 10 00 AM

For ADA assistance, contact the Office of Equity and Compliance, 534-0781, at least 3 business days before the meeting.

A. New Business

1. [Superintendent Search](#)

Attachment: [Timeline DRAFT #1 \(Polk\).pdf](#)

Attachment: [Planning Meeting Worksheet - 2016.pdf](#)

Minutes:

Dr. Bill Vogel and Mr. John Reichert of the Florida School Boards Association (FSBA) discussed the plans to begin the search for a new Superintendent.

Mr. Reichert began by presenting a time line for the Superintendent Search. The worksheet is divided into four phases.

Phase I

- Develop the Initial Search timeline (which begins with today's meeting).
- Set the desired salary range
- Determine the length of the contract to be offered.
- Determine the dates for Board interviews with Finalists.
- Determine the application process including the contents of the application "packet".
- Discuss the contents to be offered on the online "portal".
- Set the dates and locations for the community, employee, and public input meetings.

Phase II

- Review all of the policies related to the Superintendent hiring and evaluation and propose any desired changes.
- Review and modify (if needed) the existing job description for the Superintendent position.

- Finalize and approve the content of the promotional materials for the search.
- Determine and approve advertisement language, locations, duration and budget.
- Determine the structure and format for employee and public stakeholder input as well as the method to collect this information and disseminate to the Board Members.

Phase III

- Determine background check requirements and screening process.
- Determine the desired number of finalists and the interview process for the Board.
- Determine if there will be visitation to finalist home districts, and if so, by whom.
- Determine the method for final selection.

Phase IV

- Determine the contract negotiation process.
- Discuss the transition plan and the 1st day/week activities.
- Set Governance Team Protocols workshop.

On April 12 the team will return for additional work and to finalize Phases I and II at the work session.

Proposed dates and locations for community input meetings are:

- April 28, 2016-- Lake Eva Banquet Hall, Haines City
- May 5, 2016--Jim Miles Professional Development Center, Highland City
- May 12, 2016-- Harrison School of the Arts, Lakeland
- May 19, 2016--Polk State College in Winter Haven or Polk County School District Auditorium, Bartow
- An alternative location of Bartow Civic Center was discussed as well.

Meetings to be held with the general public will begin at 6:00 pm and the meeting exclusively for employees will be held at 5:30 pm. On June 28, the Board will meet to discuss and finalize the qualifications, qualities and characteristics.

Based on the Board Members preference, the team discussed a community advisory committee to potentially screen the applicants to some degree. The team suggested:

- Three community advisory committee meetings.
 - First meeting held prior to the close of the advertisement, to allow legal counsel the opportunity to update everyone regarding Sunshine requirements.
 - Second meeting to set the responsibilities and specific job of the committee (these will be set by the Board).
 - Third meeting to identify the appropriate number of candidates for recommendation to the Board.
- Participants that might be advantageous to the process are Parent Teacher Association (PTA) representatives, Administrator representatives, union member representatives, and Chamber of Commerce representatives. Each of these representatives would be charged with contacting like agencies in the locale that the

Candidates are currently employed in an effort to gauge public opinion on their work.

The Board is not limited to select only those candidates the advisory committee submits.

After the Board receives the list of semi-finalists, the committee's work is done. The Board would meet to vet those candidates and background work will be done as the applications are received by FSBA to perform due diligence.

- July 18--finalization of advertisement materials.
- September 27--Board Members meet to determine the semi-finalists.
- October 11-- a Special School Board Meeting to select finalists to be interviewed.
- November 9-11-- dates to identify onsite interviews.
- November 15--Board Meeting to select the new Superintendent contract development begins after that.

Mr. Berryman asked (regarding the survey) what steps have been taken to identify the respondent as business or community stakeholders, educators or administrators as a means to determine what the public is thinking. Dr. Vogel said there will be different categories to rate individual responses and this survey would be hosted on the School District Website, www.polk-fl.net.

Mr. Mullenax asked if the survey will be generic or will it be respondent category specific. Dr. Vogel explained that the survey is being developed based on tools that were used previously with additional Strategic Plan correlations to determine six priority areas.

Mrs. Cunningham discussed the previous protocol used for candidate exposure during the Superintendent selection process. There were three individual dates because there were three finalists and each day was dedicated to a candidate. Each day was coordinated in a way that all of the Board Members had an opportunity to spend time with the candidates individually either over a meal or on a drive to some of the schools in their District.

Mr. Reichert explained the concept behind the format that is being proposed by FSBA. He gave an example of three semifinalists and the rotation that would occur with one in a full Board interview, one on school tours, and one on community tours.

Mr. Harris explained the Board Members previously were afforded the opportunity to spend a private hour with each candidate.

Mrs. Cunningham commented previously the finalists were exposed to community forums and although there is a similar approach addressed in today's proposal, there should still be the opportunity to allow the finalists one last opportunity to be presented to the public. She would like the finalists to be presented individually, one per day, at the end of the day (for instance) on November 9, 10, and 11.

Mr. Harris stated the Board Members are comfortable with the previous format, however, more community input should be added at the front end of the process.

Mrs. Fields stated she is trying to get a sense of direction from the Board as to whether or not their preference is to use the same format for the Superintendent Search as was used

previously, but with the addition of the Community Advisory Committee.

Mr. Wilson was not a part of the Board when the last Superintendent Search was formatted or pursued. He stated he would like one community meeting to exclusively for School District employees. Mrs. Fields explained that there was an element like this during the last search. She added the Board Members were discouraged from attending those meetings in an effort to allow employees to interact freely with the candidates.

Mr. Berryman suggested the previous format and currently proposed format be compared side by side.

Dr. Vogel reviewed his notes up to this point as to Board Member preferences for finalist meetings:

1. Full Board Interview
2. Time for each Board Member to meet individually with each candidate.
3. Community Receptions
4. Applicant exposure to individual community groups

Community input examples were: community forums; online survey (divided into specialty); community advisory committee; community reception; and a reception for employees.

Mr. Harris commented the following is an example of the format previously used:

- first formal interview
- meet and greet with the public
- Board Members took the individuals on school tours
- community reception followed by the second interview

Mr. Harris also commented the employee meeting should be scheduled prior to the end of the school year to avoid losing participants that leave the area due to summer vacations, etc.

Mrs. Sellers commented under the previous format the pool of finalists was narrowed down after the first formal interview.

Mr. Berryman commented on the ability to meet with the candidates over dinner and that gave the Board Members an opportunity to interact.

Mrs. Fields commented the previous Executive Assistant to the Board took fantastic notes and a thorough book of information regarding all of the activities.

Mr. Berryman asked if the Community Advisory Committee will be tasked with the entire bundle of applications or will FSBA vet out individuals .

Mr. Reichert recommended that all applications be received electronically. Additionally there will be a compressed version of each candidate's application and history which is essentially a summary accompanied by a resume, cover letter, references, and college transcripts. These in turn could be compiled and sent to Board Members on a weekly

basis.

Contract specifics

Dr. Vogel opened the discussion with the topic of desired salary range for the Superintendent position. When the position was advertised the last time, the range was \$210,000-\$260,000, with an additional benefits package. An analysis of current Superintendents has revealed this range is still adequate. The Board was of a consensus that this salary range was appropriate for advertisement.

Dr. Vogel stated typical contracts are offered for a three year period with specific payout language negotiable. He also discussed the qualifications that would be required. He added that using a broad interpretation of the qualifications encourages non-traditional applicants. Mrs. Fields commented that is why the Board formatted the qualifications that way. One of the areas Dr. Vogel touched on was the school district population of 25,000. He asked if the Board would like to make that a requirement or a preference. Mr. Berryman asked if the FSBA team would share their thoughts on this area. Dr. Vogel responded the 25,000 should be preferred to afford more flexibility.

Mrs. Cunningham stated there is a great deal of knowledge that a Superintendent must possess in a district this size and a minimum population should be set and adhered to. She also commented this was not the case last time which caused issues with candidates that were unable to fathom a district the size of Polk County. Dr. Vogel said the Community Advisory Committee will remove any candidates that do not meet the minimum qualifications from the applicant pool.

Mr. Harris commented these are the very questions the public has stated they would like input on. The community would like to participate in setting the qualifications of the next Superintendent and the community meetings would be an opportunity to do that.

Mr. Mullenax commented it was his understanding the population size of 25,000 was set previously to try to draw from the potential applicants that were Board appointed instead of elected Superintendents. Elected Superintendents typically have smaller districts and the margin of conflict among constituencies can cause additional issues.

Mr. Wilson stated he would like the Board to consider offering a one year contract instead of three years. He stated the majority of the School District employees are on annual contracts and he thinks extending anything more sends a bad message to the employees that they are not as valuable.

Wes Bridges, Counsel for the Board, commented three year contracts are the standard.

Mr. Harris commented on moving expenses in regard to one year contracts. He also commented on the provisions that have been passed by the Florida legislature regarding termination.

Mrs. Sellers is against a one year contract because there would be no "buy out" option and she does not think that would be appealing to applicants.

Dr. Vogel discussed some of the hazards associated with offering a contract that is less

than three years. He explained suitable candidates that are willing to make a commitment often involves buying and selling homes, etc.

Mr. Harris asked when the applicant documentation becomes public record. Mr. Bridges commented that regardless of where the applications and other documents are received, either in School District offices or elsewhere, if FSBA is acting as the School Board's Agent, the information is immediately public record with the exception of Social Security numbers and other guarded private information.

The FSBA team recommended that applications be submitted through the School Board Attorney's office. Mr. Bridges has agreed to accept delivery. That ensures the Sunshine Law is adhered to and the information is housed in the School District from beginning to end.

Mrs. Fields commented during the previous Superintendent Search, applications were received in the School Board Members' Office. She is concerned with the work volume that already exists in the attorney's office and feels this is too much to add to their plate. She also commented on potential conflicts that may arise if someone close to Mr. Bridges decided to apply for the position. Dr. Vogel agreed the receipt of the applications is an extensive process and includes redaction of private information.

Mr. Berryman commented he would like the applications and phone calls regarding the position to be received at the FSBA office.

Mrs. Cunningham stated that due to the sensitive nature of the information that may be provided in applications and associated documents, she would like the attorney's office or the FSBA office to be the recipient, not the School Board office.

Mrs. Fields commented her opinion is the appropriate recipient of the applications is the School Board office because too much work is being farmed out to other areas.

It was suggested that a single recipient on the FSBA team be the point of contact to receive the applications. Mr. Reichert agreed to be the lone recipient of the applications and will forward the information to the board weekly. Mrs. Fields asked the FSBA team if this service is included in the consultation fee, if so, she agrees to this option. Mr. Berryman agrees this would be the best option.

Mr. Reichert discussed the details of a typical Community Advisory Committee. Normally there are 8-10 organizations that are invited to provide 1 or 2 representatives to participate. Mr. Wilson asked what the typical size of a committee is. Mr. Reichert responded 25 is a standard number. Mr. Harris commented the committee should be composed of seven organizational representatives plus 2 appointees per Board Member. Mrs. Cunningham does not agree that organizational participation should be limited to seven. She commented 2 appointees per Board Member is acceptable. Mr. Wilson asked if the appointees must be from within each Board Members district. That is the consensus of the Board Members

Dr. Vogel referred the Board Members to the sample survey questionnaire. Based on Mr. Harris's earlier comments, the FSBA team understands the Board would like to see some additional options to allow the community to define and discuss qualifications of an

acceptable candidate. He asked the Board Members to take some time to evaluate the draft he has provided and strike through or add areas they would like to be given priority. He also stated the Board should look at the Strategic Plan as their guiding document because questions should come directly from that document.

Mr. Harris asked for the addition of an identifying area to the survey to determine what area of interest the respondents represent. He also asked if the online survey could be tabulated so that was one less item being tended to by staff members. Dr. Vogel commented that it will tabulate and reflect prioritization.

Mr. Mullenax commented that no candidate is going to meet all of the qualifications 100%. because different individuals have different priorities.

Dr. Vogel will be working with Leah Lauderdale, Director of Public Relations and Strategic Partnerships, to bring some drafts of brochures to the Board for consideration.

Mr. Reichert asked the Board to provide the policy that outlines the job description for the Superintendent. The Board consensus was that there is none. Mrs. Fields commented the Board has always referred back to the State Statute for those outlined responsibilities and the Board has never created one for its own use.

Mr. Bridges commented this is the first Superintendent search since the Board adopted the new policy manual with North East Ohio Learning Association (NEOLA) templates. With that being the case, he also stated the Board needs to create a job description or definitively state they are not going to create one.

Mrs. Fields asked if the survey link will be on the Polk County School District website (www.polk-fl.net). It will.

Mr. Harris asked the team what they recommend as action to notify everyone in the community of the accessibility to these opportunities as soon as possible.

Mr. Reichert discussed the various types of advertisement:

- Distribution Lists in email (elected officials, chambers of commerce)
- Website marquee
- School Newsletters
- Press Releases
- Social Media
- Call out to Parents

Mr. Mullenax asked Mr. Bridges about the restrictions of "robocalls". Wes Bridges commented robocalls are only allowable for emergency situations otherwise there can be substantial repercussions.

Dr. Vogel commented that the FSBA team is accessible to answer any questions at any time.

Mr. Berryman would like FSBA to research or develop some personnel testing that could be administered to the finalists.

B. Board Agenda Review

C. Information

D. Discussion

E. Adjournment

Meeting adjourned at 11:35 am. Minutes were approved and attested this day of 26th April, 2016.

Kay Fields, Board Chair

Jacqueline M. Byrd, Superintendent