



**LEADERSHIP DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES
MONDAY, MARCH 4, 2019**

PRESENT	Rosemarie Kraeger	Rhode Island Commissioner	Chair
	Sarah Forster	Maine Commissioner	
	Greg Lynch	Washington Commissioner	
	Deanna McLaughlin	Tennessee Commissioner	
	Craig Neuenswander	Kansas Commissioner	
	Douglas Ragland	Alabama Commissioner	
	Cherise Imai	Executive Director	Secretary
	Lindsey Dablow	Training and Operations Associate	
	Richard Pryor	Communications Associate	
EXCUSED	Debra Jackson	New York Commissioner	
	Tony Trongone	New Jersey Commissioner	

ITEM 1 – CALL TO ORDER AND WELCOME

1. Chair Rosemarie Kraeger (RI) called the meeting to order at 1:00 PM ET. Roll call was conducted by Communications Associate, Richard Pryor. Chair Kraeger thanked all for attending the meeting.

ITEM 2 – AGENDA AND MINUTES

2. The agenda was motioned for approval by Commissioner Deanna McLaughlin (TN) and seconded by Commissioner Sarah Forster (ME). The motion passed unanimously. The meeting minutes from November 8, 2018 was motioned for approval by Commissioner McLaughlin and seconded by Chair Kraeger. The motion passed unanimously.

ITEM 3 – LDC INDEPENDENCE FROM THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE (EXCOM)

3. The LDC was formed due to a perception that the EXCOM made decisions on leadership of the Commission. The Committee is separate from the EXCOM and independent. If a question arose about the process, an individual could propose it to the Committee Chair. Although the LDC Chair is a member of the EXCOM, the Chair is the liaison to the EXCOM.
4. Due to this, Chair Kraeger asked all to commit to keep conversations discussed, and if members are called about the elections and process, that we state that this committee is independent of the EXCOM, and we are confidential on the process.
5. All members present verbally committed to this process and confidentiality of the Committee.

ITEM 4 – WHAT DO THE BYLAWS SAY ABOUT THE ELECTIONS?

6. Chair Kraeger reviewed the bylaws regarding the elections, succession, and the leadership positions of the Commission with the Committee.

ITEM 5 – ELECTION PROCESS AND WHAT HAS BEEN DONE TO DATE

7. Chair Kraeger reviewed the slide presentation on the Committee's key timelines, milestones, and historical leadership briefed at the 2018 Annual Business Meeting (ABM) by Commissioner and first chair of the Commission, Cheryl Serrano (CO) and Commissioner Craig Neuenswander (KS). Kraeger outlined the role and responsibilities of the Committee focused on: developing a more transparent process that is visible to all; a clarification of the elected positions which require additional time and commitment; the survey of interest and key timelines.

ITEM 6 – NOVEMBER 8, 2018 LDC MEETING DEBRIEF

8. Chair Kraeger attended the meeting and stated the Committee reviewed what worked well, what didn't, and targeted areas of focus for this year.
9. Commissioner Neuenswander commented that reviewing the history of the organization was important and helpful. He recalled Commissioner Serrano stating how elections were conducted when we first began vs. now is quite different.

What worked well?

- a. Explaining the history and elections process to attendees during the General Session. There were many new Commissioners and members that may not be aware of the history and why the LDC was created.
- b. Release of the presentation slide deck in the Docket Book for preview
- c. Providing the opportunity for the nominees to address the Commission during the General Session
- d. Providing the opportunity for members and candidates to interact during the reception and meals. Commissioner Laura Anastasio (CT) stated she connected and talked with a variety of members.
- e. The Committee was well-organized in getting the information out to the Commission.
- f. Members concerns could be aired and addressed
- g. The Committee's commitment to adhere to the Compact language, bringing people back to the purpose of the organization, and why the Committee was doing what they were doing
- h. Members were much more aware of the elections process this year versus previous years

What didn't work well?

- a. The survey of interest was disseminated close to when the nominations applications were released. Perhaps revisit the deadlines and release the survey of interest at the ABM.
- b. Revisit the application submittal process to ensure applicant submittals are consistent.
- c. Add a verification or confirmation of receipt of the nomination application when submitted to MIC3.

What needs to be revised or clarified in the next year?

- a. Develop a Frequently Asked Questions document.

- b. Establish parameters and rules on running for office and campaigning. Commissioner Rosemarie Kraeger (RI) reported several Commissioners said they did not appreciate receiving phone calls from a candidate.
- c. If the nomination is submitted by another member (instead of self-nomination), clarify the application to identify who the nomination is being made by.
- d. Determine if the LDC will recommend to the EXCOM to be a permanent committee or an ad hoc.
- e. Commissioner McLaughlin commented that it was important to be consistent, and when you are consistent there is little room for people to question what is being done. Chair Kraeger concurred that clear expectations are important.

ITEM 7 – NEW BUSINESS

10. **2019 Election Timeline and Deadline** – Chair Kraeger reviewed the timeline for this year. ED Imai stated the date for the release and deadline for the *Initial Survey of Interest* (May 1 and returned May 24). Commissioner McLaughlin questioned if the moving the deadlines up will allow for the Committee to develop the questions and release them in sufficient time. ED Imai stated a copy of last year's survey questions are included in the handouts for today's discussion and the Committee can modify the questions prior to release. Commissioner Forster referenced the *Initial Survey of Interest* which just has 4 questions. It was the *Nomination Application* of potential candidates in which questions arose. Commissioner Greg Lynch (WA) clarified the timeline is based on the release of the election information to the Commission, which is 15-30 days prior to the ABM.
11. Members agreed the 4 questions on the *Initial Survey of Interest* were sufficient.
12. ED Imai stated the Commissioners that expressed interest in the survey did submit a nomination application, with the exception of one Commissioner. She also clarified the Commission was sent the *Nomination Application* via Constant Contact, and a link to a document which outlined leadership positions and the estimated time commitment. Chair Kraeger referenced "MIC3 Executive Elections" document which was included in today's meeting handouts. Finally, ED Imai reviewed the updated questions which were reworded for clarity based on feedback provided by the Committee at their November meeting.
13. Commissioner McLaughlin questioned the use of "Commissioner" and "Designee" on the *Nomination Application*. ED Imai reported the two words, definitions and use of both by the Commission is under review by the EXCOM, and until they make a final determination on the this, just "Commissioner" is listed on the survey. Once this is determined, the survey can be modified so it is in-line with the Commission's terminology and use.
14. Commissioner Ragland questioned the 500-word count and if this was sufficient. ED Imai stated the prior word count was 300, and this was increased to provide the Nominees the opportunity to list their qualifications and/or explain their responses. She added that some Nominees used the entire word allotment, while others did not.
15. Commissioner Lynch commented that the process of allowing the Nominees to self-nominate and others to nominate individuals is confusing. He suggested Commissioners identify their interest in a leadership position in the Survey, then the Committee identifies an individual for the position. Commissioner Forster commented that sometimes there is a candidate that self-nominates, and another which receives multiple nominations – which resulted in a disproportionate amount of information on one candidate vs others. Commissioner Lynch said perhaps we are mixing

- processes, so identifying the candidates in the *Survey*, and sending them the nomination application to complete would provide a level process and simplify the screening for the Committee.
16. ED Imai reminded the Committee that our bylaws require floor nominations. Chair Kraeger advised that we clarify the application and process for this year. All agreed.
 17. **Developing an FAQ and Establishing Parameters/Rules on Campaigning** – Chair Kraeger said she would work with the National Office to develop a process, either via sub-committee or google docs, on how the Committee could best approach this.
 18. **Ad Hoc vs. Permanent Formal Standing Committee** – Commissioner McLaughlin said that as most of the Standing Committees report to the EXCOM, confidentiality of the LDC work could be an issue.
 19. Chair Kraeger said she did not see keeping the EXCOM updated on the process and tasks as a confidentiality breach, she did, however, see the process of the nominations and selection process as confidential. In her school district, regarding human resource hiring activities, the process and qualifications are made public, however the selection and interviewing of the individuals are confidential.
 20. She stressed the importance that all Committee members should be able to talk freely and put difficult topics on the table, and that trust among members was important to have so what is being discussed will not going to go outside of the Committee. Members concurred.
 21. **Items for the Executive Committee** – Chair Kraeger asked members for items to bring to the EXCOM's attention. This is a new item that is included in all Standing Committee agenda. Members did not have any items for the EXCOM.

ITEM 8 – ADJOURNMENT

22. Chair Kraeger thanked members for attending and committed to contacting Commissioners Debra Jackson (NY) and Tony Trongone (NJ) who were unable to join the call today.
23. With no further business to conduct, Commissioner McLaughlin moved to adjourn the meeting, seconded by Commissioner Forster. The motion passed unanimously. The meeting was adjourned at 1:56 PM ET.

Respectfully submitted by,
Cherise Imai
Secretary/Executive Director