

Saturday, October 17, 2020 at 9:30AM (Rough Transcript)

CHAIR: Good morning, everybody, I'm going to call the subcommittee meeting for the Executive Director -- we have an agenda today, and we're going to start with the call to order and move on to roll call and then adoption of the agenda, and public comments and then move on to new business, that consists of appointment of permanent Chair committee. And then move on to hiring methods with a discussion on limited bias and the ranking of applications and a discussion on how many applicants to bring forward to the interview phase, and then start reviewing the applications around 11:30AM. With that said, the agenda will be posted on the secretary state website, and this is being live streamed through YouTube and Facebook, and I believe there is language interpreter as well. And now that the meeting is called to order they will take the role. We'll start with alphabetical order. Anthony Eid, Dustin Witjes, Rhonda Lange. And all 3 members of the subcommittee are present. I will now entertain a motion to adopt the agenda.

>> I'll second.

>> Do you want to -- you.

>> You have to motion.

>> So moved.

>> Do we have a second.

>> Second.

>> All in favor say aye.

>> Aye.

>> Wonderful the agenda is adopted. We'll now move on to public comments. We have one -- all right, do we have any written public comments sent to us, wonderful. Let's move on to new business. Our first order of business is to appoint a Chairperson. I'm currently acting Chair. Are there any nominations for a Chairperson?

>> Any nominations.

>> I nominate you to stay the Chair.

>> I accept the nomination, are there any other nominations.

>> Okay, thank you for the nomination Ms. Language, all in favor of Anthony Eid as Chair say aye.

>> Aye.

>> All right, I will continue on to the meat of the meeting here today. Hiring methods and procedures, I would like to start with a discussion on limiting bias. I noticed that a couple of weeks ago we did have a public comment. That asked us how we plan to deal with limiting hour bias when it comes to the hiring of our various roles, and I think this is an important discussion to have between the 3 of us. I've done a lot of work both in economics and in business in the effect that bias has on all of us has individuals and it can make a very big deal with hiring. So it's important to stay cognizant of what those biases might be and account for those with best practices in the Executive Director search. This is also imperative to build public trust with the people of the state of Michigan. So I would like to take this time now to ask the members of the subcommittee, if anyone has any ideas on how we shall limit bias during this process. I will say a good starting point that we already made, the 3 members of the committee, the subcommittee are all affiliated with different political parties. Mr. White is identified as a democrat, Ms. Lange as republican and.

>> Are there any other thoughts?

>> We just ask what their political affiliation would be.

>> That's something we could try to do.

>> I didn't hear that.

>> So would we just ask them what their political affiliation would be.

Saturday, October 17, 2020 at 9:30AM (Rough Transcript)

>> Some did, and some didn't, I prefer they don't. That's the best way to make it so there isn't bias. They already submitted them, but I don't want to look at their political affiliation when going through them and I tried not to.

>> Same, I would agree with that.

>> I do not think this subcommittee is going to take into account the applicants political party when making this decision. I think that the main thing we're going to focus on is each applicant's qualification and serve as the executive director to the best of their abilities. I think there are also other things that we might want to consider looking at, for example, we might bias each other. Especially if we're going through all the applications at the same time. We might get into sort of like a groupthink effect where let's say somebody really likes a certain application, and someone else might instantly agree with them, without taking the time to form their own opinion on that said application. Like how they would if they were to independently review them on their own first. Another thing we might consider, a lot of studies show that even a name being attached to an application can have a significant bias depending on whoever is reading the application. Names can tell you a lot about a person. For example, my name is Anthony Eid, most people know that Eid is a Muslim holiday, how far I am catholic. So that has the potential to create a bias. Something we might want to consider doing to eliminate that bias is removing the names of the applicant from their application. So I was wondering how everyone would feel about that.

>> That does make a lot of sense. I'm a fan.

>> If I'm being honest, I reviewed all the applications last night, so removing the names, I already saw all the names and I picked out 13 qualification wise that would be a good fit, and this was before I received your agenda, so I have just -- in all honesty I have reviewed all the names, so removing them now...

>> Full disclosure is good and I think it's important to note just as human nature we're never going to completely eliminate bias. But having the discussions predisposes you to think more about the issue, and if you are cognizant of bias you are more likely to reduce the bias. And so I did go through the applications last night for myself, and I removed the names from the applications so that when I do look over them, I will not know who it is while reviewing the qualifications.

>> Dustin, if you like you could do that too, or stick with the names on there, it's whatever you want to do.

>> Can I say also: Some of them do have pictures on the resumes also.

>> Yeah, I saw that.

>> When I was going through I removed those as well.

>> I didn't even get that far. So I looked online under email addresses to see how they were sorted and that's about it.

>> Okay, okay.

>> Well... good. Okay. So I'm satisfied with this discussion. Are there any other comments eliminating bias? Okay, let's now talk about how we're going to rank the applications. Rhonda you said you have 13 you already gone through and went to the table. Can you talk about the decision-making process?

>> The ones that stuck out to me. Experience, and there is such a broad range of things we want them to do. So I looked at those with financial and managerial experience, and how long they held their positions for each job they had. Because sometimes that can tell you a little bit too. And I did a lot of reading of their letters that they sent on why they're interested. Because that plays a big role too. So it was a wide array of things. But mostly it was experience, current jobs, how many have current jobs who doesn't, you know, would there

Saturday, October 17, 2020 at 9:30AM (Rough Transcript)

be a conflict as far as if somebody worked a full time job, you know, say like the meeting was going to be online, and now in person, would that be a conflict there. A whole wide array of things to tell you the truth.

>> Wonderful. Thank you for that. I honestly think that's the way we go about it. Look at each application with open eyes and look at qualifications and experiences and any conflict of interest that may arise and pick out the select group of people to bring forward.

>> Just looking at how the department of state has done it based off of how many years of service in either the public sector or managing staff. That's about as far as I've gone. I would look at the same kind of things. What kind of jobs they've had and experiences of the position of employment they had. And then use personal judgment basically at this point in time to see if there are any conflicts.

>> Wonderful. Thank you for the comments. So what I'm hearing from the subcommittee so far as we have looked at the qualifications of the applicants it's been more of a subjective approach. I wonder if we should put in a more concrete objective approach in place. Sorry. One second, my computer wants to restart, I do not want it to do that.

>> Commissioner Eid what you are doing that.

>> Just a reminder, to speak loudly the room muffles your voice as it travels over here.

>> Okay, we're good. Windows, everyone. So as I was saying, I'm wondering if we would like to take a more objective approach for the people of our state to see. A way we could do that that has worked for me is assigning a number rank to each applicant, we can do, for example, just 0 through 10 for example. And if we each do that Rhonda, if you want to assign the 13 people you found already, and we do the same for each applicant, I'm thinking, we can then add up the numbers, and that would kind of be our rank of which applicants we should bring forward. What I'm going to be doing personally. I'm going to be ranking them on 3 different criteria. Each of the applications they have a resume and personal statement and supplemental questions. What I propose is rank each of those 3 and add up the numbers and then if we all agree to do it like this, we can combine the numbers to generate an objective list of the people that we as a subcommittee think are best for this position. I'm wondering what everyone thinks about that. I like it, it makes a lot of sense, that's how we did it at eastern when I helped interviewer advisers and we did the same method and it seemed to work.

>> Do you have any thoughts Ms. Lange.

>> I can do whatever.

>> I used to be an RA actually. You were a community director.

>> That's wonderful. Okay, so let's do it like that then. So how about... I already came with an excel document of all 40 completed applications. We did have 47 applications total. Do we think I should include those 7 that were incomplete in the list of 40.

>> I don't feel there was enough information. There wasn't enough information to make an informed decision on them.

>> I agree.

>> I also agree. I looked over the 7. It wasn't that they were inexperienced. They weren't complete and didn't ask the requisite questions we asked. Okay, so we want to do it like that. I'll email all of you the spreadsheet now and go over doing the applications.

>> Anthony I don't have my laptop here today. So that won't work for me.

>> Good old fashioned printer.

>> We can print something, yeah.

>> Okay, we can do it like that.

>> Anthony if you send it to me, I'll get it printed.

Saturday, October 17, 2020 at 9:30AM (Rough Transcript)

>> Wonderful.

>> Dustin, are you able to use excel.

>> Yeah.

>> Wonderful.

>> The three I found, resume, personal statement, and the supplement questions asked on the application.

>> Am I able to download the document, because of the restrictions.

>> Commissioner Eid how about you email me.

>> Let's do that.

>> Yeah.

>> Okay, that is sent, while we're getting that situated. We can move on to the next part of the agenda, discussing how many applications we want to recommend to the main commission to bring forward to the interview phase. We have 40 completed applicants. Obviously we can not interview all 40 people. So are there any thoughts about how many of the highest ranking applicants to bring forward for an interview.

>> I would say no more than 5. Because we need the time to do it and to make a decision, and if you get too many people interviewed, it might get a little confusing. So I say 5 would be a good number.

>> Okay, so we have 5.

>> I was going to say 5 to 10.

>> Yeah, I was going to say -- pretty much the same boat, I was going to say 5 to 7. If we do 5, that's 5% of applicants if my math is correct. No more than that it's 8%. I'm thinking 5 to 7. So we have 5 to 10, and 5 to 7. I agree that we definitely do need as much time as possible, and we also need to make sure we're getting the right applicant. So I'm wondering if there is a compromise between the 5 and 5 to 10 and 5 to 7. Any thoughts.

>> Well, go ahead.

>> -- sorry, I have a thought once you all talk.

>> I was going to say, I thought we were -- all of the applicants that applied they will be somewhat discussed with the commission. Because all the information will be made available to them anyway. So these will be suggestions to the commission as a whole on what we would recommend. But they could theoretically still want to interview people potentially we did not take into account. Yeah, it's definitely true, this would be the recommendation on the commission on how many people we should interview, and I would hope once the main commission sees the objective approach we're taking, I hope they would be happy with that and appreciate our recommendation, but they could.

>> I was going to make the same point that, you know, the finality of any discussions they all make, recommendations you make, this sort of implications of the relationship between this advisory committee and the full commission. So I would recommend, you know, maybe having a ballpark in mind, but not trying to limit yourself right now to any one particular number and then having a discussion and ultimately, you know, a recommendation to the full group, so that is what I recommend. Okay. Thank you for that recommendation. So we'll discuss that point further with the main commission. But I think we all have a tentative agreement. It should be around 5 to 7 to 10 in that ballpark somewhere and we'll see what the rest of the commission thinks about that once we have the rankings in place. So the next item of agenda is to go through and review the applications. And so I guess we should probably wait until everyone has the spreadsheet and can enter in the rankings. As soon as we get that up and going, we will proceed. I will motion for a 5 minute recess in order to get those documents in our hands.

Saturday, October 17, 2020 at 9:30AM (Rough Transcript)

>> So moved.

>> Is there a second?

>> I wasn't sure if you did.

>> I said so moved.

>> Second.

>> All in favor of 5 minute recess to get the documents in place for us to review the applications please say aye.

>> Aye.

>> Aye.

>> Okay, we will be back at 10:05.

[5 minute recess]

>> We're talking to the translators, they requested when you speak, they ask you say who is speaking and be cautious to not talk over each other, so they're able to translate as you are speaking, sound good?

>> Okay, take it away Chair.

>> Are we live?

>> I would like to reconvene this subcommittee meeting for the executive director search of the independent citizen commission. All 3 of the subcommittee members are present. We now have our rank list and we are going to go through the applications and rank them and then reconvene, as I said before, I personally would like to do this individually before we come back and talk about any applications that we see fit. Is that good with everybody?

>> Fine by me.

>> Are we openly going through each one? [Off mike]

-- I guess I just want to know what exactly we're doing.

CHAIR: Right. I would like a chance to go through them before we openly discuss them.

COMMISSIONER WITJES: Point of clarification when you say go through them first, you would mean sitting in silence, while you read them? Because going through them is the discussion that -- is that what you mean, and that would happen...

CHAIR: Yes, that is what I mean.

COMMISSIONER WITJES: That's what you are proposing.

CHAIR: We rank them and generate a list of the most preferred applicants.

COMMISSIONER WITJES: Thanks for the clarifications to Rhonda's question: Yes, there is -- just hearing her question, I'm just wondering, if you rank them all, if you were all were to agree, noting the preferences and requirements that had been identified by the commission in the prior meeting, and noting the relative -- it's not ranking at all, it's just classification if they meet a requirement, and they meet the identified preferences of the commission, what I think I hear Rhonda escaping: Is it necessary to review all 47 or start with those that actually meet the requirements versus those that meet the preferences. Out of the 47 total that we received. 40 of them met the requirements and preferences and we go through the 40.

>> Through the 40.

COMMISSIONER WITJES: If you for clarification.

CHAIR: That is a good question though Rhonda, I don't know if we would like to -- we just got the applications yesterday. And it will take some time to go through them. You said it took you about 4 hours. I read each one, and some of them, like I said, are lengthy, it took me about 4 hours to go through each application last night, and that was looking for the major, some of them I didn't, with the fine tooth comb, and I skimmed through a little bit quicker, I saw something, like, this might not jive, but I went on to the next one, but it was 4 hours. That's why I'm asking, because we are time allotted. Be mindful of the advisory

Saturday, October 17, 2020 at 9:30AM (Rough Transcript)

committee, if it's providing support to the commission, it's simply advising, it received all 47. So as much from the public as much as anything else. There is 2 hours now, to the degree the committee is able to provide advice or council and 3 hours after that. And not going to be another meeting for 2 or 3 weeks. 3 weeks. And then at that time, the schedule proposed would be to then interview another executive director. So just being mindful to think about it, what is the best use of the 2 hours to actually be able to have this advisory committee provide any kind of advice. Rhonda, do you have a proposal on the once to start with.

>> Like I said, I picked 13. If you haven't reviewed them, obviously, I would like you guys to have been able to go through all of them also. In my mind, that's what I thought we would be doing, when they emailed them to us, and we picked the ones that had potential. And I wasn't sure, that's why I reviewed each one last night. And I didn't know, like I said, I wasn't sure -- if we had the same ones on each of the lists, or how we were going to do it. I just wasn't sure. Whatever you want. Just short on time. Yes, I'm going to quickly follow-up on that. This is Anthony Eid speaking now. We're all new at this. So I think, I personally didn't know if we were allowed to review them individually before coming to the meeting because my understanding was that has to be done during a public meeting. I might be wrong about that. But maybe some clarification if we can do that.

>> The clarification is that the rules in the commission's rules as they come from the state constitution and also from the open meeting act speak to decisions and deliberations, by definition in the documents, have to involve other members of the commission. And so that's the issue. Because they were sent in advance, they can only be -- like if you weren't allowed to review them in advance, we wouldn't send them in advance, so for confusion on that front, everybody is learning for the first time, this is a brand new commission, no harm no foul, all part of the learning curve. And it's moving forward to the review of documents. What would not be, if this doesn't happen to be clear to the public, at least what I'm aware of. When staff sent them to you 3 yesterday or the whole commission, if people had been called, and got on the phone last night and said, hey, I'm so impressed with these 3 candidates and that's really great and they said, what about this and that, that discussion is what the public has a right to see, your review I imagine is probably not really interesting. The public doesn't need to see you read the document, but the discussion and the problems and all that that come to mind. Because the discussion is the business of the public and commission and committee.

>> Ms. Marsh.

>> In light of that, a couple of ideas to put on the table for all of you for consideration is that you could start with -- the applications were sent to you in a sorted way, and you could start with the least experienced or most experienced people, and you could kind of work from there and as Rhonda said, maybe the discussion of some particular applicants would be pretty fast, or maybe the ranking of those individuals would be pretty fast, where the real meat of the conversation might be around as Rhonda example 13 or so from a couple different buckets to strategically spend your time starting with the most experienced or maybe lesser experienced folks.

>> That's where I was going to start, those with 10 plus years of managing experience and work from there. So... okay, well I'll entertain any motions.

>> For what?

>> For how we want to proceed on discussion of these applications.
Like where we should start.

CHAIR: How about we start with the most experienced and work our way down from there.

Saturday, October 17, 2020 at 9:30AM (Rough Transcript)

COMMISSIONER WITJES: Yeah, that sounds good, that's what I was going to do anyway, so I'm going to say so moved.

CHAIR: Is there a second or any discussion.

COMMISSIONER LANGE: I can second it. I will need you guys to let me know a number. I don't know if we're saying names, but I'll need a number, since I don't have a laptop, I don't have them in most experienced but alphabetically.

CHAIR: But you do have all the applications in front of you.

COMMISSIONER LANGE: I do have all the resumes yes.

>> It's okay to say the name, if anyone --

COMMISSIONER LANGE: So we can say the name.

>> Absolutely.

COMMISSIONER LANGE: Thank you.

CHAIR: So the first applicant with 10 + years of management experience is Amna Shabul, and that is application number 2.

COMMISSIONER LANGE: While you are reviewing it, can I say this is one of the 13 that stuck out to me.

CHAIR: Ms. Lange any thoughts you would like to share about it. Anything that jumped out in particular.

COMMISSIONER LANGE: The length of job experience and the amount of time spent at one job, working different areas from planning on. Being members of boards of trustees, and board members before, so she knows about the open meetings act. I have to be honest, seeing that working that long in a medical field, I know that it's pounded into your head, attention to detail, so I think that's very important and I think working in that profession for so long, it would definitely be someone that had attention to detail. I also liked if you read her letter to us, or the letter she submitted with a resume, I liked the fact she served as nonpartisan Mayor, and let us know she worked with everybody. We're looking for something that is not going to be biased as you said, whether it's politically or otherwise, so I liked that she had 8 years of experience working across isles in a nonpartisan way.

CHAIR: I will say reading this personal statement, this is Anthony Eid speaking. While reading the personal statement, I do agree with what Ms. Lange just stated. It's important to note she served as nonpartisan Mayor, so she has an idea of nonpartisan work, which is what this commission is to be. As well as understanding of, you know, different government facets that will definitely aid us in our mission.

COMMISSIONER LANGE: I also want to point out in her resume when she was Mayor, she brought in cultural diversity and implicit bias training for staff. So as we look for somebody that reaches out, that it's important she has familiarity with that.

>> For sure.

CHAIR: I think I'm about ready to move on to the next application, Mr. Witjes do you have any comments.

COMMISSIONER WITJES: I do not.

CHAIR: The next application is Andrew Kline application number 3. Something that sticks out to me is this individual resides in Maryland.

>> Can you repeat that.

>> Something that sticks out to me is that this individual resides in Maryland.

CHAIR: I would also like to point out, though they reside in rarer Maryland, they did receive their masters degree in Michigan.

>> If at the last minute, we need to research. Would living out of state be a hindrance, I know we discussed this as another one, to not exclude anybody out of state, I think we were

Saturday, October 17, 2020 at 9:30AM (Rough Transcript)

thinking of someone that lived right on the border, there has to be that availability factor, and they're also going to work as an liaison with the press and questions. And right now with zoom that might not be a problem. But looking to the future, that might be.

CHAIR: Are there any further comments on the applications.

COMMISSIONER WITJES: I'm ready to move on to the next one, this is commissioner Witjes, I'm ready to move on to the next application.

CHAIR: We will move on to Bill Pembil, who is application number 6.

Is there any discussion on this applicant? Okay, hearing no discussion, I say we move forward to the next applicant with 10 + years of management experience. That is Mr. Brandon Rice and that's application number 8. And.

COMMISSIONER LANGE: I was going to let you know this is also another one I selected. When I reviewed last night it was one that stood out to me. He seems to have a lot of experience, very good education. I liked the answers to his questions. There was just something about this one that really stuck out to me.

>> Anthony, are you good to go to the next one.

CHAIR: I'm going to be honest, I don't think we'll be able to get through all of these applications in the time we have allotted and I'm not sure I feel comfortable making a recommendation to our commission until we have all given that a chance. And I think the way we're going about this might actually be a -- it might not work.

>> Could I ask then in the remaining time to look at the ones I picked out just to look at them, and you can rate them and then if we have to conclude and extend this, we can. But just -- that will get a few more out of the way, we still have 45 minutes, but rather than going through each one, if you don't think that would show any kind of.

>> Mine be me.

>> I'm good with that.

>> And I can make notes.

>> And there is one too, not one I picked out, but I would like to discuss, if you don't mind.

>> Could you repeat that.

COMMISSIONER LANGE: There is one I did not pick, but I would like to discuss on the reasons I wasn't comfortable picking this person, if we could discuss that one first. It's... let's see here. Applicant number 27, James Lancaster.

>> Commissioners, in the 1-4 years public sector and 5-9 years managing staff.

>> Thank you, Sally.

CHAIR: Does everybody have this application in front of them.

COMMISSIONER LANGE: I'm looking for that, I did take some notes.

CHAIR: We're now looking at application for Mr. James Lancaster. Ms. Lange you have some notes.

COMMISSIONER LANGE: He's very familiar with our new -- sorry, I just blanked out. With our new constitution amendment, how far he also helped write the proposal and worked with an organization that helped do the proposal and get it on to the ballot. So my concern is, because you know, like we said in other meetings you can't make everybody happy, but I my concern is that he was too involved from the very beginning and people that maybe weren't as on board with the proposal I guess is what I'm saying. I mean, qualification wise, from what I read, he has good qualifications, but since he was there from the start and everything, that might make people think there might be a little bit of a -- I don't know how to put it in words, do you understand what I'm trying to say. Not necessarily a bias, but they might look, your executive director is someone who actually started this and they came -- he did come

Saturday, October 17, 2020 at 9:30AM (Rough Transcript)

recommended from Nancy W who was also a speaker at one of our first meetings, so again, it goes into that, as people watch, would they see it as a conflict?

COMMISSIONER WITJES: This is Dustin, I don't think so. My thought process is this is someone who held the written language for an actual proposal. It doesn't seem like they would be in any way influenced in any way or capacity or anything. If someone was writing a constitutional amendment for the commission we're now a part of. I don't foresee him helping write the words for the said amendment would be anything that would cause a conflict in my opinion.

COMMISSIONER LANGE: I'm saying -- this is Rhonda. I'm saying as far as public opinion of it. Was he too involved in the initial proposal to where the public sees it as too much involvement? I'm trying to look at it from all angles.

>> Sure.

COMMISSIONER LANGE: The public what was really gung-ho, it didn't get 100%. So I'm looking at all angles that might be perceived.

CHAIR: I can definitely appreciate trying to look at it from all angles. Oftentimes perception is reality. Especially in the independent, but still political sphere we find ourselves in currently. With that said, I do think this individual has a ton of qualifications, both in public and private sectors. And it was a city council member for 2 different terms for the city of -- and the Mayor for that same city as well. And as well as the planning commission member, and it looks like he has been in public life dating back to 1992.

Which is as long as I've been alive. So interesting to me.

[Laughter]

COMMISSIONER WITJES: I'm ready to move on to the next one. Sorry, this is Dustin.

CHAIR: I'm also ready to move on.

COMMISSIONER WITJES: Sorry, I was ready to move on to the next individual you looked at last night.

COMMISSIONER LANGE: Number 41, Dr. Sheryl L. Mitchell.

[Sneeze]

>> Excuse me, bless you.

>> Would you like to say your initial thoughts on the applicant.

COMMISSIONER LANGE: Experience wise, a lot of experience. City manager. Chief of staff. Senior analysis. So I think education wise, a lot of education, and experience wise, a lot of experiences in different roles I think would be helpful to us. She's worked in a municipal role and familiar with the open meetings act and done budgeting preparations that will be important also. I also liked her approach she put to leadership with open lines of communication and empowering the staff. I just liked what she had to say in number 4 of that.

COMMISSIONER WITJES: This is Dustin. Going off of what was said earlier in regards to optics in regards to someone who helped write verbiage for something, I'm rethinking things at this particular point, now I'm also taking into account -- could be too much governmental influence by these people as well. A lot of people have been working for cities, and different roles in government, whether it's local or anything above that. And that could also cause people to look at it that we're taking someone who potentially had too much influence in a governmental setting. And so now I'm rethinking some of my numbers.

[Laughter] COMMISSIONER LANGE: I agree. When I was reviewing them last night, there were some, and one of the main things going through my mind was, "who are people going to feel are the least -- may lean one way or the other -- "some government experience might be necessary, because with the commission, they will be interacting with other government

Saturday, October 17, 2020 at 9:30AM (Rough Transcript)

officials anyway's and interacting with the secretary state office. So I'm thinking some experience on the government level might be important, I get what you are saying. Because the same thing went through my mind go through them, how much is too much? Especially in public opinion how much is too much. I also tried to look at the dates in which they worked in those government positions if they were older dates, it kind of set my mind at ease a little bit more. But I do get what you are saying there. "

CHAIR: Is everyone ready to move on to the next applicant.

COMMISSIONER WITJES: I am.

>> The next one I had was Nicky Devold, number 27. What stood out on hers was summed up in the objective. 20 years of financial management, educational leadership, social service humanitarian work, inventory merchandising. I gave her two stars, just for the experience she has. Also, skimming through really quick, at the end where she put hobby volunteer activities. She also worked on the grievance mediation committee. I think mediation is really important, especially when working with so many different people, that can be a good thing to have those skills.

CHAIR: Is anyone familiar with the KP/MEA, I'm not familiar with that organization.

COMMISSIONER WITJES: I can give it a quick google.

>> What organization?

CHAIR: KP/MEA.

COMMISSIONER LANGE: Is that the Michigan educational association?

CHAIR: I believe so.

COMMISSIONER LANGE: I believe KP is for the public schools.

CHAIR: I'd also like to state for this applicant their answers to the supplemental questionnaire is very thorough.

>> Sorry, I can't hear what you said, I apologize.

CHAIR: So this is Anthony Eid speaking. What I had said was this applicant, their answers to the supplemental questionnaire was very thorough.

CHAIR: I'm ready to move on when everyone else is.

COMMISSIONER WITJES: Yep.

COMMISSIONER LANGE: Good to go. This is Rhonda again, my next one is number 28 Janet Phillips. On hers, I see she has worked previously as executive director, and she has that experience, and also the director of development.

CHAIR: This application also stuck out to me as well when I was going to scrub out the names of the applicants, just doing that and going over it, for the brief amount of time that I did it definitely stuck out.

CHAIR: Any other comments about this applicant? Okay, we are ready to move on.

COMMISSIONER LANGE: Okay, the next one is number 44, Susan Courtright H-Smith. It looks like she has many years of experience working as an executive director. She's also been a director of development and public relations so I think that would be a plus also.

COMMISSIONER WITJES: I'd like to make a comment, this is Dustin. This is the first one that I have seen that has letters of recommendation. And so...

CHAIR: I believe Mr. Lancaster had a couple letters of recommendation as well.

>> I missed that.

COMMISSIONER LANGE: Are you ready for the next one, Dustin.

COMMISSIONER WITJES: I just need about one more minute.

COMMISSIONER LANGE: The next one was Marie, and forgive me if I pronounce it wrong, Johnson number 34.

CHAIR: Any general comments.

Saturday, October 17, 2020 at 9:30AM (Rough Transcript)

COMMISSIONER LANGE: I notice she has Executive Director experience, and also had experience in communications director position. I think that could be important too.

CHAIR: Something I tend to look at in an applicant's personal statement, if they put in there specifically what -- why they want to be a part of this commission in particular. And I do not see that in this personal statement.

CHAIR: So we have about 15 minutes left before we're set to adjourn and start getting ready for the main commission meeting. I think we should take this time to talk about where to move forward from here, and if we would like to schedule or just put -- not necessarily a date -- but an idea on scheduling another committee meeting to discuss the applications once we all had time to go over them. I would like to note that we did lose two meetings. One on October 13th and one on October 16th due to what is happening in our state right now. And so I don't think our main commission will be disappointed that we need a little bit more time to review these applications before making a recommendation. Are there any thoughts or ideas about this?

COMMISSIONER LANGE: I agree with you that we do need another meeting, like I said, I did 4 hours last night, and you guys obviously need to see all of them to truly make an informed decision, so yes, I agree with that, so I know the department of state is very busy right now too, with this time of year, so I guess that would be if they're able to work it. My understanding is that we would be able to do that again via zoom, am I correct, Sally. So is it possible to do it fairly soon if they have the time and resources.

>> This is Sally speaking. I think this is a topic you will want to discuss with the rest of the commission, because it would affect the proposed -- the updated proposed meeting schedule you all are going to discuss today. I would also say that for the next 2 weeks, it would be very difficult for the department of State to facilitate another meeting and that's not something we can do until after the election, so that meeting at the earliest would be able to be the Tuesday or the Monday, or really that Tuesday of the 2nd week of November, and so, if you decide to have another subcommittee meeting, it would push back the current schedule, and kind of w we would have to adjust from there.

COMMISSIONER WITJES: Sally did you say if we were to have another meeting with us 3 it could be through Zoom as opposed to in person?

>> This is Mike Reid. Yesterday afternoon, [off mike]

Passed a law, temporary amendment to allow for any public body to have a virtual meeting through the end of the year. And the rules change 2021. But the same rules that applied during the last several months are now back in place, more or less to the allowance of virtual meetings unless December 31 of 2020. That was in the legislature and the Governor signed it yesterday. And then the last step that has to happen before a bill becomes a law. And so that happened yesterday, at 4:45 or something like that. So you need 18 hours notice, if there isn't 18 hours between that time frame when it was filed and became law, and the beginning of this meeting this morning, and that's why this meeting is in person, because it was required to be in person given the 18 hour notice requirement. So virtual meetings are allowed again for any meeting, at least 18 hours after yesterday afternoon at 4:45 and ultimately in terms of the question of whether the committee meets again, may very well be a question for the full commission. Notably the schedule laid out and proposed in the last commission meeting was proposed even at the time it was virtual meetings. This didn't shift as a result of that. So the next 3 weeks, we're very up front about the capacity concerns about the state. With everything in the pandemic and everything else, there is a fair amount of work I personally don't nope the half of. The translators not in the room, and virtual meetings do take time and cost money. And so the next meeting we'll be able to support

Saturday, October 17, 2020 at 9:30AM (Rough Transcript)

you on is noted on here Tuesday November 10th and that's a time we can make it work, and time, again, that had nothing to do with the shift in virtual versus in person or whatever else. To the degree, to note as well, this is an advisory committee, so this committee was never fully charged to officially narrow and limit the number of applications that would be reviewed by the full commission, so the full commission receives -- saying this for the public as a whole. They did receive 47 applications and the commission itself have the authority to narrow what will be interviewed. And the advisory committee is a committee to review and facilitate 47 down to a number that is more manageable. In a certain regard. Not letting perfection be the enemy of the good. Maybe the committee is able to narrow from 47, to 20. If you did that, that's still a value add to the commission as a whole. Even if you weren't able to narrow down to 5. So thinking about something along those lines, that is an agenda item on the full commission agenda today to discuss who to actually interview and I expect some of the other commissioners having received all the applications yesterday, will have reviewed them and have thoughts about who should be interviewed and who should not be.

>> Thank you.

CHAIR: I just can not in good conscience make any advisory to our commission at this point. The facts of the matter would be a disservice to not only ourselves but the applicants that put in time to apply for this job. This is something we'll have to discuss with the main commission later. But, if we have to change up our agenda, and move it around a little bit, I think that is something we might need to do to make sure we get the best possible executive director working for us. Any other thoughts? Is there anything stopping me from reviewing these and sending me numbers over to you Sally to be distributed? To everybody.

>> Yes. Through the Chair, this is Mike Brady. I think the answer is yes, but to clarify. When you are reviewing them, on your own time and sending to Sally Marsh. So that could very well be a violation of the open meeting act to the degree that -- your review is not. That's true for everyone on the meetings and all the material sent to you in advance and a lot of materials provided to you ahead of that. So the review is not. But when you review and at the point offer perspective on the candidates, that gets a lot closer to deliberation.

>> I see.

>> So someone can say, I agree with your 13, and I add one more, and I agree with that or that, and that's the kind of substantive work. It's not quite at the point of decision per se, but it is deliberation, and as noted in all the prior meetings that's covered by the open meeting act, that's public business, and they have the right to what is made, and what went into the decision.

>> Got it. I will propose we take this time to adjourn. And depending on what happens when we discuss it at the main commission meeting, we can then reevaluate. In the meantime, as Mr. Brady just said, we can look at all these applications on our own, and then let's do that and next time we come together we can have a -- put our thoughts together and come up with that list of people. I'm seeing head nodding. So with that said, I would entertain a motion to adjourn. Is there a second.

COMMISSIONER WITJES: Second.

CHAIR: All in favor say aye.

COMMISSIONER WITJES: Aye.

CHAIR: All right, this meeting is now adjourned.

>> Too bad you don't have a gavel.

CHAIR: I know.

COMMISSIONER WITJES: I have one, I can bring it. Why not?

>> I should have thought of that. I have one too, I could have brought one.

Saturday, October 17, 2020 at 9:30AM (Rough Transcript)

>> Next, meeting we'll keep the door open. But just be clear the door remains open.