

**OHIO ARTS COUNCIL
EXECUTIVE SEARCH COMMITTEE MEETING
November 14, 2013**

The meeting was called to order by Executive Search Committee Chair Jeff Rich at 9:30 a.m. in conference room 1932 of the Riffe Center for Government and the Arts in Columbus. OAC board members in attendance were: Jeff Rich, Ginger Warner, Sara Vance Waddell, Monica Kridler, Robb Hankins, Jane Foulk, Emma Off, Senator Gayle Manning, Leo Almeida, legislative aide to Senator Eric Kearney and Michelle Peasley, administrative aide to Representative Peter Stautberg. Absent members: Jim Dicke, Juan Cespedes, Sharon Howard and Representative Armond Budish. Also present was: Goran Babic, administrative aide to Senator Manning. Staff in attendance were: Julie Henahan and Missy Ricksecker.

Mr. Rich reminded the members that all board meetings are open to the public. All board meetings are audio recorded for documentation purposes and as such are part of the public record. To further promote transparency in the agency's work, the meeting minutes will be posted to the OAC website under the tab, "About OAC." Mr. Rich reminded the members to direct their questions through him to help the quality of deliberations and allow staff to more easily record the discussions. Board Secretary Sara Vance Waddell called the roll.

Mr. Rich posed the first question of the meeting, whether to hire an outside search firm to conduct the search or for the committee to act on its own. Committee member Sara Vance Waddell shared that in her experience search firms are very expensive and often do not bring about better results than a search conducted without one. She suggested that if the committee posted the position on websites and social media outlets and through channels, such as the National Assembly of State Arts Agencies (NASAA) and the National Endowment for the Arts (NEA), the word would get out quickly. If an adequate number of quality applications are not received by these methods, the committee could then look to a search firm.

The committee agreed with Ms. Vance's assessment. Committee member Emma Off cautioned that the committee needs to make sure that the search yields applications from a national pool. The committee agreed with this and Mr. Rich reiterated his willingness to manage the search process and keep the committee informed of any developments. He added that the last Executive Search Committee did hire a search firm and the committee had been dissatisfied with the three finalists they had brought in. Mr. Rich added that for all the effort and cost, the board ended up hiring from within the agency.

Mr. Rich then directed the committee's attention to the second item on the agenda, Major Criteria for a New Executive Director. He introduced the general outline of the task to determine what sorts of qualifications the committee is looking for and what kind of person they want to hire. He then opened the discussion to the committee.

Committee member Robb Hankins asked for clarification of which set of documents Mr. Rich was referring to. Mr. Rich answered that the committee members should refer to the "Position Announcement: Executive Director" document in their folders. He shared that this document, once

revised by the committee, will be posted along with the position description in various outlets that the committee will decide later in the meeting.

Mr. Rich then proceeded with an item-by-item review of the position announcement beginning with the "Pertinent Education and Experience" section. The committee considered the first criterion:

- "Respected leader in the arts with demonstrated commitment to public service"

Mr. Rich started the discussion by asking if the board wanted someone who is already a respected leader in the arts, or is this necessary to run this organization. He shared that he thought the person needed to have a demonstrated commitment to public service, but questioned the need for the person leading the agency to already have an established reputation as a respected leader in the arts.

Mr. Hankins shared that in his experience as the administrator of a local arts council he has found it important to have a strong footing in the arts lest constituents question whether the leader knows what their business is. He recommended that the committee consider it a priority that the leader of an arts agency have at least a background and experience in the arts in order to have credibility with constituents.

Mr. Rich recognized Mr. Hankins special knowledge of this area and agreed that the candidate must have a "fire in the belly" for the arts in order to promote them in the community.

Committee member Ginger Warner inquired whether the committee was writing the announcement at the meeting. Mr. Rich answered yes, and added that he wanted to post the opening that day as soon as they finalized the copy. Ms. Warner continued that the second sentence "qualified applicants will exhibit the vision and ability to think outside the box and the energy to lead the agency into the future," contained wording that was unnecessary to state in the job posting.

Committee members Senator Gayle Manning and Jane Foulk agreed with Ms. Warner. Given the general consensus of the committee, the sentence was struck from the text.

Mr. Rich then asked the committee to consider what the educational requirements for the position should be. The draft posting cites a requirement for a bachelor's degree in the liberal or fine arts. The discussion centered on whether to narrow the group with requirements for specific degrees or to leave this open so as not to exclude any candidates.

Ms. Vance suggested that while a bachelor's degree in liberal or fine arts was necessary, specific degrees in law, business or public administration, for example, were perhaps desirable but not necessary. She added that the wording could include terms such as "preferred" or "highly desired." Executive Director Julie Henahan referenced the excellent professional resources available to the agency, such as Assistant Attorney General Angela Sullivan, and suggested that while an advanced degree in business, law, or policy would be an asset, requiring such degrees might inhibit a number of very qualified candidates from applying.

Mr. Rich reflected that the recommendation of the group was to simply require a bachelor's degree and not any specialized advanced degrees.

Ms. Foulk posed the hypothetical question of how the committee would consider a person who is in all other ways qualified but does not have a bachelor's degree. She offered that after 10-20 years in a job, for example, experience becomes a more valuable predictor of success than formal education.

Committee member Monica Kridler asked for clarification of whether the criteria listed were a checklist of requirements or guidelines of desired attributes. Mr. Rich replied that the list the committee was creating was a checklist of preferred qualifications, not requirements. Ms. Warner inquired whether the "required" part of the degree qualification could be left out of the list. Leo Almeida (proxy for Sen. Kearney) suggested the posting have a list of "preferred" qualifications and a list of "required" qualifications. Ms. Kridler inquired whether listing items as "required" would obligate or legally bind the council to hire only a candidate who fulfilled all of the required items.

A discussion of the efficacy of designating "required" and/or "preferred" qualifications ensued. Ms. Warner suggested that the candidates would self-select with regard to their own qualifications, and would consider whether they think they are suitably qualified or not. Ms. Off suggested the criteria should have at least a minimum of required qualifications so that the committee can spend its time focusing on the most qualified applicants.

Ms. Sullivan asked the committee whether they preferred to have a broad group of applicants from which they will cull a short list through the process of review and interviews, or if they preferred to start with a narrower pool in which fewer applicants are considered to be qualified at the outset of the process.

Mr. Rich referenced the batch of sample job postings in the committee's folders, sharing that the length of the posting varied greatly, and pointing out that the candidate that California Arts Council (CAC) had chosen had a 23-year background as a cable TV executive who had some background in the arts. He reflected that the committee seemed to be leaning toward being more inclusive from the outset, and asked for input from the committee members.

Mr. Hankins inquired what the process for reviewing the applications would be, and suggested that a narrower pool would be advantageous. He stated that in his experience everyone thinks they could run an arts council or state arts agency. Therefore, it is important to have set criteria to narrow the pool so as not to have the onerous task of screening a potentially large group of questionably qualified applicants.

Ms. Warner remarked that selecting the next executive director of the agency is a rare and important opportunity for the board, and sorting through the applications is task they should be willing to do. She shared her concern that narrowing the pool would exclude qualified applicants, such as the candidate who was chosen by the CAC.

Ms. Foulk directed the committee's attention to the CAC posting, stating that under "ideal experience" the first qualification listed was seven years minimum of executive business experience, and the last criterion listed was education. She added that the posting stated that experience could be substituted for the education requirement.

Mr. Rich suggested the following wording for the first two sentences of the OAC posting:

"Respected leader in the arts with demonstrated commitment to public service and a strong reputation for integrity and ethics; additional consideration will be given to candidates with proven experience or a degree in arts administration, public policy or a specific arts discipline."

General agreement on the first paragraph was expressed by the committee.

Mr. Rich then moved on the next criterion:

- "Five to seven years of demonstrated successful experience with increasing responsibility in state arts management or non-profit arts experience."

He suggested broadening this to include for-profit experience, and gave as a hypothetical example an in-house lobbyist for a large corporation who loves the arts and is looking for a career change. He shared that he had received this suggestion from David Fraher of Arts Midwest.

Ms. Vance and Ms. Off agreed that the criteria should be expanded to include for-profit experience.

Mr. Rich proposed the following wording:

"Five to seven years of demonstrated successful experience in positions of increasing responsibility in for-profit businesses, or in state agency management or non-profit arts experience."

Ms. Warner suggested that "state agency management" was too narrow a criterion. Mr. Rich suggested removing that from the text.

Ms. Sullivan shared that removal of the state agency wording would exclude government workers because they do not necessarily have for-profit or non-profit experience. Mr. Rich suggested changing the wording to "government or non-profit arts experience."

After further discussion about the wording, it was decided that the text should read:

"Five to seven years of demonstrated successful experience in positions of increasing responsibility in government, for-profit or non-profit entities."

Mr. Rich then turned the committee's attention to the next criterion:

- "Five to seven years supervisory experience; proven success in leadership, securing federal

grants, and personnel management are highly desired.”

Ms. Off suggested removing the word “federal” from this criterion. Mr. Rich reminded the committee that in fact the agency does apply for and receive roughly \$1 million a year in federal grants, so leaving it in would be advisable.

A discussion about the importance of grantwriting experience followed. Ms. Off and Ms. Vance suggested that inclusion of such criteria would exclude candidates from the for-profit arena who don't have federal grantwriting experience.

Mr. Hankins asked for clarification about which criteria were “preferred” and which were “required.” Mr. Rich answered that all of the criteria are “preferred.” He added that the intent was to keep the posting as open as possible.

Discussion followed about the order of the phrasing and the exact wording of the length of experience preferred.

Ms. Henahan provided insight about the necessity of significant grantwriting experience, sharing that the federal grant the agency secures every year is a major part of the agency's budget. The agency has been very successful in securing funding at that level, and in order to fulfill the agency's mission it is important that this is maintained. She suggested that the criteria include language referring to securing “major” grants, and explained that there is a significant difference between securing a \$2,500 grant and a competitive million-dollar federal grant.

Mr. Rich suggested the following revision to the posting:

“...a minimum of five years supervisory experience; proven success in leadership, securing major grants, and personnel management are highly desired.”

There being no objections to this wording, Mr. Rich moved on to the next criteria:

- “Demonstrated administrative ability; excellent communication skills and interpersonal skills, a mature and confident presence and image.”

Ms. Foulk referred again to the CAC posting and suggested the following wording:

“...demonstrated administrative ability developing and overseeing a multi-million-dollar budget.”

Mr. Rich read back the following edited text:

“Excellent communication skills and interpersonal skills, a mature and confident presence and image; demonstrated administrative ability developing and overseeing a multi-million-dollar budget.”

Ms. Warner suggested that given the desire to attract a larger pool of applicants, perhaps the

committee should reconsider the requirement for having managed a multi-million-dollar budget. Mr. Rich pointed out that the criteria should include experience running a major enterprise.

A discussion followed concerning how long the process of these revisions would be and when the position opening would be posted. Mr. Rich expressed confidence that he could complete and distribute the revisions in enough time to receive approval from all those present and still have time to post the position that day.

Ms. Warner asked if a copy of the job description from the last time the position was posted was available. Ms. Henahan responded that the current posting was based on the one that was posted in the last search, with modifications based on agency changes that happened in the intervening years because of budget cuts, staff reductions and changes in current practices.

Mr. Rich redirected the committee's attention to the discussion of the "multi-million-dollar budget" wording. Ms. Warner offered that the securing of major grants implied the management of a major budget, and suggested that the wording reflect that so as not to be exclusionary.

After more discussion, Mr. Rich suggested keeping the wording of:

"Demonstrated administrative ability developing and overseeing a multi-million-dollar budget; excellent communication skills and interpersonal skills, a mature and confident presence and image,"

and adding to the first set of criteria:

"Additional consideration will be given to candidates with proven experience in executive-level management, or a degree in arts administration, public policy or a specific arts discipline."

Ms. Sullivan raised the question of whether the word "mature" implied that candidates must be a certain age, reminding the committee that they should be aware of EEO issues and potential lawsuits. Ms. Warner suggested that the description leave out the wording about "presence and image."

Mr. Rich proposed the following wording:

"Demonstrated administrative ability developing and overseeing a multi-million-dollar budget; excellent communication and interpersonal skills."

The committee accepted this version.

Mr. Rich then led the group to discuss the next criterion:

- "Experience in strategic planning and evaluation, including performance measurement."

Mr. Rich noted that strategic planning was a critical part of the NEA's expectation of state arts agencies for consideration of partnership grants.

Ms. Vance suggested that, per the CAC posting, the OAC posting state only "strategic planning and implementation."

Ms. Henahan explained that evaluation was a specific and different activity from planning and implementation. She shared that it was important to evaluate how successful the implementation of a plan had been.

Mr. Rich agreed, stating that he was impressed that, unlike typical strategic planning, the OAC used their plans as a roadmap and followed through with evaluations and reports that lead to program improvements.

It was agreed to keep the wording of this criterion.

Mr. Rich then led a discussion of the next criterion:

- "Knowledge of the process and protocol for working with the state legislature and the governor's administrative staff."

Ms. Off pointed out that such a requirement again narrowed the pool by possibly excluding professionals from the for-profit sector.

A discussion followed about whether or not the committee wanted a candidate to have experience in or interacting with government entities. Senator Manning shared that in her experience in the legislature interpersonal skills and personality were more important than government experience. The discussion returned to the overall criteria, and Ms. Kridler suggested that rather than remove the entire section about visionary leadership, the posting include a single phrase about innovative thinker and visionary thinking.

Mr. Rich read back the revised text crafted thus far:

"Pertinent Education and Experience:

- A respected and visionary leader in the arts with a demonstrated commitment to public service and a strong reputation for integrity and ethics; additional consideration will be given to candidates with proven experience in executive level management, or a degree in arts administration, public policy or a specific arts discipline.
- A minimum of five years demonstrated successful experience in positions of increasing responsibility in government, for-profit, or non-profit entities.
- A minimum of five years of supervisory experience, proven successful leadership, securing major grants and personnel management are highly desired.
- Demonstrated administrative ability developing and overseeing multi-million-dollar

budgets. Excellent communication skills and interpersonal skills.

- Demonstrated experience in strategic planning, implementation and evaluation, including performance measurement.”

The committee accepted this version.

Mr. Rich directed the committee’s attention to the next section of the posting, “Skills/Knowledge.”

The committee considered the criteria in this section:

- “Qualified candidates will have, but are not limited to, **skills** in the following areas: Team building, meeting facilitation, delegation of responsibilities, motivation, personnel management and evaluation, research, proposal development, report preparation, networking, excellent written and oral communication skills (including persuasive argument and negotiation, tact and diplomacy, debate and public relations).”

Ms. Vance asked Ms. Henahan if all of these items had been listed in the posting when she applied for the position. Ms. Henahan replied that she had developed some of the skills after starting in the position, but that all were part of her job now.

Mr. Hankins suggested the committee remove wording that repeated what was already covered in the “Pertinent Education and Experience” section.

Ms. Kridler referenced the following in the CAC posting: “experience working with state and local government providing public testimony,” and offered that this is an essential part of the job and should be included somehow in the OAC posting.

Ms. Foulk shared the example of two directors who had been hired by the city who were very qualified for the positions but failed utterly because they did not have experience dealing with state and local government.

Mr. Hankins agreed, sharing his experience as director of state and city arts agencies. The private and government sectors are vastly different in their operations, and a person can have all the spirit and enthusiasm in the world, but if they are not prepared to deal with the pace and requirements of working in the government, they will likely not serve the agency well.

Discussion followed about keeping the criteria broad and not excluding candidates by scaring them away. Ms. Warner and Senator Manning promoted broad criteria to ensure a large pool of candidates; Mr. Hankins reiterated his concern that an otherwise qualified candidate without a modicum of experience in the public process would be at a disadvantage.

The committee agreed to add the following as the last bullet point in the “Pertinent Education and Experience” section:

“...experience with government relations.”

Discussion continued regarding the “Skills and Knowledge” section.

The committee agreed to cut the entire first paragraph of this section because the items were either redundant or obvious.

They advanced to the next item:

“Qualified candidates will have, but are not limited to, **knowledge** in the following areas:

- Broad and specific knowledge and understanding of the arts and humanities, arts management and public policy in the arts,
- Human resources administration, including knowledge of state government structure and regulations, union negotiations and contracts, labor law, interviewing and supervisory techniques and regulations, understands and values diversity at all levels.”

Ms. Vance, Ms. Warner and Ms. Foulk agreed that these items were too onerous and would prevent too many qualified applicants from applying, and suggested removing the entire paragraph.

Ms. Henahan responded that these items were critical to the position because the agency does not have a human resources manager; the OAC executive and deputy directors share personnel and human resources responsibilities. She explained that half of the agency’s staff are in the bargaining unit (union) classes. Some basic experience with personnel and human resources and knowledge of what it means to work within a union shop should be listed so that the candidates know what to expect.

Ms. Warner shared her understanding of human resources management, asking if it weren’t primarily about health care coverage and insurance, and suggesting that they leave out the union references. Ms. Kridler asked if they would be misrepresenting the job if they didn’t mention the unions and reiterated that applicants deserve to know what they are getting into.

At 11:15 a.m., Mr. Rich announced that Ms. Sullivan had to leave the meeting to attend to another commitment. He asked committee members if they had any questions for her regarding how the Open Meetings Act applies to their search process. He explained that other than the actual interviews, all of their deliberations and process had to take place in a public meeting. Everything must be above board and no private deliberations could take place.

Ms. Sullivan stated that this was correct, and referred the committee to her informal opinion on the matter located in their folders. She added that according to the Public Records Act (*R.C.* Chapter 149) all of the materials developed or obtained during the process were public records and subject to disclosure. This includes interview questions, applications, and resumes. If the documents are used in making a decision about the candidate they are public records. She suggested including some wording about this in the position posting so applicants will be aware of this.

Ms. Warner asked if there were some allowable private discussion about the candidates after the interview process.

Ms. Sullivan replied that under the Open Meetings Act (*R.C.* Chapter 121) there is some allowable *discussion* in executive session, but that it usually becomes clear in the meeting minutes following the executive session if a *decision* has been made in private. She added that this is why she included a newspaper article in their materials about a case in Athens involving Ohio University trustees in which it was clear that a decision had been made in executive session. They were found guilty and were fined and enjoined for their misconduct.

She added that the board needed to be very careful that there are not any straw polls or decisions made before open deliberations and voting.

Ms. Foulk asked how the board should handle discussing candidates about whom they have negative things to say. Ms. Sullivan replied that they needed to use tact and discretion when discussing candidates, and reminded the group that the candidates know what they are getting into when entering into competition for a high-level public job such as this.

Ms. Warner shared that she was confused about these regulations, that she has served on many public search committees and they have had discussions in private, and she was concerned that a candidate's privacy or integrity might be compromised if the discussion about their shortcomings or misconduct were public records.

Ms. Sullivan explained that *discussions* were not prohibited, only *deliberations and decision-making*. She added that many public boards and committees deliberate in public, and job candidates always run the risk of their own ethical misconduct being exposed when they enter into the hiring process. She advised the board to be very conservative in this area, because there is little to no existing case law to help them. They could not foresee what the outcome would be unless or until they were sued.

Ms. Sullivan left the meeting at 11:31 a.m.

Returning to the discussion regarding needed knowledge of personnel and union contract issues, Mr. Rich summarized that the general consensus was that the posting include enough information for the candidates to know what they are getting into, but not restrict it so much that the pool is dramatically modified because of that.

The committee exchanged thoughts and preferences regarding word choices and syntax, and agreed upon the following wording:

“Human resources administration, including knowledge of state government structure and regulations and union agreements, supervising and interviewing techniques and regulations.”

Mr. Rich then directed the discussion of the next criteria:

- “Budget development, including knowledge of fiscal controls and management; policy

development and long-range planning; assumes responsibility for agency budget, including knowledge of outside funding sources; funding trends and application processes.”

Mr. Rich reminded the board that the agency has to submit budget proposals to the Office of Business Management (OBM) every two years and to the NEA with each grant application.

The committee briefly discussed the text and offered edits for clarity and settled on the following:

“Budget development, including knowledge of fiscal controls and management; policy development and long-range planning; assumes responsibility for agency budget, including knowledge of outside funding sources; funding trends and grant application processes.”

Mr. Rich continued to the next criteria:

- “Provides creative and innovative leadership and strategic vision for agency, including knowledge of strategic planning; board’s role and responsibilities; staff role and responsibilities; and public relations;”

The committee agreed that this point was redundant and requested that Mr. Rich strike it entirely.

Mr. Rich continued to the next criteria:

- “Agency government relation, including knowledge of state and federal government structure; process and regulations; and advocacy techniques and regulations;”

The committee agreed that this point was redundant and requested that Mr. Rich strike it entirely.

Mr. Rich continued to the next criteria:

- “Knowledge of the field, including knowledge of the arts and humanities, nonprofit organizations, local government structures and other state arts agencies.”

The committee agreed that this point was redundant and requested that Mr. Rich strike it entirely.

Ms. Henahan clarified that in the human resources criteria, the text includes “knowledge of state government structure and regulations,” which refers back to the human resources aspect of things, while the “knowledge of state and federal government structure” in the agency government relations point refers to the various state and governmental entities, such as the DAS, OBM and the Legislative Services Commission, with which the agency works closely on issues different from those in the area of human resources. She added that these are skills and knowledge a candidate could develop after being hired.

Discussion about this item continued briefly, focusing on the issue of brevity versus inclusion of important aspects of the position. Ms. Foulk introduced more specific government relations wording from the CAC posting; Ms. Off suggested including such language in the next section: “Opportunities and Challenges.”

The committee agreed to strike this paragraph and to include such information as was necessary in the "Opportunities and Challenges" section.

Mr. Rich continued to the "Opportunities and Challenges for the incoming Executive Director" section. The committee considered the criteria in this section:

- Developing and implementing a new strategic plan for 2014-2017.
- Developing and implementing the annual Work Force Plan with the Department of Administrative Services.
- Leading one of the largest staff transitions in the history of the agency and using the agency's Work Force Plan to manage this transition.

Mr. Rich shared that the staff reduction of 60 percent had been a huge transition, and asked what similar or larger transition was on the agency's horizon. Ms. Henahan clarified that the large transition included the retirement of a significant number of long-tenured staff over the next two years (and the loss of that institutional knowledge).

The following wording was proposed for this item:

"Leading one of the most significant staff transitions in the history of the agency and using the agency's Work Force Plan to manage this transition."

The discussion continued, focusing on the next items:

- Developing relationships with key leadership in the Ohio House and Senate.
- Promoting a stronger and more visible public advocacy program; creating a unified "arts voice" in the state and integrating it into public discussion of key statewide and community issues.

Ms. Off suggested fleshing out this item to include other individuals, agencies, and entities.

The committee agreed on the following wording:

"Developing relationships and maintaining relationships with key leadership in the Ohio House and Senate, the Governor and staff, and other state agencies in Ohio, other state arts agencies and the national government."

Ms. Henahan then recommended that the following items be included under the "Opportunities and Challenges" section:

- Developing and implementing a new Ohio Arts Council state budget for FY2016/2017.
- Developing and implementing a new three-year Arts Partnership grant for the National Endowment for the Arts for FY2015/2016/2017.

She noted that these two major projects will be due at the same time in the fall of 2014.

The consensus of the committee was to add these two items.

Ms. Foulk then suggested striking all of the items in the "Skills and Knowledge" section since the content is listed again in the "Opportunities and Challenges" section. Discussion followed that the points should stand since the general thrust of each section is different. Mr. Rich pointed out that "Skills and Knowledge" and "Opportunities and Challenges" point to entirely different things. One is about what you need to have knowledge or skills in, and the other is about what you are going to have to do when you get into the position.

The committee agreed that the wording in the "Skills and Knowledge" section should stand.

Mr. Rich then directed the committee's attention to the next section regarding the application procedure.

"A complete application must include: 1) a signed letter of application; 2) detailed resume; 3) salary history; and 4) five letters of recommendation sent directly from their source. Only complete applications will be considered. Semifinalists will be asked to participate in a phone interview with the Chair of the Search Committee and other members of the search committee; finalists will be brought to Columbus, Ohio, for direct interviews with the full search committee."

Ms. Kridler asked if it were possible to do Skype interviews. Mr. Rich answered that it was possible.

Ms. Off suggested removing the salary history since some candidates would be hesitant to share this information in a public record document. She shared that in her company, salaries are confidential. The committee agreed to strike the salary history from the application procedures.

Ms. Warner suggested that five letters of recommendation was an onerous request. The committee agreed to change the number to three.

Mr. Rich continued with the next sections:

"Salary and Benefits: Salary commensurate with skills and experience with full State of Ohio benefits package."

Deadline: January 31, 2014 for all application materials.

Referrals of qualified candidates are also welcome.

Send application materials to: Jeff Rich, Chair, Executive Director Search Committee, Rich & Gillis Law Group, LLC, 6400 Riverside Drive, Building D-100, Dublin, OH 43017-5197"

Mr. Rich explained that he will create a chart listing each candidate and what materials have come in for that candidate. He will update the list daily and send to committee members.

Ms. Kridler left the meeting at 11:57 a.m.

Ms. Warner asked if the resumes would be sent to committee members at some point; Mr. Rich responded that resumes will be sent to committee members as soon as they are received.

Mr. Hankins inquired if there were any reason that application materials were only being accepted by mail; Mr. Rich responded that he would add an electronic option to the posting.

Mr. Hankins asked if the committee would be receiving all of the applications; Mr. Rich replied that he would forward everything he received. Ms. Off asked if there were a way to cull the group so they could spend time only with the applications of viable candidates. Mr. Rich responded that her question would be addressed during the next section of the meeting.

Mr. Rich then turned the committee's attention to the determination of how the committee would promote the job posting. He shared that NASAA had been a tremendous help in this regard, providing a list of recommended outlets that post job openings.

He led the committee on a quick run-through of the recommended sites, and the committee decided to list the job posting with Americans for the Arts Job Bank; Art.Job (WESTAF); Arts Manager; Association of Performing Arts Presenters JobBank; International Federation of Arts Councils and Cultural Agencies; and International Society for the Performing Arts

Senator Manning left the meeting at 12:04 p.m.

Ms. Vance asked if NASAA and the NEA would list the job posting on their sites. Ms. Henahan replied that NASAA and the NEA would post the job on their websites, as will the OAC. NASAA will also push the posting to its member organizations.

Ms. Off suggested promoting the job posting via social media outlets. Mr. Rich replied that this would be a part of the strategy as well: the OAC will announce the opening on Facebook and Twitter, and board members can re-post and re-tweet on their own accounts. Ms. Vance suggested that in addition to this, board members should submit the contact information of their own arts contacts to Ms. Henahan, so that the information could be sent to them and passed on to their stakeholders. It was agreed that this strategy would be added as well.

Mr. Rich asked Ms. Henahan whether the budget would support posting the job in outlets that require a fee. Ms. Henahan answered that a small budget could be created to publicize the job in outlets the committee thought were especially important.

Ms. Warner suggested that the posting only be placed in outlets that had no cost attached. Ms. Vance agreed, adding that with all the email and social media promotion paid postings would probably not be necessary. Ms. Warner offered that it would be unwise to post the job too broadly in these individual outlets because it would generate too many applications from unqualified candidates. Ms. Vance and Mr. Rich agreed that this would be undesirable.

Approved: January 16, 2014

Mr. Rich stated that he would email the revised job posting to committee members that day for their review, and asked them to send their comments to him by the following Tuesday, so he could post the job that day. Ms. Warner suggested delaying the post until the first Monday of December to garner as much excitement as possible after the Thanksgiving holiday. Ms. Henahan added that a December 2 posting would allow two full months for responses, which is typical for this type of job. It was agreed to post the job on Monday, December 2, 2013 with a deadline for submission of January 31, 2014.

Mr. Rich continued the discussion of the selection process, re-stating that he would forward the complete application materials to committee members as soon as he received them. Those applications which did not meet the minimum criteria listed in the "Application Process" would not be forwarded. He suggested that the group meet in mid-February to decide which candidates they wanted to interview in the first round, and that the members should have reviewed all the candidates by that time.

Ms. Warner suggested that the committee use a scoring mechanism similar to the one used for the artist selection for the Holocaust Memorial, and that the application materials be forwarded to the committee in two batches: one on January 15 and one on January 31. The discussion continued with Ms. Henahan describing the online scoring process for the Holocaust Memorial artist selection. Mr. Rich requested that staff look into creating a modified scoring mechanism for the committee to use for its selection process so that the selection process would have an element of objective evaluation and ranking of candidates. Ms. Henahan replied that she would look into this, and cautioned that it may be difficult to modify the system from one designed for the adjudication of public art to one suitable for use in an executive search.

The committee agreed to meet again between February 11 and 14 to decide which applicants to contact for phone interviews, and to bring in the finalists for interviews in March and April, with a goal of making a final offer to a candidate by April 30, and having a start date of June 1, 2014.

Mr. Rich asked the committee how much time they thought would be adequate for the new executive director to overlap with Ms. Henahan. Ms. Henahan stated that she would look into the state's restrictions on that and report back to the committee.

Addressing the final agenda item, the committee decided that there was no need to form subcommittees for this process.

Mr. Rich thanked the committee for their time.

MEETING ADJOURNED at 12:20 p.m.

An audio recording of this meeting is available upon request.


Jeffrey A. Rich
Executive Search Committee Chair


Sara Vance Waddell

OAC Board Secretary