#### **Purpose Statement:**

### **Executive Director Recruitment Subcommittee**

(ad hoc, created April 14, 2025)

Members: Francis Upton IV (Chair), Tanya Bayeva, and Ryan Micik

### A) What is the specific goal of the committee?

To review applications for the position of Executive Director of the Commission and to interview and select applicants for the full Commission's consideration.

### B) What is the expected deliverable and in what time period?

Review all applications for the Executive Director position and to provide recommended semi-finalists for the Commission's full consideration by June or July.

### C) What level of staff vs Commissioner work is expected?

Staff will post and publicize the vacancy, assist with developing interview materials, and schedule interviews.

Commissioners will review all applicant materials, conduct interviews, check references, and decide which applicants to forward to the full Commission.

### **Executive Director Recruitment Subcommittee**

(ad hoc, created April 14, 2025)

Members: Francis Upton IV (Chair), Tanya Bayeva, and Ryan Micik

May 20, 2025 Minutes

Attendees – Members: Commissioners Upton IV, Bayeva, and Micik

Attendees - Staff: Nicolas Heidorn, Executive Director

The Subcommittee reviewed 9 applications received to date and selected 2 applicants to interview with the Subcommittee.

The Subcommittee discussed standardized interview questions to ask of each applicant, the timing of the first round of interviews, whether there should be a written exam, and whether PEC staff should conduct a round of applicant interviews.

### **Executive Director Recruitment Subcommittee**

(ad hoc, created April 14, 2025)

Members: Francis Upton IV (Chair), Tanya Bayeva, and Ryan Micik

June 4, 2025 Minutes

Attendees - Members: Commissioners Upton IV, Bayeva, and Micik

Attendees - Staff: Nicolas Heidorn, Executive Director

The Subcommittee reviewed 29 applications and selected 12 applicants to interview with the Subcommittee.

The Subcommittee discussed standardized interview questions to ask of each applicant.

The Subcommittee decided to have applicants submit a supplemental writing sample.

The Subcommittee discussed and decided to have Second Round applicants complete a written exercise.

The Subcommittee decided to hold the second round interview before the full Commission on either June 18 or June 24.

## **Executive Director Recruitment Subcommittee**

(ad hoc, created April 14, 2025)

Members: Francis Upton IV (Chair), Tanya Bayeva, and Ryan Micik

June 8, 2025 Minutes

Attendees – Members: Commissioners Upton IV, Bayeva, and Micik

Attendees - Staff: None

The subcommittee interviewed four applicants.

## **Executive Director Recruitment Subcommittee**

(ad hoc, created April 14, 2025)

Members: Francis Upton IV (Chair), Tanya Bayeva, and Ryan Micik

June 10, 2025 Minutes

**Attendees – Members:** Commissioners Upton IV and Micik

Attendees – Staff: Director Nicolas Heidorn

The subcommittee interviewed four applicants.

## **Executive Director Recruitment Subcommittee**

(ad hoc, created April 14, 2025)

Members: Francis Upton IV (Chair), Tanya Bayeva, and Ryan Micik

June 12, 2025 Minutes

**Attendees – Members:** Commissioners Upton IV and Micik

Attendees - Staff: None

The subcommittee interviewed four applicants.

### **Executive Director Recruitment Subcommittee**

(ad hoc, created April 14, 2025)

Members: Francis Upton IV (Chair), Tanya Bayeva, and Ryan Micik

June 16, 2025 Minutes

Attendees – Members: Commissioners Upton IV, Bayeva, Micik

Attendees - Staff: Director Nicolas Heidorn

The subcommittee reviewed the 12 applicants it interviewed and decided to forward four applicants for consideration by the full Commission at the June 25, 2025 meeting.

The subcommittee discussed and settled on a format for the full-Commission interview. Director Heidorn will notify the round-two applicants that they may either interview in-person or via zoom and that they should give a 5-10 minute presentation on why they should be the next ED of the Commission.

#### **Chair's Termination Statement:**

### **Executive Director Recruitment Subcommittee**

(ad hoc, created April 14, 2025)

Members: Francis Upton IV (Chair), Tanya Bayeva, and Ryan Micik

#### A) What was the specific goal of the committee?

To review applications for the Executive Director position, select and interview First Round Interview applicants before the Subcommittee, and select Second Round Interview applicants for the full Commission.

### B) What was the expected deliverable and in what time period?

Review all applications for the Executive Director position and to provide recommended semi-finalists for the Commission's full consideration by June or July.

### C) What did the Commission accomplish?

Between May and June 2025, 29 applicants applied for the Executive Director position. The Subcommittee reviewed all 29 applicants and held interviews with 12 applicants (one applicant offered an interview dropped out). From those applicants, the Subcommittee is recommending four applicants for the full Commission's consideration.

As part of its process, the Subcommittee:

- Had applicants fill out a detailed application indicating their expertise and priorities if selected for the Commission
- Developed interview questions and interviewed 12 applicants
- Had the 12 applicants submit writing samples
- Developed and had the 4 second-round applicants complete a writing exercise
- Checked the references of the 4 second-round applicants
- Did an internet and Lexis search of the 4 second-round applicants

### D) Are there any recommended next steps coming out of the Subcommittee's work?

The full Commission must recommend 2-3 finalists for the ED position to the City Administrator, who will select the next ED of the Commission.

# E) Are there any lessons learned or other comments to memorialize about the Subcommittee's work or process?

Our first task was to select which candidates we wanted to interview. For this (and subsequent stages) we used a Google Spreadsheet where each commissioner voted "yes", "no", or "maybe" on the question of wanting to interview. We therefore only had to discuss the cases with mixed results. Our process there was to use the outlier commissioner (voting "no" where the other two voted "yes" for example) to

defend their reasons and reach a consensus. The votes were then adjusted and we found 12 that we wanted to talk with, which happened to fit in the time available.

Each interview was done over zoom and was 25 minutes. The chair did an introduction and asked the 5 common questions for everyone. The interviews were recorded for reference by the 3<sup>rd</sup> commissioner who was unable to attend due to travel. The other commissioner asked other questions. 5 minutes was reserved for questions from the candidate.

Once the interviews were complete, over the next few days, each commissioner was instructed to rank the candidates from 1 to 12 (where 1 is the most desirable) in the spreadsheet a couple of days before the meeting to select the final candidates. We sorted the candidates by the average of these scores and went through a process of getting consensus on the candidates with mixed rankings to agree on the 4 we wanted the entire commission to interview.

I think this process was time-efficient and worked well, as it relied on commissioners to present their views so that the other commissioners could work between the meetings to prepare. Both of the sessions where we selected candidates were done within an hour.