

Arlington School Committee
Standing Subcommittee: Superintendent Search Process Committee
Wednesday, May 6, 2020
12:30 p.m.

Meeting conducted by remote participation.
The meeting was recorded.

Approved May 22, 2020

The meeting was called to order at 12:30 p.m.

Kirsi Allison-Ampe read the Governor's order suspending certain provisions of the Open Meeting Law.

A roll call was taken to establish remote presence in the meeting

Paul Schlichtman, chair

Kirsi Allison Ampe, member

Jennifer Susse, member

Michael Mason, Chief Financial Officer

Public Comment:

No public comment was submitted.

Disclosure:

Mr. Schlichtman disclosed that he is a past president of the Massachusetts Association of School Committees. His term as a member of the Board of Directors ended on December 31, 2005.

Evaluating the Non-Price (technical) Proposals for a Superintendent Search:

Mr. Schlichtman noted there were two technical proposals that would be reviewed:

- Massachusetts Association of School Committees (MASC), Boston MA.
- Sunshine Enterprise USA, Maitland FL.

Mr. Schlichtman noted that the subcommittee was not permitted to see the price proposals before the review of the technical proposals was complete.

Mr. Mason said it was likely that the price proposals would be under the state threshold of \$50,000, and the rules for supply and service contracts under \$50,000 would apply.

Mr. Schlichtman explained the options before the subcommittee.

- It could recommend one of the two technical proposals to the full committee.
- It could review the two technical proposals and recommend moving on to interviewing two respondents.

- It could recommend discarding the technical proposals in order to submit a new Request for Proposals.
- It could retain the current proposals and request others.

Members of the subcommittee discussed the sense of the full school committee, as expressed at the last school committee meeting, to move forward by evaluating the proposals as submitted.

Mr. Schlichtman called the subcommittee's attention to the ratings sheets that corresponded to the criteria for evaluation of the technical proposals from the Request for Proposals. As the interviews scheduled for March were cancelled due to the state of emergency, Mr. Schlichtman said we would not be evaluating Criteria 4, Evaluation of Interview Presentation.

The members of the subcommittee offered their ratings using the remaining evaluation criteria:

1. Experience

Dr. Allison-Ampe rated MASC 3: Highly Advantageous.
 Dr. Susse rated MASC 3: Highly Advantageous.
 Mr. Schlichtman rated MASC 3: Highly Advantageous.
 Dr. Allison-Ampe rated Sunshine 1: Not Advantageous.
 Dr. Susse rated Sunshine 1: Not Advantageous.
 Mr. Schlichtman rated Sunshine 1: Not Advantageous.

2. Evaluation of the Proposed Plan

Dr. Allison-Ampe rated MASC 3: Highly Advantageous.
 Dr. Susse rated MASC 2: Advantageous.
 Mr. Schlichtman rated MASC 2: Advantageous.
 Dr. Allison-Ampe rated Sunshine 1: Not Advantageous.
 Dr. Susse rated Sunshine 1: Not Advantageous.
 Mr. Schlichtman rated Sunshine 1: Not Advantageous.

3. Proposer's Recruitment Materials

Dr. Allison-Ampe rated MASC 2: Advantageous.
 Dr. Susse rated MASC 0: Unacceptable.
 Mr. Schlichtman rated MASC 2: Advantageous.
 Dr. Allison-Ampe rated Sunshine 0: Unacceptable.
 Dr. Susse rated Sunshine 0: Unacceptable.
 Mr. Schlichtman rated Sunshine 0: Unacceptable.

4. Evaluation of Interview Presentation

Not Evaluated

5. Presentation

Dr. Allison-Ampe rated MASC 2: Advantageous.
 Dr. Susse rated MASC 2: Advantageous.
 Mr. Schlichtman rated MASC 2: Advantageous.
 Dr. Allison-Ampe rated Sunshine 0: Unacceptable.

Dr. Susse rated Sunshine 0: Unacceptable.
Mr. Schlichtman rated Sunshine 1: Not Advantageous.

Mr. Schlichtman offered a summary of the categories, based on the committee ratings:

1. **Experience:** The summary rating for MASC is 3: Highly Advantageous. The summary rating for Sunshine is 1: Not Advantageous.
2. **Evaluation of the Proposed Plan:** The summary rating for MASC is 2: Advantageous. The summary rating for Sunshine is 1: Not Advantageous.
3. **Proposer's Recruitment Materials:** The summary rating for MASC is 2: Advantageous. The summary rating for Sunshine is 0: Unacceptable.
4. **Evaluation of Interview Presentation:** Not Evaluated
5. **Presentation:** The summary rating for MASC is 2: Advantageous. The summary rating for Sunshine is 0: Unacceptable.

Members of the committee offered their **overall ratings** of the two proposals:

Dr. Allison-Ampe rated MASC 2: Advantageous.
Dr. Susse rated MASC 2: Advantageous.
Mr. Schlichtman rated MASC 2: Advantageous.
Dr. Allison-Ampe rated Sunshine 0: Unacceptable.
Dr. Susse rated Sunshine 0: Unacceptable.
Mr. Schlichtman rated Sunshine 1: Not Advantageous.

On a **motion** by Dr. Allison-Ampe, **seconded** by Dr. Susse, it was **voted** to report to the Arlington School Committee that the Superintendent Search Process Committee found the MASC proposal to be Advantageous, and the Sunshine proposal to be Unacceptable. Roll Call (3-0):

Allison-Ampe Yes
Susse Yes
Schlichtman Yes

On a **motion** by Dr. Allison-Ampe, **seconded** by Dr. Susse, it was **voted** to report to the Arlington School Committee that the Superintendent Search Process Committee recommends the full school committee vote to accept the proposal from the Massachusetts Association of School Committees, and move forward with the intent of engaging MASC as our consultant. Roll Call (3-0):

Allison-Ampe Yes
Susse Yes
Schlichtman Yes

On a **motion** by Dr. Allison-Ampe, **seconded** by Dr. Susse, it was **voted** to adjourn at 1:05 p.m. Roll Call (3-0):

Allison-Ampe Yes
Susse Yes
Schlichtman Yes