

**GOVERNANCE PROCESS POLICIES DRAFT 8/10/09
FOR DISCUSSION ONLY
(Comments are in italics)**

Global Governance Process Policy

The purpose of the board, on behalf of ~~<ownership>~~ the residents of the State of California is to ensure that ~~<the organization>~~ PCHS (a) achieves appropriate results for ~~appropriate persons~~ students in accordance with the PCHS Mission Statement for an ~~appropriate cost~~ (as specified in board Ends Policies) and (b) avoids unacceptable actions and situations (as prohibited in board Executive Limitations Policies).

Formatted: No underline
Formatted: No underline

“Governance” as used in these Governance Process Policies is distinct and separate from “management” in that it (a) ensures that conditions apply whereby PCHS’ managers (in particular, the Executive Director) act in the interests of the residents of the State of California and (b) ensures that the Executive Director is held accountable to the residents of the State of California and PCHS’ stakeholders for outcomes and the use of assets. The role of governance is to specify ends (e.g., that PCHS narrow, and ultimately close, the achievement gap) and to ensure that ends are achieved, while the role of management is to determine the means necessary to achieve the ends and to execute those means (e.g., allocation of resources and on what programs, classes, staff, facilities, materials, etc.).
<Note: The board will be developing Ends Policies that specify the outcomes that PCHS management must achieve. This process will draw from previously developed materials such as the PCHS charter and will involve stakeholder input.>

Policy GP #1: Governing Style

The board will govern lawfully, observing the principles of good governance practices, with an emphasis on (a) outward vision rather than internal preoccupation, (b) encouragement of diversity in viewpoints, (c) ~~strategic leadership~~ governance more than administrative detail, (d) clear distinction of board and ~~CEO~~ Executive Director roles, (e) collective rather than individual decisions, ~~(f) future rather than past or present,~~ and (gf) proactivity rather than reactivity.

- 1.1 The board will cultivate a sense of group responsibility among trustees. The board, not the ~~staff~~ management, will be responsible for excellence in governing. The board will be the initiator of governance policy, not merely a reactor to ~~staff~~ management initiatives. The board will not use the expertise of individual ~~members~~ trustees to substitute for the judgment of the board in any of its functions, although the expertise of individual ~~members~~ trustees may be used to enhance the understanding of the board as a body.
- 1.2 The board will direct, ~~control,~~ and inspire the ~~organization~~ PCHS through the careful establishment of broad written policies reflecting the ~~organization’s~~ PCHS’ and the board’s values and perspectives. The board’s major policy focus will be on the intended long-term impacts outside the ~~staff organization~~ day-to-day operations of the school, not on

GOVERNANCE PROCESS POLICIES DRAFT 8/10/09
FOR DISCUSSION ONLY
(Comments are in italics)

the administrative or programmatic means of attaining those effects
(except in cases where means violate board established policy).

- 1.3 The board will enforce upon itself whatever discipline is needed to govern with excellence. Discipline will apply to matters such as attendance, preparation for meetings, policy making principles, respect of roles, and ensuring the continuance of governance capability. Although the board can change its Governance Process Policies at any time, it will scrupulously observe those currently in force.
- 1.4 Continual board development will include orientation of new board members in the board's governance process and periodic board discussion of process improvement.
- 1.5 The board will allow no officer, individual, or committee of the board to hinder or serve as an excuse for not fulfilling the board's group obligations. For instance, the board may not blame its own failed performance on the flawed recommendation of a committee, manager or individual trustee.
- 1.6 The board will regularly monitor and discuss the board's process and performance at each meeting. Self-monitoring will include comparison of board activity and discipline to policies in the Governance Process and Board-Management Delegation categories.
- 1.7 The board will actively encourage and seek the input and opinions of stakeholders and the public on major issues and policies under consideration.

Formatted: Bullets and Numbering

Policy GP #2: Board Role and Responsibilities

Specific job outputs of the board as an informed agent of the ownership-residents of the State of California are those that ensure appropriate organizational performance as defined in board Ends Policies.

- 2.1 Authoritative linkage between the ownership-residents of the State of California, stakeholders and the operational organization.
- 2.2 Written governing policies that realistically address the broadest levels of all organizational decisions and situations: Ends, Executive Limitations,

**GOVERNANCE PROCESS POLICIES DRAFT 8/10/09
FOR DISCUSSION ONLY
(Comments are in italics)**

Governance Process and Board-Management Delegation. *Again, the specific policy categories may be altered or renamed to fit Pali's needs. <Note: The board will be developing Board-Management Delegation Policies that describe how the board delegates responsibilities to the Executive Director and what each party can expect from the another, including monitoring compliance with the other three categories of governance policies - Ends, Executive Limitations, and Governance Process.>*

Formatted: Not Highlight

- 2.3 Assurance of successful organizational performance on Ends and Executive Limitations.

Formatted: Not Highlight

Formatted: Not Highlight

Formatted: Not Highlight

Formatted: Not Highlight

Policy GP #3: Board ~~Chair~~Chair Role and Responsibilities

~~The~~ As noted here and in the PCHS bylaws, the board ~~chair~~chair, is a specifically empowered ~~member~~trustee of the board, who ensures the integrity of the board's process and, secondarily, occasionally represents the board to outside parties.

- 3.1 The ~~chair~~chair's job is to ensure that the board behaves consistently with its own rules and those legitimately imposed upon it from outside the organization. Related to this, the chair shall (a) develop board agendas (with input from trustees), (b) facilitate board of trustee meetings, (c) act as the single point of contact with the board's legal counsel for board-related issues, (d) communicate with stakeholders and the public, (e) act as the primary point of board contact with the press, and (f) address any reports that the board or individual trustee(s) are in violation of law or board policies.

- 3.1.1 Meeting agendas ~~discussion content~~ will consist solely of issues that clearly belong to the board to decide or to monitor according to board policy. The chair shall work with the Executive Director and board committees to ensure that issues that are not appropriate for board agendas are properly redirected.

- 3.1.2 The chair is empowered to chair board meetings with all the commonly accepted powers of that position, such as recognizing and calling for motions.

Formatted: Bullets and Numbering

- ~~3-1-23.1.3~~ Information that is neither for monitoring performance nor for board decisions will be avoided or minimized and always noted as such.

- ~~3-1-33.1.4~~ Deliberation will be fair, open, and thorough but also timely, orderly, and kept to the point.

Formatted: Bullets and Numbering

**GOVERNANCE PROCESS POLICIES DRAFT 8/10/09
FOR DISCUSSION ONLY
(Comments are in italics)**

3.1.5 The chair may represent the board to outside parties in (a) announcing board-stated positions and decisions, (b) providing information on board process and upcoming agendas, and (c) stating chair decisions and interpretations within the area delegated to that role.

Formatted: Bullets and Numbering

3.2 The authority of the chair consists in making decisions that fall within topics covered by board policies on Governance Process and Board-Management Delegation, with the exception of (a) employment or termination of the CEO/Executive Director and (b) areas where the board specifically delegates portions of this authority to others. The chair is authorized to use any reasonable interpretation of the provisions in these policies.

~~3.2.1~~ The chair is empowered to chair board meetings with all the commonly accepted powers of that position, such as ruling and recognizing.

~~3.2.2~~ 3.2.1 The chair has no authority to make decisions about policies created by the board within Ends and Executive Limitations policy areas. Therefore, the chair has no authority to supervise or direct the CEO/Executive Director, although the chair will act as the primary liaison between the board and the CEO/Executive Director.

Formatted: Bullets and Numbering

~~3.2.3~~ The chair may represent the board to outside parties in (a) announcing board-stated positions and decisions, (b) providing information on board process and upcoming agendas, and (c) stating chair decisions and interpretations within the area delegated to that role.

Formatted: Bullets and Numbering

~~3.2.4~~ 3.2.2 The chair may delegate this his/her authority under this Policy GP #3 but remains accountable for its use.

Formatted: Bullets and Numbering

It seems that it would also be helpful to provide general guidelines for the board chair's authority in setting agendas, addressing violations of board policies, researching legal questions, etc.

Policy GP #4: Board ~~Vice~~ Vice-Chair ~~Chair~~ Role and Responsibilities

As noted here and in the PCHS bylaws, the vice-chair of the board is a specifically empowered trustee of the board who, in the absence of the chair, presides at board of trustee meetings and may assume other roles and functions of the chair as directed by the board. Further, the vice-chair supports and assists the chair as needed.

**GOVERNANCE PROCESS POLICIES DRAFT 8/10/09
FOR DISCUSSION ONLY
(Comments are in italics)**

I didn't find any examples of this and I think that it would be helpful to define the vice chair's role as distinct from the chair's.

Policy GP #5: Board Secretary Role and Responsibilities

As noted here and in the PCHS bylaws, the board secretary is an officer of the board whose purpose is to ensure the integrity of the board's documents.

- 5.1 The assigned result of the secretary's job is to see to it that all board documents and filings are accurate, timely and adherent to legal requirements, as well as properly stored and accessible. Further, the board secretary will ensure that
 - 5.1.1 Policies will reflect most current board decisions.
 - 5.1.2 Bylaw elements necessary for legal compliance and for consistency with the principles of good governance will be known to the board.
 - 5.1.3 Requirements for format, brevity and accuracy of board minutes will be known to the board and appropriate staff. Draft board minutes will be prepared in a timely manner for board review and approved at the next following regular board meeting.
- 5.2 The authority of the secretary is access to and control over board documents, and the use of staff time not to exceed _____ hours per prudent use of staff time year.

Policy GP #6: Board Member Code of Conduct

The board commits itself and its ~~board member~~ trustees to ethical, professional and lawful conduct, including proper use of authority and appropriate decorum when acting as ~~board member~~ trustees.

- 6.1 ~~Board members~~ Trustees must uphold and champion the principles stated in ~~<the organization's>~~ PCHS' corporate documents.
- 6.2 To the best of their ability, ~~board members~~ trustees will communicate the interests, concerns and priorities of the group they represent to the board, but will at all times make decisions based on the full findings of facts and the best interests of ~~<the ownership>~~ the residents of the State of California.

Formatted: Indent: Left: 0.35"

GOVERNANCE PROCESS POLICIES DRAFT 8/10/09
FOR DISCUSSION ONLY
(Comments are in italics)

- 6.3 Board members must demonstrate loyalty to ~~the ownership~~, the residents of the State of California unconflicted by loyalties to their interest-stakeholder group(s), other organizations or individuals, or any personal interest.
- 6.4 Board members must avoid conflict of interest with respect to their fiduciary responsibility as further outlined in ~~the organization's~~ PCHS' conflict of interest code. In circumstances where the existence of a conflict of interest may be unclear, ~~board member~~ trustees are encouraged to discuss the circumstances with the board ~~chair~~ chair or full board in order to ensure that the ~~board member~~ trustee fulfills his or her responsibilities as a ~~board member~~ trustee.
- 6.5 ~~Board members~~ Trustees will exercise the powers and duties of their office honestly and in good faith, and exercise a degree of care, diligence and skill that a reasonably prudent person would exercise in comparable circumstances.
- 6.6 Trustees will not make personal promises or take private action that may compromise their performance or responsibilities as a trustee.
- 6.6.7 ~~Board members~~ Trustees may not attempt to exercise individual authority over the organization.
- 6.3.16.7.1 ~~Board members'~~ Trustees' interaction with the CEO Executive Director or with staff must recognize the lack of authority invested in ~~individuals~~ individual trustees except when explicitly authorized by the board.
- 6.3.26.7.2 ~~Board members'~~ Trustees' interaction with the public, the press, or other entities must recognize the same limitation and the inability of any ~~board member~~ trustee to speak for the board except to repeat explicitly stated board decisions.
- 6.3.36.7.3 When deliberating about the CEO's Executive Director's performance review, ~~board member~~ trustees will focus discussion on (a) the achievement of ends as specified in board Ends Policies and (b) whether the CEO-Executive Director has achieved any reasonable interpretation of board policy.
- 6.76.8 ~~Board members~~ Trustees will maintain strict confidentiality of any matters discussed in closed session. Any violation of this will result in immediate dismissal from the board.

Formatted: Bullets and Numbering

Formatted: Bullets and Numbering

Formatted: Indent: Left: 1", Hanging: 0.5",
Tab stops: Not at 1.28"

Formatted: Bullets and Numbering

Formatted: Bullets and Numbering

Formatted: Bullets and Numbering

Formatted: Bullets and Numbering

GOVERNANCE PROCESS POLICIES DRAFT 8/10/09
FOR DISCUSSION ONLY
(Comments are in italics)

~~6.8~~6.9 ~~Board members~~ Trustees will maintain professional decorum in the discussion of any non-confidential board issues.

Formatted: Bullets and Numbering

~~6.9~~6.10 ~~Board members~~ Trustees will be properly prepared for board deliberation.

Formatted: Bullets and Numbering

~~6.10~~6.11 ~~Board members~~ Trustees will support the legitimacy and authority of the final determination of the board on any matter, without regard to the board member's/trustee's personal position on the matter.

Formatted: Bullets and Numbering

~~6.11~~6.12 ~~Board members~~ Trustees will volunteer to participate for standing and ad hoc committees as necessary to fulfill the board's obligations.

Formatted: Bullets and Numbering

**DRAFT EXECUTIVE LIMITATIONS POLICY - HIRING
FOR DISCUSSION AND ACTION AT 6/9/09 BOARD MEETING**

Global Executive Limitations Policy

The Executive Director will not cause or allow any organizational practice, activity, decision, or circumstance that is unlawful, imprudent, or in violation of commonly accepted professional ethics and practices. The Executive Director is authorized to use any reasonable interpretation of the provisions in this policy and the policies that follow.

Policy EL #1: Hiring

With respect to the hiring of staff, the Executive Director will not cause or allow conditions that are unfair, undignified, disorganized, or unclear.

- 1.1 The Executive Director will not allow the hiring of any employee without the following:
 - 1.1.1 Consistent criteria.
 - 1.1.2 Wide posting and communication of open positions.
 - 1.1.3 Clear communication of job requirements, necessary skills, and length and terms of employment to candidates.
 - 1.1.4 Whenever feasible, demonstration by candidates of key skills required for the position.
 - 1.1.5 Thoroughly researched and verified candidate references, especially from recent positions.
 - 1.1.6 A completed application for employment.
 - 1.1.7 Confirmation of required credential(s) (if applicable).
 - 1.1.8 Sign-off on the employee manual.
 - 1.1.9 Appropriate health and legal screenings.
- 1.2 The Executive Director will not allow the hiring of any employee (excluding part-time, seasonal and auxiliary/stipend assignments) without first seeking input from stakeholders.
 - 1.2.1 To assist in the decision making of the Executive Director (or other supervisor as designated by organizational structure or delegated

by the Executive Director – the “Hiring Supervisor”), an Interview Committee will be formed that includes stakeholders, at least half of whom are either (a) well-versed or expert in the unique position requirements or (b) direct colleagues of the position.

- 1.2.2 To qualify for Interview Committee membership, all Interview Committee members must receive training in Human Resources law relevant to interviewing/hiring, this Policy EL #1: Hiring, position requirements and decision criteria.
- 1.2.3 Upon request, the names and contact information of Interview Committee members will be provided to stakeholders so that stakeholders may provide input to the Interview Committee.
- 1.3 The Executive Director will not deviate substantially from the hiring process that follows (excluding the hiring of part-time, seasonal and auxiliary/stipend assignments):
 - 1.3.1 The Interview Committee will narrow the field of candidates and refer finalists to the Executive Director or the Hiring Supervisor.
 - 1.3.2 The Executive Director (or Hiring Supervisor) and the Human Resources Director will conduct additional interviews with finalists.
 - 1.3.3 For senior-level positions, the Executive Director (or Hiring Supervisor) may also solicit stakeholder volunteers (other than those who served on the Interview Committee) to conduct one-on-one interviews with finalists and provide input to the Executive Director (or Hiring Supervisor).
 - 1.3.4 The Executive Director (or Hiring Supervisor) will select the finalist to whom to make an offer of employment. The Executive Director (or Hiring Supervisor) will also have the option not to make an offer of employment to any finalist.
 - 1.3.5 Prior to making an offer of employment to a finalist (or not making an offer of employment to any finalist), the Executive Director (or Hiring Supervisor) will report his/her decision to the Interview Committee along with the rationale for the decision.
 - 1.3.6 The Executive Director will have the authority to select and hire, or delegate the selection and hiring, of all employees (except for the Executive Director), as outlined herein.

- 1.4 The Executive Director will not execute any individual employment agreement that does not include written performance criteria.
- 1.4.1 The Board of Trustees must approve the employment agreements of top administrators and managers defined as officers of the corporation by the PCHS Bylaws (i.e., Executive Director, Principal, and Chief Business Officer) to ensure compliance with this EL Policy #1 and other relevant Board and PCHS policies.
- 1.4.2 All other employment agreements for administrators and managers must be developed from a Board-approved template and follow salary policies set by the Board.
-

Potential Options for Final Hiring Authority

- Committee makes final hiring decision.
- ED (or "Hiring Supervisor" as defined in the draft hiring policy) makes final hiring decision.
- Committee makes final hiring decision but ED (or Hiring Supervisor) has right to veto, but must communicate to committee the reasons for doing so.
- Committee and ED (or Hiring Supervisor) must be in agreement on final hiring decision. If not, final decision goes to the board.

Alternative Approach to Committee Composition

- At least half of any hiring committee is a standing group, appointed by the board and trained and committed for a certain period of time to participate in all hiring. Since multiple positions are often being recruited simultaneously, it could be that there are enough people in this standing group (say 6 or 8) so that they do not all have to serve on every hiring committee

PARENT EMAILS ON DRAFT EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR LIMITATIONS POLICY –
HIRING DATED 6.6.09

I'd like to share my input on the attached policy. I think it is a vast improvement over what currently goes on in hiring; it is clear and ensures more accountability in the process. My comments:

- o This is a general comment. Is there a strategy here that puts this policy in the negative? Things "not to do, unless" versus the positive, pro-active? I just think it's odd but perhaps strategic.
 - o In item 1.1.1, I suggest adding "consistent, well-defined and applicable criteria." Two issues here, one is defining hiring criteria that is sufficient versus necessary. For example, college degrees in specific content areas may be absolutely necessary for a job (eg. teaching positions); college degrees may also be useful, but not necessary, for other positions as a means to screen candidates. Experience in some positions may be in lieu of education. These types of criteria need to be well-defined in advance. This is very important in evaluating candidates. Our job postings tend to focus on describing the positions' roles and responsibilities and very little on what type of person we're looking for. I would hope this policy would address these issues in some manner.
 - o In item 1.2.1, is there some way to include members of the hiring committee who have skill and experience in hiring? ...Making the right selection, evaluating candidates, requires some experience, intuition, and skill. If 50% of the committee should understand the position and/or be a colleague, shouldn't we also be developing a core of hiring committee members who have demonstrated skill and experience? Especially if we're including other stakeholder groups, eg. parents and community members?
 - o In item 1.3.5, please replace the word "report" with "communicate." "Report" implies an employee "reporting" to a supervisor. I don't believe this policy is intending to make the Executive Director accountable to the hiring committee.
-

It is essential that the final vote be from the search committee. The final decision should not be made by any single person. This would not be healthy for Pali. Please think about this unless I am misunderstanding. The committee should vote so it's fair and a majority--a single person should not make the final decision, if we do that we will always run into trouble. This seems pretty obvious.

I am not an expert in this, and therefore don't see any issues or problems with the hiring rules, but it seems to me in this day and age - and with all the recent press (LA Times) on how hard it is to terminate staff - that there should be some ground rules in place for

rules for dismissal that the employee would have to abide by - in other words not just seek the refuge of the teachers union or what have you.

Given Pal High's charter rules, is the inclusion of such policies on termination permitted?

It seems to me that there are cases where it would be desirable to be able to dismiss or have a real threat of dismissal to keep employees in line. Could you kindly advise the status of this?

I am aware of at least one teacher that a number of parents would like to be able to get rid of or at least have a real threat of dismissal at the school's disposal, but under current rules it is nearly impossible. This is not healthy for any organization.

Please see attached comments/suggestions. I agree that our experience dictates the need to approach recruitment, selection and retention of employees in a more professional manner. Generally though, the attached document is so vague that it is unlikely to achieve the desired result (assuming that result is improved hiring and retention practices). An executive director has equal opportunity to interpret this document in a way that is consistent with, or contrary to, Board intent. And the potentially large number of "stakeholders" who can provide input makes it hard to pin hiring responsibility on the executive director (as it appears we are trying to do).

As a side note, the evaluation of the executive director's performance can only be tied to employee selection to the extent he or she follows this policy. As such, this policy should be consistent with specific and clear goals included in the executive director's contract (e.g., tie executive director performance to the defined success of his or her hires). Tying performance to vague language just sets us up for endless debate.

We should keep our eye on the ball (i.e., to improve the recruitment, selection and retention of employees with a definite, measurable criteria). This policy should be just one tool in a comprehensive HR plan, not a knee-jerk reaction to our hiring difficulties. There are people who specialize in the science of recruitment, selection and retention of employees, and the Board should seek them out. This is not a job for volunteers, and the Board cannot feasibly micromanage the process.

<This individual included very specific redline edits to the policy that were emailed to the entire board>

With respect to the draft document that Julia O'Grady electronically distributed this morning, I would like to offer the following comment:

The average parent at Pali is very much in the dark about major decisions taken by the board of directors. All we know is that every year, the last principal departs and a new one arrives, only to repeat the pattern the following year...It is disappointing and mystifying that this unprecedented turnover of key administrators has not occasioned any explanation or even communication from the board to the parent body.

One surmises that the Executive Limitations Policy Regarding Hiring was drafted to address some of the perceived failures of the selection process that has been employed in the last two hiring rounds for principal and director of instruction. But once again, in keeping with previous practice, there is no provision for input or meaningful participation by the parent body. This time, could we not try a different, and more inclusive tack?

I would like to proposed that the selection process for principal and director of instruction include an evening town hall meeting with parents, to give us an opportunity to meet the finalists selected by the interview committee, to ask questions, and to submit feedback. Scheduling the town hall meeting in the evening, with adequate notice, is critical to allowing a broad cross-section of parents, the majority of whom work during the day, to attend. Any consensus that emerges from the parent feedback (whether expressing enthusiasm or concern) should be conveyed to the Executive Director, to be factored into her final decision.

I would also strongly encourage the board to address the latest developments, and explain where we go from here, in a written communication to parents.

This looks like an appropriate next step for the school. I wish you success at the next board meeting.

... We have seen a rotating door in the administration. Here are some of my observations:

1. No clear job description - if there is one for Principal, most have not seen it. Also, there should be job objectives with metrics. (by the way, Amy Held's objectives have no metrics, how can you measure her performance, related to student grades improving, number graduating, funding generated for the school, etc.)
2. The search process - Last year, when Marcia Haskin was there, Pali only saw two

candidates; one who turned down the job the year before, and Mr. Griffin, who came from a much smaller school. In the letter that Julia O'grady sent yesterday, there was very little mentioned about the search process itself. There are not enough candidates, we don't know where Pali is currently looking, etc. I think this is a big part of the problem.

3. Roles and Responsibilities of the Executive Director versus Principal - Is this clearly articulated? Most Schools the principal runs the school, not the executive director.

4. Who is doing the interviews? Why don't you ask for parent volunteers, such as myself, who run large scale organizations, to assess management skills? I would volunteer. I manage the entire Information Technology agency for the City of LA, 800 employees.

5. Perception Issues - Last year, it was perceived that a school like Pali should have full time principal. I agree. However, contracts were only given for 1 year. Most applicants would prefer a job with a longer term contract. Pali may not be getting the best candidates with this criteria. You can always write a contract with particular job performance characteristics. I believe that since Pali felt they really needed a full time principal last year, they did not do a full extensive search. Given the economy, I am sure the Board can find more qualified candidates, particularly if they are willing to give longer term contracts.

Please let me know if there is anything I can do to help.

Is there some mechanism in place that governs the hires that occurred between the time the Pali High became independent and the present (or when this new policy will be in effect)? From one parent's perspective, I am thinking of at least two recent hires whose job assessments need looking at. Perhaps these policies, once approved and made effective, should apply to those employees hired since Pali's independence?

Just something to consider. Thanks for listening,

As I see it, we currently have a "weak CEO" form of governance. The CEO has significant powers, but the Board is an active one, and ultimately must make or approve many of the most important decisions for the school. Although some corporations are run that way, most are not. They are run with a stronger CEO who reports to the Board and is accountable to the Board, but ultimately has fundamental control over management. Recently, though, that form of corporate governance has come under fire, as CEOs have started to have too much power and, as a practical matter, were not accountable enough.

Governmental entities are run differently. Looking at city level structures (which is probably closer to Pali than a state governance structure), there are essentially the weak

General Manager or weak Mayor systems and strong GM or Mayor systems. It is hard to say which is better; the strong mayor/GM system is often more efficient, but is more vulnerable.

Pali, it seems to me, cannot be likened completely to a corporate enterprise. Unlike a corporation, we don't have just one group of shareholders. We have many stakeholders. And, of course, Pali serves a public purpose and is itself a public enterprise. At the same time, the hide-bound systems of the LAUSD have proven themselves to be unworkable, and that is the very reason that we have a Charter to begin with.

I empathize with the notion that Pali's Executive Director needs the Governance Board's support, and I understand the theory that says that he or she (she in this instance) ought to be able to pick the top management team. This, of course, goes hand in hand with accountability and the theory that if the team does not perform well, it is the team and the Executive Director's jobs that are on the line. If the Executive Director cannot pick the management team, then it is impossible to hold the Executive Director fully responsible for management's failure. By the same token, a successful team is a reflection of a successful Executive Director.

At the same time, Pali's charter is deliberately set up to give voice to the many stakeholders who care about our school, and it is designed to give them a direct say in the important decisions. Few decisions can be as important as choosing the senior staff. In addition, because there are so many stakeholders, it becomes critical to ensure that their voices are not lost or rendered powerless.

So, the question is how to find the balance between giving the Executive Director the power to do her job and find a team that shares her vision -- and also to give her the support of the Board -- while at the same time ensuring that all stakeholders do have a meaningful voice in critical hiring decisions. And, as we put the system in place, we have to remember that we are putting in a process designed for various different situations. We cannot put a process in place based on the individuals who hold positions at present. In other words, we need a process that works as well when we love the Executive Director as when we are troubled by the Executive Director, for we never know what the future will bring years down the line.

The old system had a committee make a recommendation to the Board. I have never really understood how committee members were chosen -- which itself tended to make the process less transparent than it should have been.

It seems to me there are basically two choices. One is to maintain the committee structure. Presumably, the Committee would have due regard for the fact that the Executive Director is the CEO of the school, and appropriate deference would be given the the Executive Director's views when the Board makes the final decision. But all of that said, the committee would make the recommendation and the Board would make the decision.

The other option is to have a fully advisory committee interview, but ultimately to have the ED make the decision. I see the pros and cons of both, and I understand your comments, which suggests that the Board is leaning toward the latter system. If we are going to have the latter system, I would recommend the following modifications.

1. The committee selection process (that is, who is on the Committee) should be an open one. That is easy enough for the teacher reps, as I assume the teachers select them. For parents it is a bit tougher, but we ought to have a system that makes sure that the selection criteria for committee membership are known and that diverse views are represented. This is really critical, as it is the quid pro quo if you will for taking the decision making power out of the stakeholders' hands.
2. While the Committee's selection is not binding on the Executive Director, if the Executive Director elects not to go with the Committee's recommendation, it may well be a good idea for the Executive Director to explain the reasons, either to the Committee or to the Board or both, and that ought to be done in person, albeit probably in closed session. I think this gives appropriate deference to the stakeholders and the time they spent interviewing. It also allows the Committee to explain their decision to the Executive Director. They may ultimately not be able to come to consensus, but at least there will be a free flow of communication. This also enhances accountability.
3. I agree that the Board can and should approve any contracts, especially those that are not terminable at will and without penalty. Frankly, I would have the Board at least ratify any decision that the Executive Director makes. I know that in many corporations, at least the very top picks are ratified, and as a matter of corporate formality, all officers are appointed by the Board at least technically.
4. The purpose of the new system, as I understand it, is to achieve greater accountability. For better or worse, the Board must be willing to hold people accountable under those circumstances. I suspect that goes without saying, but it probably still makes sense to say it.

At bottom, I remain concerned with the notion of taking the most senior hiring decisions away from the Board and the stakeholders. Gains in efficiency (and I know that there are some very real gains) can be offset by the loss of process and input. I hope that the Board is able to find the appropriate balance between these difficult and to a degree competing needs.

August 17, 2009

Dear Palisades Charter High School Board of Directors:

I am writing to tell you that I oppose the Executive Limitations Policy-Hiring change being proposed. Proponents feel that accountability will be enhanced by making the Executive Director solely responsible for the hiring, evaluation, and termination of all employees at Palisades Charter High School. I believe that rather than enhancing accountability, this proposal would severely weaken the Board and undermine its governance role.

The Board of Directors of all organizations have four primary responsibilities:

- Articulating the mission of the organization, and identifying those it serves in a fiduciary capacity.
- Setting quantifiable goals that are designed to meet the objectives as set forth in the mission. Continuous review to determine whether goals are being met.
- Determine the policies that will facilitate meeting the goals in order to fulfill the mission.
- Staff positions with people who are competent and determined to follow the policies that will lead to the desired goals.

The Board of Directors bears the ultimate responsibility for whether an organization has fulfilled its mission, used its assets judiciously, and conducted itself in a lawful and appropriate manner.

The mission of Palisades Charter High School is to educate its diverse pupils by developing their skills and talents to help them make a positive contribution to the global society. I have not seen any concise, quantifiable goals articulated by either the administration, or the board, so I question why the board is considering policies (Executive Limitations Policy-Hiring) whose purpose is to accomplish goals that don't yet exist.

At Palisades Charter High School (PCHS) we are currently going through a period of considerable instability as it relates to the academic leadership at the school. We have had four principal changes in four years, and three director of instruction changes in three years. I have heard talk from some people that since API and high school exit exam pass rates have risen the last few years academics have not suffered. I beg to differ. Look below the surface and you see a very different picture.

PCHS API scores have risen, but so have every other schools. According to the California Department of Education, in 1999 4.9% of the high schools in the state had a base API of 800 or above. In the latest results, 17.1% of high schools in the state met or exceeded that bar. Our API score has benefited from a significant demographic shift. Comparing PCHS to similar schools, our ranking has declined, going from 10 to 9, and now 8.

In 2005-2006 PCHS earned the title of Distinguished School and was honored by being ranked in the top 1% of high schools by Newsweek Magazine with a ranking of 209. After staying within the low to mid 200 range for many years, our ranking declined dramatically, rising to 349 in 2008, and 560 in 2009.

University of Southern California- The Center on Educational Governance ranked charter schools this year on a number of measures. Palisades Charter High School ranked well on all measures, except academic momentum, where we scored four out of a possible ten.

I was a parent involved with our midterm accreditation review this spring. The representatives from the Western Association of Schools and Colleges (WASC) voiced strong concern for the period when we lacked effective and consistent academic leadership. They expressed relief that Martin Griffin and Grace La Tegola were on board, and felt that they were starting out strong. Less than a week later, Mr. Griffin's contract was not renewed, and Ms. La Tegola resigned.

The WASC Midterm Progress Report (April 2009) acknowledges that the lack of effective, consistent academic leadership has adversely affected our ability to accomplish our primary mission- academic excellence. Some quotes-

The administrative/management team at PCHS now appears to be securely in place; the turnover, however, resulted in major time and resources being devoted to human resources issues by administration, faculty, and staff at the expense of priorities such as instruction, intervention, and the Professional Learning Community's efficacy and structure.

Due to the administrative upheavals of 2006-2008, and the resulting overburdening of permanent administrators with duties outside their job descriptions, PLC's essentially for two years had little feedback from the administration at a critical time in their development; while some thrived, others struggled.

One observation that was voiced repeatedly in stakeholder feedback about the "pyramid" (Pyramid of Intervention) was that while the process seemed fairly clear in 2006-2007, it has not been articulated since then. As a result of this lack of coordination and communication of the process, departments, PLC's, programs, and individual teachers and staff have often gone their own way with interventions. This lack of consistency across the board has been confusing to both staff and students.

One of the teachers from this group called the conference "career-changing," felt it validated what he had been instinctively doing for some time, and began implementing many of the strategies immediately. This teacher later presented his findings and materials from the conference at a professional development breakout session on the buy-back days in fall, 2007. To this date, however, there has been no creation of a group of "peer trainers" to share and demonstrate strategies. As with the pyramid of intervention, the WASC differentiated instruction goal suffered during the 2007-2008 school year due to the partial leadership vacuum. Depth of understanding about the relationship between student assessment, and lesson planning as it relates to differentiated instruction is in need of development, schoolwide.

The general area in which PCHS has not followed the Action Plan is in the development and implementation of a knowledge management system which would capture, store and ready for access, best formative and summative assessment tools, in use at PCHS and elsewhere in the field. Although the general benefits of formative assessments, models of formative assessments, and the use of formative assessments have been laid out for the faculty repeatedly, primarily by Mr. Rauschuber, the administrative gaps of the last year or two have not permitted PCHS to focus on, inventory, share, and systematize to some extent the use of formative assessments. Knowledge Management will be a focus of PCHS in 2009-2010.

Evidence of which PLC's are more advanced in their use of common formative assessments can be found in various PLC notebooks and minutes; as a result of both the wide variety of formative assessments as well as the last year (2007-2008) of leadership, however, there has never been a systematic inventory of formative assessments used by individual teachers or PLC's on campus, nor a sharing out of best practices among PLC's, departments, and leadership. PLC data coordinators agree that PCHS needs to be more systematized in the way it develops, assesses, modifies, shares, and reflects on the results of formative assessments.

I hope that I have convinced you that your # 1 priority at this time is to reestablish at PCHS the framework that leads to academic excellence. We need a principal with exceptional credentials, experience, and leadership skills to first reinvigorate, and then drive us to the next level.

I attended the June Board meeting when the revised Executive Limitations-Hiring Policy was discussed. I was disappointed to see some board members disavow themselves of responsibility for presumed academic leadership mistakes by claiming they did not participate in the candidate interviews. Under fiduciary governance laws, the Board is ultimately accountable for the success or failure of an organization. I do not believe that revising the bylaws so that the Board is seemingly removed from any accountability tied to hiring mistakes is appropriate. Instead, I believe that if individual board members do not want to take responsibility for decisions regarding hiring, firing, or anything else, they should offer their resignation to the Board, so that they may be replaced with people who are willing to accept the responsibilities of the office, including accountability.

At PCHS we need to stop pointing fingers. Rather than asking who is to blame for the "hiring failures," I think the more appropriate question to ask is, "Why are we unable to attract highly qualified, inspiring, innovative, principal candidates."

One intention of the charter founders was to have the school operate more like a corporation. If we look to public companies we see that the Board of Directors is actively involved in identifying, recruiting, interviewing, and selecting top management. High quality companies' Boards continuously evaluate and track employees for their management potential. Financial performance is predominately determined by the quality of the firm's employees, and shareholders would consider the board negligent if they removed themselves from the process.

In conclusion, I would ask you to consider whether removing the board from the employment process enhances, or detracts, from the school's mission. I recommend that a representative from the hiring committee, and the Executive Director, inform the board of their recommendations. The board, with its wealth of diverse expertise and experience, as well as its fiduciary responsibility to all stakeholders, is the most appropriate governing body to select the top administrative positions.

Thank you for your time,

Susan Frank

TEACHER EMAILS RE: EXECUTIVE LIMITATIONS POLICY – HIRING

August 24, 2009

I was reading the attachment and the part "The Executive Director will not deviate substantially from the hiring process that follows" what does "will not deviate substantially" mean? That is a bit abstract and open to interpretation from an executive director. This could open an avenue of going around the process and in one's interpretation that could mean they deviated only a little and not substantially. Maybe define deviate/substantially a bit more to decrease misinterpretation or abuse of the process.

How many people are the interview committee suppose to narrow to: 1, 2, or 3? I think it might be needed to clarify. Knowing our school, if they narrow to one and the exec. dir. doesn't like the candidate, a power struggle could be created, especially if the committee liked the candidate. I think the committee needs to be very clear on their duty of only narrowing and not get attached if the exec. doesn't like what they narrowed to.

Food for thought. Hope you are having a great summer.

The Search Committee should pick the final candidate and the Executive Director should be part of the Search Committee. The Committee should present to the Board...the Executive Director will lose the vote (that's in new charter which I believe LAUSD has not approved yet?) BUT can try to sway the Board (yay or nay), ...the Board will decide...Also, if the Executive Director is on leave and the Board President is in charge, the Board President should give up voting right (as he/she is acting as Executive Director and the ExecD in new Charter is a "non-voting" member). What about liability? better to NOT have it be on just ONE individual (as in Executive Director which is why a Committee Decision would be better

Thank you for communicating with the faculty as the faculty board representative.

While the provisions in 1.3.4 and 1.3.6 make me a little uneasy, I have become disenchanted with our current hiring process, as well. Our hiring committees, and I have served on more than one, have always done their job with integrity and to the best of their ability. Nevertheless, the committees, including those upon which I have served, have made some important selections that later turned out not to be in the best interest in the school. I have given a great deal of thought to this phenomenon, and although I don't feel I have all the answers, I do have one or two thoughts.

I think the Board's policy MUST include details on the vetting of candidates who are finalists for any position. The language of the proposed policy may not be strong enough on this issue. I believe that, wherever feasible, the candidate should be observed in his/her current position, especially if that position is similar or relevant to the position for which the candidate is applying at PCHS. This observation should be done by the Executive Director, H.R. Director and other PCHS personnel, including, but not limited to, direct colleagues of the position. Whether or not direct observation is possible, a more thorough process of checking with previous colleagues and supervisors must take place. We have hired and replaced more than one candidate whose inappropriateness for the position at PCHS became apparent only upon his/her actual employment at our school, when more thorough background checks, especially conversations with former colleagues, might have made us aware of the issues that prevented the hire from working out.

The issue of who makes the final decision is a thorny one. If that power lies with the Executive Director, then the E.D. must be a person of the highest integrity, discernment, and judgment. While our current E.D. may possess all those attributes, and I know there are some who might not agree that she is qualified to make such decisions alone, future E.D.'s might not have the same level of the qualities I have listed. On the other hand, quite simply, the committee process has not worked well enough for us.

I am pleased that the policy calls for training of hiring committee members; this is a good step. I recommend that the Board include our incoming Interim Principal in further discussions of this matter, before the final

policy is drafted. I have reason to believe that Marcia Haskin has a great deal of experience and expertise in the hiring process, and we would be foolish not to include her ideas in the formulation of this critical policy.

Thank you for your time and your earnest consideration of this issue. Your term on the Board is obviously very beneficial to the school.
Sincerely,

I am more concerned with the interviewing committee and the interviewing process. This policy gives a lot of responsibility to the ED but at the same time he buck has to stop somewhere.

I like that the ED has the ultimate responsibility for he hiring. I am glad that the hiring process is being put down on paper. It is a sign we are growing up as an institution.

if someone doesn' work out I think the ED should go back to the committee that recommended the hiring and discuss the problem. Also, what is the crieria used to evaluate an administrator? Is it that we don' like he person or the person has not complied with his/her duties? What is in place to evaluate the administrator? Is it done by only one person? We need to ask ourselves these questions.

Faculty indeed must vote on this. I do not comprehend in any way whatsoever how a person without any teaching experience or credentials can be hiring faculty. If she had some degree in education, then well, yes. As the director she should be raising money for the school, seeking public and corporate grants, courting community wealth and figuring out ways to increase our financial revenue. The Director of Instruction should be in charge of hiring practices. At least it should be within his job purview.

It seems enabling her to meddle into classrooms further increases her autocracy at Pali. What a disaster!!!

These are my thoughts on our ridiculous hiring policies at Pali...

Our "do everything by committee" process, which frequently has people involved in decisions that they know absolutely nothing about, is not necessarily logical nor productive.

It gives people a tremendous amount of power to make decisions that they will not be responsible for. Let's say that a PE teacher sits on the principal committee, hires a principal that is a disaster, goes back to teaching PE, and the whole school is responsible for the disaster and the PE teacher ultimately has no accountability for a bad decision.

I sort of like the new policy. As I understand it, the committee can recommend the people they like, and the person who will be over that person has the last say. So, APs would be hired by the principal, teachers would be chosen by the AP over that department, etc. Whoever the person answers to gets to pick the person they will work with best? Is that correct? It's way more logical in terms of building actual teams that can work together and are good fits. I am under the understanding that the executive director wouldn't sit on most committees. Only the the ones that hire people who report directly to her . . .

. . . The person in charge should have more weight than some person who gets dragged into the committee and will not have to deal with the repercussions if the person does not work out.

The asst. coach analogy is the best. We don't hire asst. coaches by committee. The head coach has to be able to work with the asst. There has to be a fit.

We are a little committee heavy in this regard I think. I know that Pali loves the idea of sharing all power, and that's cool cause we all love power, but the reality is, things aren't getting done because a committee has no

accountability. Committees can neither hold other people accountable nor can they held responsible themselves. When things don't get done, no one is responsible.

That's my two cents.

Sorry I wasn't able to get to this before now.

This is over the top, I think. Why bother having committees? Is the purpose to throw the faculty a bone, make a half-hearted attempt to provide collegial input, keep the natives happy whilst stacking the deck?

Dosen't this violate the Charter's provisions?

I'll set aside time later this week to make specific comments in the draft and forward to you. Don't much like this policy, fear it puts too much power in the ED's hands. More efficient maybe, but eviscerates the faculty hiring committee's contribution.

If you get a chance give me a call.

Thanks for being involved in such a important matter. Here are my thoughts:

1) I feel that the Executive Director should NOT be involved in hiring practices, unless the postions are those that are directly related to school business affairs, ie CFO, Operations Manager, Human Resources etc. All positions dealing with academic affairs, ie faculty and administration should be handled by the faculty. All non-certificated positions should be handled by the Hiring Supervisor.

2) I feel that the interview committee should pick and present to the board the final recommendation for hire.

***Footnote - The position of the Executive Director was created to oversee: facilities expansion, fundraising and grantwriting, being a liaison to LAUSD and dealing with business interests such as the budget, health insurance benefits, etc. I strongly believe that it is time for the board to ensure that the Executive Director acutally fulfill these duties for which she was hired. Thanks,

Kudos to our board!!!

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on a document while is it in DRAFT form!! In the past, documents have been open for comment too close to approval time, by which time philosophies stated in the document are too entrenched to be properly evaluated.

My first comment concerns the source of authority for policies at Pali. The document should be the authority, not a particular person. This is especially important for Pali since we have had such a great turn-over in personnel in recent years. The document can become the source of stability – not a particular person. In other words, the POLICIES NEED TO TRANSCEND ANY PARTICULAR PERSON. Since the document is providing the stability and authority, it must be well thought-out and clear. SO THANK YOU for the opportunity to give my ideas - I will be developing them further and email them to Karen.

AGAIN, THANK YOU for doing this so early in the process!

Here are some of my thoughts about the document you sent out for comment:

- If the CEO and Executive Director is the same person, then the document should use the same word throughout.
- In the Executive Limitations Document, the CEO is given responsibilities that I would assign to HR.
- What are the consequences for not following this document?
- How can this document be changed?

However, the BIG, most important comment I have is why are we writing this policy directed at the Executive Director? Shouldn't we have a general hiring policy that covers what you are trying to do? If the problem is that people don't feel the Executive Director is doing his/her job, or overstepping boundaries, then disciplinary action should be taken – I believe the CEO reports to the board. If the board has not clarified the job sufficiently, then that problem should be addressed, which is what I think is the purpose of the Exec. Limit. Doc. However, if a good hiring policy was in place, you would only have to specify in the Executive Director's contract, that the Executive Director is responsible to carry out ALL the policies of PCHS (which would include the hiring policy). Documented failure to consistently carry out policies AFTER board warnings will result in termination of employment.

It seems that you really need a hiring policy that transcends people and a few statements giving the duty of ensuring that the hiring policy is carried out. I would suggest writing a hiring policy that specifies the process, who is in charge of each part of the process, and how to change the process.

I read some hiring policies that were posted on the internet. They go from a few sentences to book length. This outline was taken from the University of Wisconsin. The parts in brackets {} were added to correspond to the participants defined later, so you might see how it applies to Pali.

- **Announcement of Position Vacancy**
 - ✓ Preparation {HM, HMS define position}
 - ✓ Recruitment {HR}
 - ✓ Development of Interview Forms {HM, IC, HR develop evaluation criteria}
- **Applications**
 - ✓ Application Materials {HR}
 - ✓ Receipt of Materials by Search and Screen Committee {HR}
 - ✓ Notification of Receipt of Materials {HR}
 - ✓ Return of Materials {HR}
- **Screening/Selection Recommendation Process**
 - ✓ Screening Applicants {HR, HM Screen}
 - ✓ Department Head/Supervisor Recommendation of the Candidates {HR Recommends to HM}
 - ✓ Dean/Senior Administrator Recommendation of the Candidates {HM recommends to IC}
- **Interviews (Interview Committee)**
 - ✓ Preparation of Candidate's File {HR}
 - ✓ Candidate On-Campus Interviews
 - Invitations {HR}
 - Interviews {HR, HM, IC interview}
- **Evaluation of Candidates (Interview Committee)** {HM, IC. HM takes offer to HMS for approval}
- **Offer of Appointment** {HR}
- **Issuance of Contract** {HR}
- **Notification of Unsuccessful Applicants** {HR}

I left the hyperlinks for additional information if desired. Our hiring policy will probably cover similar ideas but does not need to be this extensive.

For Pali, we need something that is comprehensive and easy to understand and follow – preferably a single page document. Below is a flow chart incorporating some of the above ideas which developed from the draft document.

Definitions

Hiring Manager = the person doing the hiring of an employee who will work for him/her.

Hiring Manager's Supervisor = the person to whom the Hiring Manager reports. Gives initial approval for the position and for the hiring process to begin. Gives final approval of the offer.

Human Resources = the person who coordinates and oversees personnel policies, benefits, the hiring process, etc.

Interview Committee = a group of stakeholders in the position being offered who directly participate in the interview process. Created by the Human Resources Manager with input from the Hiring Manager and Hiring Manager's Supervisor. Does not include CEO for most positions because the CEO is usually not one of the stakeholders who directly oversees most positions.

Stakeholders: those individuals who would work with the candidate when the candidate is hired.

Example #1: The CEO needs a secretary. The CEO is the Hiring Manager. The secretary is the employee to be hired. The Board is the Hiring Manager's Supervisor.

Example #2: Science Department needs a new teacher. The Department Head is the Hiring Manager. The teacher is the employee to be hired. The Principal or the reporting Administrator for the department (in this case, the Director of Instruction) is the Hiring Manager's Supervisor.

Example #3: The Operations department needs a new janitor. Ken Jefferson (The Facilities Supervisor) is the Hiring Manager. The janitor is the employee to be hired. The Head of Operations (Maisha Cole-Perry) is the Hiring Manager's Supervisor.

Example #4: The Nurse needs an assistant. The Nurse is the Hiring Manager. The assistant is the employee to be hired. The Principal (??) is the Hiring Manager's Supervisor.

Example #5: The Counseling office needs another counselor. The Vice-Principal of Counseling is the Hiring Manager. The Principal is the Hiring Manager's Supervisor.

The flowchart has the following principles:

- checks and balances to ensure the hiring process is fair, impartial, and in keeping with the Pali Mission
- hiring is localized; e.g. the hiring is done by the Hiring Manager with support from HR, the stakeholders and the Hiring Manager's Supervisor
- min number of people are involved – mainly those who will be working directly with the new employee
- Numbers refer to the text in the Exec. Limit. Doc.

Respectfully submitted,

Four phone calls indicated that teachers are in favor of the search committee choosing the candidate and the board making the final decision.

I really appreciate you giving the faculty the opportunity to provide input on the Hiring Policy Draft, and for voicing the opinion of the faculty at the Board of Directors meetings. In addition, I would like to thank the Board of Directors for their countless hours and effort they have dedicated to making the school a great school for students, staff, teachers, parents, etc.

The following is my opinion on: (1) the proposed Hiring Policy Draft, and (2) the rationale presented in support of the draft found in the email sent by Rene Rodman on June 07, 2009.

The driving force (philosophy) behind pursuing an independent charter was to give teachers (and other stakeholder groups including classified staff, community members and parents) the ability to make decisions pertaining to policy, finance, educational programs, human resources, leadership, governance, and other elements of running a school. In fact it was LAUSD's rejection of the 7 day absence policy that led a group of teachers to shed light on the idea of converting from an "affiliated" charter to an "independent" charter. One of the "selling points" of becoming an independent charter that was shared with the rest of the teachers was this

ability for teachers to make decisions at all levels including the the "Human Resources" Committee. The "Human Resources" Committee allowed teachers (and other stakeholders) to make decisions with regards to hiring, personnel structure, etc. With the dissolving of the Human Resources teachers lost that voice. Now, with the hiring guidelines and procedures outlined in the Draft Hiring Policy of the Executive Limitations Policy, teachers and other stakeholder groups will lose their ability to make a direct impact on school leadership. You may have already seen that this has upset groups of staff as evidenced by emails sent my Mr. Schugalter (and other teachers), and by the UTLA Union Representative Tim Henderson speaking at the Board meeting on this topic. I believe that if the draft Hiring Policy is passed as written, their will be further alienation of some of our staff. Some of the staff believes that there is already to much decision making ability ("power") in the executive directors position. They would like to see a greater balance of "power." Furthermore, in the future, if the principal makes decisions that negatively impact teachers and the school there may be a tendency for teachers to blame the hiring policy and the executive director for hiring the principal.

In regards to the rationale for the Hiring Policy as written in an email by Board of Directors Chair Rene Rodman dated June 7th, 2009 and sent to everybody;

1) Regarding lack of accountability; I believe the Executive Director (E.D.) may be held accountable for evaluating the top management, but not for hiring these candidates. Again, I don't believe the E.D. should be held accountable for the hiring of school staff including top management. The accountability of the Executive Director should be in the evaluation of top management. I believe that a principal (or other top management) can be effectively coached, guided, and evaluated without giving the E.D. the hiring "power." After all, the candidates' resumes are screened, background checks are done, references are checked, and interviews are completed. This is the quality assurance needed for hiring. As an example against the draft Hiring Policy, if the E.D. makes the decision to hire a certain principal, and this principal does not work out or does poorly for unforeseeable reasons should we then fire or negatively evaluate the E.D.? What if the E.D. did everything in their power to guide, and coach the principal and still the principal has not performed well?

2) Regarding the ability to conduct "one-on-one" interviews; In the dozens of interviews that I have participated in for public agencies, very few of them have been done individually. Group interviews demonstrate to the candidates (and to everyone) that the school staff has the ability to collaborate, and that collaboration is an integral part of the organization. A one-on-one interview may demonstrate that this ability to collaborate is lacking. Decisions that are based on "one-on-one" scenarios/environments may be looked on suspiciously and with distrust by some staff.

3) Regarding team building; since teachers compromise the majority of school staff and there will therefore be a high frequency of interactions with the school principal and other top management, the teachers should have the decision making ability with regards to selecting top management. In other words, team building priorities should be with the teachers. I believe it would be in the best interest to have senior management that works well with teachers since they compromise the majority of the school.

In conclusion, I believe that the Hiring Policy Draft should not be passed since it disrupts a structure and procedure that increases balance of "power," and instead places "power" it into one position. Furthermore, this policy goes against the philosophy upon which the charter was founded. That philosophy being that teachers and other staff should have the ability to make decisions pertaining to policy, finance, educational programs, human resources, leadership, governance, and other elements of running a school. Furthermore, since the draft Hiring Policy will go against this policy it will further disenfranchise teachers and other stakeholders who will lose faith in the system.

I propose that the current structure of hiring top management be kept intact and that the interview committee which consists of different stakeholders have the final decision in hiring top management.

Thank you,
Very Concerned Teacher