

City of Chicago
MINUTES OF NOMINATING COMMITTEE MEETING

Meeting Information

Regular Meeting
Saturday, November 18, 2023, 9:00 AM
Malcolm X College, Room 4406
1900 W. Jackson Blvd, Chicago, IL 60612

1. Call to order

The meeting was called to order at 9:09 AM.

2. Roll call & quorum determination

Jamie Brown, DC001	Present	Michelle Page, DC012	Present
Ephraim Lee, DC002	Present	Ashley Vargas, DC014	Present
Anthony Bryant, DC003	Present	Karen Arewa Winters, DC015	Present
Gloria Jenkins, DC004	Present	Colleen Dillon, DC016	Present
Tom McMahon, DC005	Present	Beth Rochford, DC017	Present
Aisha Humphries, DC006	Present	Robert Johnson, DC018	Absent
Dion McGill, DC007	Present	Sam Schoenburg, DC019	Present
Al Cacciottolo, DC008	Absent	Darrell Dacres, DC020	Present
Denise McBroom, DC009	Present	Lee Bielecki, DC022	Present
Elianne Bahena, DC010	Present	Marilyn Págan-Banks, DC024	Present, Remote
Jocelyn Woodards, DC011	Present	Angelica Green, DC025	Present

The Nominating Committee had a quorum at the meeting.

3. Public comment

The Nominating Committee held public comment and had no speakers.

4. Reviewing meeting norms

The Committee reviewed a set of norms to guide the members through the meeting.

5. Approval of 7/8/2023 Minutes

The Committee reviewed the minutes from the regular public meeting on July 8, 2023. A motion was made to approve the minutes.

Jamie Brown, DC001	Yes	Michelle Page, DC012	Yes
Ephraim Lee, DC002	Yes	Ashley Vargas, DC014	Absent
Anthony Bryant, DC003	Absent	Karen Arewa Winters, DC015	Yes
Gloria Jenkins, DC004	Yes	Colleen Dillon, DC016	Yes
Tom McMahon, DC005	Yes	Beth Rochford, DC017	Absent
Aisha Humphries, DC006	Yes	Robert Johnson, DC018	Absent
Dion McGill, DC007	Yes	Sam Schoenburg, DC019	Yes
Al Cacciottolo, DC008	Absent	Darrell Dacres, DC020	Yes
Denise McBroom, DC009	Yes	Lee Bielecki, DC022	Yes
Elianne Bahena, DC010	Yes	Marilyn Págan-Banks, DC024	Yes, Remote
Jocelyn Woodards, DC011	Yes	Angelica Green, DC025	Yes

15 votes cast. Yes – 15; No – 0. Motion carries.

6. Authorization of closed sessions

The Committee reviewed the rules for holding closed meetings for the purpose of nominating people for positions on the Commission in compliance with Section 2(c)(3) of the Illinois Open Meetings Act.

A motion was made to authorize a series of closed meetings over the course of not more than three months only for purposes cited under the exemption in Section 2(c)(3) of the OMA.

Jamie Brown, DC001	Yes	Michelle Page, DC012	Yes
Ephraim Lee, DC002	Yes	Ashley Vargas, DC014	Absent
Anthony Bryant, DC003	Absent	Karen Arewa Winters, DC015	Yes
Gloria Jenkins, DC004	Yes	Colleen Dillon, DC016	Yes
Tom McMahon, DC005	Yes	Beth Rochford, DC017	Absent
Aisha Humphries, DC006	Yes	Robert Johnson, DC018	Absent
Dion McGill, DC007	Yes	Sam Schoenburg, DC019	Yes
Al Cacciottolo, DC008	Absent	Darrell Dacres, DC020	Yes
Denise McBroom, DC009	Yes	Lee Bielecki, DC022	Yes
Elianne Bahena, DC010	Yes	Marilyn Págan-Banks, DC024	Yes, Remote
Jocelyn Woodards, DC011	Yes	Angelica Green, DC025	Yes

15 votes cast. Yes – 15; No – 0. Motion carries.

A note was made that the Committee will need to vote to authorized closed meetings one more time to ensure the entire nomination process is covered by the authorization.

7. Scheduling the Nomination Process

Rolling Review of Applications

The Committee discussed the nomination schedule. They discussed the pros and cons of reviewing applications as they come in, versus waiting the application period to close before commencing the review. Considerations for a rolling process included the advantage of reducing the workload the Committee will face after the application period closes' considerations for waiting to the end of the application period included the importance of mitigating biases that may positively or negatively impact early applicants. The Committee noted that the Commission experienced an inundation of applications for the Police Superintendent search at the very end of the application process and considered the ramifications for how they would process and review applications. The Committee tentatively voiced support for a rolling review process with applications.

Review of Youth Applications

The Committee also discussed the applications for the two youth Commissioner seats and the importance of reviewing youth applications side-by-side. One Committee member inquired about the number of interim Commission applications received by City Council in 2022. Another Committee member suggested using a separate rubric for youth applicants and applicants that qualify for the 10-year lawyer requirement. The Committee voiced general agreement for reviewing applications from applicants ages 18-24 separately and side-by-side.

Scheduling Key Process Dates

The Committee scheduled closed meetings for February 10 and February 17 for meeting to determine which Commissioner applicants to invite for interviews. They also scheduled interviews to take place on February 24-25 and March 2-3. They scheduled a closed meeting for March 5 for discussing which candidates to consider for nomination; they also set March 6 as a tentative second closed meeting in case they did not complete their post-interview review of candidates for nomination on March 5. The Committee also set March 8 for a public meeting to move for final action on nominations; March 8 marks 60 days from the opening date for applications and is the deadline for meeting to decide on nominations, pursuant to Municipal Code of Chicago Sec. 2-80-040.

Scheduling a Special Public Meeting for December

The Committee discussed whether to schedule a special public meeting in December. The main considerations were whether December would be too busy to schedule a meeting, and whether another public meeting would be necessary or useful to hold prior to the opening of the application period. One Committee member voiced interest in holding a meeting to discuss more marketing campaign ideas for the application opportunity, arranging press opportunities, and celebrating the holidays. The Committee generally agreed to hold a December special meeting. The Committee could not decide between December 8 or 16; it was decided that the meeting would take place on one of those dates, depending on results from a survey on the availability of Nominators.

Setting the 2024 Public Meeting Schedule

The Committee decided to postpone discussion of a 2024 public meeting schedule for the special meeting in December.

8. Interview Format

The Committee discussed a proposal for an interview format that involves breaking interviews into four 30-minute sessions, with 15-minute breaks in between. Each session would be hosted by a different group of geographically diverse Nominators. The Committee would interview 8 candidates per interview day using this format. Interviewees would rotate from one group to the next, answering different interview questions for each. The Committee showed tentative support and agreement around this format.

9. Rubric

The Committee reviewed the concept and usage of a rubric as a post-interview assessment tool, separate from the initial assessment of applications based on application questions. The purpose of the rubric is to help select candidates to nominate.

The Committee reviewed progress in developing the rubric. Each Nominator collected community input on what to look for in applications for the Commission. Each working group then discussed the input collected and brainstormed rubric categories. Liaisons then reviewed the proposed lists and merged them to establish a draft rubric. The draft rubric is as follows:

1. Commitment to/history of community engagement
2. Commitment to accountability
3. Ability to be fair, open-minded, equitable
4. Transparency-focused
5. Creativity and vision
6. Subject-matter expertise and competency
7. Capacity to do the work
8. Collaborative, good listener, ability to show understanding
9. Credibility and professionalism

The Committee reviewed and discussed the draft rubric. Committee members noted that subject matter expertise means more than academic expertise, and credibility needs to encompass the issue of avoiding conflicts of interest with an emphasis on reputation. Committee members discussed how to assess what is required to have the capacity to do the work of a Commissioner. This question led the Committee to discuss polling the Commission to ask about the number of hours Commissioners spend on average on Commission work. The Committee also weighed the idea of inviting President Anthony Driver, Jr. of the Interim Commission to attend a Committee meeting and discuss the work of Commissioners, but

there were some concerns about the fairness of such a conversation given the anticipation that he would be applying to be a Commissioner. An emphasis was made on distinguishing between questioning Commissioners to ascertain what the work of the Commission is like, versus questioning Commissioners in a manner that verges on an interview. The Committee ultimately opted to develop an anonymous survey for the current Commissioners. The plan would be for the working groups to develop questions for the survey, and the liaisons would combine the questions and arrive at a recommended final draft of approximately 5 questions. The draft will then be shared with the rest of the Nominators for review.

10. Miscellaneous

Due to time constraints, the Committee agreed to shorten the remainder of the agenda items. First, the Committee broke into their working groups to practice simulations of application reviews based on mock applications. The Committee then reconvened to discuss findings and takeaways. One clear takeaway was the need for a measure of the quality of resumes, since the current approach only scores the responses to the application questions. Another takeaway had to do with youth applications. Committee members noted that the residency requirement may be a concern, particularly for youth applicants that are away for school. Some Committee members considered the possibility of a different set of evaluation criteria for youths. There was strong agreement for evaluating youth applications side-by-side, as discussed earlier in the meeting.

The Committee then discussed anonymization. Committee members filled out worksheets listing their suggestions for what information to redact in the initial application review process.

11. Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at 11:40 AM.