

Meeting Information

Sunday, October 20, 2024, 2:00PM—5:00PM Metropolitan Missionary Baptist Church 2141 W Washington Blvd, Chicago, IL 60612

Minutes

I) Roll call & quorum determination

Adrienne Johnson, DC001	Present	Michelle Page, DC012	Absent
Alexander Perez, DC002	Absent	Ashley Vargas, DC014	Present
Anthony Bryant, DC003	Present	Karen Arewa Winters, DC015	Absent
Gloria Jenkins, DC004	Absent	Colleen Dillon, DC016	Absent
Tom McMahon, DC005	Present	Elizabeth Rochford, DC017	Present
Aisha Humphries, DC006	Present	Robert Johnson, DC018	Present
Dion McGill, DC007	Present	Samuel Shoenburg, DC019	Present
Al Cacciottolo, DC008	Absent	Darrell Dacres, DC020	Present
Denise McBroom, Dc009	Absent	Lee Bielecki, DC022	Present
Elianne Bahena, DC010	Absent	Marylin Págan-Banks, DC024	Absent
Jocelyn Woodards, DC011	Absent	Angelica Green, DC025	Present

a. Quorum reached with 12 members present

II) Public comment

The Nominating Committee held a public comment portion with 0 speakers.

III) Meeting norms

Chair reviewed norms and reestablished agreement from all members of the committee.

- **IV)** For discussion and votes:
 - a. Committee agrees to hold a series of closed meetings to discuss the selection of candidates to fill the vacancy of Commissioner Presley.
 - b. Update on application outreach and recruitment



Nicole Garcia, Director of Communications, gives update of the outreach done to recruit applicants. List of organizations and elected officials provided to DCs.

- c. Nomination cycle calendar and selection of dates
 - i. Motion for holding 11/12 and 11/13 to hold closed meetings for the purpose of interviewing candidates passes by majority vote;
 - ii. Motion to cancel November 16, 2024, Nominating Committee Regular Meeting, passes by consensus
 - iii. Motion to hold closed meetings to discuss and select nominees on November 19, November 21, and November 22, 2024, passes by majority vote.
 - iv. Motion for a Closed Meeting to decide on final 2 nominees se for either: Monday 12/2, Tues 12/3, and Wed12/4
- d. Scoring practices and procedures
 - i. **Key Question 1**: Assuming that we agree on a scoring system, will the resulting scores completely determine the final ranking and interviews? Or are the scores just meant to give us helpful information?
 - 1. OG explains materials and key question
 - 2. Discussion:
 - a. Beth R: How doe sit compare to last time?
 - i. CI: last time scores determined the first 28 people, and additional people were added based on how we determined their merit or need.
 - b. Sam S: I tend to lean on them not being wholly determined on scores. There's a correlation with who scores high and who we like. But I don't want to lock us onto this.
 - c. Robert J: I disagree a bit. I respect the people who know the applicants best and who can speak on the benefits of adding applicants. I think that as long as the numerical score includes some kind of "acceptance metric" we should stay with those scores.
 - d. Anthony B: I think it would be most useful as a helpful guide.
 - e. Darrell D: It made sense on how we scored, but when ties were there, we ended up with people who were less qualified but were the next score up. We need to have room for creativity.
 - f. Sam S: I want to suggest that we look at the scoring process first.
 - g. Lee B: I think people should take the process seriously



- ii. **Key Question 2:** Should we include a favorability score? In other words, should we allow people's general agreeableness towards a candidate count?
 - 1. Motion Session: Should favorability score be considered? With no opposition, the motion passes with 12 favorable votes
- iii. **Key Question 3:** How much should each section (application questions, resumes and letters, and general favorability) weight? Which part of the application matters more? Do they all matter the same?
 - 1. Motion Session: Proposal to have a weighted scale for grading candidates where 55% is given to the application questions, 25% to resumes and letters, 20% to general favorability passes:
 - a. District 1: YES
 - b. District 2: ABSENT
 - c. District 3: YES
 - d. District 4: ABSENT
 - e. District 5: NO
 - f. District 6: YES
 - g. District 7: YES
 - h. District 8: ABSENT
 - i. District 9: ABSENT
 - j. District 10: ABSENT
 - k. District 11: ABSENT
 - 1. District 12: ABSENT
 - m. District 14: YES
 - n. District 15: ABSENT
 - o. District 16: ABSENT
 - p. District 17: YES
 - q. District 18: YES
 - r. District 19: YES
 - s. District 20: YES
 - t. District 22: NO
 - u. District 24: ABSENT
 - v. District 25: YES
- iv. **Key Queston 5:** Are there any edits that we can make to make the assignment of points more systematic or fair? For example, instead of a rubric that determines how you gain points, we can assign a "level of agreement" with each answer (similar to fist to 5)
 - **1.** Motion Session: **Motion to keep the point breakdown as is with the edits that all of the point metrics are included in the question passes:**
 - a. District 1: YES
 - b. District 2: ABSENT
 - c. District 3: YES
 - d. District 4: ABSENT
 - e. District 5: YES
 - f. District 6: YES



NOMINATING COMMITTEE

COMMUNITY COMMISSION FOR PUBLIC SAFETY AND ACCOUNTABILITY

- g. District 7: YES
- h. District 8: ABSENT
- i. District 9: ABSENT
- j. District 10: ABSENT
- k. District 11: ABSENT
- 1. District 12: ABSENT
- m. District 14: YES
- n. District 15: ABSENT
- o. District 16: ABSENT
- p. District 17: YES
- q. District 18: YES
- r. District 19: YES
- s. District 20: YES
- t. District 22: YES
- u. District 24: ABSENT
- v. District 25: YES
- 2. Motion session: Aisha's motion- Motion to not include half points in grading system PASSES
 - a. District 1: YES
 - b. District 2: ABSENT
 - c. District 3: YES
 - d. District 4: ABSENT
 - e. District 5: YES
 - f. District 6: YES
 - g. District 7: YES
 - h. District 8: ABSENT
 - i. District 9: ABSENT
 - j. District 10: ABSENT
 - k. District 11: ABSENT
 - 1. District 12: ABSENT
 - m. District 14: YES
 - n. District 15: ABSENT
 - o. District 16: ABSENT
 - p. District 17: YES
 - q. District 18: YES
 - r. District 19: YES
 - s. District 20: YES
 - t. District 22: YES
 - u. District 24: ABSENT
 - v. District 25: YES
- 3. Motion session: Aisha's Motion, Anthony B Seconds- Question 1 Moves that scores will NOT be 100% determinative in final rankings PASSES
 - a. District 1: YES
 - b. District 2: ABSENT
 - c. District 3: YES
 - d. District 4: ABSENT



- e. District 5: YES
- f. District 6: YES
- g. District 7: YES
- h. District 8: ABSENT
- i. District 9: ABSENT
- j. District 10: ABSENT
- k. District 11: ABSENT
- 1. District 12: ABSENT
- m. District 14: YES
- n. District 15: ABSENT
- o. District 16: ABSENT
- p. District 17: YES
- q. District 18: YES
- r. District 19: YES
- s. District 20: YES
- t. District 22: YES
- u. District 24: ABSENT
- v. District 25: YES

Meeting adjourned at 4:22 PM due to lack of quorum.

Pending items:

- e. Discussion on candidate interview questions
- f. Discussion on data produced by the Nominating Committee
- V) No future meeting or location is determined.