

**MINUTES**  
**LAS VEGAS-CLARK COUNTY LIBRARY DISTRICT**  
**BOARD OF TRUSTEES' SPECIAL MEETING**  
**LAS VEGAS, NEVADA**  
**February 26 and February 28, 2009**  
**(approved April 16, 2009)**

The Board of Trustees of the Las Vegas-Clark County Library District met in special session in the Las Vegas Library, Las Vegas, Nevada, on Thursday, February 26, 2009 from 9:30 a.m. to 4:00 p.m. and on Saturday, February 28, 2009 from 3:08 p.m. to 4:39 p.m.

**Present:**

Board:	F. Barron, Chair	K. Carter
	A. Arthurholtz	A. Aguirre
	V. Davis-Hoggard	K. Benavidez
	R. Kirsh	K. Crear
	E. Sanchez (via phone - February 28)	

Counsel: G. Welt

Absent:

Staff: Jerilyn Gregory, Human Resources Director (February 26 & 28)  
Patricia Marvel, Marketing & Community Relations Director (February 26 & 28)  
Allison Boyer, Executive Assistant (February 26 & 28)  
Rest of the Executive Council (February 28)

Guests: Cameron Stuart, Clarity, Inc.

F. Barron, Chair, called the meeting to order on February 26, 2009 at 9:34 a.m.

**Roll Call** All members listed above represent a quorum. Trustee Sanchez attended in person on February 26 and via phone on February 28.

**Agenda (Item II.)** Trustee Benavidez moved to approve the Agenda as proposed. There was no opposition and the motion carried.

**Chair's Report (Item III.)** None.

**Discussion and possible Board action regarding interviews with final candidates for the position of Executive Director. (Item IV.A.)** Trustee Arthurholtz asked to speak prior to beginning the interviews with the final candidates for the position of Executive Director. She said that past and current Trustees have repeatedly expressed the view that the District's most valuable asset is its staff. Arthurholtz asked that District staff applicants who met the minimum requirements for the Executive Director position be allowed to interview with the Trustees. Arthurholtz also wanted to go on the record expressing her dissatisfaction with the current process.

Counsel Welt advised Trustees that the meeting would probably have to be reposted if they decided to interview staff applicants in addition to the final applicants. In addition, Welt said that choosing now to interview District employees would invalidate the entire search process and force the process to begin again. The search process included approximately 140 individuals who expressed interest and 40 people who were actively pursued by Clarity, who then produced the 3 final candidates being interviewed at the meeting.

Trustees discussed Arthurholtz' remarks. Their comments are summarized below.

Trustee Arthurholtz felt she had lost control of the process due to the confidential limitations. She also commented that including staff in the final interview process would not be a courtesy interview for staff, but a re-affirmation of their worth.

Trustee Davis-Hoggard noted that she had been against a national search from the beginning and felt that the process had ignored the current District staff. She commented on a letter all Trustees received prior to the announcement of the final candidates names regarding a District staff member who apparently was not a finalist. Trustee Davis-Hoggard felt a national search could have turned up more diverse candidates and that there would be collateral damage in the community if one of the candidates was chosen.

Trustee Sanchez said her perspective was that the Trustees had agreed to a specific process and the result was the final candidates to be interviewed at the meeting. She also noted that the District had been paying for the approved process. If Trustees want to stop the current process, she wondered what process they wanted to follow. She felt there would be collateral damage in the community if they did not proceed.

Trustee Aguirre noted that Trustees already approved the search process used by Clarity to find the three top finalists which has been done. He felt there was no reason to stop at this point due to Trustees not agreeing with the process. He also noted that there was no limitation on local candidates applying for the position.

Trustee Crear expressed her concern about the process and wanted to know more how the final three candidates were chosen including the criteria used to evaluate each candidate. She said she was very upset to receive the letter and learn that no one from the community was being considered.

Trustee Kirsh commented on receiving a letter on the previous Friday, but not receiving any notice of the final three candidates until the day before the meeting. He also said finding out no one local was a finalist jaded his view of the entire process. He said he understood the need to keep information confidential, but felt the process could have been handled differently.

Chair Barron noted that the only way an individual outside the process would have found out someone was no longer a candidate was from the candidate and asked Trustees to take that into consideration upon evaluating the letter. She said that Clarity vetted individuals for several months based upon criteria the Trustees gave Clarity. Clarity's charge was to review and investigate as large a number of candidates as possible. Trustees directed Mr. Stuart to bring the top national candidates, not just a group from Las Vegas, nor to include courtesy interviews for District staff.

Trustee Carter recalled that requiring a local candidate was not part of the criteria approved by the Trustees.

Counsel Welt said that Trustees had two options: One, stop the process and re-open the search, which Welt did not recommend. Two, Trustees could go through the final interview process and if they did not like the final candidates presented they could continue the search.

Trustees agreed to go through the interview process as planned and discuss the issue once the interview process was over on Saturday.

Mr. Stuart discussed the information provided for each candidate which included a one-page summary as well as a cover letter and resume. He explained the interview process that would be followed for each candidate. He would ask each candidate the same questions. After those questions had been answered, Trustees would have an opportunity to ask follow-up questions. Jerilyn Gregory, Human Resources Director, advised Trustees to stay away from questions of a personal nature and stick to questions about the candidates experience and what they have done.

Nancy Ledeboer, Director of the Pima County Public Library in Tucson, Arizona, was escorted in for her interview. Ms. Ledeboer was asked the following questions by Mr. Stuart:

1. What is the specific difference between a Leader and a Manager?
2. As a leader, how are you perceived by your subordinates?
3. What techniques do you use to get your people behind your unpopular ideas?
4. What would be your first three acts of leadership as Executive Director of the Las Vegas-Clark County Library District (District)?
5. What do you do specifically to set an example for your employees?
6. A county commissioner speaks to you in person that his daughter has applied for the open position of Chief Financial Officer. What do you say? What do you tell your HR Director? What else do you do?
7. What additional opportunities currently exist in the District's diversity practices?
8. From your knowledge of the budget and finances of the District, what specific categories will see major adjustments in the 2009-2010 fiscal year?
9. What specific opportunities does the District have for doing more with less?
10. What process would you use to reach out to community residents, who by reason of ethnic, geographical, or economic circumstances, are currently underserved?
11. What leadership characteristics will constitute political effectiveness at the local and state level for the Executive Director of the District?
12. What makes you stand out from amongst your peers to justify your selection as our next Executive Director?
13. What answer could you give to the question that wasn't asked here?

Chair Barron and Trustees Carter, Kirsh, Aguirre, Sanchez and Davis-Hoggard asked how the Pima County Public Library compared to the Las Vegas-Clark County District; whether Ms. Ledebouer would be the District's sole spokesperson; was there something she missed most about leaving Las Vegas and would miss if she left Tucson; the possible synergy between the District and the local education community; how she mentored staff and, if given time and resources, what she would do to improve her skills. Ms. Ledebouer was also asked about the ability and interest in her staff to move into higher leadership positions; how she would deal with a fractured board; her relationship with any Pima County Foundation and Friends groups; her feelings on strong Friends groups; how the Pima County Friends/Foundation operated and what skills she brings as a result of those relationships. Ms. Ledebouer was also asked why she pursued leadership positions in the library field.

Ms. Ledebouer thanked Trustees for the opportunity to interview for the Executive Director position.

The meeting recessed for a break from 11:17 -11:39 a.m.

The meeting reconvened at 11:39 a.m. All Trustees were present.

Chair Barron asked Mr. Stuart to discuss several of the activities scheduled as part of the Executive Director search process and how the Trustees will receive feedback from the Executive Council (EC) and the Open Forum.

A dinner with the Trustees, Counsel, Executive Staff, Mr. Stuart and all the candidates is scheduled for Thursday evening at 6:00 p.m., February 26. Candidates will rotate to each of three tables between courses so that every attendee has the opportunity to speak with each candidate. It is an opportunity to see how the candidates interact with Trustees and staff outside an interview setting.

On Friday, February 27, each candidate was scheduled to meet individually with the EC. Mr. Stuart said they would meet with him after the interviews and provide feedback for use by the Trustees. On Saturday, February 28 at 9:00 a.m. an Open Forum was planned for the public to hear presentations from each candidate and ask questions. Mr. Stuart will ask questions and members of the public would also have the opportunity to ask questions after they have been vetted by Counsel Welt and Ms. Gregory.

The Trustees will reconvene on Saturday, February 28 at 3:00 p.m. Mr. Stuart will provide the feedback from the EC and Open Forum for Trustees to review at that time as Trustees discuss a choice for the Executive Director position.

The meeting recessed for a break from 11:57 a.m. – 12:28 p.m.

The meeting reconvened at 12:28 p.m. All Trustees were present.

Jeanne Goodrich, currently an independent library management consultant and former Deputy Director of the Multnomah County Library in Portland, Oregon, was escorted in for her interview. She was asked the same 13 questions by Mr. Stuart as was the previous candidate.

Chair Barron and Trustees Davis-Hoggard, Kirsh, Sanchez and Aguirre asked questions about services for the elderly; Ms. Goodrich's interest in returning to library employment rather than remaining independent; her legislative experience from her previous position in Nevada; her experience in dealing with unions; whether she expected to dissolve her consultancy business; her philosophy on succession planning; how she would balance the funding for library programs and activities with collection development funding; her experience with Foundations and Friends groups; her leadership philosophy; how she would handle a divisive board and, if she had resources and time, how she would improve her skills.

Ms. Goodrich said she enjoyed the opportunity to meet with all the Trustees.

The meeting recessed for a break from 1:32 – 2:36 p.m.

The meeting reconvened at 2:36 p.m. All Trustees were present.

Dianne Duquette, Director of Libraries of the Kern County Library in Bakersfield, California, was escorted to her interview and asked the same 13 questions by Mr. Stuart as the previous two candidates.

Chair Barron and Trustees Davis-Hoggard, Kirsh, Sanchez, Carter and Aguirre asked Ms. Duquette to describe the area, population and services of the Kern County Library; what she would miss if she left Kern County; her philosophy on succession planning; her experience working with Foundation and Friends' groups; how she would handle a divisive board; her experience and philosophy for dealing with unions; her current budget and how she felt about obtaining grant money. Ms. Duquette was also asked about who she reported to; how her relationship was with her governing body and, if she had the resources and time, what areas of professional development she would focus on.

Ms. Duquette thanked Trustees for the opportunity to interview.

The meeting recessed for a break from 3:30 – 3:38 p.m.

The meeting reconvened at 3:38 p.m. All Trustees were present.

Mr. Stuart asked Trustees if, after the interviews, each of them had a favored candidate without naming the candidate. Most said they did. Stuart cautioned Trustees about making a decision based upon the interviews that had just occurred. The interview with the Trustees was only one part of the process. He reminded Trustees about the other activities that are part of the process and encouraged them to focus on evaluating each candidate equally at every meeting.

## Minutes - Board of Trustees' Special Meeting

February 26 and February 28, 2009

Page 6

In response to a question from Trustee Sanchez, Mr. Stuart discussed the EC participation in the interview process and how they may present their feedback.

In response to a question from Trustee Davis-Hoggard, Mr. Stuart confirmed that Trustees would receive feedback from the Executive Council's individual interviews with each candidate and also from the Open Forum. Stuart will provide these to Trustees, at the latest, at the start of the Saturday meeting.

Trustees Sanchez, Kirsh and Davis-Hoggard all commented that they would encourage the EC members to be not just positive in their evaluation, but also feel free to point out concerns about knowledge, skills and abilities if they feel that would add to the Trustees understanding in their evaluation of each candidate and that they should feel it is part of their responsibility in their interviews. The EC members should not feel they must reach a consensus or even make a selection if they do not feel inclined to make that choice.

Chair Barron recessed the meeting at 4:00 p.m. until Saturday, February 28 at 3:00 p.m.

**Saturday, February 28, 2009**

Chair Barron reconvened the meeting at 3:08 p.m.

### **Roll Call**

Chair Barron, Trustees Aguirre, Arthurholtz, Benavidez, Carter, Crear, Davis-Hoggard, Kirsh and Sanchez were present when the meeting reconvened which constituted a quorum. Trustee Sanchez attended via telephone.

### **Discussion and possible Board action regarding selection of Executive Director (Item IV.B.)**

Chair Barron began by thanking everyone for their participation over the past several days. She said it was the goal and task of Trustees to select a leader. The Trustees set direction and policy and are finally accountable for the leadership of the District. She acknowledged that the selection process was not perfect, it was fluid. Barron said that there are three excellent candidates for the position of Executive Director.

Prior to hearing the input from staff and the public she asked everyone to write down their first choice to quickly identify the Trustees' top leader without influence from others. The Trustees wrote their selection down on pieces of paper and Mr. Stuart read them out in no particular order except for Trustee Sanchez who went first as she was participating via phone. Counsel Welt confirmed that this was not a formal vote, simply an informal poll. Trustees Sanchez, Barron, Kirsh, Aguirre and Carter selected Ms. Goodrich. Trustee Benavidez selected Ms. Ledeboer. Trustees Crear, Arthurholtz and Davis-Hoggard selected no one.

Trustee Crear moved to stop the current recruitment and begin a new recruitment for the Executive Director position. There was extensive discussion on the motion and all Trustees took part. Their comments are summarized below (in no particular order) along with comments about the process from Mr. Stuart and Counsel Welt's evaluation.

Trustee Crear felt that the search process was not open and transparent and she did not believe that the criteria used to select the final three candidates were clear to her. She believed that Trustees owed District staff, themselves and the community another pool of candidates that better reflect the position.

Trustee Arthurholtz commented on the lack of control she has felt throughout the process to select the one employee the Trustees directly hire. She felt the process was flawed. She was offended by the changes in the process such as the Open Forum not occurring as planned and not receiving the Executive Council recommendation prior to the start of the Saturday afternoon meeting. She said her definition of leadership seemed to be different than other members of the Board because she does believe some current staff members possess leadership qualities and should have been included in the final interview process.

Trustee Sanchez said that she did not believe there is a perfect selection process and that she had also felt she has had a limited role due to the legal issues. However, she also felt that Trustees had a fiduciary responsibility to the public. A majority of Trustees have made a choice in favor of one candidate and the rest should not stop what has been a difficult process.

Chair Barron reiterated that the process was not perfect but that there are 3 good, nationally known candidates that have emerged from the nation-wide search that started out with a pool of 140 potential candidates. She emphasized that Trustees were looking for a top leader.

Trustee Davis-Hoggard reminded Trustees that she had voted "no" throughout the process for a national search, preferring to promote District staff. She said that she was not happy that a national search ended up with three final candidates who were all white women from the western part of the country.

Trustee Kirsh said he expected the process to turn up a superstar and he did not believe it did.

Trustee Carter felt that the process went as planned and those local candidates had the same opportunities as those from outside the area. He also said that if Trustees choose to start over there will be an issue with Trustee turnover as between three and six Trustees' terms expire soon.

Trustee Benavidez did not agree with the process, but tried to keep in mind that she is only one vote and the majority rules. She felt she was being forced to make a decision. Staff members should have been looked at more carefully. She asked why they were not considered for the final three candidates. She disagreed with the results of the national search.

Trustee Aguirre felt that given the legal requirements and direction from Trustees, Clarity was hired to perform a task and was given the direction to perform a function to the best of its ability. Clarity provided three final candidates to Trustees for their final decision.

Counsel Welt commented that Trustees could legally start the process over; however, he urged them to consider the following issues:

- The effect on the Trustees, staff and community to reject three nationally known candidates.
- There would be no way to provide Trustees with information on the candidates ranked four through ten as requested by one Trustee as candidates were promised confidentiality.
- If a full public search would be conducted, why would someone risk being named publically as 1 of 10 or 20 candidates? If Trustees participate in the evaluation process, the Open Meeting Law comes into play which would require the entire process and all the candidates' information to be made public.
- The Board makeup will be changing with at least three new Trustees and possibly six new board members if the three Trustees who can be re-appointed are replaced by new members.

Mr. Stuart discussed the search process from the point when he interviewed each Trustee who indicated their great interest in participating in the process. However, legal constraints such as the Open Meeting Law limited Trustee involvement and information until February 25, when the final three candidates could be made public.

Mr. Stuart also discussed internal candidates. He assured Trustees that there was consideration of such candidates but could not go into more detail. He said that the candidates themselves could discuss their own interest, but he was limited by the agreement he had made to keep the interest confidential until the final three candidates were announced. Stuart emphasized that each internal candidate had the same opportunities as each external candidate. While he did not chase candidates, he did make a point of following up with each internal candidate who expressed interest in the position. Two of the internal candidates decided not to apply as they were happy in their current positions. One accepted a new job and moved out of the area. Only one internal candidate applied.

Mr. Stuart said the candidates were made aware prior to Saturday that the Open Forum format would change if there were only a small number in attendance. He acknowledged that late in the process the final selection of the candidates was moved up from April to February due to the expiration of the terms of several Trustees. He concluded by saying that the search process was not simple. Currently, the market favors candidates, not employers, as there are several executive director positions available nationwide. He is aware of at least one interested party who dropped out due to the current economic situation, while others had concerns for their spouse's local employment options or other economic situations.

Trustee Carter called for a vote on Trustee Crear's motion to stop the current recruitment and begin a new recruitment for the Executive Director position. Trustees Arthurholtz, Benavidez, Crear and Davis-Hoggard voted to approve. Chair Barron and Trustees Aguirre, Carter,



Kirsh and Sanchez voted to oppose. The motion was defeated (5 votes to 4 votes).

Trustee Sanchez moved to approve Jeanne Goodrich as the new Executive Director. Counsel Welt said that would not be an appropriate motion at this time due to the wording of the motion. Trustees may choose to offer Ms. Goodrich the position which would then be subject to contract negotiations. Trustees Benavidez and Crear requested that they hear the Executive Council recommendation and evaluations from the Open Forum prior to considering a motion. Trustee Sanchez withdrew her motion.

Trustee Crear said she wanted to go on record that she was very disappointed that the search process continued to change from the way it was originally described. She had expected to receive a summary from the Open Forum and information from staff prior to being asked to make a decision.

Mr. Stuart read out the responses from the Open Forum. One evaluation form had been turned in for each candidate. Respondents were asked to check off areas in which they felt each candidate was strong, declare if the candidate was their choice for Executive Director, and also included space for comments.

Mr. Stuart reported that the evaluation turned in for Ms. Ledeboer had all areas of strength but one checked. The respondent rated her first and second as their choice for Executive Director and commented on her familiarity with the District, ability to work with both the City and County and her ideas such as community partners.

Mr. Stuart reported that the evaluation turned in for Ms. Goodrich had all strength areas checked off. The respondent rated her first as the choice for Executive Director and commented on her overall view, specific goals for the use of resources and staff to reach the public and her wide variety of experience due to her consulting work.

Mr. Stuart reported that the evaluation turned in for Ms. Duquette had four strength areas checked off, no choice checked off on whether the candidate was the respondent's choice for Executive Director and commented on her years in a similar geographic area.

Mr. Stuart then read the Executive Council's (EC) recommendation. He said the EC assessed the final candidates according to three broad criteria which were: the ability to understand external forces and set the course for the District's future, the "best fit" for building visibility and public value for the District while being the best fit for the community and the "best fit" for building the internal capacity of the organization with the readiness to take on the immediate leadership of the District.

Mr. Stuart said the EC members appreciated the opportunity to interview and provide their input to the Trustees for their important decision. The EC members respected that the final decision remained with the Trustees and looked forward to working with the candidate selected by the Trustees. The EC members were impressed with each

candidate's qualifications and their positive presentations. Stuart said the EC members recognized that their criteria might be different than that of the Trustees and their recommendation was in no way intended to distract from or interfere with the Trustees' selection process. The EC staff also did not intend for their assessment be interpreted to disparage any of the excellent professional qualities of the candidates. Mr. Stuart said that the EC's unanimous assessment, after extensive discussion, was that Nancy Ledebouer was the candidate who best met the EC's three criteria.

Trustees thanked the EC members for their participation in the process and their assessment.

Trustee Davis-Hoggard moved that an offer be extended to Jeanne Goodrich. Chair Barron and Trustees Aguirre, Carter, Davis-Hoggard, Kirsh and Sanchez voted to approve. Trustees Arthurholtz, Benavidez and Crear voted to oppose. The motion carried (6 votes to 3 votes).

Trustee Arthurholtz moved a vote of confidence in Jeanne Goodrich and asked for a unanimous vote of the Trustees. Chair Barron and Trustees Arthurholtz, Aguirre, Carter, Davis-Hoggard and Sanchez voted to approve. Trustee Benavidez and Crear voted to oppose. The motion carried (7 votes to 2 votes).

Trustee Aguirre asked about the next step. Counsel Welt said that once Clarity has informed the final candidates of the Board's decision and confirmed Ms. Goodrich's agreement, the next step will be for Trustees to direct Clarity and or Counsel to negotiate a contract with Ms. Goodrich which must then be approved by the Board. Trustees and Counsel discussed how they wanted the negotiation process to work, given Open Meeting Law requirements and the desire of Trustees to be involved with the negotiations.

In answer to a question from Trustee Carter, Ms. Gregory said the Executive Director position was step 145 but did not have the actual salary range with her; she believed it was \$127,000 to \$179,000.

After extensive discussion, Chair Barron said Clarity would notify the candidates and Trustee Kirsh would work with Counsel on the negotiations. Counsel Welt and Trustee Kirsh will then bring back a proposed contract for the Board's review and approval, probably at the next Board meeting. Ms. Gregory, Human Resources Director, will provide District contract, position and salary information as necessary for inclusion. The negotiated contract will also include an expiration date and performance reviews as well as other items as directed by the Trustees.

Trustees discussed the transition, potential start dates and confirmed that Ms. Goodrich would not also continue her consulting work.

There were questions from Trustees about a process to follow if Ms. Goodrich declined the District's offer upon receipt or during negotiations. Counsel Welt said that it was up to the Trustees to determine if they want to move to another candidate or bring the whole question back to the Board to discuss at a special meeting.

**Minutes - Board of Trustees' Special Meeting**  
**February 26 and February 28, 2009**  
**Page 11**

Trustee Carter moved that if Jeanne Goodrich declined the District's offer, an offer would be extended to Nancy Ledeboer. Chair Barron and Trustees Aguirre, Carter and Sanchez voted to approve. Trustees

Arthurholtz, Benavidez, Crear, Davis-Hoggard and Kirsh voted to oppose. The motion was defeated (5 votes to 4 votes).

In response to a question from Trustee Aguirre about when several Trustees' terms expired, Counsel Welt confirmed that Trustees whose terms expire serve until their replacement is named.

**Announcements**  
**(Item V.)**

The next Board Meeting will be held Thursday, March 12, 2009, in the Clark County Library at 6:00 p.m.

**Public Comment**  
**(Item VI.)**

None

**Adjournment**  
**(Item VII.)**

Chair Barron adjourned the meeting at 4:33 p.m. on Saturday, February 28, 2009.

Respectfully submitted,

Andrea Arthurholtz, Secretary