

## Montgomery County Public Schools

### Community of Practice: Promotions Process Subcommittee

#### Initial Findings and Draft Recommendations

Members: April Key, Dr. Christine Handy, Kevin Beverly, Co-Chairs  
Pia Morrison, Linda Ferrell, James Allrich, Christina Lee, Jennifer Martin, Tawanna Stokes, Monique Riddick, Kara Trenkamp, Michael Bayewitz, Michael A. Durso, Josean Acevedo-Soto

The Promotions subcommittee recommends the following enhancements to the current process for hiring for appointed positions.

#### Vetting

1. MCPS will proceed with candidate vetting by:
  - a. Verifying minimum qualifications for eligibility have been met (CV, training)
  - b. Completing background checks
  - c. Completing a Google search\*
  - d. Completing an MD state judiciary search
  - e. Consulting the MD Safe Tip Line\*
  - f. Querying the MD sex offender registry
  - g. Completing reference checks
  - h. Fingerprinting candidates
  - i. Completing an HB486 check
  - j. Collaborating with DCI regarding pending and open investigations

**Target: Transparency, Candidate Quality**
2. The Community of Practice recommends establishing a standardized process for the evaluation of anonymous complaints submitted through the MD Safe Tip Line, Lighthouse, and for the results of Google searches to reduce subjectivity, improve follow-through, and prevent disruption in candidates' consideration due to potentially meritless complaints. **Target: Transparency**
3. The CoP recommends standardizing the investigation process and establishing guidelines for how pending or in-process investigations impact candidate eligibility for promotion. The CoP is concerned that with their current resources, DCI cannot complete investigations quickly enough to avoid negatively impacting candidate opportunities. **Target: Transparency**
4. The Community of Practice recommends establishing firm guidelines for the consideration of candidates' record of disciplinary action and whether such action prevents consideration for promotion and, if so, for how long. **Target: Transparency**

#### Interview Structures

1. The Community of Practice recommends that MCPS continue the established practice of reviewing potential candidates in the Appointments Committee and confirming candidates in a closed session of the BOE. **Target: Candidate Quality**
2. The CoP recommends reducing the number of panel interview rounds from three to two, consistent with benchmarking in similarly sized districts. Some second-round panel members may participate in the first round, and the Superintendent will participate in the second round. **Target: Time in Process, Transparency**

### **Communication: Process**

1. Candidates will be informed ahead of time of the necessary steps and timeline expected when applying for an appointed position. This will be achieved through the A&S website, linked to each job posting. **Targets: Transparency, Communication**
2. MCPS will establish a standard for the composition of each interview panel, and candidates will be informed of the panel membership prior to the interview through information posted to the A&S page and linked to each job posting. **Targets: Transparency, Communication**
3. MCPS will establish a standard for and clearly communicate to prospective candidates the expected time-in-process from application to appointment via the A&S website and the candidate email invite. Time-in-process is presently estimated at 5-7 weeks. **Targets: Communication, Time in Process**

### **Communication: Status**

1. To improve communication with candidates in-process and reduce uncertainty among the candidate pool about who is moving forward, candidates will receive direct communication about their status at the following critical points (**Target: Transparency, Communication**)
  - a. When MCPS receives their application
  - b. When selected for an interview
  - c. When interview date is confirmed and a firm timeline can be established around panel convenings and other rigid dates (such as Board convenings)
  - d. After each panel interview and on final selection

### **Communication: Feedback**

1. Each candidate should receive qualitative feedback as they go through the interview process, specifically after the appointments committee when it is decided who will move forward. **Target: Communication, Transparency**
2. Each candidate who requests such should receive feedback from the hiring manager, coordinated through OHRD. **Target: Communication, Transparency**
3. Internal candidates should receive feedback upon request explaining why their names were not being moved forward to the interview stage. **Target: Communication, Transparency**

### **Other Recommendations**

1. The CoP recommends that MCPS reexamine and increase available support for career pathways for MCBOA members to advance into MCAAP level positions. **Target: Transparency, Prof. Development**
2. The CoP recommends that MCPS proactively communicate the process for selecting “acting” administrators and articulate what role, if any, experience in an acting role plays in consideration for a permanent appointment. The CoP also recommends identifying process change opportunities that may reduce the system-wide need for “acting” administrators. **Target: Transparency**