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Chair LaRock welcomed finalist candidate Dr. William Heineman.

Trustees introduced themselves to Dr. Heineman,

Chair LaRock reviewed the format of the interview, which would include three parts in the following order:

Dr. Heineman would present his business case, followed by a Q&A session and ending with an opportunity for Dr. Heineman to ask questions and make a closing statement.

Dr. Heineman’s presentation included a vision of student life outcomes, a review of situations and trends that included data on enrollment decline, demographic trends, revenue changes and institutional capacity. His presentation also included practical goals and creating a holistic plan prioritizing the Lynn campus.

Trustees reviewed perceived strengths and concerns of Dr. Heineman at the conclusion of the meeting.

Strengths included that he is articulate, genuine, sincere, analytical, intellectual, practical, a serious person, sees glass as half full, turns challenges into opportunities, extremely knowledgeable, very impressive, detail oriented, superb strategic thinking about challenges ahead, did homework, used real data, intertwined macro factors to current situation, clear thinking leader, good business case with clear and practical goals that were backed up by proven results, very impressive presentation with research and learning, experience in Lawrence is similar to Lynn and parallelism between the 2 could be applied in Lynn by using Lawrence as a template, a real business case which was quantified and clarified, self-acknowledgement of his own disadvantage, reframing the mission to student life outcomes, when challenge with faculty and staff arose brought focus to students, interesting and clever approaches, capable of moving college to next step, lots of ideas that could work such as adding on majors and jobs after college.

Concerns included that he expects unit is working together already, possibly too authoritative and too much emphasis on rules and structure, vision may be too drastic, lacking in soft skills and EQ, and lacking in charisma.
Chair LaRock welcomed finalist candidate Dr. Dione Somerville.

Trustees introduced themselves to Dr. Somerville.

Chair LaRock reviewed the format of the interview, which would include three parts in the following order:

Dr. Somerville would present her business case, followed by a Q&A session and ending with an opportunity for Dr. Somerville to ask questions and make a closing statement.

Dr. Somerville presented her business case, which centered around a re-imagining of a shared vision for NSCC’s future to include strategic planning and visioning, inclusive college wide conversation, capturing opportunities uncovered by the pandemic and forming broad partnerships. She also shared thoughts on potential opportunities to address enrollment, such as returning adults, leveraging institutional aid addressing financial imperatives.

The trustees reviewed their perceived strengths and concerns of Dr. Somerville at the conclusion of the interview.

Strengths included Dr. Somerville’s inclusive leadership style with specific examples, brought teams together, introduced topic of change first as a way on handling a re-org, communication skills, knowledge and depth of challenges facing NSCC and higher ed, numerous examples of actions to be taken and explored, strategic thinker with hands of experience, confident, thoughtful, sincere, approachable, calming tone, transparent, excellent extemporaneous speaker, spent time thinking about questions and how to best answer, analyzes data to make decisions, sense of urgency, said diversity and inclusion is a financial imperative, said there is not one way to solve ethical issues, approach to achievement gap, keen knowledge about student life, sees connection to gainful employment, economic program linked to student career, holds own self accountable in situations and results, synergistic, takes equity into account, understands what NSCC has been doing and understands sector and is well put together.

Concerns included Dr. Somerville’s knowledge of the community, influence will take time, thoughts with respect to fundraising not innovative with examples not pragmatically pertaining to colleges, not enough about industry, weak business case that contained ideas and brainstorming without level of specificity.
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Chair LaRock welcomed finalist candidate Dr. Joel Frater.

Trustees introduced themselves to Dr. Frater.

Chair LaRock reviewed the format of the interview, which would include three parts in the following order:

Dr. Frater would present his business case, followed by a Q&A session and ending with an opportunity for Dr. Frater to ask questions and make a closing statement.

Dr. Frater’s business case focused on boosting college completion rates, closing achievement gaps and attracting and graduating more students from underserved populations. He reviewed risks and opportunities, funding beyond HEERF, workforce development, academic and programmatic innovation, equitable outcomes and raising revenue through grants and philanthropy.

Trustees reviewed their perceived strengths and concerns of Dr. Frater at the conclusion of the meeting.

The strengths of Dr. Frater were that he is impressive, moral, enthusiastic, kind, intelligent, passionate, a natural academic, a good person, has good philosophical stands, communicates well, experienced with specific examples, had a thorough business case, knowledgeable about philanthropy and could cultivate donors, has a deep understanding of community college environment, is student forward, strategic in goals set out, on point about board responsibilities in regards to financial health and close relationship with chair, lifted up philanthropy and workforce development, did homework and referenced BHE’s 3 priorities, many good qualities of a leader who can be present.

The concerns of Dr. Frater were that he has a tendency to meander, is charming in some ways but would struggle in others, hard to connect to, is well rounded enough, had no direct questions to student trustee, no specific examples of diversity, not enough about future planning, response to racism situation at his college, business case referred to Monroe Community College without calling out what could be done for NSCC and did not fully answer the scenario presented, did not hear compelling answers to some of business questions, and did not get enough out of business case.
Chair LaRock welcomed finalist candidate Dr. Matthew Reed.

Trustees introduced themselves to Dr. Reed.

Chair LaRock reviewed the format of the interview, which would include three parts in the following order:

Dr. Reed would present his business case, followed by a Q&A session and ending with an opportunity for Dr. Reed to ask questions and make a closing statement.

Dr. Reed presented short term opportunities such as CRRSSA, Rescuing America, Title V and free community college. He also reviewed long term challenges such as declining number of eighteen year olds, an increasingly competitive sector, Baumol’s cost disease, and income polarization. He included the following first steps in his presentation: listening and asking questions, develop short strategic plan, over-communicate, set broad goals early and determine methods together, and resilience and sustainability in fiscal, Educational, Political, Environmental.

Trustees reviewed perceived strengths and concerns of Dr. Reed at the conclusion of the meeting.

The strengths for Dr. Reed were out of box thinking, prepared with actual outline/mini plan, scholarly approach, high level of pragmatism and experience, passionate about community college setting and culture, blog writing keeps him current, theoretical framework, economic paradigms, soft spoken, strong moral compass, intertwined good examples to make points, logical approach and steps around shorter courses, observations about fundraising, business case thorough and detailed, very impressive, good way of explaining complicated information, used examples for everything, innovative, strategic thinker with solid ideas, ready to start Day 1, BOGO scholarships, concept of prioritization, will narrow down and focus on things of the most significant impact right away, mission of community college is of serving, highly inquisitive mind but also focused, asked bold questions about what is going on, will react on reality and addressing real issues, easy to listen to and follow, interesting, learns through experience of self and others, no ego, will apply what works, tries different things and can exit programs, leadership style, sets broad goals and lets others determine methods, Shark Tank, innovative standpoint, talked about bringing people in to make decisions and participate in decision making process, presentation was grounded in academic plan he implemented at Brookdale, academically focused ideas around structure and time with concrete steps that involve mechanics of learning, most innovative set of ideas of all the
candidates, spoke authentically around issues of culture and collaboration, answered questions directly and asked questions directly, deeply informed of community colleges nationally, takes on board what works in other institutions, refreshing, self-assured, articulate, understands need to communicate over and over, courageous enough to say what he truly thought, high level of innovation and pragmatism, will boil strategy down to 1-5 pages, lean thinking, sincere, referenced uncomfortable truths, half way ahead in recognizing difficult conversations, said “the time is now” in regards to question about racial climate, person of action, inclusive style and decisive, and will face issues head on.

The concerns for Dr. Reed were perception of self vs. how he’s perceived, uses “I” a lot, maybe too practical and blunt, ways of delivering messages sounded a little condescending, used the word “stupid” several times, thought being kicked out of his own meeting as a positive, not careful with language, stereotyped students as being naïve and sweet, had to write a letter of apology to college, fell on both sides of line of clear strong leader and self-absorption, higher risk/higher reward, and the way he spoke about faculty – “that's what they do.”
Chair LaRock welcomed finalist candidate Dr. Gloria Lopez.

Trustees introduced themselves to Dr. Lopez.

Chair LaRock reviewed the format of the interview, which would include three parts in the following order:

Dr. Lopez would present her business case, followed by a Q&A session and ending with an opportunity for Dr. Lopez to ask questions and make a closing statement.

Dr. Lopez reviewed the current state, enrollment opportunities, expanding population and differentiation. She also presented frameworks to consider that included work, worker and workplace as well as proactive, innovative, engaged and resilient.

Trustees reviewed perceived strengths and concerns of Dr. Lopez at the conclusion of the meeting.

Strengths of Dr. Lopez were that she is authentic, passionate, inspiring, likeable, has a high EQ, heart is in the work, great influencer, good communicator, personality, told her personal story, long career in higher education and non-profit, represents as someone who has experience similar to NSCC students, student centered, mental health focus, and could express emotional impact of being excluded.

Concerns of Dr. Lopez were that she answered questions rhetorically but did not follow up with actual concrete examples and implementation, was weak on financials, non-specific on multiple occasions, talks idealistically, ability to deal with financial issues pragmatically, too big picture thinking, lacking in details, no examples of gig economics, missed the mark on the business side, and was underwhelming.