## THE CHILDREN'S TRUST <br> NOMINATING COMMITTEE MEETING

The Children's Trust Nominating Committee Meeting was held on Wednesday, February 28, 2018, commencing at 2:33 p.m., at 3150 S.W. 3rd Avenue, Training Room, Miami, Florida 33129. The meeting was called to order by Rodester Brandon, Committee Chair.

## Committee Members

Rodester Brandon, At-Large Board Member Laurie W. Nuell, At-Large Member Lileana de Moya, Gubernatorial Appointee
The Honorable Orlando Prescott, Juvenile Court Division Dr. Susan Neimand, Miami-Dade College Marissa Leichter, Gubernatorial Appointee
Dr. Daniel Bagner, Florida International University Leigh Kobrinski, Assistant County Attorney

STAFF:
James Haj, President/Chief Executive Officer
Imran Ali
Muriel Jeanty, Clerk of the Board
Vivianne Bohorques

## PROCEEDINGS

(Recording of the meeting began at $2: 33$
p.m.)

MR. BRANDON: Good afternoon, everyone. I'm happy to call this meeting to order, the Nominating Committee. We have -- we're here to nominate folks for open positions.

Before we begin, Muriel, do we have any -MS. JEANTY: We don't have any public comments.

MR. BRANDON: -- public comments? Okay, very good. So we have three items to deal with today; to review a nomination for secretary of the Board because of a vacancy, recommendation to identify a locally recognized faith-based coalition to fill the seat on the Board to comply with the changes in the ordinance, recent changes, and then we have the approval to send the nominations to the Board.

Okay. I've been told to make this a quick meeting and it looks like it will be at $2: 30$ on Wednesday afternoon.

So it looks like we have two nominees for secretary, people that have stepped up already, Karen Weller and Tiombe Kendrick-Dunn.

I'd like to open up the floor for discussion
on either one of those. Perhaps we can -- yeah, either one of them.

DR. NEIMAND: Who was the first one you mentioned?

MR. BRANDON: Karen Weller. Can you help us with who that is?

MS. DE MOYA: Before we go there, I've brought this up before and $I$ want to discuss it again. Are these people who nominated themselves that they showed interest in wanting to be secretary?

MR. HAJ: Yes. Well, one was nominated by the other and she agreed to it.

MS. DE MOYA: What?
MR. HAJ: One was somebody else nominated her and she agreed.

MS. DE MOYA: Okay. So we talked about this before. And I know that some of you have not been at those meetings. You know, I feel this whole process should be different and I've said that.

I feel that, again, $I$ will say that $I$ think that the Children's Trust is a different organization, that it's a prestigious organization and it should have a better way of determining who should be on the Executive Board, who should be chairs, who should be chairs of the Board, etc. Some of you have been at
meetings where I have expressed this concern of mine.
I think that there should be some different process of succession. I think that a vice chair should want to be chair. I think that a chair of a committee should be part of the leadership, you know, want to be on the Executive Committee, and that before you make somebody a vice chair on the Program Services Committee, you need to know that that person is going to want to be one day, if so be it, the chair of the Program Services Committee. And the chair of the Program Services Committee one day, if there's an opening, would want to be on the Executive Board.

And I think that we should stop doing it the way that we're doing it, and this is an opportunity to do something about this process that should be a better process. This is a big organization. We're in charge of a lot of money.

And the leadership of this Board should be determined in a better planned process than, Hey, I want to be secretary, oh, okay, is it okay with you, oh, well, all right, or, Hey, nobody wants to be secretary, do you want to be secretary?

That should not be happening at the level of this organization and $I$ feel very, very strongly about that.

DR. NEIMAND: Do we have a job description for the secretary or any of the roles open at this point? I don't know. I'm asking.

MS. DE MOYA: No, you're right. That's a very good point, too. Like, what does it entail? What do you do if you're secretary or if you're --

DR. NEIMAND: Because we have someone who takes notes. So to me, that's the job of a secretary. MS. DE MOYA: The secretary does roll at the TRIM hearings and gets minutes approved.

MR. HAJ: The roles of the chair and the vice chair and secretary, they are identified in the by-laws.

MS. KOBRINSKI: Would you like to hear them, the roles?

DR. NEIMAND: Would I like to hear what?
MS. KOBRINSKI: The roles.
MR. HAJ: The role of the secretary.
DR. NEIMAND: The secretary.
MS. KOBRINSKI: The by-laws say, "The secretary shall ensure that minutes of meetings are accurately recorded, perform all duties that may be assigned by the Board and assume the office and duties of the vice chair in the event that office becomes vacant until the Board fills such vacancy through an
election as set forth in another provision of the by-laws. In the event offices of both the chair and vice chair should become vacant, the secretary shall assume the office of the chair until the Board fills such vacancy through an election."

MS. DE MOYA: So that, you know, kind of leads right into my point. Do these people know that? That what if, look, God forbid, I'm not trying to kill you or anything --

MR. HAJ: Then that fills the position of the vice chair.

MS. NUELL: Right, and then someone might ask the vice chair. We could together be hit by a truck today.

MS. DE MOYA: Right. We could all be hit by a truck and okay, now, all of a sudden, the secretary is the chair.

MR. HAJ: Temporarily until the vote
happens.
MS. DE MOYA: Okay. But does the secretary -- do they even know that?

MR. BRANDON: I'm in organizations where the positions are -- they have, say, a chair-elect and then there's an incumbent that's selected underneath. So, you know, at the time that person, you know, the chair
decides their time is up or they move on for whatever reason, then there's a natural flow for the second person. I think that's reasonable, you know.

MS. DE MOYA: You know, it's kind of a succession type of --

MR. BRANDON: So right now --
DR. NEIMAND: That's what most organizations do.

MS. DE MOYA: And that's how it starts, and that's what $I$ think, and this is the opposite way to do it.

MR. BRANDON: So would that be kind of a reorganization of by-laws?

MR. HAJ: Madam Chair?
MS. NUELL: So I don't disagree with you.
And we've been talking about it, especially as this came up again, because it's just not -- you know, it's not necessarily, $I$ don't think, a smart way to build our leadership.

But it is what our by-laws say. So one of the things that --

MS. DE MOYA: What do you mean?
MS. NUELL: Our by-laws state exactly how officers are appointed.

MS. DE MOYA: That they e-mail the CEO to
say if they're interested? They actually say that?
MS. NUELL: Yes, they actually do. Yeah, I just read it yesterday.

MS. KOBRINSKI: "And the nominating
committee shall make recommendations necessitated by vacancies."

MS. NUELL: But there's somewhere else that it also says that.

MS. KOBRINSKI: It says that they have to, at least for the at-large positions of the Board, they solicit candidates to fill them. "The Committee shall forward recommendations to the Board along with a list of all candidates who applied and that the Board chair shall accept nominations from the floor."

So basically, once this committee makes the recommendations to the Board, at that time, it will also open it up to anyone on the floor that wants to be considered.

MS. NUELL: Which is really not a great way to select your --

MS. DE MOYA: It doesn't say anything how the nominating committee --

MS. NUELL: It does say it somewhere because I'm, like, very carefully re-reading all the by-laws. Because what $I$ was going to say is, I don't think it can
help us today because $I$ don't think this committee has the authority to change the way we select officers.

But I'm calling a by-laws committee to really -- the by-laws committee to review all the by-laws, because there's a lot of discrepancies in the by-laws. There's lot of things that we -- that are in the by-laws that we don't do or that don't make sense from when it started and that sort of thing.

So it is through the by-laws. I don't know where it is because $I$ didn't bring my notes.

MS. DE MOYA: Well, let's be really sure that the by-laws say that.

MS. KOBRINSKI: I don't recall anything in here about how this committee solicits those.

MS. NUELL: Yeah, let me see because I just was reading it.

MS. DE MOYA: Does it say anything about a time period? Who says we have to pick a secretary today? Why can't the secretary position be vacant for a while if we need to address the by-laws? Like, let's not keep going down the same road if we all agree that this process should be changed.

An Executive Committee meeting has agreed this process should be changed. I'm seeing nods of heads. So why do we have to do this --

MS. NUELL: Well, they are -- I mean, I don't know if the by-laws address that, if you can leave it open. I mean, it says, "At the April Trust Board meeting, the Board shall elect a chair, vice chair, treasurer and secretary, all of whom shall be members of the Board."
"The nominating slate shall recommend a slate of officers pursuant -- the chair shall also" -so that says at the April Board meeting, we have to -we don't present a slate because it's for two years, but in this case, we have a vacancy.

MS. KOBRINSKI: Right, the vacancy of officers.

MS. NUELL: Right. "So if the vacancy should occur in one of these offices, the Board shall proceed to elect a Board member to fill such vacancy at a regular or special meeting as soon as reasonably possible. The officer so elected shall serve the remainder of the unexpired term and thereafter may serve in the same office for no more than two additional successive terms." Because Board officer positions, you can serve three two-year terms.

And then I'm trying to find where it said something about -- so that's why we went ahead and called for a replacement for that because the by-laws
say that that's what you're supposed to do.
MS. DE MOYA: Okay. So I understand that part. But what $I$ think we can still remedy, if we wanted to, unless you find what you're talking about, that it says that this is way it's supposed to happen, is that we kind of discuss how this process is improved.

And then we could go and say, okay, so the next person that should be on -- this is just an example -- the next person succession-wise or leadership-wise that should be on the Executive Committee would be a chair of a committee.

So that would be Pam or Ken, right? Isn't he the chair of the Finance Committee? So at a minimum, if we want to have a better process of leadership succession into the Executive Committee is to ask them, you know, to say, well, like, this is what we think, as the nominating committee, we're looking into a better process, or however we want to word it, and then we can make a decision on if they're not interested or they don't want -- Marissa is a chair of a committee.

MS. LEICHTER: I used to be.
MS. DE MOYA: You're not any more?
MS. LEICHTER: I'll still on the Executive Committee but I'm not -- I was chair of the $H R$ and now it's the guy from the Coral Gables --

MR. HAJ: Mark Trowbridge.
MS. LEICHTER: Mark Trowbridge, thank you. But I'm still on the Executive Committee as just a member.

MS. DE MOYA: Right. So we also have at-large members on the Executive Committee. So why aren't we considering the at-large members on the Executive Committee to move into an executive -- one of the secretaries? I just feel that that's way it should be happening.

MS. NUELL: Well, because these things -- I know, but we can't just do whatever we feel like doing. We have to change the by-laws in order to do that. So if the by-laws say --

MS. DE MOYA: The by-laws do not say this is the way we have to do it. I'm sorry.

MS. NUELL: Yeah, they do -- it does. It says --

DR. NEIMAND: Well, has anybody approached the people from the Executive Committee to see if they were interested in serving in that role?

MR. HAJ: The e-mail went out to all Board members, who is interested, because you also want people who are interested.

MS. DE MOYA: Right. But, I mean, I don't
know if anybody else feels like that. I feel like sometimes you don't really see the e-mails and you just kind of, like, oh, gosh, do I really want more responsibility.

But then if somebody -- if there's a process, you know, if there's a process that says that Executive Committee members --

MR. BRANDON: Will be connected -contacted --

MS. DE MOYA: -- will be contacted to see if they are interested in moving to the next position, then, you know, if I'm an Executive Committee member and somebody comes and says to me, there's an opening for vice chair, even though $I$ saw the e-mail but I'm not interested, $I$ might feel that it's my responsibility and my duty as an Executive Committee member if I accepted to be on that committee, that if there's a vacancy, that it's my turn to step up and be next. And I might not do it if I'm not asked.

MR. ALI: Well, I mean, at the same time, I know that Tiombe consulted with Muriel because she wanted to know what the duties were before putting her name in the hat. Karen Weller also spoke to me extensively as to what the duties were.

They had two other Board members who called
me to find out what the duties were. And after I described what they were, they declined to put their names in the hat. So you had at least four people who were interested in the position. But the two who felt they wanted to do it are the ones that you have their names today. I just put that out there so that you know.

MS. DE MOYA: No, I'm glad you said it and I understand.

MR. BRANDON: If there's a desire to change the way we do it, it seems like it would be more than just deciding. It would have to be a change in the by-laws and it would have to be in the next round, it seems.

MS. DE MOYA: I agree, as long as there is something in the by-laws that says, this is the way we have to do it. If there isn't, then who says we have to do it this way?

MR. HAJ: But I do think it's a larger
conversation that the avenue to do that is in the by-laws. If you really want the succession management, a true succession management that has been spoken to, it has to be further delineated in the by-laws.

MS. DE MOYA: Right.
MR. HAJ: And you also need to give the
power to the Nominating Committee to appoint an executive. We need to direct it to the Board and I also think diversity is also critical. Diversity on the makeup of the committees have to be on there as well.

MR. BRANDON: So where are we at this point?
MS. DE MOYA: I'm just waiting to see what Laurie says about what the by-laws say, like, where did this come from in the by-laws? And if it's not in the by-laws, then -- so you thought this meeting was going to be short. You didn't know I was coming. I'm sorry, but I've been talking about this for over a year.

MR. BRANDON: Good, good discussion.
MS. NUELL: I mean, I just read everything yesterday and made, like, copious notes, not for this meeting, so $I$ didn't bring my notes with me. So that's why it seems really fresh in my mind.

And I read the ordinance. I didn't read the statute. But going by this, that's why I have it in my mind that it says somewhere that you can, you know, if you're interested -- and one of the reasons I want to look at the by-laws anyway is because there's a way that we do things.

But just because we've been doing it that way doesn't mean that we're supposed to be or that it's, you know, that we should be. So I think, you know, we
have to make a decision. And I think what we probably will do is, you know, things will go back to committees to have the committees work and make recommendations to kind of review -- do a full review of the by-laws.

Because it's been -- the by-laws were changed in 2015 but it's generally one section or one issue because we're all working on governance.

But this says -- and I don't know where I, you know, read it otherwise. "The Nominating Committee shall recommend a slate of officers" -- it's very vague -- "and the chair shall also accept nominations from the floor."

And I don't disagree with you. I'm not sure I agree with everything. I'm not sure about the succession and the vice chair should be the chair. Some places do that. Some don't. I mean, that takes a long time to, you know, figure out.

You know, you say, you're a vice chair and then in six years, are you going to be the right person for that job? But $I$ was hoping that it said --

MS. DE MOYA: I don't want to be chair.
MS. NUELL: No, no, no, it's not you. I mean, $I$ don't mean you specifically, just in general. In terms of leadership, that's why I said, if there was no one and some random person says, okay, well, I want
to be the chair, that may not be the person that is the right person for the job.

So I do think some kind of clarity is --
MS. DE MOYA: No, I agree. I'm just giving examples. It's not like $I$ have a plan, just ideas.

MS. NUELL: No, no, no, right. And when I say "the vice chair," I don't mean any specific person or whoever it is. So you can take a nomination from the floor.

First of all, the whole thing reminds me of junior high. So, you know, and, like, that doesn't seem to me the best way to run a Board of this caliber, as you say.

MS. DE MOYA: Right.
MS. NUELL: So I definitely think it's worthy of review. But that's what this says. And for some reason, $I$ have it in my head that $I$ know that $I$ read that we take -- we can take -- someone can either nominate someone or express interest.

And that's how we've been doing it and then they sent it to the CEO, which is what the letter that Muriel sent out. So that is why we continue to do it this way. But I think we're --

MS. DE MOYA: We've been having this discussion for a while now, so I think it's time --

MS. NUELL: No, it is, and that's why
we're --
MR. BRANDON: If we decide things need to be changed, what process do we go about to change it?

MS. KOBRINSKI: Well, I think that would need to be an amendment to the by-laws as far as setting out a specific process for the selection committee to follow in soliciting interest for the positions.

I mean, you could defer the vote on this member, this treasurer is going to serve for one year --

MS. NUELL: No, the secretary.
MS. KOBRINSKI: I'm sorry, the secretary. The secretary is only going to be serving for one year because they're just filling a vacancy. So that's something the by-laws committee can deal with in the future before the next slate of officers is nominated.

MS. NUELL: And then who -- is there anything --

MS. DE MOYA: Does the process of -- or does the role or description, responsibilities of the Nominating Committee have to be in the by-laws? Because it's very vague right now.

So does the process have to be in the by-laws? Every committee doesn't have in the by-laws everything that they do.

MS. NUELL: Yes, they do. They do. It does, actually. Every committee has a list of responsibilities.

MS. DE MOYA: But that's very vague.
MS. NUELL: No, that's not the role of the Nominating Committee. That's the role of officers or -what is it called?

MS. KOBRINSKI: Right. To the extent that you're talking about just amending the process of e-mailing the Board members to solicit who's interested, that could be possibly in the discretion of the Nominating Committee.

But to the extent that you're talking about changing the roles of the officers and making a succession plan, that affects the entire by-laws.

MS. DE MOYA: Or something like that.
MS. NUELL: Yeah, because that -- what I was
reading is the section on -- what is it called -officers? It's not the role of the Nominating Committee. The by-laws state every responsibility of each committee.

MS. KOBRINSKI: Right, so they'd have to change the duties of the officers to say, for example, the vice chair shall become the chair after a certain amount of time.

MS. DE MOYA: Is it feasible to say that the same way that it says that the vice chair becomes chair and then the secretary becomes the vice chair -- right, that's what it says.

So is it feasible to say that if the secretary position becomes vacant, that an Executive Board member would be, you know, would fill in, like, for the year until the new -- or a chair of a committee, like, give it some kind of plan, you know.

JUDGE PRESCOTT: I would suggest that it be spelled out, because understanding this situation as it is now, see what's going on, I think moving forward, we need to make that determination, have it placed in the by-laws.

And even, as you state, even if it means that in the by-laws, it's stated that a position such as that becomes vacant before an election year or an election cycle, that the CEO can make the appointment of a chair from one of the other committees or something like that.

MS. NUELL: Or a member.
MS. DE MOYA: Or an Executive Committee
member.
MS. NUELL: Right.
MR. HAJ: I think there was an agreement. I
just think that needs to be really well thought out and vetted. Because there are instances that you might not want that to occur. So there needs to be outlets and things like that.

JUDGE PRESCOTT: That needs to be the by-laws committee.

MS. NUELL: Right.
MS. LEICHTER: And there are also
complications -- everybody has, like, different term limits, term years, and what if, like, a vice chair and a chair are the exact same sequence and then the chair leaves and the vice chair leaves at the same time, and you have all the leadership kind of leaves at the same time, and then, like, how long are you going to go, like, the logic of who takes after what person?

MS. DE MOYA: No, that's all -- absolutely, that all has to be thought out.

MS. LEICHTER: Unfortunately, we're not all on the same timeline.

MS. DE MOYA: If we have a plan where it says, you know, if this person is next, okay, so that's not feasible, then that person is next, okay, you know, and then somebody can open it up and say, okay, there's nobody to take this position right now so if anybody on the Board --

MS. NUELL: So, Lily, I think, in answer to you, it's not particularly helpful right this very second because actually, the by-laws don't state what happens if there's a vacancy in that secretary.

But the time is here, not this second, but that we're going to review all the various aspects of the by-laws and figure out, you know, how to move forward.

So I think there will be a time for a really robust conversation with information as opposed to you specifically saying -- and you're not wrong -- saying, I brought it up a year ago.

And so anyway, within the next month to two months, the time has come where we're moving -- I just called for, you know, just tried to set up a by-laws committee to go ahead and we were doing things sequentially.

So we will -- we are going to get to this for sure.

MS. DE MOYA: The reality is --
MS. NUELL: I don't know what the outcome is
but --
MS. DE MOYA: -- my term is up in March.
MS. NUELL: I know, but you're staying on, right, until the governor appoints God knows when.

MS. DE MOYA: I've chosen not to. I'd never do that. But technically, you could have another vacant position. So, no, I'm not leaving until somebody appoints, you know, which could take two or three years, which is why I'm not reapplying for the third term, because I figured two or three years plus another four years -- so, yes, $I$ will stay until someone else is appointed.

But, I mean, technically, the secretary is gone and now as of March 1st, you know, I could be gone, too.

MS. NUELL: Well, that's -- well, except, then, I don't know, we would have to --

MS. NUELL: Your term is coming up soon, too.

MS. NUELL: Well, I think my term is up but I could, as the chair, like, I guess, supersedes that because $I$ could have six years of being a chair.

But anyway, I was just -- that's why I just thought we should fill the vacancy until, you know, and if you said, my term is up and I'm leaving, we would have to either move the secretary up and replace the secretary or -- I don't know if we can make an amendment.

I don't know if it's legal to make an
amendment to say, the secretary, to finish this vacancy, because then it's a new slate. So in other words -MR. HAJ: I think that's the way it reads now, Madam Chair, is going to fill in for the rest of the slate.

MS. NUELL: It might be whoever it is just for this one year and then -- or until, I don't know, I don't even know if it's 12 months. I don't know when the term begins.

MS. DE MOYA: So can I just suggest that maybe we could put together a group -- a work group, like, that kind of thinks all this out, this nominating process, and then those recommendations go to the by-laws committee.

MS. NUELL: Well, I think the by-laws committee will ask or charge the various committees to do $X, Y, Z$. And then, yes, that's what would happen. And then, I think, I mean, that's up to Susan is the chair. So they're going to figure -- they're going to have to figure all that out.

MS. DE MOYA: For the by-laws committee to work on by-laws, you kind of have to know how to plan. So if we put together a group that comes up with and kind of works through the kinks and all the thoughts like Marissa brought up, what happens with this and what
happens with that, that's not really by-laws.
Once that kind of plan is in place, then it goes to the by-laws, I think -- I would think.

MS. NUELL: Oh, yeah, that's a recommendation.

MS. KOBRINSKI: Are you talking about this committee making recommendations to the by-laws committee?

MS. DE MOYA: Well, I think if everybody's willing to work on it, you know, I don't see why not.

MR. HAJ: In some committees, it's started. HR started talking about, like, when by-laws opens, they want to get recommendations and tweak it. So it's up to Dr. Neimand, but if this committee wants input --

MS. NUELL: So we're not 100 percent there yet but we're close, you know, in terms of how it's going to go, what the process is, what conditions in the by-laws need review, because not all of them do.

So, you know, we're getting there. I don't even think we have a date yet but we're getting there. Maybe we do. I don't know.

MS. LEICHTER: That was my suggestion or question, is that $I$ feel like I've been at so many meetings over the years where, we need to develop a plan, we need to change in the by-laws.

And I know we can't have, like, private conversations because of the sunshine laws, but $I$ was thinking either Laurie or Jim, at one of the Board meetings, can just remind the Board or ask the Board what are the issues that have come up in the last five-plus years that we just kind of like, poof, float away in the air.

And like this one, for example, of how we replace leadership or the succession of leadership. The other one that you just mentioned, now it's already gone poof from my brain. It's one that always comes up.

MS. NUELL: As my father used to say to me, you're too young for that to happen. It happens to me on a minute-by-minute basis.

MS. LEICHTER: What was the other thing we were just talking about that needs to be changed in the by-laws, that we were just talking about five seconds ago? I don't know.

MS. NUELL: Yeah, or reviewed to see if it needs to be changed, yeah.

MS. LEICHTER: I just know there's a lot of issues that we always talk about that are always, like, so maybe if we just open it up to the whole Board, a few more issues that we forget, and so when the by-laws committee meets or we want to create or present, that we
have all the topics.
Because, you know, we always say we don't like to work in silos and when we meet in these small committees, we're kind of, you know, focused and then we forget when we get to the big group. So if we open it up to the big group for ideas, then all the other little groups will know that the other little groups are kind of thinking that these are areas that the by-laws need to be amended. And I still can't believe --

MS. NUELL: It will come to you.
DR. NEIMAND: I think that the other
committee chairs should have a voice, you know, this is working really well.

MS. NUELL: Absolutely, yeah.
MS. LEICHTER: HR was the other thing we were talking about that you guys were saying you were looking at stuff, the $H R$ by-laws you might want to tweak.

MS. NUELL: Well, I'm not even sure -- I don't even think the word "any succession" is actually in the by-laws or the responsibility of the Nominating Committee. But it's time to look at it in every aspect. MS. DE MOYA: I would like, from this meeting, to come out of here with more than just, "It's time to look at it" --

MS. NUELL: Well, we're setting up a
meeting.
MS. DE MOYA: -- and either we decide that we're going to, at the Board meeting, that Jim would announce, you know, that we want to know who's interested in being in a work group to work on this particular issue or that we decide today that it should be the Nominating Committee who works on it or, like Dr. Neimand said, would we say, let's put a group together of people who are interested or the Nominating Committee plus the chairs of other committees. I just want -- I want --

MS. NUELL: I, personally, and this is just my voice and anyone else can chime in, I think the process needs to first come from the by-laws committee. I don't think every Board member can then just bombard the by-laws committee of what they, you know, of any thoughts they have.

I think the directive should come from the by-laws committee. And they haven't even met yet to review what are the, you know, areas that are right or wrong. That's this committee.

Another committee may, I mean, I don't think we can have seven work groups going at the same time, especially with the solicitations going. But there's
definitely -- we're definitely going to do it.
I mean, I'm not a voter in this committee.
MS. DE MOYA: I disagree.
MS. NUELL: And Susan, we haven't even
discussed it yet. But I think the by-laws committee has to review the by-laws first to make a determination of what the issues are. But that's just my opinion as opposed to the committees charging the by-laws committee of what they're going to do.

MS. DE MOYA: I agree with that but I don't agree with you that it should be a directive of the by-laws committee. I think it should be a directive of the Nominating Committee, the one that's involved in the process and that we are the ones who should determine the recommendations of some kind of plan and then it goes to the by-laws committee and then they decide, you know.

But if the by-laws committee looks at it and says, there's nothing wrong with the by-laws, it's fine the way it is, then what, we didn't do anything.

DR. NEIMAND: I don't think that that's what is being suggested. What I understand is being suggested is that there's a committee who comes together, looks at the by-laws and says, this looks weak, this looks okay, this looks wrong, and then
bringing together the chairs of all of the committees' roles that are delineated in the by-laws and have those conversations.

When we looked at this, we saw that the nominating process was weak, let's have a conversation about how to strengthen it.

So I think what Laurie is saying is, we have to look at the big picture first and then we can look at the little finite pieces inside.

MS. NUELL: And also said this -- so the Nominating Committee is actually an ad hoc committee. It's not a standing committee. So this is what it says.
"The Nominating Committee shall be convened as needed by the chair of the Board subject to approval by the Board. The Committee shall consist of the vice chair of the Board and six Board members selected by the Board chair subject to the approval of the Board. A quorum shall be three members. The Board chair shall appoint the chair and vice chair of the Committee.
(A) The purpose of the Nominating Committee is to solicit candidates to fill the four at-large positions to the Board and make recommendations to the Board. The Committee shall forward its recommendations to the Board along with the list of candidates who applied. The Board chair shall accept nominations from
the floor from the list of candidates." So that's for the four-at-large.
"(B) The Nominating Committee shall also make recommendations necessitated by vacancies. Every two years, it shall make recommendations to the Board for election of officers in a timely manner in accordance with these by-laws."

So those are the two responsibilities of the Nominating Committee. So I think -- and that's why I think we need to start with by-laws because this doesn't say that the Nominating Committee's role is to figure out, you know, how we solicit, how we --

MS. DE MOYA: Or even in this process.
MS. NUELL: -- and so that might be
something that's changed and added to it or not. But I don't think we can just do it because that's what we feel like, you know what I mean?

MS. DE MOYA: No, of course not.
MS. NUELL: But also that's --
MR. BRANDON: But $I$ would imagine if we had concerns about the process for nominating, we could contact or bring the issue up to the by-laws committee.

MS. KOBRINSKI: And just to clarify, by it saying the purpose of the Nominating Committee is to solicit candidates to fill the positions, again, I think
that leaves discretion for the Nominating Committee to determine how they want to gather interest.

But what $I$ was saying to Lily's point was that if the point is to change the succession plan and to impact the role of the vice chair and the chair and to make those kinds of impacts, that is more the by-laws arena as opposed to the Nominating Committee.

MR. BRANDON: So with that -- with
nominating our two people, we have Karen Weller and Tiombe Kendrick-Dunn.

MS. LEICHTER: I'm having a hard time placing Karen Weller.

MR. BRANDON: I don't know who that is either.

MS. KOBRINSKI: She's from the County Department of Health.

MS. NUELL: She's the vice chair --
MS. DE MOYA: She's the vice chair of the Programs Committee.

MS. LEICHTER: Okay. Thank you. She's been serving for a while.

MR. BRANDON: She sits to your right.
MS. DE MOYA: She recently started sitting next to Pam because she's the vice chair.

MS. LEICHTER: Right, that's what I thought.

DR. NEIMAND: No, but I think the point is right. I don't know her either. I know who she is but I've never had a conversation with her. I know Tiombe well because she works in the school system.

MS. LEICHTER: No, that's who I thought it was but $I$ just wanted to be sure.

MS. KOBRINSKI: Muriel, when you send out the e-mails, just to clarify, do you just ask for anyone -- I don't think $I$ would see the e-mail, so do you just ask if anyone's interested? Do you ask them to submit a statement about why they're interested?

MR. ALI: I ask for everyone who's interested or if they want to make a nomination.

MS. KOBRINSKI: Okay. Did you ask them to submit a statement or they just submitted their name and said, I'm interested?

MS. JEANTY: We tell them to call Jim.
MR. HAJ: Yeah, and it's the same thing we did -- that we did with the -- what was the prior seat? The Finance chair and the slate.

MS. LEICHTER: So as of now, she's the vice chair of the Programs Committee. And Tiombe, is she a chair or vice chair of anything?

MS. NUELL: That's what I'm trying to find the list here. I don't know about that.

MR. BRANDON: I think she's a member
at-large.
MS. NUELL: No, she's a gubernatorial.
MR. HAJ: She's not a chair or vice chair.
MS. LEICHTER: She's not a chair or vice
chair.
DR. NEIMAND: No, she's not.
MS. NUELL: Or she could be on the Executive
Committee. I'm sorry. I don't have everyone's
committee appointments committed to memory.
MS. LEICHTER: But she has been on the floor
longer than --
MS. NUELL: Oh, yes.
MS. JEANTY: She's up for renewal.
MS. KOBRINSKI: So maybe we need more
information on the candidates and ask them to submit a statement. If no one's comfortable making a decision at this point and we're not ready to overhaul the by-laws in the next month, maybe we can reconsider the solicitation process.

MS. DE MOYA: I think it's time to do it differently. You know, even if we can't vote today to the extent of all the way into the by-laws and everything, but just making a decision on two people that half of you don't even know who they are is
ridiculous.

DR. BAGNER: Do we have to make a recommendation?

MR. BRANDON: Yes, we need a recommendation.
MS. LEICHTER: But then they can still bring it up. People can still mention other people at the Board meeting.

DR. BAGNER: Right. I was just wondering, instead of, like, delaying this, why don't we just ask them to prepare a statement for the next Board meeting and as a Nominating Committee we say, you know, we think who would be acceptable in these roles and they're going to present a statement about why they want to do this, and then the Board -- because ultimately, the Board votes anyway, right?

MS. NUELL: At the Board meeting? And then the two people walk up? That's like junior high.

DR. BAGNER: How else does the Nominating Committee make the recommendation?
(MULTIPLE SPEAKERS AT ONCE.)
THE COURT REPORTER: One at a time.
MS. KOBRINSKI: The Nominating Committee will make a recommendation to the full Board. The entire list, Dr. Weller's name and Tiombe's name, will go to the Board as expressing interest. But the

Nominating Committee makes one recommendation.
At the Board level, they will also open it up for anyone else to make a recommendation.

DR. BAGNER: So it's going to be like high school anyway.

MS. NUELL: Which is, as I say, you know, it's not the best way to pick your leadership.

MR. BRANDON: And seems random. It seems a little random, you know, that that someone from the floor could get nominated -- could get elected.

MS. LEICHTER: And then that's why we say "yea" or "nay," you're just doing it on that one person. But when we do the slate, we know what the slate is and then the secretary takes the roll call and you just say "yes" or "no" because you know the four people that are on the slate. So let's say it's Tiombe's name, you can say "yes" or "no" to Tiombe because you don't say one or two names. You're just saying "yes" or "no" for the recommendation.

MR. HAJ: And last time, the person who was in second place withdrew her nomination so only one went to the floor.

MS. NUELL: That was for Finance?
MS. KOBRINSKI: Yes.
MS. DE MOYA: I personally -- I can make my
recommendation because $I$ do know both of them well enough to do it and I have reasons for thinking one over the other since we're throwing this whole plan of changing things out the window right now, which I'm not happy about but okay, this is the way it has to happen so we'll do it that way.

But I'm not comfortable with the fact that half of you don't know who they are. So I do and I can pick somebody. But the fact that you don't even know what she looks like, $I$ feel comfortable with making a recommendation.

DR. BAGNER: I know who she is.
MS. NUELL: And that's one of the reasons we change positions so people can --

MR. BRANDON: Based on -- we know who they are but what rubric are we using to decide, you know, what basis are we using to decide who will be put in the position? And I think that needs to be firmed up a little bit better.

MS. DE MOYA: Absolutely, because my reasons are, like, completely -- I was just going to say that, you know, Karen just became vice chair of the Program Service Committee so let her get comfortable in that role.

And if we're going to pick somebody else and
just talk about diversity, Tiombe is very outspoken and she would be a good, I think, person in a leadership position. And she is not on any other committee in a leadership position so I think we should give her a chance. I mean, that's my reasoning. This is not a great way to go about doing this.

MR. BRANDON: Sir?
JUDGE PRESCOTT: Normally when I think of voting for a person for a position is, you understand the duties and responsibilities of that position, what the responsibilities are, and then the person who is seeking that position would give you their background and qualifications and then decide to fulfill that position, and then based upon that, we make that determination.

But I understand this process is these people want to do it and then we just pick one to do it, correct?

MS. DE MOYA: Um-hmm.
MS. KOBRINSKI: Well, the by-laws do -- you missed it, Your Honor. But the by-laws do delineate what the role of the secretary is. So it's to ensure that the minutes of meetings are accurately recorded, perform all duties that may be assigned by the Board and to assume, in the event that a vacancy occurs with the
vice chair, they assume the vacancy of the vice chair. And in the event a vacancy occurs with the vice chair and the chair, they assume the vacancy of both.

DR. BAGNER: So if we wanted to move ahead and make a recommendation here, I'm a data-driven person, so based on the roles of this position, I would say one way we could look at it is attendance at meetings.

If they're not attending meetings regularly, then whoever is attending much more frequently than the other, then $I$ think that might be a really good indication of who would serve better in this role. So we could probably get that data right now, right?

MS. NUELL: She just went to print the list for me.

MS. DE MOYA: I think that we should have a list of some type of criteria. And I think your suggestion, if we could work around that -- your suggestion of them submitting some type of letter or something to us on why they think, you know, why they want the position, what are their qualifications for the position, before we make a decision, you know.

Even if they do this by e-mail, I mean --
DR. NEIMAND: Well, that's what $I$ was
thinking.

MS. DE MOYA: -- that they submit it and then it be sent to --

MR. BRANDON: The question is, do we have time --

DR. NEIMAND: Then send our information --
MR. BRANDON: Do we have time to delay this to satisfy the suggestions?

MR. HAJ: The Board meeting is March 12th.
MR. BRANDON: So that's just 12 days. And would it be okay if we did it over e-mail?

MS. KOBRINSKI: Well, they could submit it to you. You can't have a discussion over e-mail.

DR. BAGNER: It would have to be another e-mail.

MS. DE MOYA: We could have a half-an-hour meeting before the Board meeting.

MR. BRANDON: Okay, that's a good idea, yeah. So the Board meeting is March 12th.

MS. DE MOYA: And we could come up with maybe just simple, like, three things, right? Attendance based on their submission of why, you know, their qualifications and background and why they want to do this. Three things, and you decide, okay, you make a decision and you bring that decision to the meeting.

MS. LEICHTER: Well, how do you feel about
making them come in-person and say something to us versus submitting them on paper? But $I$ was thinking if they were just here today, we could talk to them and ask them why they want to do it. I like to see people's faces and how they react to things, vibe it out, like, in-person versus on a piece of paper.

I know Laurie might say that's like junior high. I don't know. But I think --

MS. DE MOYA: When we went through the whole process of picking the CEO, they all had to sit. The finalists, they had to come in --

MR. HAJ: I would have preferred you picked me than go through all that.

MR. BRANDON: So what we could do is, March 12th, perhaps an hour and-a-half, two hours before the meeting, we could have the two candidates come in and speak to us and dismiss them, and then we can decide and then present the slate to the Board.

MS. LEICHTER: I mean, I don't think we need that much time.

MR. BRANDON: Well, okay, an hour perhaps, an hour before. Well, can we have that in the form of a motion so we can move along?

MS. LEICHTER: A statement or --
MR. BRANDON: I like the idea of having them
come.
MS. KOBRINSKI: Do you want to give them, like, a list of things that you're looking for?

MR. HAJ: Yeah.
DR. NEIMAND: Why can't we have both? Why can't they submit a statement and then we talk to them? Even if they repeat it, but there's a big difference. You want this person to be a presence. You want them to be able to express themselves. They represent the Children's Trust.

MR. BRANDON: So can I, just for the sake of preparing for the next -- for the statement, can $I$ have some ideas of what you would like to hear from them in writing?

MR. ALI: Lily just stated, the attendance. DR. BAGNER: The desired information. (MULTIPLE SPEAKERS AT ONCE.)

MR. BRANDON: Okay, Susan, say it.
MS. NUELL: What's going to be different?
MR. BRANDON: Hold on one second. We have a reporter. I'm like the Judge now.

DR. NEIMAND: Okay. So what are their qualifications for this role?

MR. BRANDON: What are their qualifications?
DR. NEIMAND: What is their commitment to
the Trust?
MR. BRANDON: Commitment to Trust.
DR. BAGNER: Their vision for --
DR. NEIMAND: -- for the role.
MS. NUELL: What did you say, "commitment?" What's the third one?

MS. KOBRINSKI: Qualifications, commitment and vision for the role.

MR. BRANDON: Number one is, what are your qualifications for the role? Number two is, what is your commitment to the Trust? Number three is, your background as to how qualified for being in the position and your vision for the role.

And then the third thing that we should have from Muriel is their bio and attendance.

MR. HAJ: Do we track punctuality?
MS. NUELL: What?
MR. HAJ: Do we track punctuality?
MS. NUELL: No. We track attendance.
MR. HAJ: They have to be there. They have to be at the meeting when it starts for this position.

MS. LEICHTER: Yes. So Laurie, when you were out, I also suggested for me, I preferred not only a written statement, but $I$ would have preferred to have them come in and chat with them for five minutes and
some people agreed with me.
So we were saying that maybe we were going to meet -- do both, actually, have them submit a statement and then bring them in for a few minutes before the next Board meeting to just chat with them a little -- because I said for me, a piece of paper is a piece of paper but when I see someone, I can really vibe if they want it or if it's something that they're really interested in.

MS. NUELL: Are we trying to -- are we going to test this and see what we think in terms of making this a -- it might not be a by-law recommendation, but a policy or something like that?

Because this is just one person, one position. So if it was a whole slate, you know, this could be 12 people that you're talking to or 15 or four, you know.

So I'm just wondering, do you want to test it and see how it works? Because we're making a big change. That's why I want to look at the by-laws, because just as we do something one way for 15 years doesn't mean that's the right way to do it.

DR. NEIMAND: Well, we could do it as a pilot --

MS. NUELL: That's what I mean, like a
pilot, and see --
DR. NEIMAND: -- to see if it works.
MS. NUELL: Right, then the committee could
decide --
DR. NEIMAND: And if there were 12, I don't
think we would take all 12 people. We would do, like,
first up and then bring in the second tier.
MS. LEICHTER: Right, clumping it to only
two.
MS. DE MOYA: Right. You could have the
bio, the attendance, their statement and then you would
determine, okay, we want to talk to two.
MS. NUELL: It would be, like, really
formalizing this process where it's been very -- I don't
know what it's been -- a very informal thing.
MR. BRANDON: So do we need to vote on this?
I need a motion as to how to move ahead.
DR. BAGNER: Can you read your questions
again? It just seems like a lot for --
MR. BRANDON: Okay. So this is what we
have. "What are your qualifications? List those."
DR. BAGNER: I think maybe it should be,
"What are your qualifications and background," combine
those two.
MR. BRANDON: Well, \#2 is -- what did you

```
    say?
```

DR. BAGNER: I would combine the two of
them. "What is your background and commitment to the Trust?" That's \#1.

MR. BRANDON: All right. "What are your qualifications or your background and your commitment to the Children's Trust?"

DR. BAGNER: Right.
MR. BRANDON: So we lump those two together.
Third one is -- or the new second one is, "Your background."

DR. BAGNER: It's the same thing.
MS. DE MOYA: I mean, you have that one.
DR. BAGNER: "What is your background" --
MS. NUELL: I mean, first of all, if you're on the Trust, there's an assumption that you're qualified.

DR. BAGNER: And then, "What is your vision for the" --

MR. BRANDON: The fourth one is "Your vision or your role."

DR. BAGNER: Right. It should be the "Background/commitment to the Trust and vision for your role."

MR. BRANDON: And then finally the last one
is the bio -- that's from Muriel -- the bio and the attendance records.

MS. NUELL: Do you want attendance for -- we don't really keep attendance for committee meetings but, I mean, Muriel might because of minutes. But otherwise, we don't.

The only thing I'd say about vision is specifically for -- first of all, the by-laws say what your job is, you know. And then $I$ would say for vice chair and secretary versus chair and finance, you know, I don't think -- I don't know what vision you could have because the by-laws sort of dictate what your role is.

MS. KOBRINSKI: Your interest in the role.
MS. NUELL: Interest, maybe. You could have a great vision to be the secretary of the Trust but it's not within your -- it's not within your responsibility. I don't know.

MS. DE MOYA: I was thinking more -- instead of that vision, $I$ was thinking more of asking a question about leadership, you know --

DR. BAGNER: A good fit, right, why you think you're a good fit for the position.

MS. NUELL: Right.
MR. HAJ: But do you want to -- you aligned the question earlier. Do you want to move up into the

Executive Committee? Do you want a larger leadership role?

MS. DE MOYA: I'm thinking more of questions on your qualities in a leadership role --

MS. NUELL: Right.
MS. DE MOYA: -- you know, and are you
interested in that type of --
JUDGE PRESCOTT: I think we can add, "face
to face."
MR. BRANDON: Okay.
MS. DE MOYA: So we'll just leave it open just like you said, "Why do you want to do this" and let them just give us --

DR. NEIMAND: Right, "What are your
qualifications?"
MR. BRANDON: And then if we have further questions, we can ask them when they come in.

MS. LEICHTER: Can I make a motion?
MR. HAJ: Are the questions going to them in advance?

MR. BRANDON: I would think so, yes.
MS. LEICHTER: So you or Imran has to reach out to them and say, this is what they came up with and can you please submit -- tell them to submit a one-page why you want this position essay, please give it to us
by the 9 th or $10 t h$, whatever, and then you'll give it to us and then we'll meet for a half hour, 45 minutes. MS. NUELL: When is this meeting?

MS. JEANTY: The 12th.
MS. LEICHTER: So I make a motion --
MS. KOBRINSKI: Why don't you make a motion
to defer the selection of the nomination for the secretary until --

MR. BRANDON: March 12th.
MS. KOBRINSKI: -- March 12th once you
receive the statements.
JUDGE PRESCOTT: I second that.
MS. LEICHTER: So I don't have to make a motion.

MS. KOBRINSKI: I didn't make that motion. MS. NUELL: You move what she said. You move what she said.

MS. LEICHTER: I don't have to make a motion with our plan, this little procedure we came up with? MS. KOBRINSKI: I don't think -- I think that's part of the informal process.

MS. NUELL: Do you want to set it for 3:15?
You said "a half hour" but --
MS. LEICHTER: Do you want 45 minutes, an hour?

MS. NUELL: I said "45 minutes," right, it's
at 4:00?
MS. LEICHTER: So 3:00?
MS. NUELL: 3:15?
MR. BRANDON: I'd say "3:00" just to have it done, you know, so we won't have to be rushed. 3:00 on the 12 th .

MS. NUELL: Because things don't usually
start right on time.
MR. BRANDON: Right.
MS. DE MOYA: Do you have a motion?
MS. KOBRINSKI: Motion to defer the
nomination of the secretary until statements are received by the committee.

JUDGE PRESCOTT: You say "ditto."
MS. LEICHTER: Ditto.
JUDGE PRESCOTT: I second it.
MR. BRANDON: It's been moved and seconded.
All in favor?
(WHEREUPON, the Board members all responded with "aye".)

MR. BRANDON: Those opposed?
(NO VERBAL RESPONSE.)
MR. BRANDON: All right. So next on the
agenda is --

JUDGE PRESCOTT: I apologize. I have to get back to Court.

MS. NUELL: Yes. I appreciate it. I said, Oh, the Judge will never be able to get here, so thank you.

MR. HAJ: Thanks, Judge.
(WHEREUPON, Judge Prescott exited the meeting room.)

MR. BRANDON: All right. Next on the agenda is recommendations to identify a locally faith-based coalition to fill the seat of a Board -- on the Board to comply with the changes in the ordinance.

And the suggestion is that we consider the Miami Coalition of Christians \& Jews, MCCJ, which is an organization that already has a presence on the Board. They've been selected -- the group is also a multi-denominational organization to be suggested to fill this position.

So does anyone have any concerns or --
MS. DE MOYA: I don't understand.
MS. NUELL: I think it was a name change.
MS. KOBRINSKI: Do you want me to talk about that?

MR. BRANDON: Go ahead.
MS. KOBRINSKI: Sure. The ordinance was
cleaned up just to reflect a better response to the language that was in the state statute. And so the state statute for the membership said, "Designate one member who's a member of and is selected by a locally recognized faith-based coalition." That's what the state statute said.

The code said, "One member who's a member of the Greater Miami Chapter of the National Conference for Community Injustice." So it basically just specifies what that locally recognized faith-based coalition was.

And my understanding is that organization has had several name changes over the past few years. So now it is MCCJ. But the idea in making the code comply with the language of the statute was just kind of, leave it a little bit more broad in case they change their name again so that there's not a discrepancy between the named member and what's in the code.

MS. DE MOYA: So it's to give them a seat on the Board?

MR. HAJ: They have a seat.
MS. KOBRINSKI: They already have a seat.
MS. DE MOYA: That's what $I$ was going to say.

MS. KOBRINSKI: Right. They already have a seat.

MS. DE MOYA: I thought there was an MCCJ
seat on the Board.
MS. NUELL: It is. That's Ken.
MS. DE MOYA: It's Ken Hoffman.
MR. HAJ: I talked to Dave about it. When the Trust was formed, MCCJ had a seat. It was written in the ordinance that MCCJ had -- well, whatever name they went under at the time and it kept on changing. So when we cleaned up the ordinance this time around, we just aligned it to the statute. So when they change the name, we don't have to keep on coming back to change the ordinance.

Now it's really just going through the process to say MCCJ has a seat to align with the ordinance; am I correct?

MS. KOBRINSKI: Right.
MS. NUELL: And is that why there's two things here, one is to align the ordinance to the statute and then secondly, have a resolution saying that?

MS. KOBRINSKI: I think the second bullet is a recommendation, so the Nominating Committee is making a recommendation to the Board. The third bullet is because there's no formal resolution before you today, it's for the committee to make a motion to submit a
resolution to the Board to accept the Nominating Committee's recommendation.

Normally a resolution would come before the committee to vote on. But because this was a discussion item --

MS. NUELL: First and then --
MS. KOBRINSKI: Right. So it's the same thing. The Nominating Committee makes a recommendation and then we'll prepare -- you're directing staff to prepare a resolution to go to the Board based on that recommendation.

MS. DE MOYA: The recommendation is to identify the faith-based coalition which already exists?

MR. HAJ: Identify MCCJ as the faith-based coalition.

MS. KOBRINSKI: And there will be, in the future, there was another change to the code, similar to make it just the language align to the statute. So there's another vacant spot that's currently vacant because the Alliance -- the former Alliance for Human Services no longer exists.

So the Nominating Committee will be meeting again and my understanding is that in the future, to select a local alliance or coalition engaged in class system planning for health and social services delivery
in the County.
So there are two spots that need to be
filled. This one is already being filled currently by
MCCJ, so it's kind of --
MR. BRANDON: A formality.
MS. KOBRINSKI: -- a formality.
MS. DE MOYA: Okay. I understand now.
Thank you.
MR. BRANDON: So is there any more
discussion about that -- about this proposal?
DR. BAGNER: Do we need to fill Claudia's
seat?
MR. HAJ: That's already been assigned.
United Way assigns that seat.
MS. NUELL: That's already done.
MR. HAJ: She'll be at the next Board
meeting and we'll introduce her.
MR. ALI: I think we need to get a motion
out to recommend MCCJ to fill the seat.
MR. BRANDON: Can I have a motion?
DR. BAGNER: Motion to have MCCJ fill the
vacant seat.
MR. BRANDON: Is there a second?
MS. LEICHTER: I second it.
MR. BRANDON: It's been seconded and moved.

```
All in favor?
```

(WHEREUPON, the Board members all responded with "aye".)

MR. BRANDON: Opposed?
(NO VERBAL RESPONSE.)
MR. BRANDON: All right. So it looks like -- so MCCJ will be our nomination to the Board. I guess the Board will have to approve it.

MR. HAJ: There will be a reso that the Board will approve, just to certify MCCJ is the one filling the seat for the locally --

MR. ALI: But the third bullet is to give staff permission to write that resolution out to present to the full Board.

MR. BRANDON: Okay. So can I have a motion for the staff to write the proposal to present to the Board?

MS. DE MOYA: So moved.
MR. BRANDON: Moved. Second?
MS. LEICHTER: Second.
MR. BRANDON: All in favor?
(WHEREUPON, the Board members all responded with "aye".)

MS. NUELL: I have a little question. I just was thinking, so what happens, then, in March --
what happens if one of those two people isn't attending the Board meetings -- that meeting? Sometimes people don't attend Board meetings.

I mean, I don't think it's fair to say, then you're not interested because, like, you know, there's lots of reasons. So I don't know. I don't know -- I just was thinking, if someone wasn't, I mean, able to attend the Board meeting --

MS. LEICHTER: Then Muriel has to send out a survey --

MS. JEANTY: We can invite them at this Board meeting.

MR. BRANDON: So you'll confirm as to whether or not they're coming?

MS. NUELL: They may not be attending, I mean, it's vacation time -- if you want them to go to the Board meeting, they probably aren't coming an hour before.

MS. LEICHTER: If they can't make the time before, then $I$ guess, like any other thing, Muriel will have to send us -- we'll have to try to get a quorum of this committee.

MS. NUELL: I'm just throwing that out there because, you know, people --

DR. NEIMAND: Tiombe is often late because
she's coming from school.
MR. BRANDON: Well, on that day, you know, that's her normal situation. But on that day, this is a special day, she perhaps can make arrangements to be there.

DR. NEIMAND: Exactly.
MS. DE MOYA: I agree. But Jim did bring up a good point which when he said that, it immediately reminded me what you said, that she is often late and you can't be late if you're the secretary. So that kind of puts a --

MS. LEICHTER: Well, we can ask her.
MS. NUELL: I just was thinking if it was, you know, it's vacation time, people leave or --

MS. DE MOYA: It doesn't disqualify her. It's a question we have to ask her and say, would you be able --

MS. NUELL: You have to be on time.
MS. DE MOYA: -- you know, with your schedule, would you be able to be at the Board meeting on time. I mean, maybe she can but we don't know.

I just have one more little thing. Since we are going to be looking at attendance, can we get attendance on committee meetings, too?

MS. JEANTY: Sure.

MS. DE MOYA: And I think it would be important to have that for any other nominating situation.

MS. JEANTY: I'll prepare it.
MS. DE MOYA: Because not just attendance at Board meetings --

MS. JEANTY: I'll have it for the Program and the Finance committees.

MS. NUELL: Our by-laws discuss attendance at the Board meetings, so that's why -- I mean, I know Muriel keeps track of it. I keep track of just the Board meeting, you know, because that's what our by-laws -- this Board changed, I guess, that was a few years ago where we had that special ad hoc committee on attendance. But otherwise, it doesn't address committee meetings, but you have it.

MS. JEANTY: Yes.
MS. NUELL: But in general for other -MS. DE MOYA: But I think for any other time we have to fill a position, we should have attendance on both.

MS. JEANTY: Sure.
MR. BRANDON: Any other discussion before we adjourn the meeting?

MS. DE MOYA: No, I'm done. I know you were
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    expecting this meeting to be short --
        MR. BRANDON: No, I didn't expect it. I'm
    in for the long haul. All right. This meeting is
    adjourned. Thank you.
                            (Whereupon, at 3:41 p.m., the meeting was
    adjourned.)
```
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| 19:6,14,19,23 | opens 25.12 | 44.6 | picking 41.10 | 6:23 8:10 |
| 31:6 | opinion 29:7 | part 4:5 11:3 | picture 30:8 | 10:21 18:8 |
| offices 6:2 | opportunity | 49:21 | piece 41:6 | $\begin{aligned} & 30: 2231: 25 \\ & 37 \cdot 14 \end{aligned}$ |
|  | 4:14 | particular 28:7 | 44:6,7 |  |
| often 57:25 | opposed 22:10 | particularly | pieces 30:9 | possible 10:18 |
|  | 29:8 32:7 | 22:2 |  | possibly 19:11 |
| once 8:15 25:2 | 50:22 56:4 | past 52:1 | $45: 1$ | power 15:1 |
| $\begin{gathered} \text { once } 8: 15 \text { 25:2 } \\ 35: 2042: 17 \end{gathered}$ | opposite 7:10 | people 2:23 | place 25:2 | preferred |
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| role 5:18 12:21 | say 3:20 5:20 | 46:10 49:12 | sense 9:7 | similar 54:17 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 18:20 19:5,6, | 6:23 7:20 8:1, | 50:17 53:21 | sent 17:21,22 | simple 40:20 |
| 19 31:11 32:5 | 21,23,25 9:12, | 55:23,24 | 40:2 | simple 40.20 |
| 37:24 38:22 | 17 11:1,7,16 | 56:19,20 |  | since 37:3 |
| 39:12 42:23 | 12:14,15 15:7 | seconded | sequence | 58:22 |
| 43:4,8,10,13 | 16:18 17:7,13 | 50:18 55:25 | 21:11 | Sir 38:7 |
| 46:21,24 | 19:23 20:1,5 |  |  | Sir 38.7 |
| $\begin{aligned} & 47: 12,1348: 2, \\ & 4 \end{aligned}$ | 21:23 24:1 | secondly | 22:17 | sit 41:10 |
|  | 28:9 31:11 |  |  | sits 32:22 |
| roles 5:2,11, | 35:11 36:6,11, | seconds 26:17 | $22 \text { 18:10 39:12 }$ | sitting 32:23 |
| 15,17 19:14 | $14,16,1737: 21$ | secretaries |  | sitting 32:2 |
| 30:2 35:12 | $39: 741: 1,7$ | 12:9 | Service 37:23 | situation 20:11 |
| 39:6 | 42:18 43: |  |  | 58:3 59:3 |
| roll 5:9 36:14 | 46:1 47:7,8,9 | secretary $2: 13$, | $10 \text { 54:21,25 }$ | six 16:19 23:18 |
| room 51:8 | 48:23 50:5,15 | 3:10 4:20, |  | 30:16 |
|  | 57:4 58: | 9,12,18,19,21 | $18: 13 \text { 32:21 }$ | slate 10:7,8,10 |
|  |  | 6:3,16,21 9:18, |  | 16:10 18:16 |
| rubric 37:16 | saying 22:11 | 19 10:5 18:11, |  | 24:2,5 33:20 |
| run 17.12 | 27:16 30:7 | 12,13 20:3,6 |  | 6:13,16 41:18 |
|  | 31:24 32:3 | 22:4 23:9,22, | setting 18:6 | 44:15 |
| rushed 50:6 | 36:18 44:2 | 23 24:1 36:14 | 28:1 |  |
|  | 53:19 | 38:22 47:10,15 |  | ma |
| S | says 8:8,9 9:18 | 49:8 50:13 |  | smart 7:18 |
|  | 10:3,9 11:5 |  | several 52:12 | social 54:25 |
| said 3:19 10:23 | $\begin{aligned} & 12: 18 ~ 13: 6,13 \\ & 14: 16,17 \text { 15:7, } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { section 16:6 } \\ 19: 18 \end{gathered}$ | She'll 55:16 | solicit 8:1 |
| 14:8 16:20,24 | $19 \text { 16:8,25 }$ |  | short 15:10 | 19:10 30:21 |
| 23:21 28:9 | 17:16 20:2,4 | seeking 38:12 | 60:1 | 31:12,25 |
| 30:10 33:16 | 21:21 29:19,24 | seem 17:11 |  | solicitatio |
| $\begin{aligned} & 44: 6 ~ 48: 12 \\ & 49: 16,17,23 \end{aligned}$ | 30:12 | seem 17.1 | $22,23,244: 2,3,$ | 34:20 |
| 50:1 51:3 52:3, | schedule | 14 15:16 36:8 | 5,13,15,18,23 |  |
| 6,7 58:8,9 | 58:20 | 45:19 | 6:3 9:22,24 | 28:25 |
| sake 42:11 | school 33: | select 8:20 9:2 | $\begin{aligned} & 10: 15 \text { 11:8, } \\ & 12: 9 \text { 15:25 } \end{aligned}$ | soliciting |
| same 9:21 | 36:5 58:1 | 54:24 | 6:15 23:20 |  |
| 10:20 13:20 | seat 2:16 33:19 | selected 6:24 | 7:12 28:7,19 | solicits 9:1 |
| 20:2 21:11,12 | 51:11 52:18 | 30:16 51:16 | 29:11,12,14 | somebody |
| 13,19 28:24 | 20,21,25 53:2, | $52: 4$ | 38:4 39:16 | 3:14 4:7 13:5 |
| 33:18 46:12 | 6,14 55:12,14, |  | 3:14 45:22 | 13 21:23 23:3 |
| 54:7 | 19,22 56:11 | selection 18:7 | 46:22 59:20 | 37:9,25 |
| satisfy 40:7 | second |  | owed 3:10 | omeone 5:7 |
|  | 22:3,5 36:21 | 18 33:7 | silos | 6:12 17:18,19 |
| saw 13:14 30:4 | 42:20 45:7 | 40:5 57:9,21 |  | 23:7 36:9 44:7 |


| 57:7 | standing 30:12 | submission | survey 57:10 | 39:10 41:13 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| something | start 31:10 |  | Susan 24:18 | their 7:1 14:2,5 |
| 4:15 10:24 | 50:9 | submit 33:11, | 29:4 42:18 | 33:15 38:12 |
| 14:16 18:15 |  | 15 34:16 40:1, |  | 39:21 40:21,22 |
| 19:16 20:19 | started 9:8 $25 \cdot 11.1232 \cdot 23$ | $11 \text { 42:6 44:3 }$ | system 33:4 54.25 | 42:22,24,25 |
| 31:15 39:20 | 25:11,12 32:23 | 48:24 53:25 |  | 43:3,15 45:11 |
| 41:1 44:8,13, | starts 7:9 | submitted |  | 52:16 |
| 21 | 43:21 | 33:15 | T | themselves |
| sometimes | state 7:23 |  |  | 3:9 42:9 |
| 13:2 57:2 | $\begin{aligned} & 19: 20 \text { 20:15 } \\ & 22: 352: 2,3,6 \end{aligned}$ | 39:19 41:2 | $\begin{gathered} \text { take } 17: 8,18 \\ 21: 2423: 4 \end{gathered}$ | thereafter |
| somewhere 8:7,23 15:19 | stated 20:16 | succession 4:3 7:5 11:15 | $45: 6$ | $10: 19$ |
| soon 10:17 | 42:15 | 14:21,22 16:15 | takes 5:8 16:16 | $26: 15 \text { 27:15 }$ |
| 23:14 | statement | 19:15 26:9 | 21:15 36:14 | 33:18 43:14 |
| S | 33:11,15 34:17 | 27:20 32:4 | talk 26:22 38:1 | 45:15 46:12 |
| 15:10 18:12 | 35:10,13 41:24 |  | 41:3 42:6 | 47:7 54:8 |
| 34:9 | 42:6,12 43:24 | wise 11:9 | 45:12 51:22 | 57:20 58:22 |
| sort 9:8 47:12 | statement | successive | $\begin{aligned} & \text { talked } 3: 16 \\ & 53: 5 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { things } 7: 21 \text { 9:6 } \\ 12: 11 \text { 15:22 } \end{gathered}$ |
| speak 41:17 | 49:11 50:13 | 0:21 | talking 7:16 | 16:2 18:3 21:4 |
| SPEAKERS | statute 15:18 | such 5:25 6:5 | $11: 415: 11$ | 22:16 37:4 |
| 35:20 42:17 | 52:2,3,6,14 | 10:16 20:16 | 19:9,13 25:6, | 40:20,23 41:5 |
| special 10:17 | 53:10,19 54:18 | sudden 6:16 | $\begin{aligned} & 1226: 16,17 \\ & 27: 1644: 16 \end{aligned}$ | 53:18 |
| 58:4 59:14 | stay $23: 7$ | suggest 20:10 |  | thinking 26:3 |
| specific $17: 7$ $18: 7$ | staying 22:24 | 24:10 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { technically } \\ & 23: 2,9 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 27: 837: 2 \\ & 39: 2541: 2 \end{aligned}$ |
| 18:7 | step 13:18 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { suggested } \\ & \text { 29:22,23 43:23 } \end{aligned}$ | Temporarily | $\begin{aligned} & 39: 2541: 2 \\ & 47: 18,1948: 3 \end{aligned}$ |
| $\begin{gathered} \text { specifically } \\ 16: 2322: 11 \end{gathered}$ | stepped 2:23 | $51: 17$ | 6:18 | $\begin{aligned} & 56: 25 \text { 57:7 } \\ & 58: 13 \end{aligned}$ |
| 47:8 | still 11:3,23 <br> $12.327 .935 \cdot 5$ | suggestion 25.22 39•18,19 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { term 10:19 } \\ & 21: 9,1022: 23 \end{aligned}$ | thinks 24:12 |
| specifies 52:9 | $6$ | $51: 13$ | 23:5,14,16,21 | third 23.543 .6 |
| spelled 20:11 |  |  | 24:9 | 14 46:10 53:23 |
| spoke 13:23 |  | $40: 7$ | terms 10:21,22 | 56:12 |
| spoken 14:22 | strengthen | sunshine 26:2 | 16:24 25:16 | thought 15:9 |
|  |  |  |  | 21:1,17 23:20 |
| spot 54:19 | strongly 4:24 | supersedes | test 44:11,18 | 32:25 33:5 |
| spots 55:2 | stuff |  | than 4:19 | 53:1 |
| $\begin{array}{r} \text { staff } 54: 9 \\ 56: 13,16 \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { subject } 30: 14, \\ & 17 \end{aligned}$ | supposed <br> 11:1,5 15:24 | $\begin{aligned} & 10: 2014: 11 \\ & 27: 2434: 12 \end{aligned}$ | thoughts 24:24 28:18 |



| ```37:5,6 38:6 39:7 44:21,22 55:14 weak 29:25 30:5 Wednesday 2:21 Weller 2:24 3:5 13:23 32:9,12 Weller's 35:24 went 10:24 12:22 36:21 39:14 \(41: 9\) 53:8 whatever 7:1 12:12 49:1 53:7 whereupon 50:20 51:7 56:2,22 60:5 whether 57:14 while 9:20 17:25 32:21 whoever 17:8 24:6 39:10 whole \(3: 18\) 17:10 26:23 37:3 \(41: 9\) 44:15 whom 10:5 will 2:20 3:20 8:16 13:8,10 16:2 22:9,18 23:7 24:16 27:7,10 35:23, 24 36:2 37:17 51:4 54:16,22 56:7,8,9,10 57:20``` |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 23:4,6,7,18 } \\ & 25: 2426: 6 \\ & 31: 544: 21 \\ & 52: 1259: 14 \\ & \text { yesterday } 8: 3 \\ & \text { 15:14 } \\ & \text { yet } 25: 16,20 \\ & 28: 2029: 5 \\ & \text { young } 26: 13 \end{aligned}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |

