



Chicano Latino Affairs Council
Executive Director and Chair Meeting Minutes

Date: December 15, 2010

Present: ED Hector Garcia, Chair Mario Vargas

Agenda Item	Discussion/Action Summary/Motions Adopted	Follow-Up/Timeline	Person(s) Responsible
Introduction	<p>(It sounds like the recorder was turned on in the middle of explaining staff's vacation days. Unsure what was said before recording started)</p> <p>ED hands over past expense reports to be signed by Chair M. Vargas</p> <p>ED requests being sent agenda ahead of time to be able to prepare for meeting.</p> <p>Chair agrees, but notes that items on agenda are things ED should be able to simply respond to right away.</p> <p>Chair presents agenda</p>		
Performance Planning (3:30)	<p>Primary items under review:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Implementation of Biennium Plan. Chair notes the need to make sure ED is on top of Plan and following it. - Board involvement through sub-committee structure - How ED works with staff, builds team, if staff is carrying out duties and responsibilities. - Other items may be included, but these are the three primary points <p>Chair notes that ED should be looking at the 6-month plan at least every-other day, the minimal on a weekly basis. Notes that ED must look at core competencies and make sure to be fulfilling them by how the plan is outlined. Chair goes on to note that these activities should already be done because of job description, and Board needs to know what work the ED is doing and how it's done.</p>	<p>ACTION ITEM: Review 6-month plan at least every other day</p>	<p>H. Garcia</p>
Operation Excellence and Planning (5:30)	<p>Chair notes that at previous meeting, ED believed to be getting on track. ED responds by saying that he believes that we're catching up considerably. Notes that a lot has been caught up on from previous 4-month period.</p>		

Agenda Item	Discussion/Action Summary/Motions Adopted	Follow-Up/Timeline	Person(s) Responsible
	<p>Chair, along with other members of the Board, are concerned with upcoming Legislative session. Notes that ED needs to bring information to Board so that CLAC can be prepared for the session. Chair doesn't feel like CLAC is ready for session.</p> <p>Knowing what's in store for upcoming session is dependent on meetings with Legislators. Chair acknowledges that many Legislators are not meeting because of election and changes at the Capitol, but goes on to note that there are issue agendas. He says that the idea of not being able to meet with new or past committee chairs and that there is no set agenda is not necessarily true, because every election year, both parties prepare for a potential turnover. He goes on to note that if meetings with Legislators do occur, they do have bills they want to introduce and are preparing for.</p> <p>(9:00) ED responds by saying that this year's election is very different than normal, due to the massive change in power and postponement of Dayton's win. ED notes that he's been speaking individually with Rep. Mullery and Rep. Carlson (Finance Committee). He attended the Health Meetings (the only meetings that occurred that week that were of importance). He notes there was a finance meeting that was just general information. He goes on to note that the House and the Senate are going to be speaking in generalities throughout December and into January, but that we're in the process of letting them know that we're interested in getting a dialogue going with them. ED notes that this is why he met with the candidates before the election to be involved in the process.</p> <p>(10:30) Chair acknowledges that attending these meetings is wonderful, but asks how the meetings translate into knowledge and recommendations for the Board. He notes that the Board needs to get re-engaged on what is going on. He goes on to note that the ED goes to a lot of meetings, which are important and necessary, but November and December should be months when the ED drills through committee meetings. If meetings aren't scheduled, ED should be meeting with Legislators separately, and if not with them, with their aides. Through this, ED should be able to find out what pending legislation is, and from that, research can be done. He goes on to note that while there may not necessarily be legislation specific to the Latino community, most (if not all) legislation affects Latinos, be it education bills, economic development bills, etc. Migrant legislation is also of importance, because it directly relates to</p>		

Agenda Item	Discussion/Action Summary/Motions Adopted	Follow-Up/Timeline	Person(s) Responsible
	<p>Latinos. He goes on to state that the ED needs to demonstrate that he can catch up. Legislative Committee should have a list of bills of incoming legislation, but that is not there.</p> <p>(14:30) ED notes that there will be some bills tracked for the meeting on December 27th. He notes that there will be a statement prepared on Revisor bill, along with position statements on Economic and Work Force Development.</p> <p>(15:00) Chair responds by saying it is not in the November report. ED notes that it's not in the November report because it is what's occurring in December. Chair responds by saying that this type of work should occur in both November and December.</p> <p>(15:30) Chair asks ED if he has a list of when session meetings begin. December is when people get to know when committees are meeting. He goes on to state that ED should have many more meetings listed in his report.</p> <p>(16:00) ED responds by noting that Chair had previously said that ED has been spending too much time out of the office.</p> <p>(16:30) Chair clarifies by saying that the nature of meetings in December is different. December should focus on Legislators. Chair goes through report, and notes lack of any meetings with Legislators, and says that meetings can occur over the phone as well. He goes on to say that all of ED's activities need to revolve around the plan.</p> <p>(18:00) Chair asks if ED understands what is going on. ED responds by saying that he understands what is occurring, and asks Chair why the question of "do you understand?" keeps popping up. Chair responds that ED is being told to do certain things, and those things aren't reflected in his report.</p>		
Board Engagement	<p>(18:15) Chair begins discussion of Board involvement. Chair and ED note Board members that are actively involved:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Mario Vargas - Edgardo Rodriguez - Nick Juarez - Michael Rosario (only on Personnel Committee, not other Board business) <p>Chair notes that BM A. Garay-Lehn is totally disengaged. ED notes that she is part of the Arts & Cultural Legacy Committee, to which Chair responds that she hasn't attended in two months.</p> <p>(19:00) Chair notes that for past two Board meetings, the regrouping of the</p>	ACTION ITEM:	H. Garcia

Agenda Item	Discussion/Action Summary/Motions Adopted	Follow-Up/Timeline	Person(s) Responsible
	<p>Education Committee has come up. ED responds that the last note made was by BM N. Juarez that Education should be covered by the Legislative Committee. Chair counters by noting that BM N. Juarez's recommendation was that he thought Board members couldn't be engaged in focusing on Education, whereas the Chair believes this is possible, to which ED agrees. Because BM F. Morales and BM T. Dawson are interested in education, let education fall to the Legislative committee.</p> <p>(20:00) Chair goes on to note that Board members, particularly new Board members, have not been engaged. ED comments that he believes they have been engaged. He notes that BM F. Morales helped prepare the Willmar forum and that BM R. Sedarski helped prepare the Rochester forum. He goes on to ask if BM A. Lizano has helped. Chair responds that when it comes to engagement, it means that they "own." BM N. Juarez can't take ownership of everything in the agency. ED needs to build leadership.</p> <p>(20:45) Chair goes on to comment on the community forums in Willmar and Rochester. He says that they were very disappointing. In regards to the Rochester forum, he feels that the Board Member (BM R. Sedarski) did all the work. He goes on to ask if the ED is satisfied with the current level of Board engagement, to which ED responds that he is not. ED goes on to say that he is always trying to get people involved, but that you can only invite people to engage to a certain extent. Chair counters by saying that ED's job is to make sure to get Board members engaged, and that if he's not able to, then he's failing at a crucial element of his job. Chair goes on to note that when ED was hired, ED said he could engage Board members.</p> <p>(22:00) Chair continues by discussing BM F. Morales and the Willmar forum, saying that he had conversed with BM F. Morales, and that BM F. Morales was confused about everything. His understanding was that he was invited to the forum and introduced to the community. Chair goes on to say that BM F. Morales invited some people, but that it was primarily ED's work and doing. The day before the forum, Chair contacted BM F. Morales to "poke and prod" in order to find out what the Board Member felt the forum was about, which the Chair believes should not be. Chair goes on to say that the life of the agency is dependent on sub-committees, not ED or rest of staff.</p>	Convene Education Committee	
Agency Programs and	(24:00) Chair asks ED if he understands why he is asked how he interacts with his		

Agenda Item	Discussion/Action Summary/Motions Adopted	Follow-Up/Timeline	Person(s) Responsible
Operations	<p>staff. ED responds that it is because it is a significant aspect of his job. Chair asks why the ED thinks it would be in a performance plan. ED responds by saying that communication and relations had been poor between him and the previous staff, who had been consistently and intentionally not submitting information to the ED, and that they didn't like the fact that he was there because no one had informed them why he was here. Chair responds that that is the ED's version, while the Board believes that it was negligence and that the ED came short of his responsibilities. ED clarifies that only some Board Members believe that and the Chair counters by saying that they are the engaged members. Chair goes on to say that those who don't communicate frequently with staff generally have no opinion. ED replies by saying that Human Resources holds similar views as him, to which Chair counters by saying that Human Resources listens to the ED, not staff or the Board. Chair goes on to say that the Board now understands where Human Resources sits and that it is why they consult the Attorney General's office when moving forward.</p> <p>(25:15) Chair begins discussion of team-building by asking who decides the agenda of team meetings (weekly staff meetings). ED responds that the agenda is jointly developed by all staff. Chair says that ED is responsible for agenda and is to base it off the Calendar and the Plan. ED is supposed to be developing that agenda, and telling where staff falls into that, going on to say "that is leadership and that's good management." Chair goes on to say that ED needs to create the agenda, not delegate it to another person in the agency. Chair then sets up the example of sitting Staff G. Rodriguez and that the same story would be told of ED creating the agenda. ED responds by saying that he creates the direction but that everyone cooperates as a team. Chair notes a miscommunication. Chair wants ED to understand that he is the Executive Director and the one entrusted by the Board. It is the ED's responsibility to create the agenda and to lead the meetings. He goes on to say that the way the ED has been conducting meetings (the organic method) is useful in some forums and for other agencies, but for CLAC, there is a need for uniformity. Chair goes on to state that that is why Board meetings are structured the way they are.</p> <p>(27:30) Chair asks who facilitates the meetings, to which ED responds that he does. Chair asks if the staff would say this as well, that ED handles the meeting</p>	<p>ACTION ITEM: ED H. Garcia to prepare and run Staff meetings</p>	<p>ED H. Garcia</p>

Agenda Item	Discussion/Action Summary/Motions Adopted	Follow-Up/Timeline	Person(s) Responsible
	<p>from beginning to end. ED responds by saying that “facilitation” needs to be defined. ED goes on to note that how the Chair facilitates a meeting is different than how the ED facilitates, that the ED let’s people speak, listens to them, takes note of their opinions. Chair takes offense and says “this is a time for you to jab at me.” Chair notes that facilitation is dependent on meeting type. He notes example of the current one-on-one meeting where he develops the agenda, mediates, and leads the meeting. Chair goes on to say that he and BM N. Juarez conduct a meeting by developing the agenda, keeping people on point, etc. ED notes that he use to jointly set-up agendas with BM N. Juarez for Board meetings and that they would consult with one another. He goes on to say that there are different styles for conducting meetings.</p> <p>(29:15) Chair responds that critiques by previous Legislative and Community units is that meetings were not facilitated by the ED, but rather, it was expected that they create the agenda. They were use to being led and told what to do. The Board has not stepped in to visit with staff out of respect for ED. Chair goes on to note that when there isn’t a strong leadership, it is demonstrated in public.</p> <p>(30:30) Chair comments on the Rochester forum, criticizing that ED left staff to essentially run and manage the entire forum without guidance or direction. Chair notes that ED “complained” that he wasn’t really told how to do his job.</p> <p>(31:30) Chair notes that by viewing Astrid’s performance at the Rochester Forum, he would come to 3 conclusions:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. A mock-up session occurred prior to actual forum, and went through everything specifically and fully prepared, but Astrid got nervous the day of the forum. 2. A mock-up session never occurred, so Astrid was trying to muddle her way through the forum. 3. Astrid’s just incompetent <p>ED responds that he doesn’t believe she is incompetent, going on to say that he believes she did a “fairly good job” considering it was her first forum. ED had shown her how to go about doing a presentation at the Willmar forum, during which she was observing and taking notes. Prior to the Rochester forum, they had gone through all the material, through the presentation, etc. Chair responds that this paints a whole different picture, saying there was a disconnect at some point. He goes on to critique the forum more:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Chair critiques Astrid not knowing the password to the laptop (through 		

Agenda Item	Discussion/Action Summary/Motions Adopted	Follow-Up/Timeline	Person(s) Responsible
	<p>which the presentation would be made). ED responds by saying this was a technical error, but Chair says it shouldn't happen 10 minutes before a forum, that they should've been there at least 1 hour in advanced.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Chair also critiques forum introductions. If the ED is there, then he introduces staff and Board members at the forum. He goes on to say that titles of individuals are clearly explained. He notes that Astrid had introduced herself as "Community Relations," and says there is no such title as that. ED notes that he realizes this. - Chair goes on to ask whether English or Spanish was Astrid's primary language, and that what she was saying was not on the presentation. Chair feels like it showed lack of preparation. It should've been done before staff beforehand. Chair goes on to comment on her English ability, saying that she was speaking very slowly. Chair felt it was insulting, and her presentation was just "not good." Chair says that on her resume, she looks wonderful. But at the Council, things are done a very specific way. CLAC wants people's talents to shine through a specific way, not their own way. He goes on to say that "she didn't reflect it very well." - Chair asks ED how much time was spent on preparing her for the forum. ED says somewhere between 24 to 32 hours. Chair immediately responds that it didn't reflect this, and that BM E. Rodriguez and others would agree. Chair goes on to note that he is unsure how so much time could've been spent on this, considering that the prior week the ED had only been in the office for 2 days. ED explains that he and Astrid prepared and trained while on their way to and from the Willmar forum, that they had met several times on a weekly basis to discuss the Rochester forum and they examined the Power Point presentation. Chair responds by saying that if ED is use to that quality of work, it is not acceptable in the Council. - Chair goes on to say that the address on the invitation had the incorrect address. There are two 2nd streets in the area. Chair notes that the turn-out and location were incredibly successful, but that is due to BM R. Sedarski. - Chair continues, saying that the previous day he and the ED had talked, and the ED said he based the forum off of the Civic Engagement Model. At the Rochester Forum, the Chair had asked Astrid if she had followed the Civic Engagement Model, to which she said yes, but the Chair believes this is not the case. The Model, according to Chair, calls for Legislators, 		

Agenda Item	Discussion/Action Summary/Motions Adopted	Follow-Up/Timeline	Person(s) Responsible
	<p>stake-holders and community members in advanced, draw out the issues (in this case, Economic Development and Education), and draw out the agenda and presentation based on that. ED responds by saying that his understanding was that we would go out into the community to listen to the opinion of the community and its leaders, not that we would bring something to listen to.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Chair tells ED that it is his responsibility to know the Civic Engagement Model and to study it, and if there is any question or doubt, to contact the Chair or Rita Garcia for verification. We interview Legislators and stake-holders, and do pre-forum research. From all of this, ED is supposed to draw out the issues and use that and recruit them to the forum. And then problems and solutions are discussed at the forum. - Chair clarifies that Operation Excellence was needed because previous community forums were used by the community as an opportunity to vent, and the conversations never really ended with solutions. - Chair notes that at the end of the forum, people began blaming one another. Chair goes on to say that he gives BM R. Sedarski kudos for her work. - Chair goes on to say that it is the ED's responsibility to reach out and invite individuals. - Chair continues by saying that if he were to ask Astrid if she followed the step-by-step process of the Model, she would say no, that she followed the ED's lead. - (46:00) Chair goes on to say that BM R. Sedarski did great, but that the staff messed up. It was the staff's responsibility to follow the Board approved Civic Engagement Model. - (47:00) Operation Excellence was developed to give structure to CLAC. Before, it was unstructured. Chair goes on to say that he has congratulated BM R. Sedarski. - (47:30) Chair notes of keynote speaker Yolanda that she is very talented, but that at the forum she was not at her best. He goes on to mention that he found out the reason for Yolanda's not-great performance was that Daniel was not called the day before, and Yolanda came out of courtesy for us. But she was lost because of the wrong address and the first thing out of her mouth was that she didn't know what to talk about. Chair notes that ED 		

Agenda Item	Discussion/Action Summary/Motions Adopted	Follow-Up/Timeline	Person(s) Responsible
	<p>should be verifying these things with Astrid at least a week in advanced. Keynote speakers need to have the process explained.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - (49:00) Chair notes that the survey wasn't fully explained, and not enough time was given to fill them out. - (49:30) Chair criticizes lack of local talent for food and facilitation of forum. He goes on to say that the IRS community member shouldn't have been assisting in the set-up. ED says that the IRS person was just trying to be helpful, and wanted to help. Chair says that it's staff responsibility. He notes that if it's needed that David come to the forum to assist, so be it. That is why a mock-up is necessary, to know what is needed. - (51:00) Staff and team-building is very important. Board never approved for ED to change titles. Changing titles confuses roles and purposes. Chair goes on to note that it doesn't matter what ED thinks is best title, that it's about job functions tied to the expectations of community. Chair notes that he'd hate to drill into staff to verify performance. - (53:00) Chair notes that Astrid needs to show higher competency in performing community forums. ED states that he believes she did a very good job, especially for her first forum. Chair counters by saying that it was "atrocious" and that she was not prepared. He goes on to note that the ED showed up at 5:15, when the forum was scheduled to begin at 5:30. He notes that at least an hour and a half is needed to make sure everything is ready and everyone's on-board about what is going to happen. He also notes that the sign-up process for potential testifiers was flawed. - (54:00) Chair believes there is a complete separation between expectations and performance, and what the ED's perception of what success is in the organization and what CLAC Board members are accustomed to. Chair continues by saying that if the ED thinks it was a matter of opinion, then he doesn't have much faith in the next community forum. - (54:30) ED notes that Astrid had only been hired a few weeks before, it was the first CLAC forum she did, and there is a necessary learning curve. There is the process of catching-up with the Plan. - (55:00) Chair comments that those are "nicely organized excuses." He goes on to say that you don't schedule a forum a week after the holidays. You need the week before to really practice and make sure everything is complete and done. He continues by saying that if the inexperienced staff 		

Agenda Item	Discussion/Action Summary/Motions Adopted	Follow-Up/Timeline	Person(s) Responsible
	work with those priorities.” Chair goes on to say that next time he asks about this, he expects the ED to know what legislators plan on presenting.		
Legislation Tracking	<p>(1:10:30) Chair remarks that he has spoken with BM N. Juarez about legislation tracking and that BM N. Juarez had commented that the ED had asked why we should track legislation. ED responds that this was never asked and asks why the Chair would think the ED would ask that. He goes on to say that if the purpose is to seek error, even if it doesn’t exist, then of course something could be brought up. ED says he’ll send the Chair an email thread between ED and BM N. Juarez in which they discuss position statements. ED asks what the intent is, if it’s to prove him wrong or something else.</p> <p>(1:11:45) Chair notes that he isn’t involved in the conversations between ED and BM N. Juarez. ED mentions bill tracking, and how we cannot track bills that aren’t there yet. Chair is concerned about BM N. Juarez’s explicit directions, and how they have yet to be followed.</p> <p>(1:13:00) Chair notes ED’s question of fact sheets. He begins by discussing internal analysis, that needs to go through the committee, and that impending legislation needs to be posted on the website (note: Chair uses phrase “fact sheets” but I think he misspoke. Chair discusses tracking charts).</p> <p>(1:13:30) Chair mentions that his understanding of the conversation he had with BM N. Juarez was that he had to sit down again with the ED to discuss bill tracking. ED responds by saying that he hasn’t been talking to BM N. Juarez, either in person or by phone, and that he will forward the email thread during which BM N. Juarez discusses position statements and then he brings up fact sheets. Chair asks if the tracking charts are online and ED responds that they are. Chair asks the ED to make sure that tracking occurs every single day. He goes on to say that aides are working through the holiday to get legislation ready to introduce. That’s why having a good relationship with aides is important.</p> <p>(1:15:00) Chair asks if ED has put any thought into Latino Day at the Capitol. ED responds that there have been discussions about this. Chair asks if it’s going to be discussed at the next Legislative Committee meeting, to which ED responds that it’s not on the agenda. Chair responds by asking if the ED understands why it’s not on the agenda. ED says that he doesn’t know why it’s not in the agenda, but that he could recommend it be included. He goes on to note that BM N. Juarez knows that we’ve been planning for Latino Legislative Day at</p>	ACTION ITEM: Send Chair email thread between BM N. Juarez and ED H. Garcia which discussed position statements.	H. Garcia

Agenda Item	Discussion/Action Summary/Motions Adopted	Follow-Up/Timeline	Person(s) Responsible
	<p>the Capitol.</p> <p>(1:16:30) Chair feels we have not done enough quantitative and qualitative research done yet to have a strong platform to bring people together from the community to have a strong showing. The Chair suggests that this is why it isn't on the agenda. ED responds that it won't be until March, that more forums are necessary to develop a group that might testify, but if Chair wants it discussed at the meeting, then it could be brought up.</p> <p>(1:17:30) Chair says that it's easy to organize a rally, but that Latino Legislative Day at the Capitol is strategic planning and an opportunity to connect community members with Legislators. He goes on to note that schedules get booked up pretty quickly, and notes that during the previous Latino Legislative Day at the Capitol, by the end of December, things were already scheduled. He goes on to say that the committee may not feel ready for a Day at the Capitol, but that something else, more low-key, could be done instead.</p>		
Council on Black Minnesotans & Ombudspersons Office	<p>(1:19:30) Chair notes that he's had a conversation with Muriel of Alma's appointment, and that Muriel said she'd be going to the Legislative Committee meeting on December 27th. ED clarifies that Muriel would not be able to make it, but Diane would be going (note: Muriel was eventually able to attend this meeting). ED says that Diane would be coming, and then Chair asks if Diane has RSVP'd, which ED says she has.</p> <p>(1:20:00) Chair notes that he fears the Ombudsperson are expanding its scope, and that it may expand into Council charters. ED says he hadn't heard of this, and Chair responds that it is not public knowledge, but his personal perception. Muriel told him that they wanted to expand. Chair says that, as Rep. Juhnke said, CLAC should focus on its legislative component. Chair is considered that a multicultural council is in the works, and that the 4 Councils may eventually be folded into. Hence ED's joint plan with Council on Black Minnesotans is significant.</p> <p>(1:23:00) Chair asks if ED ever got email about signing BM N. Juarez's name. ED goes on to say that he has, and Chair mentions that what ED did was unlawful. State is looking at BM A. Garay-Lehn's appointment period, and ED "scribbling himself as an appointing authority on an official state document."</p> <p>(1:24:00) Chair notes that fault goes to both ED and BM N. Juarez. He notes that any legal issue goes to BM N. Juarez, and that the ED is "off the hook." If BM A. Garay-Lehn loses her appointment, then it falls on ED and BM N. Juarez.</p>		

Agenda Item	Discussion/Action Summary/Motions Adopted	Follow-Up/Timeline	Person(s) Responsible
	<p>Chair goes on to note that ED is not an appointing authority. ED notes that he mentioned “by authority of the Chair.” Chair goes on to say that the agency is not a non-profit organization that ED can change contracts and other such things. Chair goes on to state that ED is now working for a State agency. Then Chair BM N. Juarez was the only person who could sign the document. He goes on to explain that it is clearly noted that only the Chair can sign, and that it makes no mention of allowing anyone else to do it. ED notes that he didn’t know, and that then-Chair BM N. Juarez must not have known either. Chair remarks that ED should’ve known enough to at least read the text. Chair says he understands that there were time restraints, but it is important to read forms correctly and to not presume anything. Right now, the matter is in the Attorney General’s office. Chair is asking from the Attorney General’s office the ability to retroactively fix her appointment starting this year. ED asks importance of matter. Chair remarks that ED is not an appointing authority, and that State policy states that the Chair is the one that appoints. Chair says ED should’ve read the statute thoroughly and brought issue up to then-Chair. Chair goes on to remark that he doesn’t know where ED got idea to scribble anything down, to which ED replies that he was told by then-Chair. Chair asks if BM N. Juarez sent him an email, which ED confirms. Chair goes on to say that then-Chair was un-informed about the process. Chair goes on to say that he’s been spending time educating himself on how things function, and how the State works, and that the Board needs that. He goes on to say that that is also needed from the Executive Director. He notes that BM E. Rodriguez has said that other Executive Directors, when presented with something fishy, go to staff for assistance. Chair continues by saying that ED thinks he can simply scribble and add his authority. ED responds by saying that he was told by his “superior” to sign it. Chair responds by saying that it was because he asked the then-Chair. ED responds by saying that he had asked the then-Chair to sign, and the then-Chair asked ED to sign it in his name. Chair remarks that that is the problem that the ED is not an appointing authority, and that now they have to go back into the process. Chair is hoping that they can simply write a letter to the Attorney General’s office. The intent is not to get BM A. Garay-Lehn unappointed, just to get it all right.</p>		
Adjournment	(1:30:00) Chair asks if anything else needs to be discussed. ED responds by saying no, and that he will send Chair requested information. Chair says he wants to		

Agenda Item	Discussion/Action Summary/Motions Adopted	Follow-Up/Timeline	Person(s) Responsible
	<p>hear more from ED, via phone and via email. He goes on to state that he doesn't want to be repetitive during these meetings. He says he doesn't want to have meetings that re-align the ED. Chair states importance of communication with ED, especially during a 6-month performance plan.</p> <p>(1:31:00) ED remarks that agency has been playing catch-up, and that for four months, the Board did not allow ED to hire a new person. Chair responds by saying that it's not true. Chair notes that during the summer, the Research Unit isn't really used during the summer months, because they are the legislative person. That unit is more involved after all the research has been done from community forums. Chair goes on to state that ED had all summer to go and do those, because he had another staff person in the office, and should've utilized his staff properly. Chair goes on to say that the ED's blaming of the Board is getting old. He also includes that there were a lot of issues with the ED's hiring practices, and that he needs to move beyond that and accept responsibility. ED responds that he's defining the scenario, and agrees the need to move on.</p> <p>-Sounds like Chair begins to say something, but audio is cut off-</p>		