

MINUTES OF THE C-WIB SPECIAL MEETING MINUTES

June 21, 2012

Chairman Jim Dickerson called the Special Meeting to order at 10:07 a.m.

Board members present included Tonette Anderson, Collin Brink, Betty Jo Brooks, Bill Debo, Jim Dickerson, T.R. Dudley, Sharon Gibson, Mary Hughes, W.D. Hunter, Joyce Jones, Janet Kinnett, Christina Spencer-Hess, Melinda Macker, David Miller, Stacy Minnick, Nancy Montgomery, Vicki Nelson, Doug Piant, Shauna Qualls, Tina Sooter, Dewey Thompson, Russ Unger, and John Vaughn.

C-WIB staff in attendance included Executive Director Jan Vaughn, Alex Blackwell, Linda Gray, and Jacque Moreland.

Other attendees included Joyce Davis of Central Missouri Community Action (CMCA), Trish Rogers of Central Ozarks Private Industry Council (COPIC), and Paula Curtman and Joyce Dampier of Lake of the Ozarks Employment Services (LOES). Presiding Commissioners Kenneth Kunze, Tom Wright, Gary Jungermann, and Callaway County Commissioner Doc Kritzer.

Jim Dickerson introduced Doug Piant, our new board member from Cole County. Doug replaces Curtis Chick and represents organized labor. Doug was selected by the Cole County Commissioner from two nominees.

Personnel

Jim Dickerson started the meeting by making a few comments. He has been hearing what is strong opinions, to the motion. We are going to try to keep the comments limited to what the agenda is, and not get into every little thing we can possibly be trying to correct.

Jim Dickerson stated there is that high interest in the motion and he wants everyone to ask for permission for recognition so we do not have a bunch of people talking at once. I do not want two or three reports that are not accurate, or that someone didn't hear. I will probably recognize everyone who asks for recognition.

Jim Dickerson stated that after our last Board meeting, the first indication that we had a problem, I came back in and told Jan there was a group of Board members huddled out in the parking lot discussing something, Jim said he didn't know what, better go over there. Then afterwards he started getting phone calls with questions.

Jim Dickerson stated he then received a request from the Callaway County Commission for a list of salaries and proposed raises and requested that information, and at that time at least in my own perspective, I learned that the rate was different than what I understood to be at the Board meeting. I talked to several of you and found there was a great deal of confusion and wanted to have a special meeting to discuss the entire personnel issue. There finally became so many request that I felt like we had to do it. Jim said this is the first special meeting he has ever called since being in this position.

Jim Dickerson opened the floor for comments. He asked to please remember what he has already said, that we are going to try to limit it to the relevant issues and not get far afield into things that probably wouldn't be protected.

T.R. Dudley asked the Chairman since we are discussing Personnel shouldn't we be in closed session?

Jim Dickerson said no. He stated to T.R. that unless we start discussing, hiring, firing, discipline, things of that nature, or promotion, it is not a sunshine law closed session. Now, if someone starts getting into any of those topics, I will stop the discussion and tell the board we need to go into closed session until we are finished with that.

Shauna Q. said she would start. As you may recall at the May 23, 2012 meeting I abstained from voting because I felt like information that was entitled to the board was not being presented to the board. I felt like I was being denied that information. I was told it was confidential and I had no right to it. That is not accurate. This board receives federal and state funding and all of that funding is scrutiny to this board. We all are entitled to have that information. That includes any personnel salaries, any issues involving personnel. That is why I abstained. I felt like I wanted to vote no against it, and probably should have. I was trying to be fair to this board and give them an opportunity to present all of the information to me so I can make an informed, educated decision, and that was not allowed. When I asked who was involved I was told I could not have that information. When I asked for the cost, I was told by several different people I could look at the fiscal report that is given to me earlier that day, and I could see what has been paid in salaries to date and then I could compute the difference for myself and come up with what the four percent cost of living would be. I am very concerned that there are people not only on the personnel committee, on the budget committee, and anyone else that was involved in the May 23rd meeting, that did not know what was involved in a cost of salary increase. There are other things besides the rate increase. I have had people who were on those committees who came to me afterwards and asked specifically what was I talking about. That is not a way to run a budget. I am very concerned and very upset about this. I felt like things were moving extremely fast. Even other members that were sitting at the table, I looked at some of their faces and I think they were just kind of stunned, even when the vote was called for. People didn't raise their hand one way or the other. They were just sitting there in kind of disbelief at how fast it had moved. I remember Mr. Haldiman holding a piece of paper and reading a recommendation. The recommendation talked about a four percent cost of living, and he used verbiage, and I am paraphrasing, "that the review had been done of the performance requirements", there was no detail provided in that recommendation as to what that review consisted of or what the performance requirements were. I have since learned that there were salary increases tied to that recommendation that was not read or presented to the board on the 23rd. That is deliberate omission because I even asked about it.

Jim D. said he would have to say when you were told the salaries were confidential, that was unfortunate because it was not true. Also, in my opinion every board member has an equal right to information. There can't be this little group or that little group or otherwise the board will not function, and should not function, that's a fact. You are saying you abstained and really now think you should have voted against it. Other board members have told me they were about to move to table it, but didn't. One board member told me that they knew a little bit more about what was going on but they were afraid to say anything. I've had reactions all over the landscape.

Russ U. said he agrees with Shauna, there was a lot of confusion. I don't know if it was a misunderstanding or miscommunication. When I left that meeting I felt we had done the right thing. I felt we had given a four percent pay raise to the nine employees we oversee. That is what I thought. I didn't think a thing about it. I was not in the group that Jim talked about out in the parking lot. I didn't even think another thing about it until I got a phone call from Jim. All through that discussion, I thought it was a four percent pay increase. I do not remember anybody saying anything else about another pay raise. Jacque was asked the question how much was this going to cost us and she said \$8,000-\$12,000. That is a four percent cost of living. Nobody clarified it that there would be more cost to this with the pay raise. Nobody said anything about that. It was always the four percent cost of living. In my mind it was a pay raise. I know the C-WIB employees we oversee work hard. They put a lot of hours in and I am the first one to say they deserve a raise, but I do not like the way this was handled or the way it went down as it did. I did not vote for a four percent cost of living plus raises.

Bill D. stated they were both wrong on several things. On the draft minutes, the motion that Harold Haldiman read included the pay increase plus the four percent also, which is in black and white because he read it.

Shauna started speaking and Bill stated he has the floor. Shauna disagreed with him. She said this is fabricated on what happened on the May 23rd meeting. Bill said it's not, it is exactly what he read. He read it twice, he read it at the end with the question was called for and the actual vote itself on the motion. He read it before that. He read it twice. Shauna said she will agree to disagree with Bill.

Mary H. stated we did clarify it. Bill D. stated if you didn't listen to it then you were talking to somebody else or something. Shauna Q. stated she was listening very closely.

Shauna Q. stated that Bill was the one on the budget committee who asked her what she meant when she said what was it going to cost in addition. Bill D. stated that is different than what we voted on.

Nancy M. suggested that may those proposals need to be in writing. Whenever you bring back a proposal from a committee meeting, put it in writing so we can tell what is going on. She stated that she is also upset about the way the meeting was called on the 21st. They were posted according to the sunshine law in Rolla and Jefferson City. Nancy lives 20 miles from Rolla but she doesn't drive there every day to check what postings there are. As C-WIB members we should be notified of all these meetings by email. Now, if you don't have email get into the 21st century and get it because that is how everybody communicates, send an email notice to all the board members, so that we are notified of all the special meetings. We have the right to attend those meetings as a guest, even if we are not on that committee. I am opposed to how that meeting was called.

Jim D. said he has a huge problem with the draft minutes. Jim said that was not his recollection of the meeting and Linda knows and he told her they would discuss those minutes, and she and I had a conversation again this morning about how to work through that because he doesn't remember things being said that are in those minutes. Linda has sent me an electronic copy of the recording of the meeting and I have not yet had an opportunity to review that and I told her that this morning, I do intend to do so. I hope I am technologically good enough to be able to get them open, but as of today I have not listened to that recording.

Collin B. said he seconded what Shauna had said earlier. He said that he was one of the people that he thinks was on the verge of motioning the table because I thought that was the best thing and then for some reason decided not to. It would be nice to see this in writing. Later, I did realize that there was something mentioned about performance reviews. To me it just sounds like it was something that wanted to be ramrodded through by the personnel committee. Collin said to Jim D. that you are supposed to be on basically every committee, except the nominations committee, and asked Jim if he were notified by this personnel committee, and Jim D. said no. Harold pretty much admits that he didn't want the chairman here, in this letter, so that the personnel could basically ramrod this through. It wasn't on the agenda but was obviously voted it into the agenda that day. Collin is all for, at some point, in creating a more detailed written procedure of how this should go where it should be in writing. As the discussion went on we were talking about four percent, four percent and nobody from personnel stood up and said wait a minute there is more money involved than what you are talking about, to me that is misrepresentation of what is going on or reported. She was remaining silent when everyone was talking four percent. Shauna Q. said she asked about the four percent but she said she was told she was not privy to it.

Collin B. said another issue he has was that during that whole meeting the personnel committee is going to stand up and say we want to give raises and more money to the board's employees they should be the ones speaking and having numbers. All they kept doing was Jacque this and Jacque this, it is not on her. The information may come from her but she is not the one who should be standing up in meetings if the personnel committee is promoting this as what they want to do. It shouldn't be Jacque this and Jacque this, he had a problem with that. He would like to also see where we have the personnel recommend it to the budget committee first and have the budget committee check the numbers, because we know the numbers weren't checked very well. There should be some written procedure which I could not find in the by-laws that says personnel recommends to budget, even though I think it's probably implied that it should be since I think it's the budget that presents to the full board. This should be done with this in mind when we are spending another forty thousand dollars a year. As far as I know the budget committee hasn't even looked at it yet.

Jim D. said he does not disagree with Collin, budget does need to look at these numbers. He also has an obligation to present budget to the commissioners, the caucus. So that is another step and I think your comment about needing some more rules is exactly right. Unfortunately sometimes you find out you need more rules when something like this occurs, but I don't disagree with that comment either.

Mary H. stated that she is a member of the personnel committee and has served on this board for a number of years, and have always tried to do things the right way. There was no preconceived notion in my mind or anybody else's to pull the wool over anybody's eyes. That was not our intention at all Nancy and Shauna. I know you are upset at the way we did it but we thought we were doing things the right way. We did it with the information we were given and we acted therefore. I just do not think we deserve this kind of slanderous treatment, I really don't think so. We are just honest hard working people trying to do a job. We might not know what we need to do, but we can learn. Thanks, if you can give us your support. It is not an easy job.

Jim D. said as Collin had already pointed it out the whole thing started out wrong and I was not notified of the meeting. I have had two people report to me that Jan told them that she was

asked by the person who called the meeting not to let me know about it. Mary H. stated she did not know anything about that.

Shauna Q. said that as a board member she would like to request a copy of the board financial manual, personnel manual, and copy of the employee handbook. Nancy suggested all of the board members have a copy. Jim D. said there was no problem in that, they have that right.

Christina Spencer-Hess stated she is necessarily a new member of this board and also has some questions. She is happy that Shauna has requested a copy of the employee manual. Christina's asked the question, do we have formal job descriptions? Jim D. reported that yes we do. Christina asked if we have an instrument in place for personnel evaluations. Because you cannot be held accountable for performance review unless there is documented language to do that. You cannot sit down and talk about what the person had done, there has to be a criteria, and it needs to be on paper. As we move forward, and at some point we do need to move forward, I think that if that instrument is not in place, then that might be a first step.

Bill D. stated that the personnel manual requires the personnel committee to meet every May to discuss personnel evaluations. He has a copy of the manual and it is on page sixty one. The personnel committee has not met in three years. The reason for that is Mr. Dickerson has not called for a meeting. That is why that meeting was called, because it had not been called, and we are required in the personnel manual to have that meeting. Now why Mr. Dickerson has not called the personnel committee meeting, who knows.

Shauna Q. asked Bill D. if he were a member of the personnel committee? Bill D. said that no he was not. He used to be and would like to know why he is not a member of it anymore. Shauna asked how he knew of that meeting being called. Bill said he serves on the evaluation committee. Bill D. said he talked with Harold H. Shauna said that on the 23rd she asked who was on the personnel committee and now she is asking who is on the evaluations committee, that it is the first time I have heard about it. Bill said serving on the evaluations committee with him is Earl Brown and Sharon Gibson. Bill said this information is available if you just ask for it. Shauna said she just did. Bill said she needs to ask the staff not him. Shauna said she asked the board. Bill said to ask the board. The personnel manual and by-laws, everything is here just ask for it.

Board discussion ensued. Mary H. stated the by-laws were mailed to the board several months ago.

Jim D. stated the evaluation committee is supposed to evaluate proposals not personnel. Bill D. said it doesn't say it. Jim D. said Jan V. does to personnel evaluations of the staff. The personnel committee then meets with Jan and exchanges that type of information and the evaluations, in my opinion, are closed meeting material. I don't want anybody's information spread out to the public. I don't think that is fair. So your question Shauna was on target, your request for material, I don't think I've ever denied a board member's request for information and material, and I don't intend to start now.

Vicki N. reported she thinks there is starting to become a very fine line. We have people and things in place. The staff that we are talking about has a director that they need to go to, and I think the board members need to be involved. The profession that I am in my board does not come directly to me, it comes to my CEO. I think there is a fine line that we are starting to overstep as a board member. I think we need to be made aware, I don't think we need

something hidden, but I think there is still a fine line. If we do not have faith in the people that we are dealing with on this in the capacity they are at, then there becomes a problem yes, but I have not seen those problems. I think that this was maybe misunderstood, but it was read, the word "additional" was stated in the reading of that. They just did not give us a dollar amount, I understand that. I just want to go back to say that we have employees, and those employees have who they answer to and that person should be answering to us. I think there is a fine line of where we need to go with how we are directing the protocol of everything.

Jim D. said for years we had problems with the board members, none of the board members sitting at this table, who felt like they could go and start questioning C-WIB staff, Jan's staff under her. In one case we had a board member tried to pressure to have a relative hired. So we have developed a practice that if the board has a request or a concern to come to Jim, to let him know as the board chair, and he goes from there. As far as the personnel evaluation I guess at one time in some point in the distant past, I have reviewed those with Jan, but I have not a normal practice. I am more aware of what the staff is doing and what is going on in the region than most of you, just because of have spent so darn much time doing it. When there is a personnel problem it usually is that Jan and I discuss it. I can't tell you that we always agree, and I've never told Jan, well you fire this one or get this or that one. I don't really think that's my decision. I do not think that you had the information to make the decision and almost over half of you have told me you feel that way and I don't blame you for feeling that way. I think we've got a problem and as Christina said earlier we are going to eventually have to move forward and that may be difficult because there are some pretty strong feelings out there, and I don't agree with all of those strong feelings but everybody has a right to feel the way they feel.

T.R. Dudley asked Jim D. who chairs the personnel committee? Jim D. said there was not a chair and he takes the blame for that, and staff have not had raises in three years and neither have the sub-contractor's staff. I know some of you feel like staff should probably get raises every year. In one of those three years was the year the house of representatives had passed a budget revelation where we may even be zeroed out, we didn't even know if we were going to be around. In our board meetings we discussed every year some of our funding challenges. If the personnel committee or Jan, had come to me and said the personnel committee wants to meet, I certainly would have gone along with it, I am not here to stop a committee from meeting, but that did not occur.

Shauna wants to make sure the full board understands there is a big difference between a salary raise and a cost of living adjustment. They are being kind of lumped together and that is not what we voted on, it was a four percent cost of living adjustment known as a COLA. Bill D. asked the chairman for the floor. Shauna Q. said the other thing she wanted to ask, because she doesn't know this information either, the Central Workforce Investment Board is a corporation? Jim D. said yes and Shauna Q. asked who the corporate officers are? Jim D. said ok, no problem with that.

Bill D. said that Shauna Q. keeps referring to it, and it states specifically in the motion that the wage increase was separate from the four percent. You don't think it was, but the only thing I can say is you weren't paying attention. It is black and white, in the motion that Harold Haldiman read. I've heard it and several other people heard it. Shauna Q. said that she would tell him that there are some who disagrees with him. Bill D. said it was confusing yes, but where the confusion was, the sub-contractor thing came up, and Mr. Dickerson brought up that they were part of the raises or something, I don't know why that was done, that is where all the confusion all started. Jim D. said he would tell Bill why it was done. There are other people in

the career centers and they need to be considered too. Right now as we sit here today they have been told that they have their own board Bill. Bill D. stated they do have their own board, and Jim D. said yes they do. Bill D. stated that they are sub-contractors of ours. Jim D. stated they have no funding to give any raises unless we give that funding to them. They need to be considered and that is why I brought it up. I don't think it was confusing, but I didn't want this board to go out of here not realizing that people in the career centers work for those sub-contractors. There was no effort on my part to try to confuse anyone, and I allowed questions and went over questions, so that part of it I am not going to take the rap for.

Vicki N. asked a question, has the sub-contractors sent something to this board requesting raises? Shouldn't they be sending something to the board requesting raises, correct? Jim D. said that is correct. Vicki N. asked has anything been submitted? Jim D. said no because they did not know that it would even be allowed and were not told that raises were even being considered. Vicki N. said shouldn't that be built into the contract that we have with them. Jim D. said that yes it should be, and if there are raises for sub-contractors it will be.

Russ U. said that there was a lot of confusion. I am the one that called for the question, and I said do we have a motion, has it been seconded, to give the nine C-WIB employees we oversee a four percent pay increase. That is why I called the question because I was told yes. Russ made a motion and read it to the board so I can make sure everybody understands. I make a motion that the C-WIB board freezes salary immediately and the chairman appoints a special committee to review this pay raise issue and to report back to the full committee with recommendations, and from now on any proposals that pertains to salary increases or pay raises will be sent to the budget committee for review and then to the full committee for review and vote. I feel bad for the employees but I think this is what we need to do right now.

Shauna Q. asked for it to be modified to make the distinction between salary and raises including cost of living adjustment. Jim D. said he would go along with that and asked if there was a second to that motion, and Melinda Macker seconded.

Bill D. asked for discussion of the motion. He asked what time frame would be put on this? When would the report have to be done and brought back to us? Russ U. asked if thirty days would be enough, and Jim D. said he thought thirty days would be enough.

Bill D. would like to say "what is this going to do to the staff"? What kind of loyalty are we showing to them, and how is this going to affect their morale? Nothing illegal was done. The committee recommended it, and the board approved it, and now the board is going to turn around and say no you can't do this? What is that going to do to the staff? What is it going to do when anyone else wants to do business with us, when we tell them we are going to do one thing and turn around and change our minds and say no we are going to review this before we tell you we can't do it. Not if you motion to make a motion to do it, and then change your mind.

Jim D. asked for discussion of the motion. Tonette A. said she don't think that Russ U. was trying to say that we are not going to consider it. It is just that we really want to start out where everyone has full understanding. I was confused and I probably should have spoke up more. I thought it was a very positive thing, that is how it felt at the time, but I did feel a lot of tension too, but of course I overheard other things happening later. Barring all that, we just really want to start out back at the beginning and do this the right way. I hope that this doesn't mean that they are saying we are not going to consider the two, being the cost of living adjustment and

the salary increase, because I think it is shameful that we have not looked at this on a yearly basis. Absolutely, we do need to be showing our appreciation for our staff.

Nancy M. thinks that in the motion, whatever decision we come to should be retroactive back to July 1, 2012, that is when it would have come into effect. Even if it is decided in August, I think the increases should be retroactive back to July 1.

Stacy M. wanted to mention that she was on the personnel committee. She works in Human Resources and she said that she did not feel at any time was somebody trying to "ramrod" her into giving raises. She felt it was a very positive thing. We looked at each person and she even made sure we were doing it consistently utilizing the same criteria, the way that I would do Human Resources. I agree that I was not here at that last meeting and it sounds like maybe things could have been said a little bit better.

Stacy said she would like to be on that new committee since I feel strongly about it as well, if at all possible. I just want to make sure that the board knew that I never felt at any moment that this was being forced. It was a very positive conversation the entire time and we took very methodical steps when we were looking at it. It is disheartening that it turned out this way.

John Vaughn asked doesn't the board have to rescind the previous motion before we do anything else of what we have already approved?

Jim D. stated not in his opinion, you can freeze raises because the motion was not to rescind the previous one. John V. asked that didn't the majority of the board vote to give the raises as presented? Jim D. said yes, but the board raises weren't presented as they turned out, in the boards opinion, in a lot of their opinions.

Bill D. asked why are they not being approved? They could be approved at this meeting. Jim D. said no they can't.

T.R. Dudley stated that if we could have had this detail that we have in front of us now, the controversy would not have been there. So in my mind the personnel committee should always submit something to the budget committee, and there should be a budget analysis done. With this kind of documentation there wouldn't have been a controversy.

Shauna Q. stated that then our board needs time in advance to have time to digest what they are being asked to review and vote.

Christina Spencer-Hess wanted to make a comment. I think the staff will understand that the board is trying to do things in the right way. There should be a certain level of confidence from the employee to the board that they are moving forward in the correct fashion.

Mary H. stated she has never voted to spend a dime of this boards money that we have not checked with Jacque in order to do it. Jacque knows where every penny goes. I think she is one of the best financial managers that I have ever worked with. You might disagree but Jacque knows what is going on in the money world. I have never voted and I don't think anybody on the committee has ever voted on something that we never got her permission to use, and that it was legal to use. I think we did cover our tracks very well.

Joyce Jones stated she was on the personnel committee as well and I echo Stacy M. Everything we did was very positive. We looked at each person one at a time. We asked Jan V. for her evaluations of each person, then we asked her to leave, so we could also talk about Jan. We made sure that we understood from Jacque, over and over and over, that money was available to do the things we were asking.

Jim D. said that he thinks, and he has talked with some board members about that, and Collin kind of referenced it earlier, even if money is available it's the boards position on how that money is spent.

Shauna Q. said that is right and I have seen for herself that the problem we have is not the availability of the money it's how everything was brought about, how it was presented, and then when we asked legitimate questions, we were shut down. No one was saying is the money available, we were asking what is it going to cost. That is totally different than from how much money is available.

Vicki N. said she agrees with there has been some confusion, but I also agree with what T.R. just said, we have the facts in front of us now. Is there a problem with what we are seeing? They have faxed everything that we needed and asked for, dollar amount wise, is in front of us.

Jim D. said we have a motion on the floor.

Kathy G. asked if there is a formal salary pool, and are there rules attached to the evaluation. Did they make sure each person met those goals. I am curious about how the decision came about to award the money. Again, to the staff, I trust that everyone is a very hard working and diligent person, and it's not about not deserving. I am just curious about the percentages, they are quite large in today's economy. Those are substantial, and I am not saying they are not deserved, I don't mean to imply that, but I would like to know that they were awarded due to goals met and very substantial measurable performance goals and also that those are conducted on a yearly basis.

Collin B. asked of the personnel committee, so were the raise numbers approved by the personnel committee? Bill D. stated yes. Collin stated that this creates a problem, because the whole meeting we talked about four percent, four percent, and now I am learning that these numbers were known on that day and the personnel committee sat on them. Bill D. stated that was not true. Mary H. stated they were presented to you, they were read. Shauna stated Mary, you did not. Mary H. asked Shauna Q. if she were calling her a liar?

Jim D. called for order. Mary H. stated they were presented, and Collin B. said no they were not. Jim D. asked for the members to wait to be recognized. Collin stated he still has the floor, and no they were not. We asked about it and all we heard was four percent. We did not get any of these numbers. Bill keeps says that we were not paying attention. I was paying attention and vaguely remember something about the additional four percent. I believe that goes back to it needs to be in writing. If you are going to approve something it needs to be in writing so everybody can see it and not just subject to what can be heard in one or two readings. It bothers me that these numbers were known by the personnel committee and not one personnel committee member said there is more money than just four percent. That creates a problem of distrust in committees.

Nancy M. stated that during the conversation we were told that we can spend up to ten percent of our allowed funds for Admin. That doesn't say that we have too, it says up to. I need to know if these numbers are ten percent or more than ten percent of the Admin funds that are available. I agree with Collin, we never did receive this. This is standard procedure that you send this information, and when I asked a question I was told to calculate that figure myself. I don't ever want to hear that again.

Bill D. stated that the paper work Collin is referring to, when they left that committee meeting they left all of that paperwork there, because they didn't know if that was public knowledge or not. They didn't know for sure, so everything was left there, so nothing was brought with the personnel committee to that meeting, other than their recommendation of what they did. That is why that wasn't there. Jacque didn't bring it with her. Why she didn't bring it with her I don't know, because she has so much darn stuff to bring with her anyway. That is the reason. Also, everybody was told they could call this 800 number, call the office and ask for Jacque to find out.

Shauna Q. stated that no that number was not told. Bill D. stated it was written right there. Shauna Q. stated that just because he has a piece of paper now, that didn't happen. Shauna stated she asked for a ball park estimate in what was going to be involved and again nobody could tell me. Bill stated that he heard it, that you could call the office to find out, he heard it said more than once at that meeting.

A board member asked if the meeting minute notes were recorded? Bill D. stated yes. Jim D. stated that Linda G. has sent him a copy of the recording and he is going to review it. Jim stated that he told you when we began that he has not had that chance yet, and he assures you that he is going to.

Jim D. stated that he has Russ Unger's motion and a second. Jim D. would like to try and get back to the motion and vote on the motion. Several of the board members would like the motion read again.

Russ Unger read the motion. The motion is the C-WIB board freezes salaries immediately and the chairman appoints a special committee to review this pay raise and a COLA issue and report back to the full committee with recommendations within 30 days and from now on any proposal that pertains to salary increases or pay raises will be sent to the budget committee for review and then to the full committee for review and vote.

Mary H. asked what Russ meant by "full committee". Bill Debo stated Russ did not have Nancy's inclusion of "any pay raises be retroactive to July 1st".

Russ Unger read the motion again. "The C-WIB board freezes salaries immediately and the chairman appoints a special committee to review this pay raise and a COLA issue and report back to the full committee with recommendations within 30 days and any pay raises be retroactive to July 1st, and from now on any proposal that pertains to salary increases or pay raises will be sent to the budget committee for review and then to the full committee for review and vote".

Shauna Q. stated she has one change. When Russ said full committee it should be full board. Bill D. stated he is not so sure you can do this.

Tonette Anderson asked if when we are saying "freezing" are we freezing with the increases? Jim D. said no. Russ U. said no, it is as they currently are now, because they don't take effect until July 1.

John Vaughn asked shouldn't the chairman send that to the personnel committee instead of voting a new personnel committee to study it? I thought that is why we had the personnel committee. It just should be a committee of one. Jim. D. said that's ridiculous, the special committee can also be the personnel committee. It makes no difference.

Bill D. stated that we need to correct the wording, it needs to be the personnel committee. Jim D. said that his thinking on the implementation of the motion that Russ made, if it should pass, is first of all I want the individual board members to come to me and let me know if you are interested in serving on the committee. I want to try to appoint a balanced committee. I don't want to try and pick ones who are for a big raise or a little raise, or people against any raise. I want the committee to be balanced so the committee could have a lot of debate amongst yourselves. I think it is important that committee be balanced, that would be my intention if the motion passes.

Russ U. stated that is why he thought about bringing it back to the full board because it's already here.

Jim D. stated he thinks that in line with the discussion, the special committee, or the special committee that becomes the personnel committee, or whatever, they need to have an interaction with the budget committee on the financial end of it, and then the entire thing needs to come back to the full board, would be my understanding of its implementation.

Stacy M. stated just to clarify if we are on the personnel committee we will be on the committee? Jim D. said no, but I do not object to members of the personnel committee being considered for it at all.

Bill D. asked Jim D. if he would appoint the committee before we quit? Jim D. asked if there was any other question on the motion?

Vicki N. asked and the purpose of the personnel committee becomes what? In this case it becomes limited to what Russ's motion is as far as any action they take, and that was to consider any raises, and the retroactive to July 1 facet of it, that is what I expect this special committee or personnel committee to consider.

Vicki N. stated that now she is fully confused. About the mention of the special committee and the personnel committee. We already have a personnel committee in place. Jim D. said that I can change the membership of that committee at anytime, ok.

Vicki N. said and you are doing that? Jim D. said that he doesn't care what we call the committee just it is more important that we understand what the committee is charged with and then how it's to proceed.

Dewey Thompson stated that one thing he thinks everyone is concerned with, and part of the motion that Russ has put before us. I think a lot of it is also about the recommendations, in terms of not necessarily whether or not they get the raise, they don't get the raise, how much the raise should be, but also some of the protocol issues we have going on here. How is

information requested, how is it distributed, what is the transparency like, how do these committees work together. It's one thing to solve problems, don't get me wrong, it is very important to do that, but to prevent this stuff from happening in the future I think it needs to be a part of what this discussion is about as well. These recommendations needs to be a target of the inner workings of this board.

Jim D. stated that is part of why I was talking about how I see its implementation, so everyone understands how we proceed. I don't want to walk out the door and see a whole group of board members again in a huddle and confused about what just happened.

Collin B. stated one thing he would either add to the motion or handled out of the budget committee is any proposal presented to the full board be in written format so that we don't have any more confusions of somebody reading something once or twice and we are all supposed to understand it completely or comprehend it, because then we get into a debate is it four percent, and forget about the second half of that proposal. If we had it in writing then we could have come back and looked at it. Collin stated he didn't know if it needs to go with this motion or just be handled out of the budget committee.

Russ U. agrees with Collin and would also like for the committees to meet before the full committee, to kind of meet together. It would be nice if the committees could meet an hour before the full committee and actually talk within the committee, then bring it to the full committee, because it is actually hard with everybody here and getting involved, if we could kind of contain that. I think we can deal with that other than this motion.

Mary H. asked Russ for clarification if he means "committee" or "board"? Russ stated he means board, and Mary thanked him for the clarification.

Jim D. asked if there was any other question or comment on the motion?

T.R. Dudley asked about committee structure. We have the three standing committees that we use every month, on the sub committees should they not report to one of those standing committees and then come to the full board under that mechanism?

Jim D. said the answer to that is yes. For instance, the evaluations committee which evaluates proposals, actually comes back to the full board. The career center sub-committee which has not met in a while, which we discuss the career center at every board meeting, there is nothing wrong with that, but in this case Russ, I want to give this committee we were talking about in your motion, they may have to meet more than once, they may not be able just to meet once before the board meeting, so we understand that, I don't want any confusion about that either.

Russ U. clarified the "special committee". Jim D. said that so they can come forward with all of the information that they all have described and present it at some point to the full board, and you all can see all the facts and figures and vote on it at that point in time. Jim stated that his understanding is that the committee can come forward with the discussion of the sub-contractors structure and raises.

Bill D. stated Mr. Chairman you are out of order there. The Chairman, Jim D. said it would then go to the budget committee before it comes to the full board. Bill D. then stated it again, Mr. Chairman you are out of order there on that motion. Jim D. asked if there was any other discussion on the motion.

Bill D. asked Russ U. to read the whole motion again. Russ U. read the motion: "The C-WIB board freezes salaries immediately and the chairman appoints a special committee to review this pay raise and COLA issue and report back to the full board with recommendations within 30 days and any pay raises be retroactive to July 1st, and from now on any proposal that pertains to salary increases or pay raises will be sent to the budget committee for review and then to the full committee for review and vote".

Several board members stated that it should be "full board" not "full committee". Bill D. asked Russ to read the top line again, you are talking about freezing all of the salaries and it should be "salary increases freeze". Russ U. read, "C-WIB board freezes salaries immediately". Bill D. stated that is wrong, it should say "salary increases" immediately, because if not, it could be misconstrued to mean freeze all salaries. A board member thought that was what we were doing and Bill stated no, that is not what we are doing, we are freezing salary increases, not their salaries. Discussion ensued. Shauna Q. stated freezing salaries "as they currently are". Bill D. stated that is exactly what it is, "as they currently are", that is not what was being said, the staff still get their paycheck. The board members agreed that yes the staff will get their paycheck. Bill D. stated again that that was not what that said.

Sharon Gibson stated that maybe Russ U. should write it up, pass it out to everybody, and let them read it, so that next month we do not have all of this again. I was not here last month but I am totally confused.

Jim D. said it will be in writing for the next meeting, but we need to vote. Russ U. said that he will put down that C-WIB freezes salary at current level immediately, and the board agreed.

Russ U. read the motion again: "The Central Region Workforce Investment Board freezes salaries at current levels immediately and the Chairman appoints a special committee to review this pay raise and COLA issue and report back to the Full Board with recommendations within 30 days and any pay raises be retroactive to July 1st, and from now on any proposal that pertains to salary increases or pay raises will be sent to the budget committee for review and then to the Full Board for review and vote".

Jim D. said that this included the changes. Jim stated you have heard the motion several times. He called for a vote. Joyce J. asked who had seconded the motion. Linda stated from her minutes, that Melinda Macker seconded the motion.

Jim D. stated to Shauna that his thinking was not on appointing the full board to be the committee or we wouldn't be achieving anything. I hope I don't have to limit the number, I want to look more at the diversity of the committee and to get a good representative of the board.

Shauna Q. said she is not so much as looking at the ceiling, as there is a minimum. Jim D. said that he thinks any less than six or seven people would not be effective because we have to bring it to a vote.

Jim D. stated we have got a motion and a second, all in favor say aye, all opposed say nay. Opposing the vote is Joyce Jones, Bill Debo, John Vaughn, and Vicki Nelson. Motion passed.

Request for Proposals Adult/Dislocated Worker

Jim D. reported the RFP is a new structure the state has been pushing for. Jim stated everyone should have received one in the mail, he received his yesterday. Shauna Q. said she did not have one. Joyce Jones said Shauna could have her copy and passed it to her.

Alex Blackwell asked if anyone needed a copy as we have extra copies with us. Copies were passed out to individuals who did not have them.

Joyce Jones stated there was one sent, and then the other UCC and Mobile Lab one sent, but all were mailed together.

Jim D. stated the Adult and Dislocated is all that is on the agenda today. I did not put it on the agenda for a vote, but I wanted to talk about it, and to ask you all to thoroughly review it because it could have a tremendous effect on our operations in the region. I intend to ask the planning committee to particularly to review it and come to the board with any comments that they have in regards to it.

Jim D. stated that as it has been pointed out, the packet you received had an RFP in it, but that is not what I am talking about, but today I will also ask the planning committee to review that RFP, but that was not on the meeting agenda so we will not be discussing that.

This RFP proposal is part of the model that Julie Gibson's NGCC talks about and like I said it is a very important decision for this board and I wanted to call it to your attention because you need to thoroughly review it, and understand it. Again, we don't want to go back to the day where everybody is confused. There will be lots of discussion regarding it I am sure, and that is why I had it on today's agenda.

Bill D. stated we need a motion to accept this so they can put it out, correct? Jim D. stated no, I am not asking for that motion.

Bill D. made a motion that we move to accept this and put it out for proposals. Joyce Jones seconded the motion.

Shauna Q. stated she has not even had time to read it, she was just handed it. Bill D. stated to read away. Nancy M. stated this is twenty pages and she could not read it in five minutes. Shauna Q. stated that was ridiculous, can I guess what's in here?

Jim D. stated that Bill has made a motion so unless we withdraw it, we are going to have to vote on it.

Bill D. stated that now unless we need to discuss it a little, there is a letter here from Julie Gibson stating that this basically needs to be looked at, and put out, is that correct Jim?

Jim D. stated that Julie Gibson want us to do it, yes.

Bill D. clarified by asking Jim D. if the state is requesting us to do this? We have to do this.

Jim D. stated that we don't have to do it.

Shauna Q. stated that she is with the state, from another state agency, and there are things that state agencies ask for and doesn't mean that you are always required to do them.

Jim D. stated that now I really feel like the board members need time to review it, I don't think any of you have, but Bill has made a motion and it calls for a vote on the motion, if there is no more discussion.

Bill D. stated there is more discussion.

Jim D. asked all in favor aye?

Bill D. stated again that there is more discussion Jim.

Jim D. stated what?

Bill D. asked if Jan Vaughn if she could explain, is she could speak on this?

Jan Vaughn said she would try, if it is alright with Mr. Dickerson? Jim D. said yes.

Jan V. said we have not been operating in the manner that this particular RFP is designed to operate. The big difference I think you will see is, at our current operations our sub-contractors basically handle a lot of other things besides staffing.

Under the Next Generation Career Center (NGCC) the State has been given permission by the Department of Labor (DOL) to operate in the new manner, and has been doing this for several years, but not the Central Region. I received this letter from Julie Gibson that said "immediately" we would put out an RFP, and I wrote back and was asked for an extension of time and was given one until the end of this month to get this RFP out, but before we put out the RFP for the career center grant, that we had to get the State's approval.

So this was sent last week to the State and we did not get that approval until Monday afternoon late. Once that was approved, we sent it to you so that you would have an opportunity to review it. It was electronically sent to everyone that we had an email. Nancy M. stated she did not receive it electronically. Joyce J. stated she received one, and Mary H. stated she received it by mail. Jan V. said that she didn't know and could not speak for that as she did not personally send them. Jan said that it was supposed to be sent to everyone on the board, and hopefully you got this and have had an opportunity to review it. If you did not, we will make sure you have a copy today so that it can be reviewed.

It is my understanding that Jim had put this on this, today's meeting, in anticipation that we would get it approved and we could put it out for bid. The reason we want to put it out for bid is because we are on a tight framework, and we have got to allow the sub-contractors, and anybody else, to bid on this, and get this all done before the end of July. This means evaluated, and recommended to negotiate, to get the negotiations done, and then recommend them to the board at the July meeting, who passed the mustard so to speak, on the evaluation of the RFP.

Basically the RFP does this, we are buying staff, and that is all we are buying. That is the way it is operated in the rest of the State. I've been visiting with several of my cohorts and they assure me that this is how they are operating and they only buy staffing services, and that is all

that they do buy. Anybody that needs a copy of this we will make sure you have a copy today. If you perhaps did not open it up, or did not see it, it may have come from Linda. I guess it did come from Linda.

Joyce J. stated she received a copy both ways, electronically and by mail.

Jim D. stated that once again we've got a motion. I know it is obvious that many of you did not have this before today and obviously you haven't had time to review it. So Bill's motion, and correct me if I am wrong, is to approve the RFP, is that correct?

Jim D. called for a vote, all in favor aye, opposed nay? The motion failed.

Russ U. asked are these employees already working in there? Are we just taking over paying their salaries, or are these new employees?

Jim D. said no not really, and that is why you need to review it and we need to discuss it.

David M. stated he read it last night. My understanding is this is what our current contractors are doing, is this not correct?

Jan V. stated they are, but when you put out a request for proposal I cannot sit here and say we will award them that contract. That has to be negotiated, it has to be evaluated, and if they are awarded that by the board then that is fine, and if they are not, you have selected a different provider.

David M. stated to Jan that he understands that and he appreciates that. David said that he did see there is a timeline that we have to follow and it's pretty quick. We do need to move rather quickly on this. Is this something that we should have been doing annually?

Jim D. stated no. Last year was the first year I had a discussion with the State about it. Jan and I met with Julie Gibson. You know Jan says we are the only region that doesn't do it, and you can walk across town down the street and they will tell you that the Central Region often times, after discussion with the state, we do things differently. I don't have a desire to be everybody else. I have a desire to be the best, and Julie Gibson and I have some very heated discussions and then we come to some kind of agreement on how to proceed. I certainly with her timeline, will be discussing that with her, that this board needs time to review this and go through proper procedures, and vote on it, and get it back to her.

Nancy asked when did Jan receive this? Jan asked the approval from the state for the RFP? Jim clarified it was Monday, was what Jan said. Jan was not sure what time it came in as she was sick that day and not there at the office. So she does not know what time it actually came that they approved it. I know that they called on a conference call on Friday and went through several things they felt like wasn't right and needed to be corrected, and we did do those corrections and we sent it back to the state. They went through it again and then they called back and told my staff that they approved what we had submitted. Nancy M. asked just this past Monday. Jan said yes.

Shauna Q. stated that she needs clarification on the broad use of the word state. I draft RFP's also for my agency, and all of those RFP's have to go to the Office of the Administration. So will this go to the Office of Administration, and then will their buyers put it out on the street?

Jan V. stated she does not know where DWD sends it to, if they do send it. But they are the ones that we had to get permission from as the letter indicated. Jim D. stated right, and it is not a state RFP, it is our RFP.

Shauna Q. stated ok that is why when she was saying approval from the state that makes it sound like it's a state RFP and that is why I needed clarification.

Jim D. stated again even though my opinion is that even though DWD has approved it, that does not force you all into approving it. You still have the right to review it and consider it, and if you decide there is something there you want to change.

Nancy M. asked if the current contract that we have expire on June 30th? Does that mean there is 30 days that we don't have a contract with anyone?

Jan V. and Jim D. both said no. Jan said that actually we were given a one-month extension that we can extend the contracts with the current providers. So we have plans to write that extension letter with the current contractors. Shauna Q. asked if DWD gave us those extensions? Jan V. stated yes, Julie Gibson.

T.R. Dudley stated that he notices that with the timeline, he doesn't see how it is going to be possible to have a full board vote on this before the next meeting. Jan V. stated the full board meeting is in July before the end of the month. It will need to be brought before this committee. Jan stated that here is one of the alternatives that Julie Gibson can implement if she so chooses. She can decide that they are not going to give us any of our money after July 30th, if they so want to, they don't have to. That is for any operation, now I don't think they are going to take that measure, but it is an option for them. So I think it is imperative that we try to act as quickly as possible and get contracts in place by July 30th.

Jim D. stated he would just tell us that he will be dealing with Julie directly on this particular item, and I think that we will be able to proceed.

A board member asked when was the next board meeting was, and it was stated July 25th.

T.R. Dudley asked what is the main difference between the two RFP's?

Jan V. stated that the first RFP that we are needing to have approved is basically funded through Adult and Dislocated dollars and it is for staffing of the career centers and some of the satellite offices. It says in there, you will see, how many staff we are wanting to buy for the career centers and satellite offices. It is the same number that they have given to us for negotiation, so I don't think you are going to see a reduction of staff. We use that same figure that our sub-contractors gave to us to give to Julie Gibson for the negotiation that we have with her staff.

On the second one, the (UCC) which is the Universal Challenge Course that we have, which is south of Rolla that is between Rolla and Salem, we need staff out there as well. They handle both adult and youth folks. We also have the Mobile Lab, which goes around to different

communities, and the staff that needs to go on that needs to be procured as well. I asked the state about that did they have to look at that RFP, and they said no.

Shauna Q. asked a question, when we are talking about the board voting on this RFP. According to the schedule that I receive at the beginning of the year, there is a meeting next Wednesday, June 27, and that is an executive meeting, correct? Jim D. said correct. Shauna Q. said so the board will not vote on this RFP until July 25th? Jim D. said correct. He does not just want the executive committee only to vote on it.

Mary H. asked if we would be able to move the vote so we can have more time in getting this information? Jim D. said we can do whatever we need to do, but I will be talking with Julie Gibson. I've already talked with her a little bit about the entire issue, but not in any detail.

Janet Kinnett asked are we going to have some more discussion on this or are we going to stay all day? I don't understand this. Why are we doing this, and what is going to be the difference when we do this and what we have now?

Jim D. said he can tell us from his discussion last year with Julie Gibson. I kept asking why do you think we need to do this, and at the time I was told that for instance CMCA had an indirect cost rate, and one of Julie's staff didn't think we ought to be paying indirect cost rate. That is just a matter of debate and opinion, but we did away with the indirect cost rate as a result of that discussion as far as CMCA was concerned. LOES and COPIC don't have such a thing. She feels like that we can save money by doing it this way and she and I have debated that point very strongly. There are some other changes that it could bring, that is why I wanted you all first to review it, and then we are going to have a discussion about the entire thing, and then you all can vote on it.

Janet Kinnett said why are we doing these RFP's? They are down two staff. Jan V. asked if Janet were talking about DWD? Janet K. said she is talking LOES staff in the Lebanon career center. She said that is what they have now and we are bare bones. Janet said they have three people up there today running it, because Joyce had to bring her here today because she wasn't feeling well. Janet said there is no way guys that we can function. I have got one lady out who lost her son, and another lady out on funeral leave, and those are both DWD positions. I've got one DWD person there today.

Jim D. stated that is why I want everybody to review it and then we are going to have a discussion. We have got additional staff challenges coming at us from the DWD direction. We are losing one person here in Jefferson City who is moving to the central office. We lost another one from Columbia, which puts us down to two DWD positions in Columbia because that staff person resigned. I think I have already mentioned to the board that we have one in Mexico that accepted another position in Warrenton, and that would leave us with one DWD person in Mexico.

Jim D. stated he has been told that we can fill those three positions. That we have now reduced our DWD staff to the point where we can fill the vacancies from this point forward. As many people knows, it takes the state some time to fill positions. They don't just put out an ad and have an interview next week and put them on board, you know that, I am not telling you anything. So I have had discussions with Gilbert Hake about our issue because we are in a place now where we can no longer move staff people around, there is no place to take them.

A board member said that we don't have a partner for this down grade. Does this Julie Gibson understand? Jim D. said that he is having discussions with her about that entire thing and have a very general discussion about this RFP situation.

Nancy M. asked about what Janet said that we have only one person in the Mexico office? Is it really true that we have just one person in that office? Jim D. and Jan V. said no. Nancy M. asked if we were just going to have one DWD person in at Linn and one in Fulton? Jim D. stated there is no DWD staff in Linn. That is a CMCA, what we call, a county office. So that is only one CMCA position, it is not a full career center, like Lebanon.

Mary H. asked then how many positions are we short? Jim D. stated we are down to two DWD positions, a supervisor and one other. Jim D. asked if there were any other questions?

Nancy M. stated she needs some clarification because I am overwhelmed.

Jim D. recommends that they first read it, and he knows they haven't had an opportunity to, and he will be glad to answer anyone's questions, and Jan V. will be glad to answer anyone's questions, but they need to review it first.

Board Vacancies

We have carried board vacancies in two counties since the last time the board was approved by the Caucus. In both cases we felt there were people coming on board in those positions and in both cases those people backed out. At least one of those counties have been unable to fill, or come forward with a nomination for the vacancy. We also have a third vacancy now in Camden County which was created by a board member that probably none of you remember.

Then we have an additional problem if you look at the board roster. We have people still on the roster who have not been to a meeting in a long time. One member hasn't ever been to a meeting. Some of them are telling us now they don't want to be reappointed. Linda has provided a list, which we have discussed with the Commissioners. This happens with changes in jobs and things of that nature, and I understand that if they want to resign, and I am not being critical of any board member, with the possible exception of the one who has never been to one meeting, and I don't think he responds to Linda if he is ever going to be here or not.

Jim D. stated he wants to be working with all of the board members and the County Commissions. One of the things the Department of Labor (DOL) questioned us about when they were here, was board vacancies, and they wanted to look at the minutes, and who all was attending. We just can't continue to have board members who are not coming. It is ok to miss a meeting here and there, but we have got some that we haven't seen in months and years in some cases. That will also be a discussion we will be having in this short time frame, but I will be working with each one of you.

One of the things I will be talking to the Commissioners about in our current structure is that we have two board members from every county, for that basic board structure, then we have our three regional board seats. If we have a county that just cannot fill their board seats, or a board seat, I need to talk to the commissioners, and maybe we need to get away from that two per county structure and work out some way where we can get a full board representation, because otherwise like I told you, we have two of those seats vacant since the last time the board was appointed, and the counties haven't been able to come up with a nomination.

Nancy M. stated honestly, I cannot believe that in a whole county those commissioner cannot find two people that won't serve on this board. I mean I just find that impossible. Jim. D. said it happens. Nancy said that in 10,000 people that live in their county there is not two to serve on this board? Jim D. said it happens. He is not being critical of any commissioner, I am just telling you it happens, and I wanted you all to be aware of that.

Bill D. asked how many are we missing? We are allowed forty one. Jim D. said in a regular structure, we are missing three, and that is not counting the one that never attended. We have three total. A board member asked if there is a total of four? Jim D. said the ones he is referencing is, one in Osage, Moniteau. There was a board member in Camden County and she resigned. You all know we have other board members that just almost never attend.

Nancy M. stated isn't there something in our by-laws that state if they miss three meetings? Jim D. stated yes. Nancy M. stated then we need to enforce that. Jim D. stated he agreed with her. That's where I was getting at. Nancy M. stated unless there is extenuating circumstances. Jim D. stated that when a board member tells him that they have changed jobs and I just can't attend anymore, let's be realistic, we need to police ourselves, because I guarantee you we are probably going to be seeing some DOL when they come back to us eventually, and they are going to be looking at that board roster and they will say well these people never attended a board meeting, or were only at one meeting, so we have got to address that, and that is why that was on the agenda.

Jim D. stated he wants to remind the board members that he has said that he wants to hear from any board member who is interested in serving on the committee they approved. He said he is going to appoint at least seven members to that committee. That's where we are at this point in time.

Jim D. stated there is no other business because the agenda cannot be amended so I entertain a motion for adjournment.

David Miller made a motion to adjourn with Russ Unger seconding the motion; and there were no objections. The board meeting adjourned at 11:34 a.m.