

Johnson County Community College Special Board of Trustees Meeting

December 22, 2022

5 p.m.

Transcript of Meeting

- Well, good afternoon and welcome to this special meeting of the Johnson County Community College Board of Trustees today, December 22nd, 2022. We're here today, Dr. Bowne, I'm gonna take a swing at this, and I think you or the staff could correct me. We received an application for the open trustee position prior to the deadline that went to a junk or spam mail box. It went through one of our filters, and we apologized to the applicant for that. And her name is Sonya Evans, and she had appropriately submitted the application that we missed. So we apologize to her and to the public for that. And we're here today, I suppose on my authority and with the recommendation of the staff to call this special meeting. So thank you all for being here. I see that we have, now formally calling the meeting to order, I see that we have everybody's present. Trustee Hamill just joined us. So we have Vice Chair Ingram, Trustee Musil, Trustee Laura Smith-Everett, Trustee Dawn Rattan, and then Trustee Mark Hamill. So thank you all for being here. I believe the staff, largely Dr. Bowne, Kelsey Nazar, and our staff had outlined several options, and I've had several phone calls in consultation with Dr. Bowne to outline what to do. And I think Dr. Bowne and Kelsey, I'm just gonna launch into the five, the five different options that I think the staff has put before us. And I know some of you have already given me your opinion, but please, if I may, as a matter of process, and procedure, and fairness, let me run through the options as the staff and I have outlined them. I probably have a recommendation I'll make to you, and then I'll open it up to you, the six of us, so that we can discuss which way we do wanna proceed, and then go from there in terms of how to handle this situation. So the first option I wanna put before us is frankly that we can do nothing. We certainly could ignore the application and just proceed with our six interviews. I wanted to lay that option out there. Number two, we could retain the six we've selected for interviews and consider the 12 not selected plus the missed candidate. And Dr. Bowne had that number one in an email, because frankly I had favored that. And as a Rotarian and a student of President Lincoln, being exceedingly fair and extraordinarily fair is typically the best way to go and the best way to ensure this college is protected from any wrongdoing. This is a foul up. We own it, and we're trying to move forward to do what's fair to everyone involved. Number three, we could retain the six selected for interviews, consider the eight that did not move out to the final round plus the one missed candidate. Number four, we could retain the six selected for interview and consider the four not selected in the final round plus the missed candidate. Or five, we could simply start over. So I'm not in favor of that.

- Can you give me option four one more time?

- Yeah, option four was to, and I think we should retain the six we've selected or agreed to move forward for interview. I don't wanna penalize those folks. They've been selected through this process to move forward.

- Was that option four?

- This is four. Keep the six selected for interview plus consider the four not selected in the final round plus the missed candidate. So taking a step back, we need to consider this missed candidate. And now the question is, how do we do that? And I think at this point, just so you can grapple with this, as Dr. Bowne and I have over the last several days, it's now on you. We've laid out recommendations. I know I just blitz through those. We can go back through them, but it's on us now. What do we wanna do and how do we want to proceed?

- I would say one in five are out for me.

- I agree.

- I do not want to start over. So I would like to retain the six, which are options two, three, and four. And then after that it gets very complicated.

- Yeah, it's just a matter of process. And I think for me, we need to consider this woman, this person. And then I thought it would be, I don't want any accusation that we opened it up for her and only her. So I wanted to open it up, consider everybody again. And my preference would be we vote for two so that we don't just pass her along. But some of you have privately said to me that you would just wanna consider her and move on. And at this point, frankly, to get back to my life, I'm okay with that. So yet as chair, I wanna protect the college, and do what's in the best interest, and take the time to do what's right. So I'll be quiet. And I see Trustee Musil has his hand up.

- Yeah, Chair Cross, I fully agree that the six people that we have moved on to interviews should be retained. They did nothing to deserve reopening or reconsideration. I fully agree that any application that we missed because of a technological error should be considered. I'm not, and I don't know exactly what is meant by the issue of consider the eight or consider the four that didn't move on. My view is I have done my best to review this application against the same criteria I did before. And my question to myself was, would I have recommended her over somebody in that remaining, the four finalists? And if I come to the conclusion no, then I don't see any reason to reconsider those four. That's my personal view of the application and how we should handle it regardless of who the applicant is. I'm happy to

listen to the rest of the board. Obviously I appreciate you offering options and wanting to do what is clearly the right thing. Appreciate your leadership on that.

- Thank you. Who's next? Trustee Smith-Everett, yes ma'am.

- First, I responded to you Trustee Cross that I felt like we should just go through the same process just with this individual, a round one and a round two. On second consideration, I have also considered the points that Trustee Musil just brought up, which is, would I have picked one person over another in that slot if I were to pick this person as one of my, when we limited our votes, and we tried to keep it to the second round of voting to, I don't even remember now. Is it seven or eight, five? So I think that's worth some debate. I guess my own thought is my considerations have changed over time because I kind of already know the outcome of what others feel about candidates, and I don't know that that's a fair way to do it. I kind of like that we went cold, and we just ran through them on Thursday, and we considered each person. And then I feel like if we opened it back up from starting from scratch, I would consider things differently, and I don't know that that's necessarily fair to the candidates that were considered on Thursday. And so I would also get rid of option, I think it's one and, I don't know. Reconsidering everybody is off the plate for me, and then doing nothing is off the plate for me. So I think what Dawn said, I'm in agreement with, whatever numbers those are. I'm not keeping track on the numbers very well today. But to me, the simplest, which I would vote for, is just go through the role, consider her on even moving on. And then after we consider that, then if that person makes, this person makes it, we consider them for, we consider them with everyone. And I guess not limit our votes this time or change our votes this time because I don't know. I had an idea, and now I've totally lost it after round one, and now I can't even remember what that second idea was. So there you go. There's a whole bunch of hodgepodge thoughts.

- Well, one thing you do bring up is in round, I do not wanna go back to the beginning, and I do not want to start over. However, in round one, every candidate had to be seconded. And so that is one consideration about moving on. Looking at this candidate's qualifications, I do not know her. I've never met her and don't follow in the same circles, but I probably wouldn't have seconded her. But then when you get to, when we got to the final round, and we had to limit those votes to seven, I feel like I don't know if you all used all seven of your votes, but I used all seven of my votes, and even regrettably had to vote no on someone I didn't wanna vote no on 'cause my votes were used up. So that's where it gets kind of murky for me is that we all probably used up by votes. So would you rescind one of those seven votes that you had, or would we now have eight votes? That's where it gets a little murky to me. Or the other thing coming from the back forward is we did say we would interview up to seven people. So we still do have that space for one more if you do an individual consideration and say that you're using the same criteria.

- Trustee Hamill, do you have any thoughts, may I ask? Yes sir, thank you.

- [Mark] Yeah, well, I do love the way we're trying to figure how to fix this. Obviously I think the accountability is really important on this. I'm glad we're looking at these things. Transparency is obviously huge. So whatever we do, I think in our biggest vote needs to actually be at the next board meeting so it's really transparent. We could kind of discuss and maybe hold off on the interviews, but I almost feel like we're back month to make sure that the public really knows what's going on. I don't know the individual that was missed as well. And I do understand that the six that were, I believe it was six that were picked, and we obviously don't wanna penalize them. They clearly made it through. I don't know if there's a perfect answer to this, but I think it's kind of embarrassing what happened, and I don't know a perfect fix, but I think we gotta make sure we do this vote at the January meeting, make sure that we're fully transparent to what's going on and how we're making these choices. So two through four are possibilities for me, I think, as well. I guess that's where I'm at on this right now.

- Okay.

- For clarification, this meeting right here is public.

- Right. That's right.

- [Mark] Yeah, I appreciate that. Yeah, I know that it is, but it's still not the same as the scheduled meeting. I mean I think there's people that probably follow it when the meeting's scheduled on the third Thursday and something like this, people are traveling. This is not the normal best case scenario to get communication as transparent as we can be.

- No, it's, Trustee Hamill. there's not two ways about it. It certainly is embarrassing. It certainly is an inconvenience, and yet it's our ball to pick up and run with. So here we are. And I see Trustee Musil has his hand up, so.

- I am, I guess before I would ever support what are now options two through four, I would need to know what the board means by consider the, whatever the number is, not selected in the prior round. I mean by consider them, they were not selected the last time, so it still comes down to me to, am I going, would I have used my seventh vote, any of my seven votes, on the new applicant? And if as I sit here today I would not have, then I would not be able to support this application. So if consider against the four finalists or the eight semi-finalists means weighing this applicant against those, I've done that in the same manner I did going into last Thursday's meeting. So I don't know how I would reconsider that other than to say, here are the criteria I used last Thursday. I'm now applying those criteria to this applicant. And would I have voted for this applicant with one of my seven votes? And I think that's still a

fair way to do it. With respect to Trustee Hamill's comments about waiting till January, I do not support that. We are being transparent, and I think it's important to note in this special meeting, we're not deciding some policy issue where the public is giving us a bunch of input or has the opportunity to come before us. We evaluated these now 19 applicants on our own as individual trustees to see if more people would agree to interview them. So I don't mind if we say we're going to keep the six and consider against the four finalists. And I guess the question then is, would you have supported this candidate with one of your seven yes votes over the other four candidates? And then we each have to remember, if we voted for the four finalist candidates, because they didn't all get unanimous votes. So my view is, would I have voted for this applicant with one of my seven votes in the final round, or really in the semi-final round? And that's how I think is fair to everybody else and fully transparent. Thank you.

- Yeah, that was the point I was saying is, would you rescind one of your votes and move it over.

- [Chair Cross] Right.

- To Mrs. Evans.

- Hold on, folks. I've got Trustee Smith-Everett, then Trustee Ingram, and then Trustee Rattan. I can come back to you.

- I think, to me the simplest approach is consider this person if they get a second. And if the person gets a second, they go to round two, and then consider them on their own for the final interview. So two rounds of voting just like everybody else got. And if they get a majority, if she gets a majority, she moves on. Because considering the implications to another candidate who has been told that they are interviewing in the next round, and then to be contacted by the college and said, actually we've now had a meeting, and now you're not going to be interviewed because this person was traded in, is going to be a horrible PR awful taste in people's mouths and appearance of what we're doing. So to me, the simplest is consider her for both rounds on her own merits. Round one, does she get a second? Round two, does she go on? And I mean we just eat the fact that we may have seven people to interview on that date, and it is what it is. But not, I think we get ourselves in a really tricky situation if we're gonna reconsider, go back to seven votes, and then have to put somebody out who's already been contacted that they're in the final round of interviews. I can suck up another 40 minutes to interview more people. That's my personal opinion.

- Well, that's my opinion too. And I think I agree with you in part Trustee Smith-Everett, and I disagree in part because by definition in rule, we're gonna violate our own rule that we established to vote for seven just to consider this woman. So it's not particularly fair. I think Trustee Musil talked on it. Are you gonna, and Trustee Rattan said it too. Are you gonna rescind one of the seven? So that's why it's been

my recommendation to essentially, and we can do it pretty quickly here, it's gonna take longer to decide what we're gonna do as opposed to what we do. Because if we start back over with the 13, I think that's utterly fair. Everybody gets another shot at a second, and we move forward, and either we pick one or two, that way she's up against all the other people. And then all the other people that did get it in, there's no really statement on her, but everybody else did what they were supposed to do. So this woman gets special consideration. We violate our rule of seven that we set last week. The good news is, we can set a new policy that we wanna abide by, and that's what we're doing now. So I'm just trying to be fair to every single person involved, and I think made my point, and I think we're close to the same page here, but I wanna go to Trustee Ingram.

- Thank you, Chair Cross. I was following along with Trustee Smith-Everett and felt like that was the direction that I wanted to go as well, just to consider the one person on her own. I felt like that was what we were here to do initially until I had the email that had all the different options too. So I'm in agreement with Trustee Musil. And there is no perfect situation or solution to all of this, but I think I would agree with Trustee Musil and his recommendation. Thank you.

- What, Trustee Rattan.

- Is it appropriate to put up a vote on whether we want to do, want to have an eighth vote? And then once we decide that we want to have an eighth vote in the final round, then we can either just do an eighth vote on this person, a yay or nay, or an eighth vote on the four that weren't selected in the final. But I think we first need to decide if, like you said, we're gonna break that rule of seven votes and go to an eighth vote. And I think we should vote on that first, and then figure out what we, how we consider her.

- I agree and maybe I haven't properly explained my logic. And I think it's perfectly fine if we adopt an eighth or ninth vote and here's why.

- But is everyone okay with that?

- But then the other candidates didn't get the benefit of that eighth vote. Then if we do an eighth vote, then the other candidates can claim that we opened this back up for her and only her and pushed her through. So I-

- And that's-

- Many accusation that we favored one candidate. So that's why I'm saying we open it back up against all 13. We could do this pretty quickly. Go through all 13. Who gets a second? Who survives? I'm suggesting we go for two, select two more interviewees, and that way all of the previous applicants that have had a chance, they're reborn. So there's no accusation that we were unfair to them whatsoever. Like we've completely started over with the 13. We leave the six in place, and then move forward to select two more, and we're creating more work for ourselves because we messed up. So that's the reality, and that's why I'm supporting an eighth and a ninth vote. So we start back over with the 13. Who gets a second, and then pick, use two outta the 13. So everybody gets the benefit of these bonus votes, 'cause nobody got the benefit of the eighth vote last time. That's my opinion.

- And under no circumstances are we changing the six that already have-

- They're sacrosanct.

- I wanna make sure it's clear in the notes.

- They're already through the final interview stage, so I wanna leave them alone, and just start over with the 13. And we could do that pretty quickly here, in my opinion. Trustee Hamill.

- [Mark] Yeah, I appreciate everybody's really working and trying to figure out how to be fair to everybody who's applied, and I agree, there's no way to cancel the six that we've already chosen. And to cancel the interview, obviously we don't wanna do that. But I will say that I don't think that the other 13, if we pick any to go through at all, is gonna feel it's unfairly if they only have two votes for 13 people if that's all we have. And I am just worried about the optics, and I'm not saying that we're obviously, as a group, all of us not trying to try to be as fair as we can and work through this, but I am still worried about the optics on what it's gonna be if we add somebody through or nobody. I don't know, I don't know. I'm worried about what it's gonna look like. So that's my take.

- Well you can just blame me. That's what my wife does. Musil.

- Let's eat this elephant one bite at a time, and I would just so we're all on the record clearly, I move that we retain the six selected interviewees regardless of the rest of the process. So we can get that fixed with the vote.

- I second.

- The motion has been made by Trustee Musil and seconded by Trustee Rattan. Any further discussion?

- Thank you, Trustee Cross, for clarifying your thoughts. I did not understand about this portion of it, so I appreciate it. 'Cause now, yes, I agree with this, and I appreciate you clarifying. That made a world of difference for me.

- Thank you for your say. All those in favor please signify by saying aye.

- [Board Members] Aye!

- And those opposed?

- That motion passes unanimously. Thank you Trustee Musil for taking the initiative to saying. So now we have our six in place and now have to move forward. Do we have a motion on that, or may be too early? We can discuss it at the motion option.

- [Mark] I will say I would really like to have the conversation at the January meeting and have another vote with January meeting is what I'd like to do for the 13 that were left over.

- Thank you, Trustee Hamill. Is there a second for Trustee Hamill's motion? Seeing, hearing none? Mark, thank you for the input. I understand what you're saying, and I think that puts it more squarely in the public view. I think that's a reasonable motion. I don't agree quite candidly, and we don't have a second for that. So any other motion on how to proceed?

- [Mark] If I may say one comment on that? My biggest reason for saying this is because we're looking at a three-year commitment to who we pick, and to lose one month of them being on the board, I don't think is the biggest concern as to make sure that the public feels that we're transparent with it. So, and I know that everybody wants that too, and I'm not trying to say anybody's not. I am just worried that somebody could come back and say that.

- I can understand and appreciate that, and that certainly would give somebody more time to make people aware about what's going on. I certainly think somebody would have that rough opportunity until January 9th 'cause we'll have maybe nobody, right? You can vote no on all these people. We may



not have any additional people to interview, but January 9th will be the interview date. We've certainly made a spectacle of that, and five people that pay attention to what we do. But Trustee Musil.

- I don't know if it's time for motion, but I'm gonna try something here. I move that we consider the 19th applicant, Ms. Evans, and that each trustee be allowed one vote to determine whether or not you would've selected her within the seven votes you had last Thursday, but now effectively with an eighth vote, if in fact you support moving her to an interview.

- If I may ask the gentleman to consider a new motion in the spirit of one bite at a time. We don't even know if she gets a second. I think she'll get a second, but we don't know yet if she has a second. So this is all moot if she doesn't get a second. Then once she gets a second, we could then figure out how to pocket her or organize what we're gonna do, if I may suggest.

- So we would consider her in the same method. So you would move her. She would need to get a second. If she received a second, she would then need to get four yes votes to move to an interview. I guess that's the clarification of the motion.

- No, I'm saying we don't know if she gets a second. You can make your motion. Let me be quiet. I'll withdraw my comment.

- Can you restate the motion?

- No!

- [Chair Cross] I confused everybody.

- I move that we-

- But I do agree.

- I move that we consider the applicant Ms. Evans, and that we do it in the same process as before. And I don't know if it's really part of the motion or part of my discussion or debate to say, in my mind, we would consider her against or with in a pool with the four other finalists who, semi-finalists who didn't

make the interview with the consideration to be, would you have given her a vote among the seven yes votes you had last Thursday, which would effectively be meaning an eighth vote today? I don't know if that's not very clear, but.

- That's the point I don't understand. It feels like it's two motions. One to, do we agree we wanna do an eighth vote, and two, that we wanna open it back up and reconsider the four, or there's a motion to add an eighth vote, and then we have to then go through and see if there's a second for her name? So it's kind of a hybrid of the first round and the second round.

- Well, let me restate the motion. I think that's a good fair point, Dawn. I move that we agree to allow each trustee an eighth vote for this applicant if they so choose, and that we proceed under the same process that we did last Thursday. I'm gonna do period, and then I'll tell you what my thought is on how I will determine my vote. But I'll just say period at that point.

- I second. I second.

- Okay, the motion has been made by Trustee Musil, and seconded by Trustee Rattan. Any discussion?

- My point would simply be that I will consider this applicant against the four, I guess we call 'em semi-finalists that didn't make it to interviews and determine whether or not I would have advanced her over one of those four. That's how I personally will evaluate this applicant.

- Okay, trustee Hamill?

- [Mark] Yeah, I'm feeling like if I was one of the applicants that didn't make it through, I would be wondering if I would've got the eighth vote. And if we're looking at it, it really could have changed how things voted, obviously, and there could be people that made it through. I could see how this is gonna feel really weird to some people that didn't make it through.

- Trustee Musil.

- I can't hear you.

- I was doing so well. We were allowed seven votes, but only six people got a majority. So I don't think giving an eighth vote now gives some big advantage. We as a collective board did not select six interviewees, or seven. We only selected six. So that mitigates to me any perceived unfairness to those who were semi-finalists but didn't get an interview, because as a board we decided we only wanted six.

- Trustee Smith-Everett.

- And we are, this motion would then allow a reconsideration of all those that did not get in. So if she makes it to the second, if she gets a second, correct, am I wrong? I'm getting looks.

- That's my concern. So she advances to essentially the semi-finalist stage, Greg, thinking and then-

- We would consider.

- We can consider her with the other semi-finalists or?

- She advances in the semi-final stage only if she gets a second and a total of four votes just like every other semi-finalist.

- Right, but to trustee Hamill's point, everyone else that did not make it to the final round, so we get that done. Let's say she gets a second. She's in the pool for the final round. We're gonna open back up everyone else that did not get into the final round and has been notified they did not make it. They are all gonna be reconsidered along with her for a consideration of the seventh slot for interviews. Is that correct? That's my interpretation.

- I think that's correct. That's how I'm reading it. That second, we see if we second her. Then we vote like we did in round one. She's gotta get four.

- Majority.

- Yeah, and then we consider her against Stephanie, Jerry, and Ken.

- Yes.

- And they have gotten an email that this happened. They all know that it happened. And so, they know that we are gonna have to develop something to fairly consider the candidate that was missed due to technology.

- And the provision we're putting in place is we're giving every trustee one vote in the second round of voting for the last slot, which is our seventh now opening up for seventh candidate that we actually didn't take advantage of, I mean, we didn't do on Thursday, and we could have done at that time with any of the ones, the four that were not considered. So we're then gonna each have one vote of one person that, including Ms. Evans and the four that did not make it, to move on to that final round. Correct?

- Yeah, and if there are ties, we'll just keep going until we narrow it down.

- Yes. Okay, yeah, so I just wanted to clarify. That's my understanding, and I'm going, I'm gonna make my vote based on that understanding.

- Yeah, that's a good clarification. And let's walk through the options in-

- Hold on, Mark.

- [Greg] Yeah, go ahead.

- I see you, Mark. Greg, go ahead please.

- Okay, so we would, as we've interpreted the motion, which is smarter than I made it, we would first, Trustee Cross's chair would move Ms. Evans' nomination. If it doesn't get a second, we're done. If it gets a second, we will go to a vote, and if she gets four votes, she will move on to the new semi-finals. If she doesn't get four votes, we're done. If she moves on to the new semi-finals, it will be five semi-finalists. We will each get one vote for each of those semi-finalists who will, and then we'll have to pair them down in some fashion to get to the seventh interviewee. But that's the process as I understand it right now. I can't see Mark nodding. I can see some other nods, but.

- Yeah, Mark.

- [Greg] Sorry to interrupt you, Mark. Thank you Chair Cross.

- You're welcome. Mark.

- [Mark] Yeah, thank you. Here's the thought I have that I think might be close as we can do to recreate that evening with her being involved. If we basically go through the six that were selected, and we know how many votes were used by each of us, so let's say, Lee, maybe four of your votes was in that six or, then you would have three more votes to redo that round. And so there would be some math included to figure this thing out and have to review the tape. But I think at that point in time, if you say, hey, Lee's got three votes now, Mark's got four, Dawn's got two, whatever it may be, and then we go through those remaining in the second round with those, would be how I think I would try to redo it. That would actually be as fairly as you possibly could and try to put it in the situation that she was actually there in the vote.

- If I may, the problem with that, Mark, is that we've already used our votes for the first round of people that we have just all voted, are already sealed in, and they were selected to move on to the final round. And so we've already used up a set of our votes for that group of people.

- [Mark] Correct.

- So the option is either resend a vote or add a vote.

- [Mark] What I'm saying is if we add a vote, let's say we move it from seven to eight, and then now let's say, so out of the six candidates made it through, Laura, let's say you voted for all six, then you would only get, then you would still get two votes to go back through the remainders again. You see what I'm saying? And if you voted for only four of yours got through, those are locked, those votes are locked in. The ones we voted for are locked. Whatever didn't get counted could be redone again. And I don't know, am I making myself clear on how I'm kind of getting at or what my thought is?

- A little confused. I think I might actually agree with you because, and let me say for the record here, I do not know Sonya Evans. My close friends and allies in positions of leadership and other civic groups don't know her. So part of my thinking was to open it up to two votes in the remaining semi-finalists was that there's no accusation that we opened this up for her and only her. So for starters, the other semi-

finalists didn't get the benefit of an eighth vote. So like I ran out of votes. I personally could not vote for Jerry Williams, Mr. Jerry Williams, who four of you did. But I was out of votes at that point. I didn't want any accusation that we opened this up for her and only her. So if we vote for her, imagine you're another applicant who's like, "Wow, they had this charade where they opened it up for her and only her." So out of an abundance of fairness, I had suggested to Dr. Bowne, and my rec, and I'll support this board. If four of you wanna do this, that's fine. I'll support it and administer it accordingly. Nevertheless, I beseech you to consider adding perhaps two more interviewees so that we are overly fair, and then we can interview whoever we want and move on. So I dunno, Mark, if that's what you meant, but I like the idea of adding even a wild card of a ninth vote. And then I know we're discussing here Trustee Musil's motion. I appreciate the gentleman making the motion. I do, I'm just saying I respectfully disagree on that split hair. But Trustee Rattan.

- I see what Mark is saying. So for instance, I had seven votes, but two of the candidates that I maybe voted for, or maybe it's three of the candidates you voted for. So, but the problem that creates is, Nancy may have three votes left, I might have two, Laura might have one, and it's just kind of funky. To uniformly, to make it more uniform, I do like Lee's modification. Someone had said the final vote, we all just get one. I like to say two. So that is kind of a hybrid between the only one vote and yours that is a non-uniform where people are gonna have different amounts of votes all over the place. So I like the two votes. I like the, we have to second her, then we have to get four votes for her in the initial round. Then in the final round we will consider her versus the other four with two votes instead of one.

- I accept that as a friendly amendment, Mr. Chair. Since Dawn's proposed it as the seconder.

- Yeah, and I was looking at my notes and documents of how we all voted. So I'm not goofing around. I appreciate your patience, but if we could restate the motion, and I'm not trying to be difficult. I just wanna be clear so we can move forward with a clear record.

- I move that we consider Ms. Evans's application initially in the same format as last Thursday in that the chair would move her, and if she gets a second, she would move on to the semi-final round. In the semi-final round we would have five candidates, the four from last week's semi-final round plus Ms. Evans. And each trustee would have two votes as we attempt to narrow that down to one or two at the maximum interviewees to add to the current six.

- I appreciate that. I love that actually. I thank you. Trustee Rattan, that's your understanding of the motion, and you second it, correct?

- I second-second it. Second-second.

- The motion has been made again and amended by Trustee Musil, and Trustee Rattan has confirmed her second. Any further discussion on this motion? Any discussion? Trustee Hamill, I can't see you, man, so I'm assuming no. If you don't have your hand up, but I'm just gonna offer it.

- [Mark] Go ahead.

- Okay. All those in favor of this amended motion, please signify by saying yes.

- [Board Members] Yes.

- Any opposed?

- [Mark] No.

- Okay, I have that the motion carries five to one. So Kelsey, Dr. Bowne, at this point, I think it would be my understanding, and I think Caitlin sent me a group of helpful documents. That's what I'm looking through now, so thank you.

- Thank you, Caitlin.

- Caitlin, I would think that I need to simply read Ms., I think it might be Dr., Dr. Sonya Evans's name, and I'll make that motion to consider her for the open position we have for trustees. Any second for Dr. Evans?

- Second.

- I have made the motion, and it has been seconded by Trustee Smith-Everett. Caitlin, would you please call the roll?

- Yes. Lee Cross?

- [Chair Cross] Yes.

- Nancy Ingram?

- No.

- [Caitlin] Laura Smith-Everett?

- Yes.

- [Caitlin] Mark Hamill?

- [Mark] Yes.

- [Caitlin] Greg Musil?

- No.

- [Caitlin] Dawn Rattan?

- Yes.

- It's four to two.

- Okay, so now, if memory holds and my understanding of procedure is correct, we now have five semi-finalists, and we each have two votes. So I lost my helpful documents. Lemme open those back up. I apologize.



- Can we have those finalist's names read back out?

- I planned it. Let me do that now. Or Caitlin-

- [Laura] Okay. Thank you.

- I'll do it. I don't care.

- Yeah, I can read 'em. I have 'em out right now.

- [Chair Cross] Please do so.

- So these are an alphabetical order now. It's Sonya Evans, Stephanie Maculas, Jerry Molnar, Ed Peterson, and Ken Selzer.

- Okay, so let's do it one more time 'cause I'm a slow learner. Sonya Evans. Stephanie Maculas. I've lost my place.

- Jerry Molnar, Jerry.

- Dr. Molnar, Ed Peterson and Ken Selzer. Is that right?

- [Greg] That is correct.

- [Dawn] Yes.

- Okay. So I believe we're ready to proceed. Is that right, Kelsey? Okay. So the first person on our list is, I think I just move again, right? My memory's failing me. I move Dr. Sonya Evans to be an applicant to be interviewed on January 9th.

- Can we just move directly to a vote? That doesn't have to be second at this time.

- Right.

- [Greg] Just vote it.

- Oh, simple enough, okay. Caitlin, if you'll call the roll.

- Nancy Ingram?

- [Nancy] No.

- Laura Smith-Everett?

- Yes.

- [Caitlin] Mark Hamill?

- [Mark] No.

- Greg Musil?

- [Greg] No.

- Dawn Rattan?

- Yes.

- Lee Cross?

- Yes.

- It's three to three.

- Well, I guess we have four more candidates, huh? Okay, so next we have Stephanie Maculas. Caitlin, if you'll please call the roll.

- Laura Smith-Everett?

- [Laura] Yes.

- Mark Hamill?

- [Mark] No.

- [Caitlin] Greg Musil?

- No.

- [Caitlin] Dawn Rattan?

- Yes.

- [Caitlin] Lee Cross.

- Abstain.

- [Caitlin] Nancy Ingram?

- No.

- The, excuse me, the next name I have is Dr. Molnar. Caitlin, is that right?

- Yes.

- Dr. Jerry Molnar. I move his nomination to be considered as, or he's the next on our list to be voted on for the interview process. Caitlin, if you'll please call the roll.

- Mark Hamill?

- [Mark] Yes.

- Greg Musil?

- No.

- [Caitlin] Dawn Rattan?

- No.

- [Caitlin] Lee Cross.

- Abstain.

- [Caitlin] Nancy Ingram?

- No.

- Laura Smith-Everett?

- [Laura] No.

- Okay, the next person I believe I have is Mr. Ed Peterson. Is that correct?

- [Greg] Yes.

- Okay. I move, Ed Peterson is next on our list to be considered for interview in the final process, the interview process for the open trustee position. Caitlin, if you'll please call the roll.

- Greg Musil?

- [Greg] No.

- Dawn Rattan?

- No.

- [Caitlin] Lee Cross.

- Abstain.

- [Caitlin] Nancy Ingram.

- Yes.

- Laura Smith-Everett?

- [Laura] No.

- Mark Hamill?

- [Mark] No.

- Thank you all. The next person on our list is, I believe it's former Kansas Insurance Commissioner, Ken Selzer. He's next to be voted upon. Caitlin, if you'll please call the roll.

- Dawn Rattan?

- [Dawn] No.

- Lee Cross.

- Please come back to me.

- [Caitlin] Nancy Ingram.

- Yes.

- [Caitlin] Laura Smith-Everett?

- No.

- [Caitlin] Mark Hamill?

- [Mark] Yes.

- [Caitlin] Greg Musil?

- Yes.

- [Caitlin] Lee Cross.

- Yes. So I believe that concludes our proceeding here today. We now have... My head is spinning, sorry.

- There was one candidate that received majority vote, which is Ken Selzer.

- Ken Selzer. So we have seven set for January 9th. Is there any other discussion or any other item that, well, I don't know that I can ask that, can I? I think we're done.

- Move we adjourn.

- Second.

- [Board Member] Second.

- The motion has been made by Trustee Musil, seconded by Laura Smith-Everette. I don't need to ask for discussion, right, Kelsey? Just- Okay, all those in favor, please signify by saying aye.

- [Board Members] Aye.

- [Mark] Aye.

- Those opposed. Motion carries. Thank you all for being here. Happy Holidays.

- Thank you all.

- [Mark] Thank you all very much.

- Thank you.