

Louisiana Developmental Disabilities Council
Executive Committee Meeting
July 20, 2022

AMY DEAVILLE: Good morning, everyone. We'll start in just a minute.

NICOLE BANKS: All right. So we're going to call to order.

JILL HANO: No.

AMY DEAVILLE: Jill, you're not muted. Just so that you know.

JILL HANO: Sorry.

NICOLE BANKS: All right. Good morning, everyone. The quarterly meeting for the executive committee for Louisiana Developmental Disability Council will come to order. So I want to acknowledge all of our people that are in-person and then acknowledge all of our Zoom people. We have Dr. McKee, Ms. Jill Hano. And that's our committee members. We're going to get our roll call from Ms. Deaville.

AMY DEAVILLE: Sure. Nicole Banks.

NICOLE BANKS: I am present.

AMY DEAVILLE: Dr. McKee.

HYACINTH MCKEE: Present.

AMY DEAVILLE: Kim Basile.

KIM BASILE: Present.

AMY DEAVILLE: Jill Hano.

JILL HANO: Present.

AMY DEAVILLE: Rashad Bristo. You have a quorum to proceed.

NICOLE BANKS: All right. Thanks. At this time we will have Ms. Deaville read the mission statement and our ground rules.

AMY DEAVILLE: Mission statement of the Louisiana Developmental Disabilities Council is to increase independence, self-determination, productivity, integration and inclusion for Louisianians with developmental disabilities by engaging in advocacy, capacity building and systems change.

Teleconference meeting protocols. Council meetings shall be accessible via Zoom and live streamed on YouTube. Council or committee members will

participate via Zoom and shall be considered present when they display a live feed video of their face with their first and last name. Have microphones muted unless called upon by the chairperson. Electronically raise their hand to request the chair recognize them to speak. Once recognized to speak by the chair their microphone should be turned on. After speaking, microphone should be returned to mute. Guests may participate via Zoom or observe meetings live on YouTube. All public meetings shall be recorded and may be made available on the council's YouTube channel as deemed appropriate by the chairperson. Public comment submitted during a meeting via any format should be considered. During a Zoom meeting, guests may electronically raise their hand to request to comment. Upon being recognized to speak by the chair, their microphone should be turned on. After speaking the microphone should be returned to mute. Post comments relevant to the item under consideration in the chat box. Public comments of a person's character will not be heard. If the comment continues after being asked to stop by the chairperson, council staff may be instructed to end the meeting. The chairperson will notify the executive committee of this occurrence. Council chair will seek guidance to determine if it's legally appropriate to redact or share the video of the meeting on the council's social media.

NICOLE BANKS: Okay. Thank you, Amy. All right. The next item of business is approval of the minute summary from January 19th executive committee meeting which was distributed. The meeting summary will not be read unless requested by a member. Are there any corrections? Ms. Jill. You have the floor, Jill.

JILL HANO: Did you say January? Because my agenda says April.

AMY DEAVILLE: It should be April minutes.

NICOLE BANKS: Oh, okay. I'm sorry. It is the April minutes. Thank you for that correction, Jill. If there is no objection, the meeting summary is approved and disputed. All right. Seeing none in the chat box and hearing none, the meeting summary is approved as disputed. Are there any other corrections? Any other comments? All right. Then the meeting

summary is approved as corrected.

AMY DEAVILLE: As presented. Cause there were no corrections.

NICOLE BANKS: Oh, okay. All right. So our next item of business is membership committee recommendations. I'm going to open the floor at this time for discussion. Jill, you have the floor.

JILL HANO: No.

NICOLE BANKS: Can you see it now?

JILL HANO: Wait. Why do I have the floor?

NICOLE BANKS: Cause I thought you raised your hand.

JILL HANO: Oh, sorry. It was just positioned weird.

NICOLE BANKS: Okay. All right. So we have up here is a motion that was entertained at our last membership committee meeting. And these are the recommendations. So we motioned that Erick Taylor and Maria Casserta be recommended for a government appointment as self-advocate members for the DD Council. And that Brooke Stewart and Rononda Washington be recommended for the government appointment as parent advocates to the DD Council. That was motioned by Rashad and seconded by Shannon. So the motion passed unanimously approval.

Then we also had another motion that the membership ad hoc committee conduct a full committee interview with the nonprofit applications for the purposes of deciding their candidate. Following the meeting where they made the final decision, full council gave approval to the membership ad hoc committee to forward that recommendation for the government appointment. And that motion was Bambi and seconded by Rashad and it passed approval. So we're opening up the floor for us to discuss both of these and we take these to the council. And also how we're going to move forward in regards to the nonprofit selections. Everybody's in agreement? Okay. All right. I'll entertain the motions regarding the membership recommendations.

AMY DEAVILLE: Jill has her hand raised.

NICOLE BANKS: Jill, you have the floor.

JILL HANO: Okay. So I've kind of been wondering,

so every membership committee is handled different. Like I know the vice chair, this is the first membership committee that was with our new vice chair. And I was wondering, like I know last committee or a couple committees ago that Dr. McKee had it chaired, there was protocols. Like, first of all, who-- I'm just curious as to who wrote those protocols. And how long were they to be in place. And also, every membership committee seems to be run a little differently. Do we have any guidance from ACL or any or like national DDC? Like last time or a couple times ago we got bios. And I'm on board with this motion because-- God, I think I don't even know who it was. It might not have been Dr. McKee. It might have been-- no. It was Dr.-- I don't remember. But we did the full committee interviews and I really liked it. But I also really liked that the bios were sent to the council members. And like I still don't know what our federal requirement is. (Inaudible). Like should it be done, I feel like I know this answer, but should it be done in an open session or closed session. And I just kind of want to discuss like how membership committee need to like, for lack of a better term, some general protocols conducting a membership committee. And what does ACL say about-- no. In April, we did say it was public. Okay. Correct?

AMY DEAVILLE: Right. So the ACL, the only real guidance that they give on membership, is what the DD Act requires. In terms of the demographic makeup of your council and the state agencies, that must be on your council. And other than that, they don't give a whole lot of guidance. In fact, I asked about what some other states do and was told that many other states don't, those councils don't have the opportunity to really engage in the membership process at all. The governors appoint everyone on the council. So there's not a whole lot of guidance there because every state is different, and some governors do all of the appointments. I don't think that there are a lot of councils that have the opportunity to do what our council is able to do in terms of helping to make recommendations to the governor about appointments.

JILL HANO: Because I'm saying my envision is that

if I'm an applicant, like the fun was like getting a call saying, oh, congratulations. You made appointment to the DD Council. But now if I'm an applicant I can watch the Zoom meeting and like just like see on a live feed what my peers think of me. Cause my big thing in life is another person's opinion of you is none of your business. But like I can sit there and watch people say okay she-- I mean, I'm fabulous so I'm not nervous. But you can watch people on a live feed give their opinion of you.

NICOLE BANKS: So that's where we came into the discussion when we were in the membership committee meeting. We can't have a whole where everyone meets to discuss and to interview all these people cause it will resonate a quorum. So when there's a quorum there then public, it has to be up on a Zoom where it's as a live thing. So that's why we were trying to avoid it being an altogether thing and just break it down into different ones. But they brought up a very good point at the meeting because it was like what someone else may think is a five, somebody else might think is a three. So we have to come to a more concrete solution of how we interview them and just the process and, you know, how everyone sees it. So it wouldn't be a bias, basically.

HYACINTH MCKEE: I have a comment about that. If I can speak to what Jill is asking. Just let me know when I can be recognized.

NICOLE BANKS: Dr. McKee, you have the floor.

HYACINTH MCKEE: Thank you. So thank you, Jill. And I'm going to try my best to answer your question. So yes, membership committees are ran differently. From what I understand, each vice chair is charged with leading that membership committee. And there really isn't, like Amy said, a whole guidance around it from ACLU. Right. They don't like give us what we need. But I can only speak from past experience in being responsible for chairing. Historically, we've had some issues where we've had some concerns from the public, to be frankly honest, about how people were being selected to serve on the DD Council in terms of being very subjective. In that, the public was not being afforded the opportunity to be present during the

selection. The public had some concerns about who was actually being selected and placed in these seats. And actually what were we using to even engage in dialogue to start even deciding who would be the best fit. With that being said, we've also had experiences where the DD Council was recorded to different authorities in the state of concerns about transparency regarding who was selected to be on the council. And had to write letters to respond to those concerns about the selection process.

And so prior to this rubric, if you will, that was developed, there really wasn't any type of guide other than a simple application, an interview by a committee membership person with the applicant. And then there was a conversation about who would be best fit. But there was nothing standard other than the application that was used. So our response to make sure that the public seat filled, that the selection process was more transparent, a rubric was developed. Now the rubric is not supposed to be utilized as the sole means of deciding who is on, serves on the council. The rubric just serves as a guide. As a way to facilitate engaging conversation using the same standardization in terms of categories in order to start that conversation. It is not the end-all be-all. Nor should it have ever been used in that way. But what it was doing was trying to minimize the subjectivity in the selection process. You cannot completely eliminate any subjectivity when you're selecting for anybody on any type of council, memberships or boards. Period. That is not realistic. But what you can do is make your best effort to ensure that the public does feel that there is some type of standardized objective screening tool that can be used to facilitate the dialogue and conversation about selecting someone to be on the council.

So I think that some of-- so the concern that I have is if not this objective tool, which is not the end all be all, what will be the standardized tool that can be used to initiate conversation that the public can feel that there is some sense of transparency in the screening and vetting of individuals of being on the council. That's number one. Number two, to your

point Jill, yes. We did start instituting where bios were sent to all of the full council members so that they can actually see who they're voting for. The process before was, you know, these are the names that we feel that we should do, and the full council should rubber stamp that. We have worked very hard to move away from that practice and to allow the full council to really see who they're voting for. To get the bios. To get the person's name. You know, and then the full council can say, you know what, we've reviewed this. We had an opportunity to see this individual. We have an idea. Okay. So now we will move without full approval. But again, I'm not certain what the direction is, Jill, to answer your question. I'm hoping that whatever the council decides moving forward that we continue to lean upon being very transparent, having a standardized process that can facilitate that conversation. Not necessarily be the end-all be-all. But to at least show that hey, every single person that went through this application process has some type of standardization in order to help the full council make an informed decision on who should be seated. I cannot speak to the membership meeting that just took place recently cause I'm no longer serving in that capacity or serving on the membership committee. So I hope that was able to shed some light.

AMY DEAVILLE: And I will say too, we did request bios from these four individuals. It's a really tight turnaround. So we asked them to have them in by today. But because it's a tight turnaround, I don't know that we'll receive all four. But I'm hoping that we will have them for tomorrow's meeting.

JILL HANO: Okay. And if you do, you'll either email them or upload them onto the website?

AMY DEAVILLE: Yes, ma'am.

JILL HANO: Okay. Cool. So the four names, because I did watch the membership committee and I know that-- so the only interviews you're conducting are for the nonprofit candidates, right?

AMY DEAVILLE: Correct.

NICOLE BANKS: Correct.

JILL HANO: And then so if we have these four names, if we give these four bios by full council

meeting these four citizen members will be posted, correct?

AMY DEAVILLE: Right. They'll be forwarded to the governor's office for his appointment.

JILL HANO: Got ya.

NICOLE BANKS: You have the floor.

KIM BASILE: Is it possible for us to get right now before we vote on this motion, for us to get the applicants' questionnaire that they submitted, and you can redact anything on them that we can't see? But I would feel more comfortable seeing something in writing verses just names on a board.

NICOLE BANKS: Right. That's what I was going to say. Like I was going to suggest that, you know, cause when we were interviewing these people and the questions we had to write down what they were saying, right. So when you were writing down what they were saying, I feel like that should be uploaded too. Because that is what, that's what they initially answered the interview on. So if the members that interviewed these people the first time, if they can give us the questionnaire that was filled out and that had to be filled out, the questions that had to be answered. If they can give us those and we can read over them, we'll have a better, you know, we'll have a better understanding of this candidate since they all scored high. Everybody was like perfect except for one of them had a half a point off. So when we have something like that, then we can go off of what was already said. Because they had to write it down. They had to put it in there. Has to write what the person said. So if that can happen, then we probably can move forward a little because we then, again, have a better idea of who these people are from the first interview.

HYACINTH MCKEE: Is it possible to have the floor? I can't work this thing.

NICOLE BANKS: Go ahead.

HYACINTH MCKEE: I'm sorry about that. I think that what's the challenge, again you know, I think passing the baton is a very good thing, right. But I think what the challenge is and what we're going to come across is that we do not want the public's distrust. We do not want the public to feel or, you

know, or just feel like they, or even the council rather, do not clearly know who they're selecting. And I'm hearing that is a concern. And that's a concern. The council, from my experience, may have been uncomfortable with just seeing names on the board and not having an informed way, you know, way to make an informed decision. That was the challenge that we've had in the past. It seems to be a recurring theme of who do we feel collectively that can serve in this role sitting and making these huge decisions. And so, you know, to the council members concerns, which you will hear, Nicole, if you don't, you know, try your best to make sure you're being transparent, is going to be who are these people, right. Who is this person that's sitting next to us. Who's making these decisions and being part of this conversation. So again, you will need to try to do the best that you can to make sure that the council is comfortable in that. And, you know, a bio is a way. But they really need it ahead of time. What I'm learning, what I've learned, they need it prior to now in order to make an informed decision. And I know that we have a short window of time and all of that. But again, you know, if you don't do it in that manner, then you will lend to that public distrust which you don't want to walk in. And so the recommendation that Kim is making, and Kim I'm not speaking for you, or even Jill, is one that they cannot make a decision without being fully informed. And they're not comfortable. So I'm not sure how you can get that done within the next, you know, couple of hours before bringing that before the full council.

NICOLE BANKS: We have the bios. But, you know, like when I did one of the applicants that's up there, when she was speaking, I just have that kind of computer. I know everybody don't have that technology. But when she was speaking it was typing what she was saying. So I have everything that this lady said in the interview. You know, what we were supposed to be typing out. We read the question, we're supposed to type their responses. So that is definitely a way of being transparent because we're writing what they said in the interview and we're putting it on paper, and we can upload it and send it when we send our rate sheet.

You know, when we send that. And then that way that would be transparent because that should have already been done. Literally, that should have already been done because all of these people have already been interviewed. So that should have already been done. Like I have my person's one. The people that I interviewed, I have theirs where they wrote down everything that they said. So everyone should have that already anyway. Am I correct?

JILL HANO: I never write down people's answers, but like I know the criteria. So when I go to present the membership committee I came from, like even though I'm not writing down these answers, like I know that when I talk to this person, I know that I'm looking for A,B,C and D. And then so I have CP. I don't really legibly, or I don't really functionally, write. So like I don't write the answers down. I just take out like knowledge of DD Act. Like oh, my God. I don't know any other criteria. But like, and then I present it to whatever membership I'm on. Whatever membership committee is happening. So that's a different process too. But I do have a few more comments, Ms. Banks, if allowed.

NICOLE BANKS: Go ahead, Jill.

JILL HANO: Cause listening to what everybody's saying and listening to y'all today, there seems to be a very fine line between transparency and protecting someone's rights. So I don't know if like we need to come up with some kind of, like, happy medium that shows that we want to be transparent and then shows that-- and also protect the rights of the applicant. Which is also I think common sense too. Because if I know that there have been people on membership committees that say the person, like give, like the person answers a question, but then goes into heavy detail. Which, I mean, you also want to respect that they trust you. But you also want to be transparent. So it's like, where's the line. And like I think that kind of, we need to kind of establish some guidelines for that. Thanks, Hannah.

NICOLE BANKS: Okay. Thank you, Jill. Well, I'm going to try to come up with, or we can collectively come up with a plan. But I really thought that we were

supposed to be writing their responses down as a person was saying as best as we could. I mean, that's the only way that we can truly be transparent as far as the interview process. That will eliminate this all the way around because if we're writing what they're saying and then we're giving it to a council to look over it also. That's all the transparency. I mean, that's what they said in the interview. So that should be done. That should be done. And I'm going to have to come up, or we can come up with a way to put that in protocol for the responses to be written down. Cause something may have been forgotten. Something may have, you know, you can't just go off the top of your, you know, just thinking about a person. Especially if you, like I know I interviewed four people.

JILL HANO: Can we call the question?

NICOLE BANKS: Just wait a minute. Okay, Jill. Just one minute, okay. But we have to be able to hold our own selves accountable for why we sit up on this committee. We have to, when we do our interviews, we have to, there's no other way for us to know that, what we have. I know that we're supposed to write responses, right? Did anybody else did it? Kim, did you do yours?

KIM BASILE: I wasn't on the committee. I know that when I did sit on the committee, we were instructed that whatever we wrote down had to be destroyed immediately.

NICOLE BANKS: What? See, I never was told that.

AMY DEAVILLE: If you do an interview with a person and you then share all the information that you got from that person in the interview, you might as well just had the interview in a public meeting. Because once you've distributed it out to everyone, you have given their private information out to other people.

NICOLE BANKS: So how can we truly be transparent then?

AMY DEAVILLE: Well, I mean, that's where we have to figure out where that line is. I don't have the answer to that.

NICOLE BANKS: So do we like sum it up? I mean, I'm going to put that out there right now. Like do we sum it up or do we-- I'm open to suggestions for that.

I know Dr. McKee you were going to-- I see your hand, Jill. You have the floor.

HYACINTH MCKEE: Who has the floor? Jill or myself? I don't know.

NICOLE BANKS: Jill, she had her hand raised unless that's from the last time.

HYACINTH MCKEE: Oh, okay. I will defer to Jill if she wants to speak.

JILL HANO: Okay. Kim made a good point. Because I was never told on a membership committee to destroy all my notes. However, I was told on a PIP selection committee to destroy my notes. So my angle is what is the difference between a membership interview and a PIP interview?

NICOLE BANKS: Amy.

AMY DEAVILLE: There really shouldn't be one. The only thing that I will say is that becoming a member of the council you are becoming part of a public entity. Becoming a participant in Partners in Policymaking, you're a classmate. You don't have that same expectation of everything being public as you do as a member of the council.

NICOLE BANKS: All right. Jill, did she answer your question?

JILL HANO: That puts a lot of prospective on it. Thank you.

NICOLE BANKS: All right. Dr. McKee, you have the floor.

HYACINTH MCKEE: One, I do have a hard stop at 9:30, so once I jump off, I'm not sure if you all will have a quorum. I want to say that publicly. I have another meeting to go to. Number two, I find it almost humorous how people suddenly, you know, their recollection of events changes daily. No one was instructed to destroy their notes immediately. The only issue was if there had information on those notes that was a HIPPA violation or that someone disclosed that was very personal. The concern-- and this is the thing. We've done this, Nicole, back and forth. I'm telling you, we've had the AG come in the DD council to question membership protocol. We have gone through this for two and half years, literally, since I've been on. So hopefully the membership committee that you

will chair will come up with a protocol that would address all of the issues. Transparency, public's trust in the selection process, HIPPA and making sure we're protecting people's rights like Jill did speak of. Hopefully the membership committee, as moving forward, will be able to do that. So having a sound committee. But I do not want to discredit the efforts of all of vice chairs, including myself, and prior to that, and prior to that, and prior to that trying to get to a place to meet all of the needs and respond to all the concerns as it relates to membership process. It is not something that's an easy task. It is not a one person's task. And recognizing and appreciating all the efforts that everyone has done to this point to get it to this place. So in saying that, I'm not sure how we're going to move forward. I don't know if we want to call the question. But I will be jumping off. I have a hard stop at 9:30. So I'm not certain what the direction will be happening once I jump off.

NICOLE BANKS: Okay.

AMY DEAVILLE: So I will say that this actually does not require a vote from the executive committee because the recommendation is to go to the full council. So the full council will vote. So you don't need to call the question because you don't need to vote.

HYACINTH MCKEE: Great. Thank you so much. I have a hard stop right at 9:30.

NICOLE BANKS: Okay. Dr. McKee, because I'm over the committee and I know you've done it before, I definitely want to hear, you know, what you guys tried to do in the past or whatever, you know. If you don't mind. Not right now.

HYACINTH MCKEE: Yeah. It will not be right now.

NICOLE BANKS: Yeah. Not right now.

HYACINTH MCKEE: It will not be right now.

NICOLE BANKS: Yeah. But if I can reach out to you up on another date or something like that. I just want to, you know, get a rundown of what you guys tried in the past. You know, maybe we can just revamp it. Or, you know, we can all collectively come up with something. But I don't want to come up with something you guys already tried before, you know. That's just

where I'm trying to get with it. I don't want to keep going around and around and around if we've already tried that.

EBONY HAVEN: Ms. Banks, there's a member of the public who has their hand raised.

KIM BASILE: Nicole, can I say something first?

NICOLE BANKS: Wait. Hold on. We'll get the committee and then we'll get to you, Kim. Okay?

KIM BASILE: Okay.

NICOLE BANKS: Go ahead for the public member. She has the floor.

CORHONDA CORLEY: Good morning, everyone. This is Corhonda Corley, proud parent and disabilities advocate nationally. First and foremost, thank you, Vice Chair Banks, for allowing me the opportunity to speak. One, when I was on the Partners in Policymaking ad hoc committee, I am a Partners in policymaking alumni as well as I do nationally lot of things as it relates to advocacy. One of the things that Dr. McKee and former council member Ms. Sonnier Victorian, one of the things that they did before was they tried to get the council to actually do a nondisclosure as it relate to the people that are applying to be DD Council members. That would have actually been effective and that would actually help you in the process right now. Because it would allow those individuals that are going to be council members to know that we're not going to violate HIPPA in any shape or form. And that their protected information would be protected and remain protected. But Dr. McKee and Ms. Sonnier Victorian, they received a lot of pushback because a lot of people at that time on the council are not, did not understand the law of HIPPA. HIPPA is the law that covers you as it relates to any of your personal information in the medical arena. But it would have actually allowed us the same protection as people that would have sat on the council.

Now as it relates to Partners in Policymaking. Let's not get the two construed. The Partners in Policymaking individuals actually know upfront that when they apply to be in Partners in Policymaking that it's held in a conference room. All of your meetings are held in a conference room. So the open public can

actually just pass by and open a door and come in. Is it made a safe space for the people that are in Partners in Policymaking to actually be able to speak up and vent or say whatever they want and actually be able to ask questions in a professional manner? Yes. But are your rights and your information, have we ever had anybody sign a nondisclosure. Absolutely not. Because it is held in a conference room. It always has been. We always had a running contract with Embassy Suites. That is where the meetings are held for Partners in Policymaking. And I think that what you would do is you would not, it would actually hurt people from actually forming the relationships. I have plenty of pictures and videos from when I was in Partners in Policymaking. Kim Basile was actually in my class. So when I state that we had relationships, everyone have relationships and bonding time. Yes. But if you start having Partners in Policymaking to do nondisclosures and hold them to the same level that we hold council members, then what you're going to do is you're going to interfere with them actually developing the relationships that they should be able to do. Partners in Policymaking is a national thing that actually allow people to learn how to advocate. But I think right now what we're having is that people not understanding what the contract is for Partners in Policymaking and how it actually should run, how it actually need to be ran, etc. And I think maybe our program manager might be the one that's having the problem. I mean, after all, this is a contract. It's plain and simple of how it should be ran. And if there are any questions dealing with Partners in Policymaking, bring back that Partners in Policymaking ad hoc. Which was nothing but Partners in Policymaking alumni. Bring that back. And if you bring that back, then we can actually answer a lot of these questions as well as there is a national board that deals with Partners in Policymaking.

But what we have to make sure is, is that our program directors actually know what they're supposed to do. And I think that's where we have the problem. We have too many people that are new that don't know what their role is. That don't know what they're

supposed to be doing. And that is where the problems are being created. And so if we're going to do things correct and do it right, we have to make sure that we actually bring national to the table. National. Bring people that actually know what's doing it. I'm not putting the fault or the blame on our executive director, but we do have to take into consideration that we do have a new executive director. We have a new deputy director. The only person that has been with the DD Council the longest is the gentleman that is not the executive or the deputy. That's one person. He's been here the longest. And I think that right now what we need to do is we need to actually have our former deputy and former executive director be consultants. Because there is a disconnect and it's because we are in the blind because the individuals that are supposed to lead us do not know. And when you can talk, when we can get to a point to discuss legislative session, I will be able to elaborate on how that is creating a problem legislative wise. Thank you so much for the opportunity to speak.

NICOLE BANKS: Okay. Thank you, Ms. Corley. We're going to move onto the next, Ms. Kim Basile.

KIM BASILE: I want to state that my memory doesn't fail me. And that I did confirm with staff that under previous staff I was asked, and everyone was required to sign something when we joined the membership committee stating we would not divulge anything outside of that committee. And that once we were finished, we had to either destroy our notes or they had to be mailed back to Shawn's attention. So that was under-- that did happen. It was under prior staff.

NICOLE BANKS: Okay. Okay. So it seems like we would have to have another meeting where we have to come up with protocol in regards to how we're going to handle the interview process moving forward so that we as the council don't get any kind of indiscrepancies(sic) in regards to transparency, in regards to how we're doing things and how things are set up. And also how things are measured and how we're picking the members of the DD Council. So we may have to table this because we only have seven minutes. We have seven minutes left. And I know that's not going

to get completely done. But I'm here to entertain at least one suggestion. No suggestions? Okay. All right. So if there's not any further business, no other comments, no other anything, we're going to adjourn the meeting at this point. So we want to thank you guys for all your hard work and all of the things that we have done. We're going to bring these motions. We're going to bring all of this to the council meeting for tomorrow. The two motions that we had earlier. Okay.

HYACINTH MCKEE: I have a comment. Hold on. Hold on. I'm seeing, I'm looking at Jill's face right now and I'm not comfortable with adjourning. And I don't know what the protocol is about this. And I know, Jill, I only have five minutes left and I have a hard stop. But I can see on your face that--

JILL HANO: (Inaudible)

HYACINTH MCKEE: Yeah. So I'm thinking that if someone could speak to her offline and try to-- I would love to do that, Jill. I have a meeting at 9:30. But I'm not, I'm concerned that we haven't really come to a place of resolution that's comfortable for everyone. And then also we did have an attendee who did have his hand raised. And I don't know if that individual was acknowledged as well. And I'm not sure, cause I did see an attendee hand raised. So we didn't leave that opportunity for that public member to speak. But if they don't want to speak, that's fine. But I just want to say on the record maybe someone could reach out to Jill. Jill, I wish it was me, but I have a 9:30. I'm so sorry about that.

NICOLE BANKS: We still have more time. We have five minutes. If you want to say something.

EBONY HAVEN: Dr. Michel has his hand raised. And he was the public member. He put his hand down, but he raised it again.

NICOLE BANKS: You have the floor.

CHARLIE MICHEL: Thank you. I just want to say that y'all conversation is really good. And it seemed like y'all were all right. I listened to what Hyacinth proposed and it seems really good. I listened to what Nicole was talking about. Jill's comment, though, I think has kind of been overlooked a little bit in that

whatever the procedure is if writing the answers to the questions, which is what we typically do, there needs to be something in there to accommodate those people who can't physically write. And whether that's recorded, whatever it is. But the thing is, Hyacinth, you said something about the procedure or the lack of transparency. And that has been an issue for a long time. What you're suggesting is great. I think if y'all come up with something it won't fit for this particular meeting tomorrow. There's no way to get it done. But anything you write down, if it's not destroyed immediately after the interview, my understanding is it becomes then a matter of public record. Along with the resumes and everything else. I don't think that's a bad thing because if I'm applying for a position whether it's employment-- cause I do this with job applicants when I was in special ed at the school district and now in my current position. Write it down. It's good because then it is a more objective way for other people to feel what you've done.

And Hyacinth, you were right also. Unless you're going to do it in a public meeting venue, you really can't do more than a quorum. You can't do a quorum in there because then it just brings all this other stuff. Not that you don't want to necessarily have it public, but it's not maybe as efficient as it could be if y'all did it and then shared the information. Again, it won't work for tomorrow, but I think the discussion needs to land on a written procedure and protocol that will meet everyone's needs. It meets the needs of those people with disabilities that will prevent them from doing some aspects of it. It also defines the line between what is transparent and what is violating people's right. And in my opinion, that line is sharing it amongst yourselves, the resumes and the answers to the questions. That's not violating their rights. They have applied to a full council for a recommendation. You might blur the line and actually cross the line if you were to post the resumes, post the interview stuff. That would possibly, probably violate their rights. So just keep that in mind and whatever y'all do for tomorrow's meeting, it's going to

be what y'all are going to do. But for the next opportunity comes up, I think you take parts of what Hyacinth said, part of what Jill said, part of what Nicole said and y'all already have the protocol. You just have to put it down in writing and kind of get it all looped, melded together. I think this discussion has been very healthy. It just hadn't come to fruition yet, but it will.

NICOLE BANKS: Thank you, Dr. Michael. I definitely appreciate it. We will have more.

JILL HANO: Michel.

NICOLE BANKS: Jill. Oh, wait. Do I have another attendee with their hand raised?

AMY DEAVILLE: That's still Dr. Michel.

NICOLE BANKS: Oh, that's still--okay. Does anybody have any more questions? Cause that is a point. Like I have that kind of technology where you don't have to write. You don't have to, you know, put it. If you can't type, you can just talk, and it will just write it out. But not everybody has that. So that's just something that we definitely can bring up for the next time. But what we can do moving forward and bring to the council is that we're going to come up with a concrete plan in writing where we can move forward in the interview process in regards to protocol, how it has to be done, what information we're collecting and how it's collected. And how is it going to be transparent to the public so we don't have that indiscrepancy(sic). So we're going to bring that to the council tomorrow. Because we have to come up with that. We have to come up with that in order for us to move effectively and have something in place so that we don't keep running into these brick walls years to pass. You know, even when I'm not here. We still need to have something in place that's measurable and concrete that we can see in writing. So we're taking all of what we had talked about today into consideration and we're going to present that part to the council. Can you put that on there, Amy?

AMY DEAVILLE: That you'll have a written protocol?

NICOLE BANKS: That we'll come up with a written protocol because I can't, what, I'm doing it on my own?

HYACINTH MCKEE: You mean your membership committee

will come up with a written protocol.

NICOLE BANKS: Yeah. A membership committee.
Yeah.

HYACINTH MCKEE: Will not be executive.

NICOLE BANKS: The membership. That's what I meant
to say.

HYACINTH MCKEE: Have a great day, you guys.

JILL HANO: Thank you.

NICOLE BANKS: Thank you, Dr. McKee. And we will
have to come up with a time, a place. You know, a time
that is good for everybody for us to discuss this.
Because this needs to happen. All right. Now, is
there any other questions or comments from anyone in
regards to what we have discussed today? All right.
Since there's no objections and there's no comments,
I'm going to call the meeting adjourned. Thank you,
guys, for all of your hard work and your participation.