

MEETING #428
OREGON STUDENT ACCESS COMMISSION
Wednesday, April 10, 2013

DAS - Executive Building (DAS West)
Main Floor – Conference Room B
155 Cottage Street NE
Salem, OR 97301

COMMISSIONERS

Glenda Melton
Gary Weeks
Shawn Fincher
Mike Holland
Bart Howard

STAFF

Vic Nunenkamp, Interim Chief Operating Officer
Bob Brew, Interim Executive Director
Thomas Ridder, IT Staff

GUESTS

Brent Wilder, The Alliance
Susie Hosie, DAS HR

(by telephone)

Norm Smith, The Ford Family Foundation
Denise Callahan, The Ford Family Foundation
Tricia Tate, The Ford Family Foundation

CALL TO ORDER

Chair Weeks called the meeting to order at 3:00 p.m. Having a quorum present, the meeting proceeded.

PRIVATE AWARD APPLICATION AND THE FORD FAMILY FOUNDATION PROCESS

Chair Weeks stated he wished to set the stage for the purpose of meeting: Staff has worked many months to stay on top of the grant program and is now struggling with the private awards program. He stated there are consequences for people that work with us and that is the reason for having the conversation and they need to talk about how things will be managed from this point forward with the IT challenges we have.

Chair Weeks stated that, in addition to the private awards program, the commission has thoughts about the governor's budget recommendation for a brand new system and they need to be sure we have the right people in place and oversight in place for us to move forward with the governor's support. He stated he takes responsibility for the challenges that some commissioners feel have not been fully explained and will make sure all are well informed and educated about challenges talked about repeatedly in meetings. He stated they have heard we are making progress; staff is working long hours and we are close to getting there. This is not about the Ford Family Foundation or for discussion about challenges dealt with- it's about what do to differently in the future. How do we prepare to build new system and how to transition to the governor's vision for higher education? He does not want us to drop a challenge of this nature into the lap of a new commission (the HECC). The transition to the

governor's vision will be with us having a good handle on things and not dropping a bag of problems on the new commission.

Chair Weeks stated if it appears they are asking penetrating or probing questions, understand we have to be clear on how we got here and how we are going to get into a better situation.

Chair Weeks asked if any commissioners had anything to add to the opening remarks.

Commissioner Howard commented that he is concerned about misinterpreted challenges and he is very worried now and wants to find out how confident staff is about fixing private scholarships and getting private awards and Opportunity Grant awards out on time. He referenced a prior email from Sue Strauslin where she stated the project would be a disaster; Josette, and later Bob and Vic stated everything would be fine, and he stated one of you had to be right - this leaves him thinking we missed the boat on this. He stated we have to do something; it's now April; it's been nine months of mistakes and going forward, though he does not want to dwell on it, staff knows there are problems.

Commissioner Holland that he has been an active participant in discussions and paid attention during meetings, but he is shocked to learn now that we are not providing the deliverables to our partners. We are not fixed yet, but we have to pay attention to what the problems are and fixing them; the Commission needs to have confidence that we have fixed it so that the Commission can answer with confidence, when asked. They are hoping at the end of day to end up with a concrete fix strategy plan to provide a roadmap out of this. How did we get here? Where we are right now regarding the Opportunity Grants and private awards? These are fiduciary responsibilities and failure is not acceptable; our responsibilities are not negotiable. At the end of the day, we want to be apprised of the problem and where the responsibility is; we want a concrete strategy to get this fixed.

Vice Chair Melton asked where we are now and stated she is regrettably not a technology person; when people say, "yes we can do this", she believes them. She stated they didn't listen to the right things and now thinks the greatest need is to come up with plan that will get us out of this with as few persons as possible. She said she wishes they had Susan back; she doesn't know if we can't get her back or if there is even a program left.

Commissioner Fincher stated at this point we have to go full steam ahead and stay focused on what we can do to make it work; make sure staff have the resources needed so they are not going at it alone and as a group we will get there.

Chair Weeks asked where we are today and said let's answer that question. He has been told staff are working hard but that's not enough; it's not going to cut it anymore. They need to know the best estimate of where we are and they will bring on resources. At the end of the day, we will have a plan and bring people in committed to help. Staff needs to tell us where we are, what they think we need to do to get on top of this problem right away.

Bob Brew stated that the Opportunity Grant program is at no risk. It lives in the legacy system, and Sue Strauslin is on contract to provide maintenance to that system. He provided background and clarifying information about the difference between the old and new systems. One being relational based (Legacy/old system); the other (new) being object oriented. The new scholarship system is a standalone system that is fundamentally different. The vision to restructure the application predates his tenure by at least one year. Statistics show 99% of databases is relational; 1% is object oriented. What

this has meant is when we reached out to community colleges, DAS, staff and partners for help, we could not find a single other programmer that has the skills to work in the object oriented environment. We are left with Jordi doing his job literally 12-16 hours a day, 7 days a week; Brandon is learning this system but is not an expert. They are the only programming resources at this point that we can find. He stated he hadn't realized the problem of fundamental differences in the programs back in February and March stating the incompatibility between the two systems is similar to the incompatibility between Apple and IBM (Windows); they are two different languages and communicating between the two systems is extremely difficult. The fundamental differences between the two systems create several issues.

Bob Brew stated the Scholarship application is about 95% there; it's good and gets data into the system. Now, getting information out of the system to complete the rest of the process is the challenge. Ford is unique in that they are first in line and require reporting and query information at the same time. There are three phases to the program: the scholarship application itself, which students complete; the query process; and the reporting process. Ford requires both the 2nd and 3rd steps at same time in order to select their awardees. They are seeing all of our flaws right up front. All of the tools exist in the legacy system, but because of the inability of the old system to talk to the new system we cannot access the data. Jordi is creating queries in the new environment. Jordi and Bandon are doing a good job given the situation that we find ourselves in. Bob feels for Jordi as he has not had a role in how the system would be created and he's never been through the awarding process before.

Chair Weeks stated we made decision to go with the object oriented system. When we made that decision, did we know there were no programmers available to do this work? Why wouldn't we have known that?

Bob Brew stated the decision was made by one member of the IT staff who felt confident he had skills to learn the programming. This was challenged by Sue Strauslin, who later left the organization. At that point, the initial assertion went unchallenged.

Chair Weeks asked at what point did we realize we can't do this.

Thomas Ridder stated when OSAC pursued bringing in additional staff from CCWD, their lead programmer and his supervisor reviewed our system and discussed it with us; we then began to realize the diversity and difficulty of the situation; it became apparent that key decisions had never reached management. What was presented to management were the major advantages and benefits to this approach and we are finding out now that was short-sighted; it was never determined how the mission would be accomplished and it appears there was short-sighted project planning.

Bob Brew introduced Thomas Ridder as a member of the IT staff, and stated Thomas has been keeping the rest of the organization going from an IT perspective, during the development process.

Chair Weeks stated his assessment that our programmers made the decision to go with this and they had great confidence in their ability to learn what they needed to learn for the object oriented system. That decision never was part of a management decision; management didn't hear the pros and cons; none of that came to anyone in management.

Thomas Ridder stated if management had made a decision, it would have been Josette Green. It had been brought to her attention that Sue did not believe the new approach would work, but because Sue didn't have expertise in the new technology, her opinion was discounted.

Commissioner Howard stated it sounds like the whole project was managed from the bottom up.

Thomas Ridder stated there was not much of an IT structure and it was more of a flat format; Sue was team lead but she never oversaw staff. Everyone in IT has diverse areas of responsibility and Sue didn't really delegate or coordinate tasks. When replacing the scholarship application arose as a project, it essentially fell to the person with the least on their plate.

Commissioner Howard asked if we have the person that knows what we want to get out of that system giving instruction to IT?

Thomas Ridder stated that the initial phase of the project involved a developer meeting with every member of the scholarship team to determine their needs. The purpose of those meetings was to determine what the application needs to do.

Commissioner Howard asked if holes were created because staff could not produce what was asked for or because management didn't ask for the right things.

Thomas Ridder stated there was really no project oversight by management at this phase of the project.

Bob Brew described the scenario where a programmer would ask staff what they needed of the system. Staff might say it needed to do queries; the programmer writes down queries; he says 'okay' but has no idea what they specifically need, or the work involved to make it happen. Everyone thinks they have communicated, but there's still a big gap.

Commissioner Howard asked if that is fixed.

Bob Brew stated he doesn't ever want to say anything is definitely fixed again, but he does think there is a much better understanding. Meetings are held daily between IT and staff to discuss status, talk about what we are actively working on fixing and to gain better understanding.

Commissioner Howard stated on Monday it was said it now looks like Ford has lists and described an issue with phone numbers of students not populated properly. He reference Vic Nunenkamp stating at that time the reason is we have a relational database- sometimes they don't communicate. He stated we don't we have a relational database and he is now confused.

Bob Brew stated she misspoke at that time by using that terminology; this is all new terminology for her.

Thomas Ridder stated it sounds like they are asking how you can ask for something and get garbage information. He reiterated that the scholarship system is an object-oriented database, and that all of our other systems are based on a relational database.

Commissioner Holland asked if, since we had problems with Ford, are we going to have problems meeting deadlines for the Oregon Community Foundation or others?

Bob Brew stated the query process now does get better each day as we are solving problems and creating tools in the new system. Some issues solved for Ford can be cloned for others; some will be created from scratch. Some scholarships require need-based information and Jordi is working on this now; some rely on FAFSA data which is all in the legacy system. Jordi is creating the process to go in and pull information out of the relational database and put it into the object oriented system. We are working on this but it is not finished. At the same time we are doing that, we know what our deadlines are for providing information to partners; CJ, Holly and Lacie are doing some of calculations by hand; pulling from the old system and trying to buy Jordi time to make sure we are as early as possible for meeting deadlines. We are trying to do both: make the system work and do work that needs to be done so we do not go without a back-up anymore.

Commissioner Holland commented on the vastness of the problem for programmers.

Bob Brew confirmed the situation is ugly.

Chair Weeks asked Thomas Ridder, if you were in our spot, what would you do? What should we tell you?

Thomas Ridder asked if we are confident that we understand where we are, where we are going with what Bob described as dealing with deliverables produced by manually processing and creating queries of all applicants; additional complications with computations; putting in manual information to generate numbers. He stated that ideally, they would like to take the old system and put in valid data for the new applicants, in order to take advantage of some of the processes that exist in the old system. This would allow staff to process awards in the way they are used to.

Bob Brew stated it is a very heavy task to do what Thomas suggested but we know that regardless of the size of the task, we are determined to complete it since it will certainly be less difficult than processing 9,000 applications by hand. We are currently doing both (working on back-porting and processing applications by hand).

Commissioner Melton asked, given the difficulty of the task, what would be the total number of hours and people needed to solve the problem.

Bob Brew stated he had no idea what it would take to solve the issue once and for all.

Thomas Ridder stated right now there are two programmer resources; one is working on backporting into the old system and the other is generating lists to allow processing by hand. We'd like to have an intermediate step that takes a subset of the data to calculate remaining need for need-based scholarships. It's a stopgap for falling behind on timelines.

Commissioner Holland asked if it would be crazy to just admit defeat and go back to the legacy system.

Thomas Ridder stated that we are doing that somewhat, by porting into the old system. Going back to what brought us here, somehow there was a disconnect with programming that didn't hit home the notion that the data needed to get back into the system. There was no plan to recreate what the old system did for selection; programmers were very focused on the application portion and not on back-porting support of the selection process.

Commissioner Howard asked who made the decision to move to the object oriented database, why did they make that decision, and are we going to abandon that system now?

Thomas Ridder apologized for using the word “abandon”. The plan from the beginning was to use the object oriented system for data entry only, and to use the legacy system to query the data and produce the needed reports.

Bob Brew stated at the time that the querying development was being discussed, we were told it’s much easier to do what was needed in the new system.

Commissioner Holland asked what is being worked on toward fixing the application.

Commissioner Fincher asked what we are using the new system for.

Thomas Ridder answered to get the data, populate lists and pare down and make selections and refine.

Commissioner Fincher asked for help in understanding the 1% of folks in programming who can work with the new system.

Thomas Ridder stated it has to do with how new technologies catch on. Most programmers are not familiar with object oriented databases but he fully anticipates down the road it will be a dominate format but at this time it’s not.

Commissioner Fincher asked once we make it out of the woods, and more staff understand how it works and folks universally work with it, will it be less work than it seems to be right now?

Thomas Ridder answered yes. He stated the intent behind the project was well founded but overoptimistic. It tried to remove programmers from the process of updating and modifying the scholarship application. Something lacking in the past was the ability for staff to request data on the fly to identify students meeting certain situations. In years past all this went through Sue and it had to be put on the backburner. Or, if the application changed it very much all revolved around one programmer having to make the updates. The goal the project attempted to achieve was to create a scenario where staff could have control to change questions, add new questions, or create new funds without overreaching involvement of IT and provide staff more flexibility.

Bob Brew stated from that perspective it was a huge success. It was not programmers who added questions for the 450 funds, it was admin staff.

Commissioner Fincher asked if there has been any investigation of a bridge program. Are we the only ones facing these challenges? Are there any other organizations that can help or does it have to be created in-house?

Thomas Ridder clarified it has to be done from scratch, but not necessarily in-house. They are hoping to find someone who can give management better information and the status of where we are. The concern going forward is the need for someone more experienced than current staff to make an objective evaluation of the new system and if it will support the volume we need.

Bob Brew stated the next step may involve bringing in a forensic programmer to say yes it's the right tool, or no it's not and to give us feedback.

Chair Weeks asked what are the chances of importing all the data from the new system to the legacy system without significant problems?

Thomas Ridder said he anticipates many of the same problems with the Ford phone number issues. There has to be a significant amount of vetting of data; this review will require a lot of sanitation and demo versions, and staff review for accuracy.

Chair Weeks asked how long he thinks it will take before we can be assured the import is accurately populated?

Thomas Ridder reported they are developing a timeline for that, and we need to get it right. Probably three weeks

Chair Weeks asked if we are caught up on deliverables at this time, using a manual system.

Bob Brew answered he didn't have enough information to say.

Thomas Ridder stated OCF has been notified we are week behind and are prioritizing to meet their priorities. Going forward, we anticipate delays.

Commissioner Howard asked, if you had a magic wand and could apply whatever resources you thought you might need to fix the problem, what would those resources be.

Bob Brew stated he doesn't know if having two people or twenty would be helpful or if they would just be tripping over each other and making parallel mistakes. He has total confidence in Jordi. He asked Thomas his thoughts on the need for more people.

Thomas Ridder stated they had been offered programmers but the pushback is it takes time to bring an individual up to speed on the architecture and format. Bringing on additional clerical staff might help; it might make a difference or be an option.

Bob Brew stated they have CJ, Lacie, Holly and Dale helping. If they need to pull CJ off of her work to train others, he would rather she train six people than two and that in all honesty, all we are doing is buying time for Jordi to build an automated fix.

Commissioner Howard asked how bringing in a forensic programmer would help. Would they be able to assist in development?

Bob Brew said it is like using an auditor- you don't want them to have any ownership; you want a third party with the skills to give an objective assessment. We need to do this carefully when we bring someone in and we need Jordi and Brandon to walk them through the system. If we brought someone in now they would be in the way, and slow our current work.

Commissioner Holland stated his position is we need to bring someone now who is experienced in managing these types of transitions and to give us a roadmap. We need to make sure our deliverables are there. Do we have any confidence that what we are doing is going to be helpful?

Chair Weeks asked after one month or however long it takes to import data, what do we have? It is something we can use next year or is it a fix at the end of the awarding period with no value next year?

Thomas Ridder stated we need the objective evaluation of the new system as we conceived it just for the data; once we have the architecture to transition data from one system to another, then the objective is to optimize the application process.

Chair Weeks commented all the work being done would be of benefit next year.

Thomas Ridder stated that he is correct.

Bob Brew talked about a scoping project for a financial aid management (FAM) system; this scoping would involve a third party professional consultant look at the OSAC legacy system. Out of that review will come a plan to replace that system. Once we have a solid plan, then ask we can ask the Legislature for money to hire a third party to create the new system, part of the budget for this will include a professional project manager. We will have to do this work again to get the new scholarship system to work with the new FAM system. That whole project will be vetted, professionally managed with a solid project plan - all the things you want to see in an IT project done right.

Chair Weeks stated they are all sitting there as policy people asking what they can do to help and not get in the way. It sounds like you are trying to buy enough time to manage deliverables on OCF and hope porting of information will get done to be able to use it sometime this year, for some part of the process.

Bob Brew stated he didn't want to be flippant but we are laying the track as we are running full speed ahead. By the time we realized we didn't have a solid plan, deadlines were too tight and we could not stop.

Commission Howard asked if there is a project manager capable of laying the track.

Bob Brew stated since January, Thomas Ridder has been managing the project; he has done amazing work in his responsibility to track and ensure programmers are hearing what staff and partners have to say and acting as a liaison with Ford. It is unfair that life works out this way, but on the totem pole of IT he is on the bottom of hierarchy. He's managing this crew of people and doing it better than many project managers I've seen. Do we have someone who knows all the systems? No, but Thomas is as close as we have. He's putting out fires and planning a few days at a time. He does not have the luxury of time.

Commissioner Howard asked Thomas how he feels about that.

Thomas Ridder stated he thinks given the situation, while he didn't jump up to volunteer, given this role was what the agency needed at the time, he was glad to fill the role. Unfortunately he does have a great deal of other work to do. Ideally, project management would be done by someone who has no other work to do. Project management has suffered somewhat, because he has had to step away from project

management to actually be involved in producing products to meet deadlines. The agency as a whole has not been able to step back and manage the project the way it should be.

Chair Weeks asked who is instructing the programmers; who does that?

Bob Brew said they do that in a daily briefing “(SCRUM)” meeting. To a certain extent the programmers are given outcomes and they explain how they will meet the outcomes. The meetings are somewhat dynamic and that is why we all are in the room; so programmers are clear on priorities.

Chair Weeks stated we’ve been doing this since November; we haven’t managed to meet a lot of it.

Bob Brew stated we’ve had a lot of successes. Not to underplay failures, but he can say if they didn’t have daily meetings he can’t imagine the outcome; we’d still be having application issues.

Vic Nunenkamp said Thomas has the responsibility to follow up with all parties after the scrum to make sure the agreed-upon directions are followed, and she gave an example.

Chair Weeks asked if Thomas has been given authority to manage the project.

Chair Weeks stated commissioners are having difficulty because they don’t have anyone managing that understands IT. We need someone to report to management with authority to direct staff. If not now, certainly for next year, we need to have better management defined than we do today.

Bob Brew agreed.

Commissioner Holland asked what deliverables get in the way of Thomas managing the project. Are those things someone else can do if we had to hire someone?

Thomas Ridder stated much of what he does can only be done by him because of knowledge of the agency.

Bob Brew stated one of the things Thomas does is work on legacy system; he’s the gatekeeper with Sue Strauslin in that if he can fix something in 15 minutes, he does rather than send it to Sue. This is very valuable and saves a lot of money.

Commissioner Howard stated that if someone from the Governor’s Office asked who was in charge of this project, it’s unclear who would be named as responsible. He asked Thomas who he reports to.

Thomas Ridder stated he reports to both Bob and Vic.

Bob Brew stated he is ultimately responsible.

Commissioner Howard asked if he felt he had a good grasp of the situation.

Bob Brew stated he’s not been here for an entire scholarship process, and Vic’s only been here for one.

Commissioner Howard stated he is not looking to blame but find out how do we fix it; how do we find someone.

Bob Brew stated the project started off poorly and was not managed for a long time. He said the train is going full speed down the track and the best thing we can do is get through the season. He is confident we can make it a good system going forward. All agree there is nothing we can do to fix it without stopping the process for two weeks and regrouping and planning. We do not have the luxury of time. The conclusion he has come to is to do the best we can to get awards out and track what's going wrong and get someone on board to help us.

Chair Weeks said he appreciates the candor; he appreciates Thomas being there and that all are being direct and honest. He asked for any concrete recommendations. He asked if it is better to plunk people in to process by hand and get it done, or to take two months to put data into the old system when the application season is over.

Bob Brew suggested continuing to do both in order to complete the current application season.

Commissioner Howard stated there is a fairness matter and asked what is fair in terms of fees assuming we have not lived up to our commitment? What is fair to OCF if we don't fix it?

Bob Brew stated he thinks it's a policy issue. He can see both sides of the issue. He could make a case for not charging the money, since we clearly did not meet all their deadlines, but he could also make a case for charging them, since we've provided all the services they requested.

Chair Howard stated they trusted us to do that and asked if Bob was saying it's a problem with them trusting us.

Bob Brew stated no.

Bob Brew stated with regard to not meeting deadlines we were late and he takes full responsibility.

Commissioner Holland asked if Sue Strauslin should be brought in to provide direction and recommendations.

Commissioner Howard asked if there would be a problem bringing her in.

Bob Brew stated he's not sure she would be best person, due to it involving new technology that she is not familiar with. Despite personality differences that we can overlook, he does not think she's the right person to manage it based on her technical skills.

Thomas Ridder confirmed this opinion.

Chair Weeks stated he likes Commissioner Holland's suggestion; she may not have to be technologically competent in the new system, but she may have the strategy knowledge to give us a third party analysis of our strategy.

Commissioner Holland asked what the best choices with another set of eyes on the problem.

Commissioner Fincher said they are struggling with the concept of if there is accountability; the situation warrants a plan for the next 8 weeks. In assessing all that has been done and what needs to be

done, it's taken on a life of its own. If he were in Chair Week's position and was asked for the official version of what's going on, what would the response be? That's what we are looking for: a third party, independent contractor. We need an analysis of the situation and resources available. He stated he is not comfortable sitting there without any sense of control other than we know we are going to make mistakes. What do we need to do for the next 4-8 weeks? If there are other options, he would love to hear them; something that documents and leads us down that next 4-8 weeks and the resources available during that time to give us the maximum benefit.

Vice Chair Melton asked if there is anybody the group knows in the state that might be able to help. She asked is there anyone better than Sue; is there anyone else that they know of.

Commissioner Fincher asked if this a document that can be produced internally? Can someone be assigned internally to document work to be done and resources needed/available to minimize mistakes and maximize deliverables in a timely fashion? Can that be done internally?

Thomas Ridder stated he believes so. It is a matter of allocating resources and not over-allocating. He stated one reason why he stepped in is that he is not a producer of anything in the new scholarship application. Now with Ford's deliverables being off the table, he would like to be removed from the production side to take on more of the oversight role and work with Leads to document what we really have; what we need to deliver and ascertain from CJ and Lacie what we can expect from a manual process. From that, we can determine how many additional staffing resources we would need to maintain the manual process to meet deadlines. We can use that for both a resource request and for project planning to move forward for the next 4 to 8 weeks.

Commissioner Holland stated with all due respect it's as much an examination of what the alternatives are going forward that he thinks an independent party would bring. It is not so much a summary or description of what the problem is or how we got there, but is about going forward and from an outside perspective is what we are planning to do the best option.

Commissioner Howard asked if he would be correct in saying along the way if Thomas or any of the staff suggested someone else could do that for us it would be an option. He mentioned Bob expressing concern that having to make space for a new person and get them up to speed, his thought is that in working with Susan would not require the expenditure of time and effort to incorporate her and get her up to speed. If there is someone else who can do it, that would be good.

Vic Nunenkamp stated she heard the generous request to help. She stated that they had not been able to get Thomas reclassified in order to fully empower Thomas to fully manage the program. The IT team needs to know that this guy knows what he's doing and they need validation; he's been outstanding.

Chair Weeks stated he shares Commissioner Holland's position to get someone from the outside to do this. He stated many of them do not know Susan; they only know her name but they are going to have to assume she has enough integrity that she would come in and do this in a manner that would help the agency move forward. He does not think the agency would have kept her as long as they did if they did not think she had that kind of integrity. This can't wait. This has to be done quickly and this poses the concern about looking around for other outside parties. If the Commission agrees, he recommends she be contacted soon. He clarified instructions for her are to sit down with the team, have a good discussion about the strategy for going forward and see if she has any suggestions for us or other ideas based on the strategy you have determined to be right.

Chair Weeks asked for a motion to bring in Sue Strauslin for the purpose outlined.

Commissioner Holland made the motion and Vice Chair Melton seconded. There was no discussion.

Motion passed unanimously.

Chair Weeks stated they meet again in April 26th and they hope that will provide time for the team to sit down and make clear with her that we are not expecting a detailed analysis of every step. We are expecting her to listen to the strategy and give us her best advice as to if she thinks our strategy is successful or what she suggests or would add to it.

Chair Weeks stated he thought about Vic Nunenkamp's statement and he's unsure if they can get a reclassification for Thomas right now. But they certainly can say to Bob as the Executive Director we need somebody overseeing this. Thomas appears to have grabbed it and is doing the job. To the extent that you can reinforce that from the Commissioners' position that we want him to be in that position. We can deal with the salary issue down the road. We need the programmers to understand that he is invested by you and by the Commissioners to provide the oversight that we will need for the next eight to twelve weeks.

Thomas Ridder asked how they would like the team to proceed should they approach Sue for help and she decline. He stated he mentioned this because that was her prior direct statement from the onset that she did not want to be brought back in to clean up the mess.

Chair Weeks stated they are not asking her to clean up a mess. We are asking her to look at the proposed strategy and give us an analysis of that. She's not cleaning up any mess. He stated if Thomas needs help talking with her he would be happy to be part of that conversation. Should she not agree to do this, there are some other people he has worked with over the years who could come in and do this work at the higher level needed. He is counting on Sue and her integrity toward the success of the agency to get her to table one more time.

OTHER BUSINESS AND ADJOURNMENT

Chair Weeks called for other business to come before the commission at this time. There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 5:00 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Approved by Commission at Meeting 429 - April 26, 2013

Gary Weeks, Chair
