



**MINUTES OF THE TWO-HUNDRED AND NINTH
MEETING OF THE UNIVERSITY CIVIL SERVICE MERIT BOARD –
August 29, 2019**

**State Universities Civil Service System (University System) Office
1717 Philo Road, Suite 24
Urbana, Illinois 61802
&
(Video Conference)
University of Illinois at Chicago
Human Resources Building
Room 201D
715 South Wood Street
Chicago, Illinois**

Call to Order and Roll Call

Chair Smart called the meeting to order at 1:07 p.m.

Members present at the primary meeting location were: Naomi Jakobsson, representing the University of Illinois; and Stuart King, representing the University of Illinois.

Members present at the Chicago video conference location were: Jill Smart, Chair, representing the University of Illinois; John R. Butler, representing Northern Illinois University; Sherry Eagle, representing Northeastern Illinois University; Julie Jones, representing Illinois State University; and Miriam Mobley Smith, representing Chicago State University.

Members absent were: Joseph Dively, representing Eastern Illinois University; and John Simmons, representing Southern Illinois University.

Also present were: Jeff Brownfield, Executive Director; Gail Schiesser, Legal Counsel; Teresa Rademacher, Secretary for the Merit Board; Jami Painter, representative of the Human Resource Directors Advisory Committee (HRDAC); and Jill Odom, Chair, State Universities Civil Service Advisory Committee (EAC). Various other university employees and State Universities Civil Service System (University System) staff were also in attendance

Consideration of participation by other Merit Board Members not physically present at meeting site

Chair Smart asked for approval for Merit Board members not physically present to actively participate by other means in accordance with the Open Meetings Act requirements. There were no members requesting to participate by audio conference.

Welcome new board members – Jeff Brownfield

Mr. Brownfield welcomed three new board members to the University Civil Service Merit Board, Joseph Dively, representing Eastern Illinois University; Miriam Mobley Smith, representing Chicago State University; and Julie Jones, representing Illinois State University. Bios for each of the members were included with the Merit Board agenda materials.

Merit Board Reorganization

The Merit Board conducted reorganization activities due to the former Chair, Carney Barr, not being reappointed to the Board of Trustees for Governors State University and then not being able to serve on the University Civil Service Merit Board.

The Merit Board took action electing officers until the first meeting of 2020 by Mr. Brownfield calling for nominations for the position of Chair. Dr. King made a motion to elect Ms. Smart as Chair. Ms. Jakobsson seconded Dr. King's motion. In accordance with the Merit Board Bylaws, a voice vote was taken and the motion carried.

Chair Smart called for nominations for Vice Chair. Chair Smart made a motion to elect Dr. Eagle as Vice Chair. Mr. Butler seconded Chair Smart's motion. In accordance with the Merit Board Bylaws, a voice vote was taken and the motion carried.

Chair Smart called for nominations for the Executive Committee of the Merit Board. Chair Smart made a motion to elect Ms. Jones. Dr. Eagle seconded Chair Smart's motion. In accordance with the Merit Board Bylaws, a voice vote was taken and the motion carried.

Following are the officers until the next election in 2020:

- *Chair: Jill Smart*
- *Vice Chair: Sherry Eagle*
- *Executive Committee: Julie Jones and John Simmons*

Public Comments

Mr. Brownfield stated that two requests had been received to present public comments after the agenda materials had been mailed. Mr. Brownfield further stated that Mr. Larrison, an employee whose discharge case is pending on the agenda, along with an attorney for the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign pertaining to a different discharge case, have both requested to present comments. Mr. Brownfield stated that in the past the Merit Board allowed these type of public comments to be made during the proper agenda items. Chair Smart suggested that these public comments be allowed at the time of the agenda item.

Consideration of the Minutes of the 208th Meeting of the Merit Board, April 17, 2019

The minutes of the 208th Meeting of the Merit Board, April 17, 2019 had been transmitted to members of the Merit Board with the agenda materials.

Ms. Jakobsson moved to approve the minutes of the 208th Meeting of the University Civil Service Merit Board. Dr. Eagle seconded Ms. Jakobsson's motion. In accordance with the Merit Board Bylaws, a voice vote was taken and the motion carried.

Consideration of Discharge Proceedings Number ISU-19-1 filed against Larissa Bailey by Illinois State University

Ms. Schiesser provided a brief summary of the discharge case stating that Illinois State University (ISU) served Written Charges for Discharge against Larissa Bailey on March 19, 2019. Ms. Bailey, a Building Service Worker since January 6, 2002, made a timely request for a discharge hearing. ISU charged Ms. Bailey with excessive unscheduled and unexcused absences, and with violating ISU policy 3.6.18 regarding Attendance and Punctuality. She further stated that ISU had adopted a non-punitive progressive disciplinary process. Beginning in September, 2016, ISU began progressive discipline regarding unscheduled and unexcused absences by Ms. Bailey with the informal step of a Counseling letter.

Ms. Schiesser further stated that the Hearing Record showed that at each point in this progressive discipline process Ms. Bailey was reminded of the university's policy regarding unscheduled absences presented with the dates that ISU determined were unscheduled absences. The Hearing Record also showed that the employer identified 12 additional occurrences of unscheduled absence by Mr. Bailey between June 4, 2018, and January 22, 2019, all of which were after the Ultimate Decision Letter signed by Mr. Bailey in April of 2018. She also stated that the Hearing Officer found that the employer had met its burden of proof on both counts.

Chair Smart called for a motion in regards to the “Motion for Personal Appearance” filed by Wendy Smith, Legal Counsel for ISU, to provide comments. Mr. Butler made a motion to allow Ms. Smith to present comments. Dr. Eagle seconded Mr. Butler’s motion. In accordance with the Merit Board Bylaws, a voice vote was taken and the motion carried.

Ms. Smith stated that Ms. Schiesser had given a great overview of the case and added that ISU had a very open leave and absence policy that Ms. Bailey was aware of and that she was available to answer any questions of the Merit Board. Mr. Brownfield confirmed Ms. Bailey was not in attendance and had not asked to provide comments.

Mr. Brownfield stated that there are three options in discharge cases, those being to discharge the employee, reinstate the employee, or reinstate the employee with a 3 to 120 day suspension in accordance with the Administrative Rules of the University System.

Dr. Eagle stated that there appeared to have been sufficient notification provided to Ms. Bailey as was listed in the record. Ms. Smart mentioned that it was the employee’s responsibility to track FMLA hours, not the responsibility of the university to track the time for the employee.

After discussion, Dr. Mobley Smith made a motion to discharge Ms. Bailey. Dr. King seconded Dr. Mobley Smith’s motion.

A roll call vote was taken and the motion was approved with the following vote:

Dr. Mobley Smith	Aye
Mr. Simmons	Absent
Chair Smart.....	Aye
Mr. Butler	Aye
Mr. Dively.....	Absent
Dr. Eagle	Aye
Ms. Jakobsson	Aye
Ms. Jones.....	Aye
Dr. King	Aye

Consideration of Discharge Proceedings Number UIUC-19-1 filed against Scott Larrison by the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign

Ms. Schiesser provided a brief summary of the discharge case stating that the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign (UIUC) filed Written Charges for Discharge against Scott Larrison on February 26, 2019. Mr. Larrison, a Building Service Worker since August 22, 2016, made a timely request for a discharge hearing. UIUC charged Mr. Larrison with engaging in a physical altercation, a fight, with another Building Service Worker, during working hours, while in Allen

Hall, a UIUC undergraduate residence Hall. The Hearing Officer, Donald Parkinson, found that the employer had met its burden of proof on the charge against Mr. Larrison.

Chair Smart called for a motion in regards to the “Motion to Appear” filed by Claire Brooks, Legal Counsel for UIUC, to provide comments. Dr. Eagle made a motion to allow Ms. Brooks to present comments. Mr. Butler seconded Dr. Eagle’s motion. In accordance with the Merit Board Bylaws, a voice vote was taken and the motion carried.

Ms. Brooks stated that Ms. Schiesser had given a significant overview of the case. Ms. Smith added that Ms. O’Donnell had provided photographs of the bruises from the physical altercation between herself and Mr. Larrison consistent with Ms. O’Donnell’s statement of the event. Additionally there were female residents at home during the altercation and the residents were very shaken by the event and also spoke with police officers and one of the students had also appeared at the discharge hearing. Ms. Brooks asked the Merit Board to enter a discharge decision in this matter.

Dr. Eagle asked if Mr. Larrison ever explained why he went to the other building for a spray bottle and why he had a key to the other building. Ms. Brooks responded that Mr. Larrison did not explain why he needed a spray bottle, but his supervisor did say there were spray bottles available at the building that Mr. Larrison had been assigned to for the day. Ms. Brooks also stated that Mr. Larrison was a swing Building Service Worker and that possibly why he could have had a key to both buildings.

Ms. Smart asked if Mr. Larrison was in attendance. Ms. Rademacher stated that Mr. Larrison was not in Champaign to provide any comments.

Dr. Eagle stated that Mr. Larrison made a poor decision and brought his emotional feelings into the workplace. Chair Smart stated that physical violence needed to have a zero tolerance.

After discussion, Dr. King made a motion to discharge Mr. Larrison. Ms. Jones seconded Dr. King’s motion.

A roll call vote was taken and the motion was approved with the following vote:

Dr. King	Aye
Dr. Mobley Smith	Aye
Mr. Simmons	Absent
Chair Smart.....	Aye
Mr. Butler	Aye
Mr. Dively.....	Absent
Dr. Eagle	Aye
Ms. Jakobsson	Aye
Ms. Jones.....	Aye

Consideration of Discharge Proceedings Number UIUC-19-4 filed against William Brownfield by the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign

Ms. Schiesser stated that Executive Director Brownfield had recused himself from this case and had not read or seen any of the pertaining documents due to the possibility of this employee being a relative.

Ms. Schiesser then provided a brief summary of the discharge case stating that UIUC had filed Written Charges for Discharge against William Brownfield on May 2, 2019. The employee, William Brownfield, a Building Service Worker since March 12, 1995, made a timely request for a discharge hearing. UIUC charged Mr. Brownfield with submitting a falsified FMLA Application. The Hearing Officer found that there was nothing in the record to support Mr. Brownfield's "speculation" that someone else had altered the certification and also found that the employer had met its burden of proof on the charge against Mr. Brownfield.

Chair Smart asked for clarification of the difference regarding the FMLA document Mr. Brownfield submitted versus the FMLA document received directly from the doctor. Ms. Schiesser explained that the form Mr. Brownfield submitted to HR at UIUC had been altered.

Chair Smart called for a motion to allow Ms. Brooks, Attorney for UIUC, to provide public comments. Dr. Eagle made a motion to allow for public comments. Dr. Mobley Smith seconded Dr. Eagle's motion. In accordance with the Merit Board Bylaws, a voice vote was taken and the motion carried.

Ms. Brooks stated that she also felt the FMLA form was confusing. She further stated that more time would have been allotted to Mr. Brownfield than he should have been granted as listed on the altered FMLA form. She also stated Mr. Brownfield did confirm that he turned in the altered document; however, he theorized that someone else had changed the FMLA document during a period in which he lost the document. Mr. Brownfield testified that he had lost the document at work for a two week period and did not mention to HR at any time that the document had been missing during this time.

Ms. Jones asked if Mr. Brownfield mentioned the form was lost when turning the document in or only after he was questioned and how soon after the document was turned in did HR reach out to the doctor. Ms. Schiesser stated that HR noticed immediately the document had been altered and contacted the doctor the next day for the correct document.

At this time, Dr. King recused himself realizing that the healthcare provider is a colleague physician at the clinic where he is also employed.

Dr. Eagle stated that Mr. Brownfield was a 24 year employee and questioned the reasoning why Mr. Brownfield had changed the form and questioning if this was a malicious intent. Chair Smart commented the form was changed for more time off and asked if this type of dishonesty

warranted discharge or another disciplinary action. She also inquired as to if any FMLA time associated with the document had been used by Mr. Brownfield.

Ms. Jones stated that it was Mr. Brownfield's responsibly to turn in the document and if he had lost the document this could have been resolved with a call back to the doctor's office asking for a new form. Also, she mentioned she didn't know who else would benefit from altering his FMLA form.

Dr. Mobley Smith stated that if Mr. Brownfield thought the time allowed on the FMLA document was not sufficient the correct process would have been to go back to the doctor and discuss this and that there is clearly falsification in the document Mr. Brownfield turned in and that most doctor's offices take a very dim view of altering these types of documents and this is a character issue.

Chair Smart asked if there was a precedent set for falsification of documents. Ms. Rademacher mentioned that there is not a precedent and the decision varies with different Merit Board members.

Mr. Butler stated he had an issue with discharge and questioned if there could have been a different outcome. Also, he asked if the employee had had an opportunity to speak with the university; such as, if he had stated that he was in consultation with his doctor and these were estimates and was under the impression he could manage his condition. Mr. Butler was questioning if this was a single incident and if he could have been reformed with respect to this behavior. He further stated that this is an obvious falsification and excuse, but asked if there was any room to preserve employment for a 24 year employee. Ms. Brooks stated Mr. Brownfield had been given two opportunities in both the pre-disciplinary and the reconciliation meetings prior to the filing of Written Charges for Discharge, but he was unable to provide any explanation that reduced the university's concern about the decision. This is not only the falsification of one document, but this is FMLA fraud which is a serious violation. She further stated that Mr. Brownfield has not shown any remorse, that he was not regretful, and hadn't taken action for what he did.

Mr. Butler stated that his concern is whether Mr. Brownfield wanted to put into evidence of what his provider has to say on this and if Mr. Brownfield was under the impression he was able to estimate time based on his own condition. Ms. Brooks stated that Mr. Brownfield was a unionized employee and could have gone to his union representative prior to the pre-disciplinary and reconciliation meetings and failed to do so. Also, Mr. Brownfield was offered a last chance agreement, but he refused to accept it. Mr. Butler asked what the last chance agreement consisted of. Ms. Brooks stated that in general a last chance agreement is a two year contract between the employee and the employer and the employee agrees to abide by all rules and workplace expectations and if they do not, then they will immediately resign and forfeit their rights to challenge the resignation.

Mr. Butler asked why Mr. Brownfield would ever turn down a last chance agreement down and asked Ms. Brooks to speculate as to why he did not accept this agreement and what was the expectation of this specific last chance agreement. Ms. Brooks stated she was unable to speak for Mr. Brownfield and did not have the specific terms of his last chance agreement with her.

Dr. Eagle asked if Mr. Brownfield would have still been allowed to use his FMLA leave time during a last chance agreement. Ms. Brooks confirmed Mr. Brownfield would have been allowed FMLA time in a last chance agreement.

Ms. Jones stated the two week delay is a cause for concern and seems to be more of an intent to defraud the university. If someone thought they could alter the form then there would be no need to delay submitting the document.

Mr. Butler stated he does not dispute that Mr. Brownfield changed the FMLA document, but questioned if there was any hope for this individual and if there could have been a reform option for him instead of discharge. Mr. Butler asked the Merit Board if this case could be tabled.

Ms. Jones stated her concern was that the Merit Board was trying to make arguments for Mr. Brownfield that he was not making for himself and Mr. Brownfield was the one who had requested the hearing. Mr. Brownfield had an opportunity to come and present his own case and he had chosen not to.

Ms. Schiesser stated that she had spoken with Mr. Brownfield and he was aware he was able to appear and speak before the Merit Board to present his case. Offers of settlements are not admissible in such matters, and if counsel had not brought up the last chance agreement, the Merit Board would not have been aware of the settlement offer.

Dr. Mobley Smith commented that often times in her area of expertise, these types of issues are more often fraud.

The question was raised if Mr. Brownfield was able to retire, without the specific details this could not be answered. After further discussion, Mr. Butler made a motion to reinstate Mr. Brownfield with an unpaid suspension of 120 days. The motion failed due to lack of a second.

After further discussion, Chair Smart made a motion to discharge Mr. Brownfield. Ms. Jakobsson seconded Chair Smart's motion.

A roll call vote was taken and the motion was approved with the following vote:

Chair Smart.....	Aye
Mr. Butler	Nay
Mr. Dively.....	Absent
Dr. Eagle	Aye
Ms. Jakobsson	Aye

Ms. Jones.....Aye
Dr. KingAbstained
Dr. Mobley SmithAye
Mr. SimmonsAbsent

Chair Smart made a comment that she was disappointed with the number of questions the Merit Board had that were unable to be answered.

Consideration of Discharge Proceedings Number SIUE-19-1 filed against Kathleen Stipe by Southern Illinois University Edwardsville

Ms. Schiesser provided a brief summary of the discharge case stating that Southern Illinois University Edwardsville (SIUE) filed Written Charges for Discharge against Kathleen Stipe on March 25, 2019. Ms. Stipe, an Office Support Associate in University Housing Facilities since December 1, 2014, filed a timely request for a discharge hearing. SIUE charged Ms. Stipe with nine counts of misconduct: failure to follow time reporting procedures and falsification of records; misuse of sick leave; misuse of sick leave and use of non-accrued sick leave during periods of otherwise no pay; misuse of vacation leave and accrual during periods of otherwise no pay; mismanagement of payroll reporting and processing, for her personal benefit, in her capacity as leave/payroll administrator for the University Housing Department; unethical practices, unprofessional conduct, and employee misconduct in violation of SIU and SIUE policies and Procedures; unprofessional conduct, insolence, and insubordination.

Chair Smart called for a motion regarding Southern Illinois University Edwardsville’s Motion for Oral Argument before the Merit Board. Dr. Eagle made a motion to allow for comments. Dr. Mobley Smith seconded Dr. Eagle’s motion. In accordance with the Merit Board Bylaws, a voice vote was taken and the motion carried.

Ms. Cole stated that Ms. Schiesser thoroughly summarized the discharge case and added that there were multiple violations by Ms. Stipe’s over the years. SIUE made repeated attempts to work with Ms. Stipe to change the behavior, shorter suspensions, etc. Ms. Stipe’s behavior become worse over the years and she had created extreme disruption in SIUE housing, a department that directly effects students.

Ms. Jones commented that this was an employee with access, had opportunity and clear knowledge of the policy and she had violated the policy on numerous occasions and had concerns about any type of rehabilitation for this employee.

Mr. Butler made a motion to discharge Ms. Stipe. Dr. Eagle seconded Mr. Butler’s motion.

A roll call vote was taken and the motion was approved with the following vote:

Mr. ButlerAye
 Mr. Dively.....Absent
 Dr. EagleAye
 Ms. JakobssonAye
 Ms. Jones.....Aye
 Dr. KingAye
 Dr. Mobley SmithAye
 Mr. SimmonsAbsent
 Chair Smart.....Aye

Report of the Human Resource Directors Advisory Committee – Janice Bonneville

The Merit Board heard a report from Janice Bonneville, representative of the Human Resource Directors Advisory Committee (HRDAC). Ms. Bonneville stated that over the past 12 – 18 months, the HRDAC had worked closely with the University System on several items that impacted the various campuses. All campuses continue to work to apply the guidelines of the changes to the Principal Administrative Appointment procedures that went into effect last October 2018.

She further stated that HRDAC had been working on two more issues on the agenda. The first being the changes to the discharge process. She stated that HRDAC had requested a meeting with the Merit Board to discuss the discharge process and the committee had hoped that this meeting would occur before the Merit Board votes on the final process. The second issue is the handling of grant funded employees. The universities continue in their insistence that these employees need to be classified in a way that are outside of the current available classifications. These employees are generally hired for a certain amount of time under a limited funding source. The individuals applying for these positions are fully apprised of the duration limitations before this applications is made. Taking action to turn a status employee at the outset works against the interest of the employee, grant and the university. The committee asks for open discussions on this topic, both with the University System and the Merit Board.

Additionally Ms. Bonneville stated that based upon the discharge discussion earlier, HRDAC is limited on their availability to communicate with members of the Merit Board, unless the Merit Board invites them to do so. She further stated that the HRDAC members would welcome the opportunity to help the Merit Board members understand the process.

Ms. Smart asked if a HR representatives could be available for questions during discharge discussions. Mr. Brownfield suggested this could be an area of concern as one representative might have one view of a situation and another representative might have an opposite view of the situation. If representatives of management or HR are allowed time to speak, there would also be a requirement that union representatives or other representatives be allowed to provide information. Ms. Schiesser stated that the court anticipates the Merit Board to make the decision based on the record, rather than testimony or opinions from anyone from the outside. Ms. Jones

stated typically you should not be trying to retry the facts and hear witnesses again. The job of the Merit Board is to see if the policy was followed or not and that the university meets its burden. This is a process that needs to be respected, if the Merit Board disagrees with the process then we, the Merit Board, need to change it. She further stated that if the Merit Board has a question that is not in the record, then it is not up to the Merit Board to ask the question, but to make a decision based on the record. Mr. Butler stated that the Merit Board is not a court, but a policy maker, and that it requires the Merit Board to ask questions and sometimes speculate. Ms. Jones stated that the Merit Board has a Statute and Administrative Rules that need to be followed.

Report of the State Universities Civil Service Advisory Committee – Jill Odom, Chair

The Merit Board heard a report from Jill Odom, Chair, State Universities Civil Service Advisory Committee (EAC). EAC continues to collaborate with the University System on specific topics that are of concern, these include Grant Funded positions, the updated PAA policy and procedures, and revisions to Section 250.100 and 250.110 of the Administrative Rules.

Consideration of the FY 21 Budget Recommendation for the State Universities Civil Service System Office

Mr. Brownfield stated that the University System was asking for an increase for the FY 21 budget request. The increase would allow for the agency to try to reestablish the relationship with UIUC in regards to the Sponsored Research Agreement for a student. Also, the request is for a new phone system (VOIP) which the state is requiring, a general salary increase for full-time staff, along with hiring one additional staff person.

Dr. Eagle made a motion to approve the FY 21 budget recommendation of \$1,245,300 as a going in request to the Illinois Board of Higher Education. Ms. Jones seconded Dr. Eagle’s motion.

A roll call vote was taken and the motion carried with the following vote:

- Dr. Eagle Aye
- Ms. JakobssonAye
- Ms. Jones.....Aye
- Dr. KingAye
- Dr. Mobley SmithAye
- Mr. SimmonsAbsent
- Chair Smart.....Aye
- Mr. ButlerAye
- Mr. Dively.....Absent

Update on adopted rulemaking to Sections 250.100 and 250.110 of the Code (80 Ill. Adm. Code §250.100 and 250.110)

Mr. Brownfield gave a quick overview of the changes to the rules that have gone into place.

General Discussion regarding Principal Administrative Appointment Appeals/Communications

Mr. Brownfield stated that the University System had received some reports on the conversion of appointments from Principal Administrative Appointments to Civil Service Appointments. The two main areas being worked on are the vacant positions and then current incumbents. The HR offices are working hard to put these changes into place. It will take some time to see what impact the new procedures will have on the number of PAAs moving to Civil Service.

Governance, Risk, and Compliance Audit Program – Review of Recent Activities

Ms. Schiesser stated that the audit program had started back up, conducted one audit then the auditor, Lucinda Neitzel resigned in May 2019. The audit process is on hold again and the University System is in the process of hiring a staff person for the audit position.

Report of the Executive Director – Jeff Brownfield

Mr. Brownfield stated that there are still some outstanding bills from FY 19 that could lead to prompt payment charges. Also the University System is working on updating classifications and looking at classifications to be eliminated.

He further stated the Grant Funded position discussions needed to be on how these processes would be implemented and will continue to conduct discussions and bring a proposal back to the Merit Board in the future.

Mr. Butler stated he would like to continue to discuss positions that align more with faculty positions and some classifications should simply be exempted and this might be a better option and Grant Funded positions have very complex issues that need to be worked out. Chair Smart commented that several classifications were laid out specifically in the PAA procedures.

Mr. Brownfield stated that the current revision of Section 250.110 of the Administrative Rules is still in the development stage.

Report of the Legal Counsel – Gail Schiesser

Ms. Schiesser stated that in FY 19, 54 Written Charges for Discharge were served on employees and 14 of those employees requested a discharge hearing. Four of which the Merit Board heard at this meeting. Thus far in FY 20, six Written Charges for Discharge have been served on employees and four employees had requested a hearing.

Ms. Schiesser stated that the Administrative Review Case, Colwell vs. Merit Board/Brownfield, is still pending. The Merit Board is represented by the Attorney General in this case and that there had been no action.

Ms. Schiesser stated that there is a matter before the circuit court in Madison County. We are alleging that an employee cheated on a test and this resulted in severely impacting the integrity of the Electrician examination.

Other Items as Presented

Chair Smart stated that she would like to see Merit Board meeting scheduled for three hours instead of two hours.

The next meeting of the Merit Board is scheduled for Thursday, December 5, 2019 beginning at 1:00 p.m.

Ms. Jakobsson made a motion to adjourn the meeting. Dr. King seconded Ms. Jakobsson's motion. In accordance with the Merit Board Bylaws, a voice vote was taken and the motion carried.

The meeting adjourned at 3:31 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

/s/ Teresa Rademacher

Teresa Rademacher
Secretary for the Merit Board

APPROVED:

/s/ Jill Smart

Chair
University Civil Service Merit Board

December 17, 2019

Date