

TENNESSEE BOARD OF FUNERAL DIRECTORS AND EMBALMERS

MINUTES OF BOARD MEETING

DECEMBER 14, 2021

President Robert Shackelford, III, called the meeting to order at 10:14 a.m. The meeting was conducted in Conference Room 1-A, Davy Crockett Tower, Nashville, Tennessee.

Board members physically present: Robert Shackelford, III, President; Charles Rahm, Vice President; Fred Berry, Anthony Harris, Tonya Scales Haynes, Clark McKinney and Scottie Poarch.

Staff physically present: Robert Gribble, Executive Director; Anthony Glandorf, Chief Counsel; Troy Bryant, Associate General Counsel and Lisa Bohannon, Regulatory Board Administrative Manager.

ADOPTION OF AGENDA:

A motion was made by Clark McKinney to approve the Agenda as published.

Seconded by Anthony Harris

Adopted by Voice Vote

APPROVAL OF MINUTES:

A motion was made by Fred Berry to approve the Minutes of the October 20, 2021 Board Meeting.

Seconded by Charles Rahm

Adopted by Voice Vote

LEGAL REPORT:

TROY BRYANT, ASSOCIATE GENERAL COUNSEL

Abbreviations:

GPL – General Price List

CPL – Casket Price List

OBCPL – Outer Burial Container Price List

SFGSS – Statement of Funeral Goods and Services Selected

1. Case No.: 2021037041 – Funeral Establishment

Complainant is an attorney on behalf of the sister of the deceased. Complainant alleges unprofessional conduct, specifically that the Respondent, through an associate of theirs, has lost the deceased's remains/cremated remains. Complainant took the statement of the deceased's roommate who had interacted with the associate of the Respondent on behalf of the deceased's family. The roommate stated that he paid and received a receipt from the associate and that the last time he saw the body, it was brought into the church. The associate responsible soon stopped all communications with the roommate and the family regarding the whereabouts of the body or the deceased's remains/cremated remains.

Respondent has not responded to the complaint.

This complaint was sent for investigation. The investigator spoke with the owners of the Respondent establishment. The owners indicated that the associate had made all the funeral and financial arrangements with the family of the deceased. One of the owners stated that following the service and transfer to the crematory, he picked up the cremains of the deceased and brought them back to the Respondent establishment. The Respondent contends that two or three days later, the associate returned to the establishment where he was given the ashes of the deceased. The Respondent stated that they were under the assumption that the associate would deliver the cremains to the family. Further, the Respondent contends that neither the family of the deceased nor the associate ever paid any money to their establishment for services provided stating that to date the associate still owes the Respondent Establishment \$5,050. Finally, Respondent stated that they have had no further communication with either the associate or the family of the deceased.

The Department spoke to Complainant on December 9, 2021, and confirmed that the family, the funeral home, and the client of Complainant still do not have the remains/cremated remains. Complainant has not received any communication from the associate regarding the remains.

Recommendation:

- Discussion. What penalty, plus costs of investigation, does the Board feel is necessary to issue to Respondent based on the fact that cremains have not been provided to the family.

A motion was made by Anthony Harris for a \$5,000 civil penalty and costs of the investigation. Authorize via consent order and a formal hearing if necessary.

Seconded by Charles Rahm

Adopted by Voice Vote

2. Case No.: 2021049621 – Funeral Establishment

Complainant/purported wife of the deceased submitted a complaint against Respondent/funeral establishment alleging unprofessional conduct for refusing to provide a death certificate despite Complainant's claims of being next of kin. Complainant states that originally the deceased's mother was identified as the next of kin, but after presenting a certified marriage certificate to Respondent and after calling the Tennessee Department of Health, Vital Records Section, to confirm its authenticity, Respondent allowed Complainant to sign the cremation form. However, Complainant contends that Respondent now refuses to supply a copy of the death certificate or provide the deceased's ashes to her.

Respondent replied stating the paperwork from the medical center listed the deceased's mother as the next of kin. After being provided with Complainant's marriage certificate, Respondent allowed her to select the desired services and sign the necessary paperwork. However, on the day of the viewing, the deceased's mother and the deceased's ex-wife provided documentation showing that the ex-wife was still married to the deceased at the time of Complainant's marriage. Specifically, that the ex-wife's divorce was granted seven (7) months after the marriage to the Complainant had occurred. Respondent ultimately made the decision to acknowledge the deceased's mother as the next of kin and refused to provide the Complainant in this case a copy of the death certificate per the wishes of the deceased's mother.

Recommendation:

- Closure, for determination by a court of competent jurisdiction.

A motion was made by Charles Rahm to accept Counsel's recommendation.

Seconded by Fred Berry

Adopted by Voice Vote

3. Case No.: 2021052661 – Funeral Director

This is a companion complaint to the complaint above. Complainant is the mother of the deceased from the previous complaint and alleges unprofessional conduct against Respondent. First, Complainant states that Respondent required proof of next of kin multiple times, specifically in the form of documentation to show that Complainant from the previous complaint was not the deceased's wife. Complainant states they told Respondent numerous times to not allow the purported current wife to have any of the deceased's ashes or his death certificate. Further, Complainant purports that the death certificate she was provided is incorrect as it lists the deceased as married to the purported wife.

Respondent replied stating that they complied with Complainant's wishes and did not provide the purported current wife with any of the cremains or the death certificate. Respondent contends that they informed Complainant that they would need to provide more than just a statement to Vital Statistics as to the reason for the change in marital status. Respondent purports that they communicated this to Complainant but never received any evidence they could send to Vital Records to justify a change in marital status. Respondent stated they have made a request for the death certificate to be corrected and provided documentation to show a request had been made.

This case was sent for investigation. The inspector spoke first to Complainant and obtained copies of the deceased's marriage certificate and divorce documentation from his ex-wife. The date of marriage was dated December 16, 2000 to April 27, 2018. Complainant further stated that the Respondent failed to place the deceased's obituary in the paper. Next, the inspector met with Respondent who stated that he informed Complainant that the death certificate would have to be amended to reflect the deceased's marital status. Respondent contends he told Complainant that this could take some time to amend and that he would need documentation to have the certificate amended. Respondent admitted that Complainant had paid to have an obituary run in the local paper but stated that it was not run for a reason he could not explain. The investigator stated that there was no evidence that Complainant's money for the obituary had been refunded. The inspector received a copy of the purported current wife's marriage certificate which listed the date of marriage as September 4, 2017.

Recommendation:

- The next of kin issue is for determination by a court of competent jurisdiction. A \$500 civil penalty to be reduced to \$250 if Respondent shows proof of an issued refund to Complainant at time of execution of the

consent order regarding the obituary that was not run in the paper. Authorize via consent order and formal hearing if necessary.

A motion was made by Fred Berry to accept Counsel's recommendation.

Seconded by Clark McKinney

Adopted by Voice Vote

4. Case No.: 2021056591 – Funeral Establishment
Case No.: 2021067661 – Funeral Establishment

These are two different complaints filed by two different people regarding the same circumstances. First Complainant, husband of the deceased, alleges unprofessional conduct on behalf of the Respondent. Complainant states that on March 4, 2021, the ashes of the deceased were collected. The Complainant requested that the ashes be put in an urn provided by the family. On July 19, 2021, the family opened the urn to discover two pieces of identification in the urn, one contained information that did not belong to the deceased. Complainant called Respondent who requested the disc number. Complainant states they were told that the provided disc number matched the deceased's information. The second Complainant is the daughter of the deceased whose mother's information was found in the urn. The second Complainant's complaint is virtually identical regarding the alleged unprofessional conduct of the Respondent, additionally alleging that Respondent failed to ship them their mother's belongings.

Respondent replied stating that on the date of cremation, February 23, 2021, they placed the deceased's ashes inside a temporary urn. Respondent contends that on March 2, 2021 they removed the deceased's cremains from the temporary urn and placed them in the urn provided by the family. However, there were cremation labels for other deceased persons placed on the table where the transfer occurred. Respondent contends that the urn Complainant received contained only the information tag of another decedent and maintains that no cremains were mixed in the urn.

This case was sent for investigation. Respondent stated that after pulling the disc number in their records, they confirmed that the disc number had been assigned to the deceased and that they were "one hundred percent sure" that the ashes belong to the deceased. Respondent further provided an explanation as to what they believed happened. When the staff transferred the ashes from the black

plastic temporary container to the urn the family provided, an employee carried the urn and the round metal disc number of the deceased to the cremation office where the employee requested, they get the identification device and information “on the Hispanic lady.” As Respondent contends, the employee mistakenly picked up a file for another deceased Hispanic woman (the mother of the second Complainant) and placed it in the cremation urn for the deceased in the first complaint. Thus, as Respondent maintains, only the identification information was placed in the urn.

Based on the above, a determination as to whether the cremains were correctly provided to the Complainants cannot be determined by any process available to the Board. The question as to whether the cremains provided to the families is that of the decedent created undue emotional stress upon the families that cannot be remedied. Likewise, Respondent has acted unprofessionally in failing to maintain an accurate chain of custody regarding the cremains of the deceased allowing such emotional stress to occur.

Recommendation:

- \$5,000 civil penalty plus costs of investigation. Authorize via consent order and formal hearing if necessary.

A motion was made by Charles Rahm to accept Counsel’s recommendation.

Seconded by Anthony Harris

Adopted by Voice Vote

5. Case No.: 2021062291 – Embalmer

Complainant/intern at Respondent Establishment filed a civil suit against Respondent alleging sexual harassment and assault. In response to the complaint, the Respondent denies the Complainant’s allegations. In a communication with the Department, Complainant expressed they would like to have the complaint dismissed as the matter had been resolved.

Recommendation:

- Closure, pending confirmation of closure from Complainant’s counsel.

A motion was made by Clark McKinney to accept Counsel’s recommendation.

Seconded by Anthony Harris

Adopted by Voice Vote

6. Case No.: 2021065301 – Funeral Establishment

Complainant/sister of the deceased purchased a pre-need funeral contract for her brother in 2013 while Respondent establishment was under former management. Former management sold the establishment to current management in 2018. Complainant contends that both former and current management acknowledge that this contract has been paid in full, but neither will fulfill the contract. Complainant provided documentation to show that the contract had been paid in full and that the pre-need account was to be placed in irrevocable trust.

Respondent replied through counsel stating that Respondent had contracted to purchase from former management only the real property and business equipment. The contract stated all items were purchased “as is” and was not a contract for Respondent to purchase former management’s accounts, contracts, or debts. Respondent further states that current management, which opened a new and separate limited liability company from former management, has never been licensed as a preneed seller and has never sold preneed funeral contracts.

The Department searched all available records and found no documentation of an appointed trustee or trust account opened by former management.

Based on the above, we recommend closure. The purchaser of Respondent establishment did not purchase any preneed contracts from former management, and there is no record of an appointed trustee or an irrevocable trust account related to this contract. Complainant should seek civil or criminal remedies through a court of competent jurisdiction against the former establishment owner.

Recommendation:

- Closure, to be determined by a court of competent jurisdiction

A motion was made by Anthony Harris to accept Counsel’s recommendation.

Seconded by Charles Rahm

Adopted by Voice Vote

7. Case No.: 2021065441 – Funeral Establishment

This complaint was administratively opened following an inspection conducted on September 14, 2021. The inspector issued a citation for the following violations:

- 1- Violation of Tenn. Code Ann. § 62-5-303 for engaging in funeral directing, embalming, or operation of a funeral establishment without being duly licensed.
- 2- Violation of Tenn. Code Ann. § 62-5-313 for operating a funeral establishment without a licensed funeral director managing or supervising the establishment.
- 3- Violation of Rule 0660-6-03 for failing to submit a final application to the Board for the change of ownership for this establishment. The rule requires this to be done within seventy-five (75) days. The establishment ownership changed over 92 days ago as of the date of this inspection.

Respondent replied on October 4, 2021 stating that his employer had informed him that all the proper paperwork had been submitted.

The Department confirmed that the correct and necessary paperwork had been submitted by Respondent.

Recommendation:

- Letter of Warning

A motion was made by Fred Berry to accept Counsel's recommendation.

Seconded by Clark McKinney

Adopted by Voice Vote

8. Case No.: 2021065921 – Funeral Establishment

Complainant/son of the deceased stated that he had yet to receive the death certificate for the deceased. Complainant stated that the deceased passed away on September 7, 2021, and that since the primary care physician would not sign the death certificate, the body had been at the funeral home for the past 16 days. Complainant expressed that without the proper paperwork, he could not file her life insurance or have her shipped to New Jersey to be buried with the rest of his family.

Respondent replied stating that they had diligently been in contact with other physicians in order to have the death certificate certified. After learning that the primary care physician would not sign the death certificate, Respondent made numerous calls to various offices in an attempt to get a doctor to certify the certificate. Respondent states that on September 24, 2021 a medical examiner finally agreed to sign the certificate as pending. Respondent stated the certificate has been filed and Complainant had picked those copies up and viewed the deceased before the remains were shipped to New Jersey.

The Department spoke with a representative in the Vital Record Section of the Department of Health and confirmed that they had received the death certificate. It appears that the Respondent took reasonable steps to get the certificate certified in a timely manner.

Recommendation:

- Closure

A motion was made by Clark McKinney to accept Counsel's recommendation.

Seconded by Charles Rahm

Adopted by Voice Vote

9. Case No.: 2021066361 – Funeral Establishment

Complainant is an employee of the Vital Records Section for the Department of Health. Complainant alleges that Respondent has failed to timely file multiple death certificates into their VRISM queue. Specifically, Complainant stated that the unfiled certificates date back to deaths that occurred on January 7, 2021, January 27, 2021, June 28, 2021, and August 26, 2021. Complainant stated that they have spoken to Respondent on five separate occasions and Respondent has yet to complete the certificates.

Respondent replied stating that all but one of the listed certificates has been filed. Respondent contends that the final one has yet to be certified because the doctor it was assigned to has refused to sign the certificate since they had not seen the patient in over a year. Respondent further contends that they have made attempts to find another doctor to certify the final certificate and that difficulties with the VRISM system has led to further delay.

The Department spoke with the Complainant in the Vital Records Section on December 9, 2021 to check on the status of the delayed certificates. The representative stated that the current oldest certificate goes back to October 8, 2021 and that only two certificates in the VRISM queue have not yet been assigned to doctors. The Complainant noted that due to the significant improvement in Respondent's VRISM queue, they were willing to have the complaint closed.

Recommendation:

- Letter of Warning

A motion was made by Charles Rahm for \$500 civil penalty. Authorize settlement via consent order and a formal hearing if necessary.

Seconded by Anthony Harris

Adopted by Voice Vote

10. Case No.: 2021071291 – Funeral Establishment

Complainant/acquaintance of the deceased's wife alleges that Respondent failed to cremate the deceased in a timely manner. Specifically, Complainant alleges that the deceased passed away on July 27, 2021 and Respondent was unable to cremate the deceased until September. Complainant claims that the wife of the deceased still does not know the status of the cremation and that Respondent refused to provide Complainant any information regarding the deceased or his cremation.

Respondent replied stating that a permit could not be obtained right away because the deceased had not seen a physician on a regular basis. Respondent contends they obtained the permit on September 14, 2021 after communicating with the medical examiner's office, and cremation took place on September 16, 2021. Respondent maintains that the deceased's wife is aware of the status of the cremation as she received the cremains on September 24, 2021. Finally, Respondent stated that they did not provide information to Complainant because she had not been listed as a family member by the wife of the deceased and thus Respondent was not permitted to speak to Complainant regarding these matters.

The office has attempted to contact the wife of the deceased but has not received any communication from her or the deceased's family.

Recommendation:

- Closure. Complainant is not related to the decedent; the decedent's family has not provided information in relation to this complaint and have not joined in or contributed to the complaint.

A motion was made by Fred Berry to accept Counsel's recommendation.

Seconded by Clark McKinney

Adopted by Voice Vote

**11. Case No.: 2021071661 – Funeral Director
Case No.: 2021071641 – Embalmer**

These complaints were administratively opened by the Department following an Order issued by the Mississippi State Board of Funeral Service against Respondent's funeral director and embalmer licenses. The Mississippi Board, in their findings of fact, stated that Respondent had been indicted in the Circuit Court of Grenada, Mississippi, for Conspiracy to Commit a Crime and two counts of Insurance Fraud. On August 15, 2019, Respondent entered a plea of guilty to the felony crime of Count 1: Conspiracy to Commit a Crime. Further, in violation of a Board Rule, Respondent failed to notify the Tennessee board of his conviction.

Respondent replied stating that they pled with the district attorney for the well-being of their family and states that he was a victim of unfair and unlawful prosecution. Respondent maintains that he is not guilty of crimes of moral turpitude or unprofessional conduct. Respondent also contends that he failed to notify the Board because he was informed by the authorities that they would inform the Board.

Based on the above, a felony conviction of Conspiracy to Commit a Crime is considered a crime of moral turpitude under Tenn. Code Ann. § 62-5-317.

Recommendation:

- \$2,000 civil penalty to be assessed as a \$1,000 penalty against Respondent's funeral Director license and a \$1,000 penalty against Respondent's embalmer license.

A motion was made by Charles Rahm to accept Counsel's recommendation.

Seconded by Clark McKinney

Adopted by Voice Vote

12. Case No.: 2021071901 – Funeral Establishment

Complainant/competitor submitted a complaint against Respondent/funeral establishment alleging delay of death certificate and invoices. Complainant contends they contacted Respondent to do removal and embalming for the deceased on September 29, 2021. Following these services, the deceased was picked up the same day, and Complainant provided Respondent the necessary information to complete the Tennessee certificate of death on September 30, 2021. Complainant ordered five death certificates and asked for an invoice to be faxed to their funeral home. Complainant contends that they contacted Respondent several times over the next two weeks regarding the death certificates and invoices. Finally, after receiving contact from the family requesting the death certificate, Complainant contacted Respondent on October 19, 2021. Complainant contends that Respondent stated the death certificates would not be mailed until payment had been received; thus, Complainant again requested the invoice be faxed. The invoice was received that day; however, Respondent could not accept payment via credit card to expedite delivery of the death certificate, so Complainant mailed a check. On October 26, 2021 Complainant contacted Respondent who stated that the check had been deposited the week before and that they would mail the death certificates.

Respondent replied stating that the invoice was faxed to Complainant on the same day they requested the necessary vital information, October 7, 2021 and faxed again on the same day when an employee of Complainant requested the invoice. Respondent stated it is standard operating procedure that death certificates are not sent out until payment for services are made. Respondent faxed the invoice again on October 19, 2021 at the request of Complainant. On October 26 following another call from Complainant, Respondent's employee informed Complainant that they had just received his payment in the mail that morning and entered it into their system. Per standard operating procedure, the

certificates had already been placed in the mail upon receipt of payment and had already been mailed at the time of Complainant's call.

Recommendation:

- Letter of Warning

A motion was made by Anthony Harris to accept Counsel's recommendation.

Seconded by Charles Rahm

Adopted by Voice Vote

13. Case No.: 2021071871 – Funeral Director

Complainant/daughter of the deceased filed a complaint against Respondent for alleging mishandling the body of the deceased. Complainant originally sought to use the removal and services of Respondent but when told that they were not available for an appointment for the next four days, Complainant sought the services of a different establishment. When Complainant contacted the hospital to let them know of the change, the hospital informed Complainant that the Respondent had already picked up the deceased. Complainant purports that Respondent refused to return the body until Complainant paid the transportation costs.

Respondent replied stating that when Complainant agreed to their arrangement, an employee was sent to pick up the deceased. When Respondent learned that Complainant had decided to go with a different funeral establishment, Respondent arranged for the new funeral home to pick up the deceased from their establishment and informed Complainant that their fee for removal is \$395.00. Respondent states that Complainant paid this fee. Respondent likewise attached documentation from the hospital to show that the Complainant gave verbal permission for Respondent to pick up the deceased from the hospital.

Recommendation:

- Closure

A motion was made by Anthony Harris to accept Counsel's recommendation.

Seconded by Clark McKinney

Adopted by Voice Vote

ADMINISTRATIVE MATTERS:
ROBERT B. GRIBBLE, EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR

FINANCIAL DATA FOR FY20-21:

**Board of Funeral Directors and
 Embalmers Financial Recap
 Fiscal Year July 1, 2020 – June 30, 2021**

Financial data was provided to the Board’s Executive Director by the Assistant Commissioner’s Office for Regulatory Boards of the Tennessee Department of Commerce and Insurance on November 15, 2021 for use in the compilation of this report.

Beginning Balance – July 1, 2020	\$1,269,374.00
Net Revenue (Earnings) for July 1, 2020 – June 30, 2021	\$ 472,614.00
Total Funds Available	<u>\$1,741,988.00</u>
Total Expenditures for July 1, 2020 – June 30, 2021	<u>\$ - 540,797.00</u>
Reserve Balance – July 1, 2021	\$1,201,191.00
CORE Expense for FY20-21	<u>\$ - 70,605.00</u>
Reserve Balance – July 1, 2021 (After CORE Expense)	\$1,130,586.00

LEGISLATIVE UPDATE:

Representatives from the Tennessee Funeral Directors Association and our Department (TDCI) met recently to discuss possible legislation the association may pursue when the General Assembly reconvenes on Tuesday, January 11, 2022.

Our office has not received any notification from the Tennessee State Funeral Directors & Morticians Association of legislation that they intend to pursue.

We extend an open invitation to associations and any other interested parties to meet with our staff and other appropriate department individuals prior to the introduction of legislation affecting the Board of Funeral Directors and Embalmers.

LICENSEE REPORT:

REPORT OF LICENSES ADMINISTRATIVELY APPROVED BY EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR PURSUANT TO BOARD AUTHORITY FOR THE PERIOD OF OCTOBER 16, 2021 – DECEMBER 10, 2021

Establishment(s)

Simple Cremation and Funeral Services
Smyrna, TN

Type of Action(s)/Change(s)

New Establishment

Individuals)

Emily Grace Crowe
Oliver Springs, TN

Type of License(s)

Funeral Director and Embalmer

Casey Roberts Harris
Mountain City, TN

Funeral Director and Embalmer

Jennifer Marie Harrison
Dayton, TN

Funeral Director and Embalmer

Ashley M. Leatherwood
Cordova, TN

Funeral Director and Embalmer

Stephanie Joan Sylvester
Nashville, TN

Funeral Director and Embalmer

Blair Marie Warner
Columbia, TN

Funeral Director and Embalmer

Durrell Sinclair Young
Memphis, TN

Funeral Director and Embalmer

Gregory Keith Rollings
Peachtree City, GA

Funeral Director and Embalmer
Reciprocity – OR, GA, SC, & NC

Chad Douglas Blevins
Bristol, TN

Funeral Director

James Weston Leonard
Kingsport, TN

Funeral Director

Stacy Nicole Neuble
Lebanon, TN

Funeral Director

Travis James Plotzer

Funeral Director

White Bluff, TN

Kaylee Nycole Schrotberger
Medina, TN

Funeral Director

CLOSED ESTABLISHMENT REPORT:

One (1) establishment has reported closing since the last board meeting:

- Patton Brothers Funeral Home, 1306 South Street, Nashville, TN

DISCIPLINARY ACTION REPORT:

No disciplinary actions of the Board to report at this meeting.

OPEN COMPLAINT REPORT:

As of December 9, 2021, there were 41 open complaints.

A motion was made by Charles Rahm to accept the Executive Director's Report.

Seconded by Anthony Harris

Adopted by Voice Vote

ESTABLISHMENT APPLICATION(S):

**COMPASSION FUNERAL & CREMATION SERVICES
ATTN: MICHAEL PAUL ILLOBRE, MGR.
6949 CHARLOTTE PIKE, SUITE 104
NASHVILLE, TN 37219-4200**

New Establishment

Ownership: Limited Liability Company

Owner(s): Compassion Funeral & Cremation Services LLC, 6949 Charlotte Pike, Suite 104, Nashville, TN 37219-4200

Upon motion by Clark McKinney and seconded by Tonya Scales Haynes, based upon application record, this establishment application was approved for licensure.

Adopted by Vocie Vote

ELECTION OF BOARD OFFICERS FOR 2022:

President:

Anthony Harris made a motion to nominate and elect Charles Rahm as President of the Board for 2022.

Seconded by Clark McKinney

Adopted by Voice Vote

Vice President:

Clark McKinney made a motion to nominate and elect Anthony Harris as Vice President of the Board for 2022.

Seconded by Charles Rahm

Adopted by Voice Vote

APPOINTMENT OF CONTINUING EDUCATION LIAISON:

Anthony Harris made a motion to appoint Fred Berry as the Continuing Education Liaison for 2022.

Seconded by Clark McKinney

Adopted by Voice Vote

NEW BUSINESS:

CE Broker –

Robert Gribble, Executive Director, presented documents for the board's review and discussion. The purpose was to discuss using CE Broker as the continuing education tracking system for the Tennessee Board of Funeral Directors and Embalmers.

John A. Gupton College –

Robert Gribble, Executive Director, presented documentation to the board showing John A. Gupton College located in Nashville, Tennessee, has been re-accredited by the American Board of Funeral Service Education for a period of seven (7) years.

Delegate Grant to Annual Meeting of the International Conference of Funeral Service Examining Boards, Inc. (The Conference) –

A motion was made by Charles Rahm to select board member Fred Berry as the recipient of the delegate grant by The Conference.

Seconded by Anthony Harris.

Adopted by Voice Vote

Election Process for Board President and Vice President –

Fred Berry made a motion to form a committee to review the process of electing the President and Vice President of the Board each year.

Seconded by Charles Rahm

Adopted by Voice Vote

Board members Fred Berry, Anthony Harris, and Tonya Haynes volunteered to serve as members of this committee.

ADJOURN:

A motion was made Charles Rahm to adjourn.

Seconded by Anthony Harris

Adopted by Voice Vote

The meeting was adjourned by President Robert Shackelford at 11:54 a.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Robert B. Gribble

Robert B. Gribble, CPM, CFSP
Executive Director