

Volunteer TN MOU Ad Hoc Committee 3-31-25 meeting-20250331_120220-Meeting Recording

March 31, 2025, 5:02PM

1h 3m 57s

● **Jim Snell** started transcription

T **Tracy Van de Vate** 0:04
Coming down on the day will be coming.

TS **Terry Silver** 0:06
OK. Are you ready?

JS **Jim Snell** 0:06
OK, I believe.
Yeah, I believe it's it's recording and transcribing. So I think we should be good.

TS **Terry Silver** 0:12
OK.

T **Tracy Van de Vate** 0:13
Don't make me do it.

TS **Terry Silver** 0:14
Well, I want to thank Jessica. First of all for taking care of the meeting last time.
Thank you so much, Jessica.
Appreciate you stepping up and doing that and I want to welcome everybody to our meeting and I want you to know that I've taken my Tums this morning in lieu of the heartburn, hopefully won't have any heartburn.
Be ready for those pain points as you guys put it so clearly.
And I do appreciate the discussions. I know that that we're working through some things.
And I have found that everybody is willing to work together and I appreciate that.

T **Tracy Van de Vate** 0:44
Can you that hands off your clothing to my lady, please?

TS **Terry Silver** 0:47
So we need to go to 3.3 to start off with and just let's review that.
I believe that's where we had some things to add and I hopefully everybody has
looked at 3.3, but let's just look at it, Jim, if you don't mind to pull that up.

JS **Jim Snell** 1:04
Yeah, sorry I I shared the wrong screen, so let me stop sharing that one and try and
share the right screen.

T **Tracy Van de Vate** 1:06
Have you know survivors?

TS **Terry Silver** 1:09
Sorry. Hey, Betty.
Let's see.

JS **Jim Snell** 1:22
Sorry, it's not OK I think.
Hold on just a second.

TS **Terry Silver** 1:28
Yeah.

JS **Jim Snell** 1:28
It it for some reason it's not recognizing.
The second screen that that is in the room and it only wants to share a single window
instead of.
Instead of the entire thing.
So let me try again.

TS **Terry Silver** 1:52
OK.

T **Tracy Van de Vate** 1:58
I get you.

JS **Jim Snell** 2:09
Yeah, I think it's right now.
It's only sharing the one draft.
Is that correct for everybody?

TS **Terry Silver** 2:15
Yes.

JS **Jim Snell** 2:16
OK.
Well, I think.
If we want to go, go back and so right. Right now, draft one is the one that we've primarily been working from. If anybody wants to go over to Draft 2. I can do that, but I don't think it's gonna let me.
For some reason I'm not really sure.
Let me do it last time.
It's not gonna let me share them on the same screen. It doesn't look like.

TS **Terry Silver** 2:47
OK.
Can you Scroll down to 3.3 for SGM?

JS **Jim Snell** 2:55
Sure.

TS **Terry Silver** 3:00
There we go.

JS **Jim Snell** 3:01

Let me see also if I can make it a little bit bigger. Sorry guys.
OK. Is that is that big enough for for folks to be able to see?

TS **Terry Silver** 3:18

I think so.
We just need you. Yeah. Yeah. Perfect.

JS **Jim Snell** 3:24

Sorry it's it's very sensitive and wants to bounce around a little bit.

TS **Terry Silver** 3:32

OK.
All right.
This has been.
Well, it doesn't look like it has been.
It looks like it coordinate communicating inform with the FNA. Work on this more do
do we have any additions?
3.3. Or do we need to start here and work on this further?

JS **Jim Snell** 4:02

Yeah, I believe.
Sorry, let me just scroll up really quickly.
Yeah. So we.
The 3.3 is we had talked a little bit about that, but at the last meeting but hadn't
really.
The group hadn't really decided exactly what this what they wanted, and so these are
notes that I I put in from last time.

TS **Terry Silver** 4:28

OK.

JS **Jim Snell** 4:32

So we can circle back to that. Terry, if you want or the group can get more into.

TS Terry Silver 4:34
OK.

JS Jim Snell 4:38
Into defining 3.3.

TS Terry Silver 4:42
Yeah. From what I my notes from listening to the conversation, we wanted to add something.
About the working relationship.
OK. And do we want to add this here and I heard I think Tracy say, we were hoping for two sentences.
To just clarify, because this Vt manages Amir Corps sub grants training and disability outreach funded through federal grants from the Corporation for National Community Service.
And then further Vt serves as a statewide advocate for community service.
OK.
So is everyone OK with those two sentences so far?

JS Jim Snell 5:32
And Terry, I think if I remember correctly, kind of where we left off, the discussion is up above.

TS Terry Silver 5:35
OK.
Uh huh.

JS Jim Snell 5:41
This section is called responsibility of parties and for the part for finance and administration it it outlines kind of some bullet point things of specifically what the department is going to do to support volunteer Tennessee.
And then this 3.3.
Talks generally about what volunteer Tennessee has a Commission is responsible for doing, but doesn't really address.

Its responsibilities back to F and A which I think is where we kind of left off the discussion of should should the Commission's responsibilities back to F and a be bullet pointed and defined a little bit more?

TS **Terry Silver** 6:12

OK.

OK.

JS **Jim Snell** 6:25

If people are happy with the two sentences above, we can strike.

The two and those again.

Those were the two bullet points.

That are there are just notes that are captured from the discussion last time. But if people are happy with what's already up in 3.3, I can strike that.

The group can move on.

It's really up to to you all in terms of if you want to spell out a little bit more what the Commission is gonna.

What responsibilities?

The Commission has back to F and a.

BW **Betty White** 6:59

I'm trying to raise my hand.

TS **Terry Silver** 7:04

Betty, do you have a question?

BW **Betty White** 7:06

No, but one thing I think I recall from the last meeting is that we started defining specifics and then we said if we do that, then we might leave something out or we might be adding something. And so maybe we want to just make it general, so that.

JS **Jim Snell** 7:08

Video.

Can't shoot both.

You can't use.

BW **Betty White** 7:24

Our we do have a lot of specific responsibilities and we were adjusting those and then I think came I think Tracy had the suggestion of let's have a two sentence. Description and that will cover it all so that we have some flexibility.

TS **Terry Silver** 7:40

Mm hmm.

The the first sentence describes.

JY **Jessica Youngblom** 7:54

So I think that I think the two sentences were fine.

I think what was supposed to be worked on was bullet points outlining what volunteer Tennessee's kind of responsibilities back to F and A were. So I think that's the piece that was supposed to be kind of passed out, not to the bullets before.

Is my. If my memory isn't written me correctly.

Because the above it's F and as responsibilities to volunteer Tennessee.

But there's nothing really saying what volunteer Tennessee's responsibility is back to F and A or.

TS **Terry Silver** 8:26

OK.

JS **Jim Snell** 8:28

Is that in a lower section somewhere?

Possibly.

JY **Jessica Youngblom** 8:33

Yes. And that's something Sarah pointed out as well.

So we could always just say please see section.

TS **Terry Silver** 8:37

4.9.



Sarah Noel 8:41

It should all be captured under 4.



Jim Snell 8:41

Or pulled it up.

Yeah.



Terry Silver 8:48

OK.



Jim Snell 8:48

Yeah, I mean, you could do a reference to, you know, a sentence that says, you know, volunteer tennis, you wordsmith it.

But volunteer Tennessee's responsibilities to F and a are further captured in section.

4R to Adams point, you can pull that up into here either way, but it it sounds like and I think it felt like it was probably captured in the document as a whole, so.



Terry Silver 9:15

OK.

How does everybody feel about taking these two bullet points out and removing what we've you know striked through in this paragraph?

And addressing specifics or maybe even moving it down to make sure that this is covered in in the 4.0 and following 4.0.



Betty White 9:41

Could you Scroll down a little bit so that I can see the preview the rest of the previous paragraph?



Terry Silver 9:41

Possessed.



Betty White 9:49

The three-point 33.3.

JS **Jim Snell** 9:49
Sorry.

BW **Betty White** 9:55
Right, because yes, I had volunteer. Tennessee manages AmeriCorps sub grants training disability outreach.

JS **Jim Snell** 9:55
Is that?

BW **Betty White** 10:07
Funded through federal.
Grants from the Corporation for National and Community service.
OK.
And then what is the second sentence?
I was.
I keep hearing there are two sentences there.

JY **Jessica Youngblom** 10:27
Further, volunteer Tennessee serves as a statewide advocate for community service.

BW **Betty White** 10:32
OK. Because I see that it was kind of in purple here as opposed to being in black.

JS **Jim Snell** 10:33
Yeah.

BW **Betty White** 10:37
So that was what I have. OK, right.

JY **Jessica Youngblom** 10:38
Yeah. 'cause that, yeah, 'cause, we added it.
I'm fine with removing the two bullets.
Especially since the specifics are outlined in Section 4.

BW **Betty White** 10:49
Right.

TS **Terry Silver** 10:50
OK.
OK.
Yeah.

JS **Jim Snell** 11:06
Did you all want to add something similar to what Eugene was talking about earlier that says.
Something along the lines of. See whatever it is 4 point whatever.
Are, are, are people happy with the way it's worded?
Yeah, I think that'd be a good idea.
I'm also trying.
I'm rereading this.
I was trying to pull it up so I could scroll on my own instead of making you do it and have everybody get it OK yeah.
I'm wondering if this section was intended to capture so it had what F and I was doing for the Commission and then this is what the Volunteer Tennessee Office, the Vt, not the Commission.
So Jim and Team does as a part of F and A and then we and then it starts to go into the chairs responsibilities.
So that's back to the Commission's responsibilities.
In part.
So I wonder if we make a reference to that in addition to the reference on further operating procedures are captured in Section 4.
So sorry to clarify to the point that we were discussing last time of we've captured what FNA does for volunteer Tennessee the Commission.
I'm rereading this now, wondering if the intent of this was this is what the the Volunteer Tennessee staff do and carry out and execute really on behalf of FNA and the Commissioner.
Yeah, well, I'm gonna.
Put back the two things I just deleted.

Because what?

What we discussed a little bit at the last meeting was more from the Commission perspective, so.

Because it starts out with.

Sorry, it's got the the chair and vice chair speak for the Commission.

Then it talks about what the Commission in general does and then coordinate with F ANDA. That was just something I stuck in and then coordinate with the F ANDA program director and planning meetings.

So it was.

It was, I think, the intent was more in line with the what?

What is the Commission itself have to do?

Kind of similar to these things that are bullet pointed out here up here for what F and A is doing for the Commission.

But it sounds like for the most part, people are happy just with the two sentences that are there and then referring back to the operating procedures that are further down, yeah.

And if that's the case, then.

Then I can just kind of redelete these things.

OK, for some reason it is then.

It's.

It wants to.

OK.

I think that's so that's it's now got the the 3.3 is it is that section but for some reason it was trying to make it under 3.2.

TS **Terry Silver** 14:28

K.

OK. Or else it. So we're good with 3.3 or do we want to add what Adam just suggested?

In terms of.

JS **Jim Snell** 14:44

Correct. OK.

TS Terry Silver 14:46
OK.

JS Jim Snell 14:48
Did anybody want to add something? Kind of Eugene suggestion of see whatever it is 4 point whatever for. Maybe that's a good last bullet in this section. I don't know how many are past 3.4.
Let's see.
Just one got the chair's responsibilities, vice chairs, responsibilities and then.
Then all other duties responsibility are outlined in the executive order.
I think we could do a 3.7 other general operating procedures are captured in Section 4.
Something to that effect.
That's what you were kind of saying, right?
Yeah. I mean, if we wanted to or.
Operating procedures between the parties are captured in section, yeah.
S.

TS Terry Silver 15:57
Mm hmm.

JS Jim Snell 16:04
Let's see.
Section 4.
Because that's.

TS Terry Silver 16:08
Mm hmm.

JS Jim Snell 16:10
OK.

TS Terry Silver 16:12
Good.

JS Jim Snell 16:12
OK.

TS Terry Silver 16:16
OK.
So let's can we go ahead and move on to 3.4?

JS Jim Snell 16:22
Mm hmm.

TS Terry Silver 16:23
OK.
So the chair of VTS responsibilities include recite over all meetings of the Commission, appoint all committee chairs, assist all chairs in the planning of committee activities, supervise all chairs as to the management of committee plans, authorize and execute the wish, the wishes of the board call all quarter. Meetings and special meetings.
And be an ex officio member of all committees.
Do we need to add anything to this?

T Tracy Van de Vate 16:56
Umm.
Terry, can you hear me?

TS Terry Silver 16:59
Yes, we can, Tracey.

T Tracy Van de Vate 17:01
OK.
Thank you.
So I guess I have a couple questions. One.
This the outline of the chair's responsibilities.
Is outlined either in the executive order or in BT bylaws.
And which the chair must follow.

I'm.

I don't understand.

The necessity of having this.

This responsibility outlined again.

TS **Terry Silver** 17:38

Mm hmm.

T **Tracy Van de Vate** 17:38

In this document and what it what it brings to this document.

That the executive order and Vt bylaws.

Don't bring.

TS **Terry Silver** 17:57

It's in my opinion, and I may be wrong, but I I believe the purpose of this document is.

To spell out the working relationship that we have with F and a.

T **Tracy Van de Vate** 18:09

Bye.

Right.

TS **Terry Silver** 18:11

So here maybe instead of repeating what's in our executive order or bylaws, it should state how I work together or how the chair works together with Vt.

T **Tracy Van de Vate** 18:23

Yes, yeah, yeah.

TS **Terry Silver** 18:24

That would be more appropriate.

T **Tracy Van de Vate** 18:26

Fna.

Yeah, the Beachy and ephnet.

TS **Terry Silver** 18:27
Definite sorry. Yes, yeah.

T **Tracy Van de Vate** 18:28
Yeah, you know.
And I think we've already got some of that where the chair.

TS **Terry Silver** 18:34
Mm hmm.

T **Tracy Van de Vate** 18:37
Where the chair can speak for the board.

TS **Terry Silver** 18:39
Mm hmm.

T **Tracy Van de Vate** 18:40
To FNA and you know, is the voice of the board.
Is that somewhere that's already in this document somewhere?

JS **Jim Snell** 18:49
Yeah. It's up in 3/2.

TS **Terry Silver** 18:49
Yes it is.

T **Tracy Van de Vate** 18:51
OK.

JS **Jim Snell** 18:53
Yeah, I would add just one clarifier that I think part of it is important to capture.

TS **Terry Silver** 18:53
Mm hmm.

JS Jim Snell 18:59

I'm I'm good with some of those edits that we're kind of brainstorming out loud, but I think part of it is good to capture here because the Commission can change its bylaws.

To have the chair, vice chair have different responsibilities as as they deem fit, which I think is appropriate.

I think it's important to capture here at minimum what we expect those responsibilities to be in case those bow walls do shift.

I agree.

It in large part it is restating what's in the EO but.

I think we could add to it or combine it with what we've already said in terms of speak on behalf of the Commission, etc.

But I do think it's important that we don't just rely on what's in the bylaws as that can change.

T Tracy Van de Vate 19:43

OK. Then I think we need to add a statement in here that that focuses back on the bylaws that these things could change as the bylaws change, you know, because. Preside over meetings of the Commission.

I.

I don't understand what F and A would need. Some of these bullet points for to point all chair committees.

That's already defined so.

I'm I'm just not I.

I just.

I I see your point about the bylaws changing because that's always a possibility.

And.

But but which?

JS Jim Snell 20:30

Again, I think I come back to the point.

T Tracy Van de Vate 20:33

Which of these are responsibilities that the chair has to F and a specifically?

JS Jim Snell 20:44

I think that is part of. The point is we have had some.

Role uncertainty as to what the chair's responsibility is with the staff, and if I again, if I were looking at this and stating it, the Chair's responsibilities are with the Commission, as the EO say, and as your current bowels say, I think it's important to rest.

It here they really don't go beyond that.

T Tracy Van de Vate 21:18

OK.

So if your issue is with staff.

What? What are those particular things?

Because the the chair does have to interact with the staff and the Executive director.

JS Jim Snell 21:35

Sure.

T Tracy Van de Vate 21:36

I mean, you know, so.

What? What specifically?

Do you?

Do you are you asking or wanting?

From the chair.

In their interactions with.

F and A you know, because they're gonna.

JS Jim Snell 22:00

Yeah. And maybe that's, yeah, maybe again, that's captured in Section 4 better and maybe these.

Are are muddying the waters between these two, but specifically to your point, I would say, you know over the last year and kind of how some of this came to be, was that again there was role and certainty and does the chair manage the Executive Director and vice?

Not vice versa, but does the chair manage the executive director? If I'm looking at

these lists of responsibilities, the answer is no.

In our operating procedures, there is clear expectations that FNA will work with the Chair to seek feedback on and incorporate that feedback of the Executive Director in their performance process.

But I think again, going back to the specifics that it's what's been discussed in a few Commission meetings and and I think you were one of the ones that said it, FNA is overstepping and how we manage the executive director.

When that is not.

An A responsibility.

Do you have the chair anywhere?

T **Tracy Van de Vate** 23:02

Well, now in the bylaws, it does state in the bylaws that the chair is supposed to do the evaluation.

And I I think I hope that you know, none of this states anything about that.

You know, so the bylaws do state that and I think that together because we do fund half the staff, BT does federally.

Fund half the staff and half the executive director's position, and the state funds the other half. So I think there are two viewpoints and that in the evaluation of the Executive Director's position, it's very important, important for those both of those things to be heard and.

To be valued.

From both perspectives, and I don't think I don't think this, I don't.

I don't get the continuation that the.

But just because it's not listed here that somehow.

The chair does not have any responsibility towards the management of the Executive director because we would have to have some to be able to ask the Executive Director to do those things that the Commission deems that it needs to do to fulfill its mission.

And we don't need to go through F and A to be able to ask the executive director to do those things.

So.

I don't.

JS Jim Snell 24:42

Look at section 4.9.

T Tracy Van de Vate 24:44

Think.

JS Jim Snell 24:44

Can we can we Scroll down?

Maybe I 'cause I think a lot of what you're saying, sorry is is captured right there.

I realize we're going this section by section instead of whole document, but just Fast forward to so long to try and make this a little more efficient.

At the use of everyone's time.

Yeah, I think what you just said is hopefully captured in 4.9 to Eugene's point about how all of that will unfold and the spirit of how the.

Assistant Commissioner over this group works with the chair to solicit that feedback and hear that feedback agree that you know, et cetera.

But again, I come back to you, ask for a specific on why does this need to be listed there? Have over the last year, year and a half been confusion between who manages the staff. And I would say hear you and that that is in your bylaws but.

That is not what F and A agrees to.

Again, I think that's why it's important.

That it's in an MOU document to clarify what is the responsibility because we didn't have a chance to.

You know, provide feedback.

Well, maybe buddy did on the bylaws, I don't know.

But the way it's listed in the bylaws, I would say is is something that F and A doesn't agree to.

Well, no, I don't.

I don't know what buddy provided feedback on because the bylaws, as far as I can tell that section.

About the chair supervising, the executive director and doing the performance review had been in the bylaws.

For almost 30 years.

So it it's not like it was added some point later. As far as I can tell, it's been there all

along.

But certainly buddy would have been aware the last time.

We, the the Commission changed its bylaws, which I think was in 2008 or 9, to add the all it did at that time, as far as I remember, was just to add the the audit

Committee, I think was the only change that that was made at.

That time, but certainly buddy would have been around and involved in that, that process.

Yeah. And I think 4.9 point captures what buddy and and the previous chairs have been doing for many years.

No, but not really, because the buddy and I did not have a supervisor supervisee relationship.

All of my management was done by the chair. My performance review was done by the chair and then Buddy just would put that into the the online system. He would take comments.

And just verbatim, just put them into into the system.

So it it really did.

It really did follow what was in the bylaws where the chair was my supervisor. And just because the chair is not a state employee, they don't have access to that online system. And we looked into potentially giving the chair access to that.

We were told, you know, it wouldn't really work to have a non state employee have access to that system just for the purposes of putting in.

Performance review stuff.

So it was better to just kinda keep doing what we've done in the past with having buddy. Just enter those comments.

Eugene, I want you to weigh in here and I'm happy to lean in. Say, I've I've been part of the problem the past year and a half of have a different interpretation of of how that should be done, and I know I've had the conversation of, you know.

If if volunteer Tennessee reports to me and you know Jim, that's you now.

I.

I don't plan to.

Only be a pass through for somebody else's comments, like if if somebody is in my reporting structure, I plan to to manage them as I do every other employee.

I can't speak for how buddy did it.

So yeah, I mean that that probably has changed over the last two years.

And and probably why a good bit of this needed to be revisited and ironed out

some. But I think where we have had a distinct difference of opinion if you will is that regardless of what's in the bylaws or what's been done.

TS **Terry Silver** 28:58

Hmm.

JS **Jim Snell** 29:07

For 30 years, the chair has no authority over a state employee because they're an F and a state employee under our hiring jurisdiction.

So I think that is again kind of the the crux of a lot of what needed to be ironed out in some of this. And Terry, I know you and I've talked about some of that as well, but. I think that is where some of the value comes in.

I've clearly stated who does what and and whose responsibility is is whose.

In this document is because I think that's where there's been some confusion over the last two years, a year and a half or whatever it's been.

TS **Terry Silver** 29:41

Mm hmm.

Mm hmm.

BW **Betty White** 29:55

Do I need to raise my hand if I can add something here?

I have notes.

I I always operate on paper as well as on the computer because I actually read better by paper. Probably my age.

I apologize for that.

But anyway, and I have notes in two different places on my draft from our last meeting that I have the words in tandem that the Chair of Volunteer Tennessee.

Works in tandem with.

The director of program, director of F and A and so I think there's some reason I have that.

I also have a note that says add a note about the working relationship and so that it's not like all or one in either way, but these two positions.

TS Terry Silver 30:37
Mm hmm.

BW Betty White 30:43
The intent is that the chair works directly with.
The executive.
Director of Volunteer Tennessee at the same time, FNA, is the employer in the state,
is the employer.
So both parties need to have input in that process and it's not one or the other.

JY Jessica Youngblom 31:03
Yeah. And there's a there's a comment on the right side that Adam added that of
what he's talked with Terry about and that's why that was added is because we
talked about that last time.

JS Jim Snell 31:15
Yeah. And just for. Thank you, Jessica, for reminding us of that.
I added as a comment because I didn't want to just insert it I think.
Their point needs to be some discussion on does this flow need to be further
explained in 4.9 or a separate or.
I put it as a comment instead of taking the liberty of just writing it into the
document, because I think that is where we kinda ended some of the last discussion
of that is kind of what we're doing in tandem there, to your point, Betty.

BW Betty White 31:44
Mm hmm.

JS Jim Snell 31:45
I guess the question is how do we want to capture it in the document?
I mean, we can be this verbose if we want but.

BW Betty White 31:48
What?

JS Jim Snell 31:51

I don't.

That's up for the group's just conversational, I guess.

And sorry, I would say I this is what I emailed.

T Tracy Van de Vate 31:57

Cannot.

JS Jim Snell 32:00

I think you've been on this.

This is what I emailed to Terry in terms of Jim and me and Terry, I would like to make it, you know, less specific as we have the rest of the document in terms of the chair and the Executive director and yeah, not positions and not names. Yeah.

Sure. Yeah. I just copied and pasted.

From what I had used with Thierry, yeah.

BW Betty White 32:22

And thank you for pointing that out.

I could not see that on my screen until now, so I didn't see any of those notes before.

They were not on my screen, so thank you.

T Tracy Van de Vate 32:35

So can I?

I think this process is really important and that we do have some at least a general outline to it and I do feel that.

And one of the reasons I think it is important is because the Board Development Committee could take this process.

And as they're looking for future chairs, use that to help understand.

And at some of those responsibilities that the chair has, and how, especially if we could put a little bit of a timeline to it about what the timeline might be, because when a chair comes on, a chair comes on very quickly and things might be happening very fast.

And so having that sort of a general outline that the Board Development Committee could share, and then, you know, a little bit of a timeline and.

I know the statement changed their timeline about how they do evaluations. And that process, so if we went back to that 3.4 then I think we could say one of those chairs responsibilities is to work with the F and a program manager.

To complete.

To complete the executive directors annual evaluation and and then somewhere else in the document when you'd go over to that other place.

If you if you're, you know, one of the responsibilities of the chair to F and A is for them to work together to be able to complete that process.

So that's an expectation that both sides would have.

You know.

 **Terry Silver** 34:26

Betty has her hand up.

 **Jim Snell** 34:26

Aye.

 **Terry Silver** 34:27

And then so Sarah also has her hand up.

So I think Sarah, you were next, I believe.

And then I heard somebody else.

 **Sarah Noel** 34:37

Yeah, I was gonna say I would advocate against adding something that detailed into this document because this is a document between F and A and the Commission, as it is this current moment, to clear up those pain points rather than to teach a new chair how to be.

 **Terry Silver** 34:50


OK.

Mm hmm.


 **Sarah Noel** 34:55


The chair of the Commission.


 **Jim Snell** 35:02
OK.


 **Sarah Noel** 35:05
The the and I think we we need to get back kind of on track of.


 **Tracy Van de Vate** 35:05
Well then.

 **Sarah Noel** 35:11
Getting to the points that we need to work through as F and A and as the Commission in order to get to a place where we can continue to.
Conduct business as we continue through, but I think ironing out every little detail for what each person does could change tomorrow, and then we'd have to come back and redo it again.

 **Terry Silver** 35:30
Hmm.

 **Sarah Noel** 35:32
So I would advise against adding any.
Additional timelines.

 **Tracy Van de Vate** 35:38
Are you asking? Are you saying that we don't need 3.4 and 3.5?

 **Sarah Noel** 35:44
I think that's important because it outlines what's expected from F and a what F and A expects from the chair of the Commission. We do not expect the director to sit down and walk through the timeline. I think we can do that when a new chair comes on.

 **Tracy Van de Vate** 35:44
Yep.



Sarah Noel 35:59

But that's not the purpose of the MOU.

I think we're drifting away from what the intent of the MOU is.



Jim Snell 36:07

Sorry, Tracy, I don't speak for you, but I see you're muted, Sarah.

I think she meant we can share some of that detail with the Board Development Committee as they're on boarding a new chair.

So we can kinda take that as a offline task. I do think adding a bullet here in terms of the chair's responsibilities, that does tie back nicely to 4.9 is what Jim is typing on the screen is working with our leadership to.



Terry Silver 36:25

Mm H.



Jim Snell 36:32

Understand and conduct the performance steps throughout the performance cycle. And I say it that way, Tracy, only editing what you said because it is more than just the the annual evaluation.

There's two interim check insurance throughout the year that I think it's really good to get that feedback from the chair.

And since we struck outlined an EO 55 because that is not an EO 55, I'm comfortable adding that as a bullet, and especially since it ties back to 4.9.

Sarah, do you have different thoughts?

I can see your face.



Sarah Noel 37:19

I think it's captured in Section 4.

I don't think it's necessary under the expectations under the chair for the purposes of the MOU, and I think that is kind of in line with the conversations we've had.



Jim Snell 37:33

I don't disagree.

I'm trying to find a middle ground if that terrier, the current chair, does that, where do you? I mean, taking what Tracy has said is some of her feedback.

TS **Terry Silver** 37:39

Mm hmm.

JS **Jim Snell** 37:43

Where do you land in in capturing that as a component of where we've had some Gray space?

TS **Terry Silver** 37:52

Two things I'm thinking about and, and I'm basing this on not only.

My experience, but also previous chair experiences that that have.

Been shared with me so.

First of all I like I like what Jim typed in.

I was curious about the actual numbers that go into the performance evaluation.

If if the designated leadership from F and A is only the only person that puts those numbers in, and the only way that I'm working with that designated leadership is through feedback, it's just it's not.

Formally, officially on the evaluation that that, for example, let's say there's a section that talks about working with staff members and and you give Jim A5 and I say no, it's a 3.

It would be kind of in the middle.

We don't do that right.

You're the one who are the designated leadership, Adam.

I'm sorry. Is the person who completes the performance evaluation?

And then I give feedback that that was a problem with previous chairs.

JS **Jim Snell** 39:07

Yeah, I.

Yeah. And again, that's where I come back to.

Not to be so hard and fast, but their state employees and it's a state process and we own that process from end to end. And I feel like we.

TS **Terry Silver** 39:21

It's OK.

It's OK.

Mm hmm.

JS **Jim Snell** 39:28

Are I want to say coming to the table to solicit the feedback and incorporate that and take it into consideration, but at the end of the day, we still own the process, but I mean, if I could, you know, not be in a one of the two people.

TS **Terry Silver** 39:34

Mm hmm.

T **Tracy Van de Vate** 39:37

Thank you.

JS **Jim Snell** 39:42

In that I would think that we could.

We would have kind of conversations.

Around.

Recommendations and and hear both sides and you know landing on. You know, yes. Does F and a reserve final.

Say, but you know, as we're working through and receiving feedback, it's it's bidirectional. In a perfect world, I think.

So.

TS **Terry Silver** 40:20

OK.

I I did not understand the process until I came in as chair.

So I have not had a problem working with Adam at all.

I just and I think it would be good if we put in here back up to that statement that you just added, Jim.

My suggestion would be.

Yeah, work with F and a designated leadership on the performance evaluation.

Fna program director.

We're not spelling it out.

Exactly what that looks like, but if we get someone other than Adam who says all I want to know is to hear your opinion, should it be spelled out what that working relationship looks like in terms of the performance evaluation? Or is it OK to be to just have it stated just like it is right here?

JS **Jim Snell** 41:16

I'd be comfortable with adding something about in, in collaboration or in conjunction through conversation, something like that.

TS **Terry Silver** 41:21

I don't.

Me too.

JS **Jim Snell** 41:21

But I almost wonder if that's better in 4.9.

It it looks like.

TS **Terry Silver** 41:25

Hmm.

JS **Jim Snell** 41:27

It looks like it based on what was already there.

Yeah, that it probably in the com like this kind of just set says that you're gonna high level. The chair's gonna work with. And I I left it kind of vague because we do want it to like if I I could put Assistant Commissioner, but if that.

TS **Terry Silver** 41:29

Mm.

JS **Jim Snell** 41:43

Changes in the future, then we would have to go in and change this. But so whoever's designated by FNA to be the supervisor would work with the Chair on the evaluation.

That's high level. And then going back to the.

This is perhaps.

TS **Terry Silver** 42:00

You.

JS **Jim Snell** 42:03

Where something here could be.

Could be added.

I don't know what it would be, but something.

Umm.

It's perhaps before its evaluation and rating.

I don't have that desert.

So maybe too simple.

TS **Terry Silver** 42:33

How how do you feel about that, Adam?

JS **Jim Snell** 42:37

Yeah, I don't think that.

Yeah, I'm good with that.

I also wonder, I mean this probably a conversation for another day, but some of that may be captured in that comment.

And again, this might be going back to some of Tracy's stuff, finding that balance of what from this comment needs to be pulled over if anything in terms of kind of the process of how I'm getting regular feedback from the chair and how I'm incorporating that versus.

What we're just comfortable.

In.

Not stating. Whereas this is kind of.

More of that flow of how.

All that happens not initially when it happens, but how it happens and at what step it happens at.

T **Tracy Van de Vate** 43:17

I do think we have to be very careful.

And not.

And be very aware that, well, well, you're giving direction and.

Working with the executive director.

That and this is, I think, very hard to do and can be very subtle at times, but.

Fna. The Commission can only change the Commission process.

And that F and A should not be able to change the Commission processes through performance reviews.

And and I think that is very subtle, but I think we have to be very careful that that, that that doesn't happen.

We're only attached to F and a administratively, but our mandate comes down from the governor's office to to the Commission.

And not to FNA. So I.

I think we I you know, I think we have to be very.

JS **Jim Snell** 44:24
Hello.

T **Tracy Van de Vate** 44:28
Very thoughtful.

In that.

That if, if, if the Commission decides to make a change, or the chair decides to make some kind of change that that comes through the Commission not to F and a through performance plans.

To the executive director.

TS **Terry Silver** 44:53
OK.

Adam, you had your hand up.

JS **Jim Snell** 44:54
Can you specify what you mean there?

T **Tracy Van de Vate** 44:57
Well, let's say you.

I don't know, somebody says.

I.

Umm.

I don't like.

I don't like the dates that were set and you don't set the dates. The executive director doesn't say set the dates correctly based on.

F and as whatever F and A wants and but the Commission sets their own dates.

The Commission, the chair assigns their own committee.

Committee chairs the the Commission decides.

On the committees that it wants to have or combined in committees or.

If something's efficient or inefficient with the Commission, that's not for FNA to decide.

That's the Commission itself to decide.

That Commission business.

And I, you know, and it is, you know, it's I I think we we need to be thoughtful about that because.

It can go down a road that all of a sudden that we see.

Fna, directing the executive director to change things about the Commission because it's in its staff review and I haven't seen Jim's review so I don't know if there's anything in there.

I'm just saying that that's something that I think we need to be careful of.

JS

Jim Snell 46:36

Yeah. And I think that that's where there continues to be Gray space of, you know, in terms of how we provide feedback for the staff to be managed or the operations of the team or stuff like that as long as it is not.

Direct Commission business.

Fna would have.

I mean through that administrative support, because the office is attached to us, it is part of FNA, we would have purview over that.

So I I guess I'm struggling a bit because I don't know if you're if you have like a specific example in mind or if we're talking in generalities of something we want to avoid.

But I I do to that point, I think, and I've shared this with Thierry is.

That is something that we have to consider because FNA still does manage this team. It's not just administratively attached, and I think that that's where the Gray space has been. Is the thought that there, you know, FNA is just here to provide space and

laptops and copies.

That's not accurate, and that's I think what needs to be clarified in this document.

T Tracy Van de Vate 47:51

I I will have to say that my viewpoint of F and A is not that they just provide space and copies. OK I I I they do a whole lot more than that and and we all I think we all know that and we understand that.

And we we value.

The expertise.

And and have valued it for a long time.

The expertise that.

And the wisdom that FNA brings when Commission has questions and.

And and and doing things and being able to to do the mission that we've been assigned to do so.

You know.

Awesome people there.

And but I I just I you don't want something to you know if if the chair has something about the Commission that says the executive director is you know we we ask the executive to director to sign these meetings at 11:00 for zoom and the executive dire. Is not doing those things.

That the chair has asked. Then you know, that's where that or if the executive or the chair wants to change committee assignments or whatever.

But at the same time, that should come from the chair in the evaluations that, that, that business comes from the chair if.

If you know and not that it's somehow managed its way.

To sneak into FN as evaluation of the chair that forces the executive director to do something so that his evaluation will be on the positive.

For F and A and that and that forces him to change or to manipulate the chair, and how the Commission does business to be able to get those evaluations. And I I don't know Jim's evaluation, I I know it when I did it years ago.

But that's all I know.

And so I don't have anything specific that I can point to, but I do think we we need to be careful with that.

So I do think you know when we talk about the process of combining ever, how we want to combine the evaluations between F and A and the chair, you know, the chair

should keep their. I mean, she's not going to put evaluations in to try to make. Put evaluations in to try to make the executive executive director to change things in F and A that that her thing is from her perspective as the chair. And the Commission, and not F and a, and I'm just afraid, I just think avoid. I think we just need to avoid that and that if the chair thinks that there's something in that evaluations that's being directed at the Executive Director. Instead of at the the Chair, because that's where those changes come from for the Commission.

JS Jim Snell 51:11

So if I told Jim, I apologize, I'm gonna have to step out a little early.

T Tracy Van de Vate 51:11

But is the chair.

JS Jim Snell 51:16

I'm not getting up and leaving the conversation, not walking away from the table. I am gonna have to drop a little bit early, but it sounds like we might be talking about last year when we added the survey component to the subcommittees, and Amy felt that that was Commission business. It to rip the Band-Aid off. Is that what we're talking about?

T Tracy Van de Vate 51:38

I don't.
I don't know.

JS Jim Snell 51:41

OK.

T Tracy Van de Vate 51:41

I.
I I don't know anything about the evaluation.
Just.
You know this is a.

This is a complex thing.

And Jim's job or the executive director's.

Pardon me, Jim. The executive director's position is very complex.

And and he does have two bosses, unfortunately.

I mean, no matter how you look at it, he has the the chair and the Commission, which he works for and.

And and he is.

That's his, you know, primary responsibility.

Ability. I mean, I know that technically he works for the state, but his position is there to do the business.

Of volunteer Tennessee and and those Commission things to change things about the Commission, if we're going to have Commission changes, if you know if I think that we're doing something wrong in the Commission or I like, I don't like the way we.

We do a meeting or something. It's not to go to FNA and to say, hey, I think we're doing this all wrong.

It's me to speak to the chair and say, hey, I think this is wrong.

TS Terry Silver 53:02
Hmm.

T Tracy Van de Vate 53:02
So same with F and a F and A thinks the Commission is doing something wrong that shouldn't show up in an executive director's.
Evaluation, because that has to do with what they think.
The Commission should or should.
Would not be doing.
That should be in a discussion with the chair.
And not with the executive director, because there's some things the executive director cannot control.

JS Jim Snell 53:32
Well, so and and I don't you know, I'm not in the weeds of of you know how how y'all operate but just playing on hypothetical since we spent the last 20 minutes on a hypothetical that I'm still not sure what we're talking about.

But let me sort of play out what you were, what you were going down and and where. I think something might might fall into an evaluation.

There's certain laws and rules around meetings.

For example, since you were given a a meeting example that the state has to follow, let's say the chair, says Jim.

I want you to schedule a meeting for tomorrow.

Of and you know, push that out.

Well, you know, there's open meeting laws and things like that. If Jim does that, you know, we expect Jim to advise the Chair and the Commission of on.

Everything related to its business.

If Jim does not do that, then yes, it will show up in Jim's evaluation.

T **Tracy Van de Vate** 54:37
Michelle.

JS **Jim Snell** 54:39
Jim doesn't.
Just blatantly and blindly.
Do whatever the chair says. If it's a violation of the law, I'm being a little extreme here because I'm not really following your concern with with what we've been talking about, but just want to say there probably is some overlap. I also think we've talked a whole lot.
About something that's.
It's a hypothetical that's that's likely not happening.
But I just want to say there's probably are some opportunities for things to show up now.
You know, we're not going to.
I don't think you'll ever see. Oh, you know Jim schedule. Let the chair schedule a meeting on a Thursday and F and A doesn't like Thursday meetings on a, you know, that's not going to.
Come into play.
But.

JY **Jessica Youngblom** 55:34
I think the other thing to point out too is Jim's evaluation every year, the way that the

state works. I'm assuming it's the same for FNA as it is for us at Department of Mental Health.

But we have work outcomes and so that's what you're being evaluated on through each interim period. And your final review.

Those work outcomes don't change throughout the year, so they're set in July and then that's what we're working off of.

So that's what the comments and that's what the final evaluation is based off of.

So I don't know if that helps clear up any of.

What the fear is but that work outcome is pretty it's a work outcome and then activities that follow that work outcome that align with that.

So I'm not sure if that's helpful at all either.

TS **Terry Silver** 56:17

I just want to make a note.

It is 1258.

I don't wanna. You know, I I wanna be respectful of your time that we have.

JS **Jim Snell** 56:35

Yes, we are running short on time.

So.

I think, Terry, if I'm not mistaken, it sounded like everybody was OK with the addition to 3.4 of that last bullet point.

And if that's the case, then I think.

The probably the next time we pick up, it would be with 3.5 and restarting there.

TS **Terry Silver** 57:10

I agree.

JS **Jim Snell** 57:11

Choose search I want search.

TS **Terry Silver** 57:18

Now Jim, you'll send out a doodle poll for us for our next meeting and hopefully we can get through.

You know, work on finishing up three.

 **Jessica Youngblom** 57:29

Yeah, and it would probably be good for everyone to review the rest of the document so everyone knows what's in it.

 **Terry Silver** 57:33

Yes.

Mm hmm.

 **Jessica Youngblom** 57:36

So that we're able to move through it a little faster.

 **Terry Silver** 57:40

I I think these conversations are such that that we we've been needing to have.

So I apologize if it seems a little.

You know overboard for you guys, but I just I think we want to just make sure that we're clear.

On this relationship and and how and and how how it works together.

How we work together so.

 **Sarah Noel** 58:03

Jim, I have a quick question.

 **Terry Silver** 58:03

OK.

 **Sarah Noel** 58:05

Do you have an estimated timeline of how many more meetings you want to have on this?

 **Jim Snell** 58:10

OK, it looks like you got.

 **Terry Silver** 58:10

Purse.



Sarah Noel 58:11

Or or Terry.



Jim Snell 58:13

Yeah, I think that's a question for Terry.

But I think someone has.



Terry Silver 58:18

I'm I'm.

Yeah, I was.

I really had hoped, you know, we could have gotten a little bit further today, but I do think we have some important things to talk about.

I'm thinking maybe 2-2 more meetings.



Sarah Noel 58:31

Two more, OK.



Terry Silver 58:35

And we appreciate you, you know, being here, Sarah and I know that's.



Sarah Noel 58:38

No, no, of course I am trying to make sure that we're all on the same page.



Terry Silver 58:43

Gotcha. OK. All right, it's 101. I want to thank everybody for being here today and we'll continue our conversation our next meeting.

Thank you.



Jim Snell 58:53

Thanks everyone.

● **Jim Snell** stopped transcription