

**State of Connecticut
Consumer Advisory Board**

**March 19, 2014
Special Meeting Summary**

Members Present: Patricia Checko (Chair); Arlene Murphy (Chair); Jeffrey G. Beadle; Alice Ferguson; Bryte Johnson; Theanvy Kuoch; Sharon D. Langer; Nanfi Lubogo; Cece Peppers-Johnson; Richard Porth

Members Absent: Yvette H. Bello; Cheryl Harris Forbes

Meeting called to order at: 2:07 p.m.

Executive Session to discuss Consumer Advisory Board and workgroup applications

The board discussed compressed time period allotted to complete their work and the process they would use to determine nominations for workgroup and CAB membership. Board members took 10 minutes to score applications and review the answers to the additional questions they asked regarding employment and potential conflicts of interest. The goal is to identify high ranking candidates for board and workgroup membership. Board members will go home with an additional 25 applications for review. The board will first focus on selection criteria and then look at balancing criteria. If there are questions that come up that need answering, the board planned to put them on a “parking lot” to work on later.

Motion: To enter into executive session to review and discuss workgroup membership – Richard Porth; seconded by Jeffrey Beadle.

There was a question as to why the review process was being done in executive session. The decision was that workgroup deliberations were personnel matters and they were trying to be mindful of applicant privacy.

All voted in favor.

The board entered into executive session at 2:28 p.m.

The board entered back into regular session at 3:53 p.m.

Planning for March 21, 2014 Consumer Advisory Board Meeting

The board discussed the potential meeting agenda for Friday’s meeting. They planned to start with a public comment period, would likely table the review of meetings to a later time, take five minutes to review the process and then move into executive session. During the executive session, the board would develop a list of final recommendations, which would then be voted on during regular session. After that recommendation is made, the board will look at next steps that will include developing a meeting schedule and a new member orientation.

There was discussion as to how the recommendations would be presented at the March 24, 2014 Steering Committee meeting. The committee will receive a list of recommendations. There was a hope expressed that the Steering Committee would not announce candidates until they have been approved by Steering Committee.

There was discussion of the time needed to vet potential members. Some of the applicants are very well known to the board but others are not known at all. Given the time available, the board will

send questions to candidates with the option of following up if necessary. The board may recommend one or two additional candidates but significantly changing the composition of the workgroups may be a problematic process.

The board discussed the vote on the recommendations and whether they should use a simple majority. They decided to go into the discussion with the expectation that they will come to consensus.

There was also discussion about the potential that some applicants have misclassified themselves as either consumer or advocates. An additional candidate was referred to the CAB by Michael Michaud. The applicant had applied as a provider but really worked more as an advocate. The board decided that particular case was likely a mistake and the candidate will be added to the board's list for consideration.

Meeting adjourned at 4:26 p.m.