



OHIO CONSTITUTIONAL MODERNIZATION COMMISSION

**MINUTES OF THE
EDUCATION, PUBLIC INSTITUTIONS, AND LOCAL GOVERNMENT COMMITTEE**

**FOR THE MEETING HELD
THURSDAY, APRIL 14, 2016**

Call to Order:

Chair Chad Readler called the meeting of the Education, Public Institutions, and Local Government Committee to order at 9:41 a.m.

Members Present:

A quorum was present with Chair Readler, Vice-chair Gilbert, and committee members Beckett, Coley, Cupp, Curtin, Sawyer, and Taft in attendance.

Approval of Minutes:

The minutes of the February 11, 2016 meeting of the committee were approved.

Presentation:

Article VI, Section 6 (Tuition Trust Authority)

Chair Readler began the meeting by noting the committee would be receiving a presentation on Article VI, Section 6 dealing with the Ohio Tuition Trust Authority.

*Timothy Gorrell
Executive Director
Ohio Tuition Trust Authority*

Chair Readler introduced Timothy Gorrell, executive director of the Ohio Tuition Trust Authority (OTTA), an agency within the Department of Higher Education charged with responsibility for administering the tuition credits program set forth in Article VI, Section 6.

Mr. Gorrell indicated the OTTA originally was created in 1989 under R.C. Chapter 3334, with the purpose of helping families save for higher education expenses. He continued that, in

November 1994, Ohio voters approved State Issue 3, a constitutional amendment that provided the state's full faith and credit backing for the Ohio Prepaid Tuition Program (now known as the Guaranteed Savings Plan), and to clarify the federal tax treatment of that plan.

According to Mr. Gorrell, in 1996, Section 529 was added to the Federal Internal Revenue Code to provide a federal tax-advantaged way to save for college education expenses. Then, in 2000, the Ohio General Assembly authorized Ohio to offer variable savings plans, as well as allowing a state tax benefit by which Ohio residents can deduct up to \$2,000 a year, per beneficiary, from their Ohio taxable income.

In December 2003 the Guaranteed Savings Plan was closed to contributions and new enrollments in response to rapidly rising tuition costs and investment pressures due to the market environment, said Mr. Gorrell. Then, in 2009, existing legislation was changed to place OTTA under the Department of Higher Education, with the role of OTTA's 11-member board being limited to a fiduciary duty over the investments in OTTA's college savings plans.

Mr. Gorrell described OTTA as a "non-General Revenue Fund, self-funded agency," with all of its operating expenses being funded through account fees paid by CollegeAdvantage Program account owners.

Mr. Gorrell said OTTA currently sponsors three plans under the CollegeAdvantage 529 College Savings Program. He said funds invested in these plans may be used at any accredited college or university in the country, as well as at trade schools and for other education programs that are eligible to participate in federal financial aid programs. According to Mr. Gorrell, across the three plans, OTTA directly manages or oversees over 641,000 accounts and \$9.4 billion in assets as of March 31, 2016.

Mr. Gorrell further explained that, in November 1994, by adopting Article VI, Section 6, Ohio voters approved providing the Guaranteed Savings Plan with the full faith and credit backing of the state, meaning that, if assets are not sufficient to cover Guaranteed Savings Plan liabilities, the Ohio General Assembly will appropriate money to offset the deficiency.

Mr. Gorrell also indicated that OTTA has the responsibility to generate investment returns on assets to match any growth in tuition obligations, noting that, currently, OTTA has sufficient assets on a cash basis to meet the payout obligations of the existing tuition units and credits held by account owners.

Mr. Gorrell concluded that Ohio's CollegeAdvantage 529 College Savings Program, including the Guaranteed Savings Plan, helps Ohioans and others across the country save over time to help offset the future costs of higher education.

He said OTTA does not recommend any changes to the existing Article VI, Section 6 of the Ohio Constitution. Reiterating that the purposes of the constitutional amendment were (1) to clarify federal tax treatment of the Guaranteed Savings Plan, and (2) to provide the Guaranteed Savings Plan with the full faith and credit backing of the State of Ohio, he said the federal tax goal of the provision came from a period of unsettled case law that created uncertainty as to whether similar prepaid tuition programs were exempt from federal taxation. Because that uncertainty has since

been resolved by the codification of Internal Revenue Code Section 529, he said the constitutional provision is no longer necessary to clarify federal tax treatment of such plans. However, he said, with regard to the second purpose of establishing the full faith and credit backing of the Guaranteed Savings Plan, OTTA defers to experts in Ohio constitutional law as to whether the constitutional language is necessary to maintain that guarantee. He said OTTA believes its duty is to continue to service the existing Guaranteed Savings Plan account holders and to manage the investments in a way that minimizes risk to the state under the guarantee.

Chair Readler asked whether Article VI, Section 6(A) continues to have a purpose. Mr. Gorrell answered that his understanding is that when the plans began in the 1990s, these types of college savings plans were just starting up and many were guaranteed plans. He said at that time there were concerns about the status of the plans under federal tax law, and no federal guidelines. He said Ohio decided to address that concern, but after the constitutional amendment was adopted and the federal government caught up by codifying Section 529, Article VI, Section 6(A) was no longer necessary.

Chair Readler followed up, asking if Mr. Gorrell agreed that it is not necessary to remove Section 6(A). Mr. Gorrell said the Guaranteed Savings Plan has been closed since 2003, with each year having fewer account holders, so there will be a time in the future when the fund will not exist anymore. He concluded that the question of whether there needs to be a constitutional provision or not will be answered by the passage of time.

There being no further questions, Chair Readler thanked Mr. Gorrell for his presentation.

Article VI, Section 4 (State Board of Education)

Chair Readler then turned the committee's attention to its continuing consideration of Article VI, Section 4, relating to the state board of education and provision for the appointment of a state superintendent of public instruction.

Russell Harris
Ohio Education Association

Chair Readler recognized Russell Harris, education research development consultant for the Ohio Education Association (OEA), an organization that represents 122,000 educators across the state. Mr. Harris indicated that he was appearing to express the OEA's concerns relating to the suggestion that the state board of education be an all-appointed board.

Indicating the OEA has had a longstanding policy that supports an all-elected state board, Mr. Harris noted that state board members are among the few public officials who are considered to be "non-partisan." He said an all-appointed board would not be less political, and that, although there are some appointed board members in the current system, "having an all-appointed board would make it more vulnerable to the political whims of whoever is governor."

Mr. Harris said, in 1994, when the then-sitting board refused to appeal the state's loss in the *DeRolph* school funding case, the governor called for an all-appointed board. He said the General Assembly rejected this idea, but compromised by creating the current hybrid board

consisting of eight gubernatorial appointees and eleven elected representatives from districts that are each comprised of three state senate districts.

Mr. Harris continued that, while the current hybrid board has at times been subject to partisan politics, it also has agreed on important issues such as the need for stronger oversight and accountability for charter schools. He said having elected board members has made the overall board more responsive to the public's desire for reform. Nevertheless, he added there are still many instances where the votes of the board are "along party lines," with appointed members joining with members of their own party to form a working majority on most votes.

He said it is not clear just who the appointed or at-large members of the board represent. He said they may represent people in their home school district or county, or they may be carrying out the wishes of the governor who appointed them. In any event, he continued, they do not have to answer to the voters.

Mr. Harris concluded that, in order to best serve the needs of Ohio's students, the state board should be an independent voice for public education. He said an autonomous, all-elected board can better advocate for high-quality educational opportunities for all children, and for providing resources based on educational needs instead of political expedience.

Chair Readler thanked Mr. Harris for his remarks, asking Mr. Harris whether one of the speakers who had presented to the committee had proposed that the state board of education be all-appointed. Mr. Harris said the only speaker who had advocated for an all-appointed board was Tom Gunlock, current president of the State Board of Education. Chair Readler disagreed, saying his recollection was that Mr. Gunlock had suggested several possibilities for improvement, with one possibility being an all-appointed board.

Mr. Ed Gilbert asked whether Mr. Harris had suggestions regarding whether the superintendent should be elected or appointed. Mr. Harris said the OEA does not have an official position on that question, but has always operated under the model that the state board has one employee, who is the superintendent, and that the board has the ability to hire and fire the state superintendent. He noted there are only 13 states that have an elected superintendent, thus, in the majority of cases, the board has control over the state superintendent.

Chair Readler noted that in a majority of states the governor appoints the board members, unlike Ohio, adding that even though the state board is picking the superintendent, the governor is picking the board.

Representative Michael Curtin commented that all all-appointed boards are not created equal, suggesting that providing safeguards as to what sort of candidates would be forwarded to the governor for his consideration could help improve the composition of the board. He said, for example, there could be a nominating council to vet and forward names to the governor, and the council could be comprised of experienced stakeholders. He added that there could be criteria for who could be considered for a nomination. He said, for example, the candidate could be required to have served two terms on a local board of education before being considered, there could be a requirement for interviews by the council along with the council's approval by a supermajority vote (2/3 for example), followed by consent of the Senate by supermajority vote.

He asked Mr. Harris, if such a procedure were in place, whether the OEA would still oppose any type of appointment to the board.

Mr. Harris said Rep. Curtin's suggestion was an interesting prescription for the board's configuration, and would be better than the current structure. He said Rep. Curtin's plan would improve the appointment process, and that OEA would have to see the details. However, he said his organization would look at that plan much more favorably than it views the current system.

Senator Tom Sawyer asked whether Mr. Harris could describe how an all-elected board differs from a hybrid board in terms of problem-solving and decision-making. Mr. Harris said there are eleven races for the state board, noting that seven of the seats are up for a vote in November, and that for the last three election cycles there have been seven board member seats contested each time. He said there has been a great deal of campaigning for state board positions. Based on his experience attending all board meetings, he said he has noticed that elected members are aware of regional, parent, and local board concerns particularly relating to high-stakes testing. He said he has seen fair and well-intended resolutions go down, and said there would be a difference if it were an all-elected board. He emphasized the importance of removing topics from the governor's administration, citing this as a way of preventing recent scandals. He noted that when the General Education Development (GED) program was taken out of the Department of Education and given to a private firm, the price increased and there are many fewer GEDs being given now. He said board members are upset, and would like to work with the legislature to get it back into the hands of the department, but the elected members are sensitive to the preferences of the public while appointed members are not because they look to the administration's view. He said he thinks things would be different if there were an all-elected board, and the autonomy that goes with that.

Mr. Harris cited the current trend in which there is frequent turnover of the superintendent as one symptom of the problem, indicating that superintendents would not be forced out if there were an all-elected board. He said, however, that state board districts are unwieldy, with three senate districts together making one state board district. He said the current system results in a huge geographical area, with approximately 900,000 or more voters in each district.

Chair Readler asked whether Mr. Harris is proposing a board with 33 members, to which Mr. Harris said no, but that the districts are too big. He said the solution would be to follow the lines of Congressional districts.

Committee member Roger Beckett said currently the constitution is silent on the question of how the state board is selected; it is left to the legislature. He asked whether it is the association's position that the method of selecting the board should be taken out of statute and put in constitution. Mr. Harris said that would be OEA's first preference, and that OEA wants a constitutional amendment for all-elected board. Nevertheless, he said, OEA recognizes that statutes allow some flexibility because times change, technology changes, and the legislature needs to react. So, he said, the first preference would be for a constitutional amendment, and the second preference would be to leave Section 4 the way it is.

Senator Bill Coley said legislators generally care more about the opinions of the local boards in their home districts rather than those of the state board. He said he does not foresee a possibility

that the General Assembly would cede authority over education or educational funding to the state board. He asked whether, given that reality, a state board of education is necessary. He also wondered why it would not work to have a superintendent who is a member of the governor's cabinet.

Mr. Harris answered that the state needs a state board to implement legislation enacted at both state and federal levels, to set standards, and to define and coordinate rules. He said he agrees the legislature should not give up authority to provide funding and set direction, but implementing educational policy needs to be done by education professionals, not political professionals. He said that can be accomplished better with an all-elected state board.

Governor Bob Taft noted that, at the committee's last meeting, Senator Peggy Lehner had recommended that the superintendent be a member of the governor's cabinet appointed by the governor, but that the person would not change with every administration. He said the most interesting part of her testimony was her observation that the primary function of the board is to set a clear educational vision for the state, and to provide a long-term strategic plan or road map for everyone to follow. He said Sen. Lehner recommended that the board include key stakeholders selected on the basis of their expertise. He said he found that plan interesting, and suggested that the state board could include parents, or business leaders, for instance. Gov. Taft asked for Mr. Harris' reaction to Sen. Lehner's model.

Mr. Harris said he worked for the secretary of education in Pennsylvania for many years, and there that model worked very well, and under that model there was a lot of coordination with other members of governor's cabinet. He said, in a sense that plan moved things up a level to the cabinet level. He continued, if there were stronger, more representative, and experienced members of the board, they could lay out that vision, advocate programs and resources for children, and could deal with a secretary of education or other title who is in the governor's cabinet. But, he said, governors change and secretaries of education change. He asserted the reason for there being only a few superintendents over a span of 35 years was that the all-elected board was independent and autonomous and acted to maintain that continuity. He concluded, there are good attributes to both models, but there is a huge disruption to the educational improvement process when you change superintendents at the same time you change governors.

Gov. Taft noted he likes the concept of prescribing the nature of who is on board, requiring members who specifically represent the interests of teachers, school boards, and parents, for example, and selecting from a pool of candidates representing each seat.

Mr. Harris said that plan relates to the best aspects of Rep. Curtin's suggestion, and reduces the problem of board members having no background in educational policy. Mr. Harris said, if Ohio had a system with those requirements, it would be a better system than the current system.

Chair Readler commented on the need to take politics out of education. He asked how the system could be made less political. He said he is not sure the constitution should prescribe the selection of the members. He said the Pennsylvania model is very governor-dominated. He asked Mr. Harris whether, under the current constitutional language, change is being inhibited because the board is required to appoint the superintendent. He said the constitution has tied the hands of groups that want to resolve these issues.

Mr. Harris said the fact that the state superintendent is the single employee of the board has been a good model and has allowed for the independence and autonomy of the state board through the decades with the result that the board has had a nonpartisan history. He said he would be hesitant to take that authority away from the state board and give it to the governor unless things really changed and there were a system such as described by Rep. Curtin and Gov. Taft.

Chair Readler commented that he would like to make the process less political, but he is not sure how. Mr. Harris gave school funding as an example, saying he worked on seven school funding cases across the country and that, because of the money involved, they politicized education in an unnecessary way. He said 49 states have now had school funding litigation. He said the conversation about education becomes about budgets, budget residuals, and the politics of spending, and not about the needs of children, or the educational system. He remarked, “we need to get the conversation back to the educational needs of the students,” adding the focus should be on the efficient administration of schools, and encouraging the best people to be teachers. He emphasized, “we need a strong, well-qualified board of education to take that on.”

Mr. Gilbert said he has a concern about Mr. Harris’ proposal to provide for an all-elected board in the constitution because the state’s history of gerrymandering has made the African American community concerned about being pushed out of the educational process. He said he does not know the current makeup of the board, but is concerned that if it is all-elected it will exclude African Americans, who predominantly rely on the public school system.

Mr. Harris noted that Sen. Sawyer has worked on that problem. He said Ohio badly needs redistricting reform, with fair districts for both the General Assembly and Congress. He said, until that happens, Mr. Gilbert’s concerns are valid because of the way the districts are drawn. Mr. Harris said he is optimistic and hopeful regarding redistricting reform. But, he said, in addition to the problems and solutions noted by Rep. Curtin and Gov. Taft, there should be diversity on the state board; thus, the criteria for choosing board members should include candidates who can serve minorities with expertise.

Mr. Gilbert asked about the current makeup of the board. Mr. Harris said there are many women members, and one Hispanic member, but no African American members of the board. He said all members realize diversity is a big problem.

There being no further questions for Mr. Harris, Chair Readler thanked him for his presentation.

Discussion:

Chair Readler then led the committee in its discussion of possible recommendations for Article VI, Section 4.

Mr. Beckett said consideration of Section 4 poses some complex questions. He said, in his view, there are parts of the section that bind the hands of the legislature, for example, there is no constitutional provision relating to the board of higher education or its chancellor, and therefore there is a forced separation between K-12 and higher education. He said, in recent years, states have begun to blend both of those educational systems, recognizing that some overlap is helpful.

As a way of assisting the committee in considering possible revisions to Section 4, Mr. Beckett proposed a revision that would broaden the General Assembly's ability to include higher education, giving the legislature more flexibility. He said his proposal also removes the constitutional requirement that there be a superintendent who is appointed by the state board. He said this does not mean there should not be a state board, but, rather, that the legislature should have the flexibility to best determine how appointments should be made or how K-12 and higher education work together.

Mr. Beckett proposed the following language for Article VI, Section 4:

To oversee education in this state, the General Assembly may provide for boards, departments, and directors that may be selected in such manner and for such terms as may be provided by law, and may prescribe by law their respective powers and duties.

Gov. Taft commended Mr. Beckett on his proposal, and said he thinks it is something the committee should seriously consider. He said, although the committee has not formally discussed this until now, it is clear that there are many views on the issue, noting his own views and those of Senator Peggy Lehner, who presented to the committee at its February 2016 meeting. He said, as compared with the local boards of education, he is not sure that the state board provides a significant measure of accountability given the size of the state board districts. Gov. Taft said the constitution has good language already that ought to be retained, for instance Article VI, Sections 2 and 3. He said language in those sections covers the educational needs of the state. He said his first inclination would be to totally remove Section 4, but that would be interpreted as a recommendation to eliminate the state board, which is not his intent.

Sen. Sawyer, expanding on Gov. Taft's comments, said the Ohio Constitution is modeled on the United States Constitution, which describes the functions the government is called to undertake and how Congress is to fulfill those responsibilities. He said this flexibility is expanded on in Mr. Beckett's proposal, which gives clarity, and reflects a goal of considering the changing nature of education in modern environment. He said he believes the proposal provides for the latitude the legislature needs, but should be combined with an electoral environment in which an elected board can provide the right circumstances for an appointed superintendent. He said while there are many formats by which that could be achieved, he would like to provide for the legislature to do that.

Mr. Gilbert said he appreciates what Mr. Beckett has proposed, but his concern is that the draft language does not require the General Assembly to do anything because it does not use the word "shall." He said that sends a bad signal to the public. He said the current language is a mandate, but under Mr. Beckett's proposal the legislature could decide to do nothing. He said a second problem is that the proposal ignores the problems that resulted in the *DeRolph* litigation, which is that poor districts were suffering because no one cared. He said there ought to be mandated language, and there must be some thought given to quality across-the-board for all school districts.

Rep. Curtin said he is concerned about the proposal, noting if this were the new Article VI, Section 4, it would wipe out the state board and the superintendent, replacing them with the great

unknown. He said, despite concerns, the existing section has served the state well. He said, “we have been trying to solve for partisanship, and increase the level of expertise of board members, but this exacerbates the problem because it gives the General Assembly the opportunity to do nothing and to leave it to the governor.”

Chair Readler said he agrees the proposal has some unknown aspects, leaving details to be addressed at some point. He observed the majority of states create state boards by statute and have resolved problems by having some kind of role for the governor. He said Ohio is the only state that has a constitutional superintendent of public instruction. Chair Readler said Mr. Beckett’s proposal would seem to take Ohio closer to other states, but that does not mean they are right and Ohio is wrong. Chair Readler asked Rep. Curtin if he has thoughts on how to ameliorate the concern about the unknown result of the proposed change.

Rep. Curtin said it is not possible to change Section 4 without a vote of the people, and, further, it would be necessary to have the support of stakeholders. He said the proposal, as drafted, “would invite warfare; we wouldn’t get it out of the Commission.” He remarked, “ideological warfare is at an all-time high, primarily because of gerrymandered districts.”

Mr. Beckett said, as a public member, he does not have knowledge of legislative concerns but can appreciate them. Responding to Gov. Taft, Mr. Beckett said what his proposal does could be addressed under Article VI, Sections 2 and 3. He agreed that eliminating Section 4 would be a mistake, and said he is not suggesting that. He agreed the proposal could be revised to include mandatory language. Mr. Beckett said he shares Rep. Curtin’s concern about how this might unfold, but noted it could be “the worst solution except for all the alternatives.” He said it would be a mistake to be more specific in the constitution, a result that concerns him. He said he wants to give the legislature the ability to address issues more effectively, rather than to allow the legislature to avoid the issues.

Sen. Coley commented that the proposed draft is a good starting point. He observed that sometimes people take questions as advocacy, cautioning that no one is suggesting that the state board be abolished. He suggested including a trigger mechanism so that the change would not take effect until 2023. He said, at that point, concerns would be alleviated because districts would be redrawn.

Rep. Curtin emphasized the importance of placing education in the hands of professionals. He said he would worry about turning policy over to the General Assembly. He said some things are so important that politics should be limited, and that nothing is more worthy of that goal than K-12 education. He said this type of proposal runs counter to the shared goal of reducing partisanship in education, suggesting that “if we could have a proposal that captures our shared goal of lowering partisanship and increasing expertise than we are onto something.”

Gov. Taft noted the role of the superintendent of public instruction in Ohio is for K-12, but that Florida has combined all educational sectors. He said, looking forward, the committee might want to preserve the option to have K-12 combined with higher education.

Mr. Gilbert agreed, saying “we need to look at expertise in the educational field.” He added that Mr. Beckett has done “an excellent job raising our attention to these matters, but to move forward we should turn to counsel, absorb comments, and come up with some alternatives.”

Sen. Sawyer commented that, as the committee progresses, it is important to remember the distinction between development of policy by the state board, and the administration of policy by the Department of Education. He said making sure the requirements of thoroughness and efficiency are carried out as a matter of policy should be done without regard to politics and partisanship. He continued, if there is a place where policy can be altered over time through elected board members, that is where democracy comes in. He concluded it is important to make sure the work of the Department of Education reflects the intended will of the elected board.

Gov. Taft asked whether staff could draft language that, without specifying who should be on the state board, would encourage the legislature to provide specifics that would secure greater expertise on the state board.

Rep. Curtin noted that many state boards reserve seats for people with expertise. But, he said, that is a matter for legislation, adding that, by statute, many boards are required to have certain members with expertise. He agreed that draft language would be useful.

Sen. Sawyer agreed with Rep. Curtin’s comment, saying the boards are where the General Assembly puts expertise within the departments.

Chair Readler asked whether requiring expertise should be part of the constitution, noting he is a minimalist and is not sure whether that is a subject for legislation. He wondered if there could be a proposal that would satisfy everyone.

Mr. Beckett said if the committee agrees to something along these lines, the legislature is going to have to act. He suggested the committee consult with the legislature. He remarked, “we have to be able to go to the voters and say this is intended to fix that problem.”

Rep. Curtin said, if the committee has staff follow up by providing draft language, there would be something for legislators to consider. He cautioned, however, that he does not want to propose something that would “create a firestorm in the educational community.”

Chair Readler asked how the committee should proceed. Sen. Coley suggested draft language could be a staff project.

Sen. Sawyer said he would want to provide the least-prescriptive mandate, noting that, under the U.S. Constitution, when there is a function created, it requires Congress to take action.

Rep. Curtin suggested a draft include a trigger date that is out several years. He said this will reduce anxiety and give time to deliberate.

Gov. Taft suggested staff have one version of proposed language that deals with the composition of the board, including the proposals suggested by Sen. Lehner as expressed in her presentation to the committee. He added there should be a succinct statement of purpose, such as “there shall

be a state board of education with authority to prescribe a clear vision for education in this state.” He said it would be useful to consider defining the role of the board in terms of long-term vision and planning in the state. He added he would encourage legislative members to convene with their respective caucuses to help refine language.

Rep. Curtin said if the committee has drafts of both statutory and constitutional language, the committee should allow the interested groups who have testified to offer more commentary on the direction of the committee, adding this would give the groups an opportunity to study the proposal.

Chair Readler emphasized the committee has been receptive to the public, and encouraged participation by interested groups.

New Business:

Chair Readler then asked if there was new business to come before the committee. Sen. Coley directed the committee’s attention to Article XV, Section 6 (Lotteries, Charitable Bingo, Casino Gambling), noting that the proscriptive language used in that section does not belong in constitution. He said he would like a presentation on that issue, asking that the question be revisited because of the monopoly issue that voters passed in November 2015. He said he would like to look at that issue as a committee because it is an area ripe for consideration now that the anti-monopoly provision passed. He noted the General Assembly has allowed promotional gaming, which has cost schools, a result that was not the intention of the voters. He said the committee might find a presentation on that topic interesting.

Chair Readler said Article XV, Section 6 is on the committee’s list, but maybe at the next meeting the committee can discuss when is the most appropriate time to bring that up.

Adjournment:

With no further business to come before the committee, the meeting adjourned at 11:24 a.m.

Approval:

The minutes of the April 14, 2016 meeting of the Education, Public Institutions, and Local Government Committee were approved at the September 8, 2016 meeting of the committee.

/s/ Chad A. Readler

Chad A. Readler, Chair

/s/ Edward L. Gilbert

Edward L. Gilbert, Vice-chair