

CCMC Committee Special Meeting (Virtual)

Thursday, January 20, 2022 12:00 pm (EST)

Join my meeting from your computer, tablet or smartphone.

<https://global.gotomeeting.com/join/677937693>

You can also dial in using your phone: United States: [+1 \(312\) 757-3121](tel:+13127573121)

Access Code: 677-937-693

A quorum was present and the meeting was called to order at 12:00 pm by CCMC Committee Chairman John Rainaldi. Attending virtually were: Denise Talbot; David Kluczowski; Lisa Madden; Beth Hamel; Jennifer Gauthier; and Lisa Biagiarelli.

John noted that this was a special meeting with only one item on the agenda: discussion of the regulations concerning recertification. The meeting was called at the request of Jennifer Gauthier of the Office of Policy and Management. John invited Jennifer to discuss her concerns.

Jennifer noted that according to the December 2021 meeting minutes the Committee had discussed a policy that appeared to be contrary to the recertification regulations relating to what happens with a candidate who fails to recertify. The December 2021 meeting referenced a discussion that took place at the January 2021 CCMC Committee meeting. At that time the Committee discussed what happens when a candidate fails to recertify but failed to clarify that there are actually two different scenarios in which this might occur, and the process will not be the same. First, a candidate might have applied for recertification, been denied, and subsequently returned for reconsideration; and second, a candidate might fail to apply at all.

The consensus was that the regulations would consider a candidate to be eligible for “reconsideration” only if the candidate had actually applied for recertification and had been denied; that a candidate who simply failed to apply at all would not be eligible to seek “reconsideration” of a decision that had never been made, or that had been made by default. A person could not ask for reconsideration if they had never applied in the first place. The Committee agreed that the regulations are clear that in this situation the individual is no longer a CCMC.

Jennifer clarified that in this case the Committee is not responsible for reaching out to the individual who has failed to submit an application at all. If that individual comes to the Committee, and wants to have their designation restored, they would need to make an application to the CCMC Committee just as those seeking their designation for the first time must do; namely, they must show that they passed all four courses, and apply to sit for the comprehensive final examination again.

It was noted that this was different from the discussion the Committee had in January 2021 when it was contemplated that the candidate would potentially have to retake all four of the courses. Jennifer clarified that the regulations do not require the candidate to retake all four classes, but they do have to re apply to sit for the comprehensive written final examination again. She noted that the January 2021 minutes incorrectly describe the requirements laid out in the regulations.

Lisa Biagiarelli noted that the Committee cannot undo or change minutes of a meeting that took place and that she feels the minutes do accurately reflect what was discussed at that meeting.

It was noted that there were ten individuals who did not plan to submit for recertification in 2021 whose designations lapsed; and there were 3 other people who either submitted but did not get approved, or who failed to submit at all even though we were expecting them to submit. Any individual who submitted and did not get approved has 21 days to resubmit, according to the regulations. Those who did not submit at all would have to now submit an application to take the comprehensive final again and would have to show or prove that they successfully completed all of the courses.

It was noted that in some cases the Committee might not even have the records for when those individuals may have taken the courses. It was also noted that in the earlier days of the CCMC program there were only three courses rather than the current four courses, and that some of those who might have to reapply would have had to complete only three courses in order to have earned the CCMC designation at that time. Discussion ensued about whether a person would have to apply for a waiver if they had taken only three courses at the time they earned their CCMC designation. It was noted that originally there were three courses and what is currently courses 1 and 2 was originally only one course, called Course 1, and it was for a longer period. That course eventually was broken out into two courses, 1A and 1B. Then later the entire series was renamed 1, 2, 3 and 4, with the former 1A and 1B now being called 1 and 2, respectively.

Lisa Biagiarelli said she had a potential concern with a person being able to circumvent the purpose of recertification by being able to apply to take the exam again, passing it, and being awarded their designation again, without having taken even an hour of continuing education. She felt this was not in keeping with the intent of what recertification was supposed to accomplish. She felt it was wrong that a person could sit for the exam and get their designation back.

Jennifer said the purpose of this discussion was to clarify the discussion that was reflected in the December 2021 minutes; she wanted to ensure it was crystal clear that if the Committee denied an applicant, that person has 21 days to ask the Committee to reconsider the denial. On the other hand, if a person failed to apply at all, it was not a "reconsideration" that would be taking place, but rather an entirely new application process. Lisa Madden clarified that there was a difference between a denial versus a lapse or falling off that occurred because a person failed to apply at all.

John indicated he had written on behalf of the Committee to the three people whose designations lapsed in 2021, and that he had attached a copy of the regulations. One was now working as an assessor; one he knew was still working as a tax collector, but the application had been incomplete, and the individual never resubmitted.

Jennifer suggested that maybe the Committee should consider having a standing policy in place to allow a person to sit for the examination only one time in order to prevent a person from doing the same thing again five years later. John said he would mention this at the CTx spring meeting at Aquaturf when doing his CCMC Committee report.

John offered a recap and noted that in 2021, there were 46 individuals who needed to recertify. There were 10 people we knew would not be recertifying because they were no longer working in the field and that those 10 individuals planned to have their designations lapse. That left 36 individuals needing to

and planning to recertify by the end of 2021. All but three had met the deadline and achieved their recertification. Of those three, one had their application denied due to incompleteness, and the other two failed to submit an application for recertification. Only the one who had their application denied for incompleteness is eligible for reconsideration. At least two of the three individuals whose designations lapsed are still working as tax collectors.

There was no further business as this meeting had only one item on the agenda.

Lisa Madden made a motion to adjourn the special meeting at 12:30 pm; David seconded. It was noted that our next meeting would take place in 30 minutes and would be accessed via a different link.

All were in favor of the motion to adjourn.

Respectfully submitted by Lisa Biagiarelli, Secretary