

**Orange Media Network Advisory Board**  
**Minutes, Jan. 27, 2026**

**I. Call to order**

Board Chair [REDACTED] called the meeting to order at 4:05 p.m.

Present:

Chair [REDACTED]

Vice Chair [REDACTED]

[REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]  
[REDACTED] and the [REDACTED]  
[REDACTED] and ex officio board member  
[REDACTED] and ex officio board member  
Secretary and [REDACTED], in attendance to take minutes

Public: [REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]

Not present:

[REDACTED] of [REDACTED] (traveling)  
Representatives from [REDACTED], [REDACTED] [REDACTED] (not yet named)

**II. Review concerns**

Chair [REDACTED] reviewed the purpose of the board meeting: to review concerns raised by a formal written complaint made to the board about [REDACTED] [REDACTED] and to ensure the board has the opportunity to gain information and ask questions. She noted the board may choose to take action as a part of the meeting.

Chair [REDACTED] reviewed the timeline of the meeting and asked whether any members had commitments. [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] representatives both said they had class at 5 and CFSL's representative said she had a commitment at 5:30.

[REDACTED] noted for the record that the public portions of the meeting were being recorded and would be made available at a later date, along with the written minutes.

█████ reviewed the board's purpose as an independent body responsible both for the hiring and the taking of any necessary disciplinary action of the ██████. This is normally the responsibility of a direct supervisor, but as ██████ are independent of the university and of administrative decisions regarding them, the board acts as an impartial group specifically for that purpose. The job of board members in this meeting, he said, is to listen to the concerns, ask questions for clarification and decide what information is necessary if any action is to be taken.

█████ ██████ said she and the ██████ had met with the ██████ who signed the ██████, and also with ██████. The intention of the meeting, she said, is to ensure people have full information and can ask questions related to the complaints.

█████ said the plan is to adjourn into executive session for discussion at 4:30. She asked whether any member felt they should not be a part of deliberation.

█████ noted that one of the board members, ██████ ██████, ██████ ██████. ██████ said she did not intend to vote on the final outcome but asked to be in the room during deliberation. ██████ said ██████, as the ██████, would be not be a part of the deliberation. ██████ said he feels it would be unfair for one party to be excluded but not the other, and ██████ reminded the board to avoid any perceived conflicts of interest and keep the optics "above reproach."

█████ made a motion to ask both members to step out during the executive session. ██████ seconded. This passed unanimously.

█████ ██████ ██████ shared a summary of the complaints and the response ██████. ██████ also shared summaries from two staffers, one former and one current, in support of ██████.

After the summaries, ██████ opened the floor for questions.

█████ asked who on the current board was involved with ██████'s hiring and whether any part of her presentation involved ██████.

Only ██████ was a voting member on the board when ██████ was elected. He noted for the board that ██████ against ██████ also had ██████.

█████ outlined the hiring procedure for ██████: They must submit a resume and cover letter and a short, videotaped presentation for evaluation before election night, and then must appear before the board to answer questions about their candidacy. ██████ said the presentation usually has to do with their vision for their medium and does not center on fulfillment of their position description ██████.

█████ noted the summary of the complaint included a mention from ██████████ ██████ of ██████████ before ██████'s hiring. ██████ read from ██████'s account.

█████ said it sounded as though both sides could have benefitted from more support. He asked the complainants ██████████ what external support they had sought when problems arose.

██████████ said different ██████████ might answer differently, but that for herself, the issues centered mostly on ██████████. She said she has dealt with similar issues all her life and therefore was not comfortable going directly to the person responsible because ██████████ have been weaponized against her in the past. She said she might consider going to the Office of Equal Opportunity and Access if she felt she needed to.

██████████ said she met personally with ██████ "multiple times" throughout the last calendar year. She said she, ██████, ██████████ and ██████ met in September to work on procedures. She said she and ██████ also met with ██████ together and individually to work on those same procedures in an attempt to clarify duties.

██████████ asked whether "external support" meant outside ██████. ██████ said no, not necessarily.

██████████ said he had concerns at the beginning of the year, which he said initially he chalked up to a ██████████ just working out ways to get along. However, he said, problems kept building. About halfway through October, he said ██████ sat ██████████ down for a meeting and reminded them to bring up any issues they had with each other to the individual themselves. He said from that, he took the direction that he needed to go not to an adviser but to ██████ ██████ if he had a concern. He said he did not do so at first, but that issues were not getting better, so he asked to meet with ██████ one on one. He said he thought that meeting was productive and that ██████ was receptive, but it was hard to say how effective it was because the term ended directly afterward and everyone went on break. He said he has talked with both ██████ and ██████████ about ██████ concerns, but that he was asked to do so rather than choosing to do so.

██████████ said she met with ██████, ██████████ and ██████ at various times to get advice about how to handle ongoing conflicts with ██████████ and between other ██████████. She said she was advised to meet with ██████ one on one and did so, in October, to outline the procedures necessary for ██████████ to do its job most effectively. She said she did see initial improvement, but when things went downhill again, she would again go to advisers. She said ██████████ met together with ██████ for a summit in January to once again outline procedures and workflow.

██████████ said she had had problems during fall term, which she said were "one-offs." She said she had met only once with ██████ one on one and never with ██████████. ██████████ asked her definition of a one-on-one meeting and whether it involved actually leaving the fourth floor to count. ██████ ██████ then redirected the board to ██████'s question.

████ said she heard very little about the issues that make up the complaint, and almost nothing was brought to her directly. She said concerns that had been brought to her attention were brought by █████ and not by █████. She acknowledged █████ came to her with some basic █████ issues.

████ asked █████ where she had gone for support. █████ said to █████, and otherwise had received no support.

████ said the summary mentioned some issues were misattributed to █████ and asked for clarification. █████ said █████ letter said some of the complaints started prior to █████'s hiring, specifically saying they were rooted in the fact that █████ was █████ over some of the █████. █████ said she felt people were criticizing █████ and her █████ skills because █████.

████ asked for a copy of █████'s letter, which █████ printed out and made available to the board during executive session.

████ asked whether anyone had seen any improvement during █████'s tenure. █████ said he felt that █████, after hearing of concerns, would have a good, productive few days, in which she was competent and communicative, and then would "coast" a couple of weeks, and then the same issues would crop up, sending everyone back to square one.

████ asked whether this was true of both fall and winter. █████ said fall, and that he couldn't really speak for winter. Initially, he said, he did see improvement, but it would be hard to say whether it is consistent.

████ said she was in the office "all day every day" during week one of winter term, and overcommunicating with everyone. She said she felt the workflow summit at the end of week one went well. She said she is confused, and unsure how to respond about how to show "improvement" given that it is now only week three.

████ asked whether any discussion had been had about █████. █████ said █████ had never brought her concerns up, and that the █████ she had been told about she apologized for.

████ said people who are █████ do not always want to have direct conversations with the people who have █████ them, because it is not always safe to do so. █████ agreed, saying it was hard to overcome the power dynamic. She also said she remembered someone directly correcting █████ at least once; she believes it was during a █████. She said it was especially hard to be █████ after arriving back at █████ following a trip home, during which she'd had a harmful experience, and having shared about that experience.

█ said what stuck out to him was the handling of █ and the handling of the █ as an institution. He said when █ deals with sensitive topics and makes mistakes, how does the program as a whole address this?

█ asked whether he was talking about a █. █ said he was. She said she tried to address those concerns to the best of her ability, and that █ had seen the same █. She said she talked to █, changed the █ and talked to the █, who was new. She said the errors were from inexperience and would not happen again.

█ asked how a █ had been assigned to the █. █ replied the █ was breaking quickly and he was available. She said yes, in retrospect she would have handled it differently.

█ asked █ whether she had heard about █ complaints from █. She agreed she had. █ asked whether █ had gone to talk with the █. █ said she did in terms of some of the procedures - for instance, a spreadsheet that had not been completed according to the agreed-upon timeline - but that for personal complaints, she did not. She said it was clear █ had no confidence in her.

█ asked █ if she were to stay in the position, how she would guarantee that she would make changes and the changes would hold. █ replied that she didn't necessarily agree with the characterization that she didn't make any changes. She said she has been in the office more often. She said she couldn't say she could guarantee that improvements would be made, but she said she could say she understands. She also said she thought █ was a place for learning.

█ asked if any board members had further questions. On hearing none, she adjourned the board for a short break at 5:03 and then reconvened in executive session. This was open only to board members, excluding █ and █.

█ reconvened the meeting in open session at 5:44 p.m. █ made a motion to table the meeting until 10:10 a.m. Wednesday to allow for enough time to continue deliberations and not rush to judgment. █ seconded the motion, which passed unanimously. The chair adjourned the meeting at 5:45 p.m.