

**National Council on Federal Labor-Management Relations
32nd Public Meeting
September 17, 2014**

The National Council on Federal Labor-Management Relations held its 32nd meeting at the Office of Personnel Management (OPM) on September 17, 2014. Co-chairing the meeting were OPM Director Katherine Archuleta, and Ms. Beth Cobert, Deputy Director for Management, Office of Management and Budget (OMB). The following Council members also attended the meeting:

Council Member	Title
Ms. Carol Bonosaro	President, Senior Executives Association
Mr. J. David Cox	National President, American Federation of Government Employees
Mr. Michael Filler	Director of Public Services, International Brotherhood of Teamsters
Mr. Sloan D. Gibson	Deputy Secretary, Department of Veterans Affairs
Mr. David Holway	National President, National Association of Government Employees
Ms. Patricia Niehaus	National President, Federal Managers Association
Ms. Carol Waller Pope	Chair, Federal Labor Relations Authority

The following individuals sat in for absent Council members:

- Mr. Matthew S. Biggs, Assistant to the President and Legislative Director, International Federation of Professional and Technical Engineers (IFPTE), for Mr. Gregory Junemann, President, IFPTE;
- Ms. Catherine Emerson, Chief Human Capital Officer (CHCO), Department of Homeland Security, for Mr. Alejandro Nicholas Mayorkas, Deputy Secretary of Homeland Security;
- Ms. Robin Heard, Deputy Assistant Secretary for Administration, Department of Agriculture, for Ms. Krysta L. Harden, Deputy Secretary of Agriculture;
- Ms. Paige Hinkle-Bowles, Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense for Civilian Personnel Policy, Department of Defense, for Mr. Robert O. Work, Deputy Secretary of Defense;
- Mr. Steve Keller, Senior Counsel, National Treasury Employees Union (NTEU), for Ms. Colleen M. Kelley, President, NTEU; and
- Mr. Richard Tarr, Associate General Counsel, Federal Education Association (FEA), for Mr. H.T. Nguyen, FEA Executive Director.

The Designated Federal Officer, Mr. Tim Curry, OPM Deputy Associate Director, Partnership and Labor Relations, was present, as were 2 media representatives and 39 other members of the public.

Agenda Item I: Welcome

At 10:05 a.m., Mr. Curry began the meeting by welcoming everyone to the fourth National Council meeting for 2014. He continued, "Before we begin today's Council meeting, I would like to make one administrative announcement. This Council operates as a committee under the Federal Advisory Committee Act or FACA. To facilitate opportunities for those of you who are not members of the Council and any other members of the public to address the Council directly, we have set aside time on the agenda for you to make brief statements to the Council. If you wish to address the Council regarding any topics presented today or any other matter, we request that you wait until the appropriate time on the agenda when we ask if any member of the public wishes to make any brief statements to the Council. Before we move on to today's agenda, we have some Council business to address. We previously shared the draft minutes of the July 2014 meeting with you via email. We've adopted all edits and corrections that were submitted. We recommend the Council approve the minutes for the July 2014 meeting. Do I have a motion to adopt the March 2014 meeting minutes?" It was moved and seconded that the minutes be approved as submitted. The Council unanimously approved the minutes without further revision, and proceeded with the meeting agenda. Mr. Curry turned the meeting over to the co-chairs, Ms. Cobert and Ms. Archuleta, to make a few remarks.

Ms. Archuleta apologized for missing the previous meeting and explained that she had been on travel. She said she knew that the Council members and Ms. Cobert had had a good meeting in July, and said she was pleased to be here today. Ms. Archuleta then announced that Mr. Sloan D. Gibson, Deputy Secretary of the Department of Veterans Affairs, had joined the Council. She noted that Mr. Gibson had joined the VA earlier this summer after leading the United Services Organization (USO) that he is continuing his support of veterans as Deputy Secretary of the VA. Ms. Archuleta welcomed Mr. Gibson and asked if he would like to make any remarks.

Mr. Gibson noted that he was delighted to be at the meeting. He noted that VA's Secretary McDonald has decades of experience working with organized labor cooperatively, but this is Mr. Gibson's first time in his career working with organized labor. He said he is very appreciative of Mr. J. David Cox of AFGE for his coaching. Mr. Cox then expressed that he is appreciative of the relationship they have formed.

Ms. Archuleta said she had a few matters she would like to bring to the Council's attention. First, during the previous week, OPM issued new regulations permitting agencies to honor fallen Federal employees with an American flag for their families and loved ones. Ms. Archuleta encouraged the Council members, if they hadn't done so already, to review the details of this benefit. She also encouraged anyone with a loved one who bravely served and passed away in the line of duty to contact the personnel office of the Federal agency where the employee worked. Second, Ms. Archuleta announced the start of the 2014 Combined Federal Campaign (CFC). She noted that there is a new feature in the CFC this year, called "universal giving." This enables employees to contribute to charities regardless of where the charities are located. Employees will appreciate the opportunity to give to charities located across the country, such as

in their hometowns. Ms. Archuleta said that she is looking forward to contributing to charities in her hometown in Colorado, through the CFC. She also noted that federal employees are extremely generous in giving to the CFC.

Ms. Cobert said that the discussion of the CFC reminded her of her former life, before she joined the federal service, when she chaired the United Way of the Bay Area. She understands how important programs like the CFC are to communities. She said she is delighted to be able to be on the receiving end of encouragement to contribute to a great cause, instead of being on the giving end of that encouragement. Ms. Cobert then reflected on the last Council meeting and said that the Bureau of Prisons presentation was inspiring with regard to what can be accomplished when there is collaboration around a common goal. She then welcomed Mr. Gibson to the Council. Ms. Cobert concluded her remarks by saying she was looking forward to another productive meeting.

Agenda Item 2: Council Discussion on Pre-Decisional Involvement

Tim Curry introduced this agenda item by explaining that, “During the July Council meeting, Council member Michael Filler requested that we set aside time on today’s agenda to discuss pre-decisional involvement or PDI. Mr. Filler noted that the Council has developed and released various tools to help labor-management forums implement PDI as called for under Executive Order 13522. Yet, despite the availability of these wonderful tools, it was noted that PDI isn’t used as widely as it could be used or used as effectively as it could be used. Mr. Filler sees a role for this Council in providing leadership to labor-management forums across the government to further make use of PDI.” Mr. Curry then asked Mr. Filler to begin the discussion.

Mr. Filler began by noting that he did not have a PowerPoint presentation to accompany his remarks, and asked the Council not to “take points off” because of that when considering what he had to say. Mr. Filler then noted that it is football season and that fits into the remarks he would make. He said the Council has many working groups that have been established since 2010 and many tools that have been made available through the work of the subcommittees. One of the key ideas of the Executive Order is PDI, and the subcommittee has been working very hard in relation to that. He noted that he is a member of the subcommittee and he knows from having served as an interviewer of several labor-management forums (LMFs) that there are some situations where serious work is needed. Mr. Filler said he wondered how the President would feel if he knew about the serious problems there are with the implementation of PDI. Mr. Filler noted that this is not to say that the Council has not been well-intentioned in their work around this table, because they have been. But, there are problems that need to be addressed. He continued by saying that PDI is an important part of the Executive Order and may be more important than collective bargaining because in PDI, “you’re in front of the problem.” Completing tools to assist with PDI does not mean that the work of the Council is complete as it relates to PDI. There are some serious relationship issues that need to be confronted. He said that the NFL [National Football League] has human resources issues to address, and this Council has issues to address as well, where parties are intransigent, both sides. “Keeping it under the radar isn’t doing any good; we need to get it out in the open.” He asked what role should the co-chairs play if there is no movement on PDI? He also asked in what ways could the FLRA and FMCS

help out? He concluded by noting that he would have to leave the meeting at 11 a.m. and thanked the Council for placing this topic first on the agenda.

Ms. Archuleta asked if any Council members wished to offer their comments on this topic.

Mr. Cox said that in many instances, management will make a decision and then engage with the union over things like appropriate arrangements. He noted that management is responsible for running the agency, but employees have a vested interest in how the operation works and whether it is the best in the world. Couching PDI solely in terms of labor relations is wrong. He noted that the VA has many issues related to serving so many veterans. He said he would not even address issues related to the Department of Homeland Security. But in any event, PDI is about how the employees love the agency and want to do meaningful work.

Mr. Gibson said that he agreed with Mr. Cox. At the VA, they are focused on improving care for veterans. He said that no one knows more about how to improve the VA's operations than the front-line staff. Mr. Gibson said they are working on creating a culture so that the employees will raise their hands and offer their comments on how to improve things.

Ms. Archuleta asked the Council about how to create a situation where employees and labor will feel as though they have been engaged in the decision-making process all along. She also said she views this as a two-way street. It's important for parties to develop a framework for PDI, where there is focus on the early steps that are taken, long before a decision is made or before potential problems become big issues. She said that she believes OPM is in a position to help, especially through the work of Mr. Curry and his staff. Everyone at the table is supportive of PDI, but there is a diversity of issues that are likely to arise as parties engage in PDI in various offices and regions throughout the government's operations. This is "where the rubber is hitting the road." Ms. Archuleta suggested that agencies and unions could avoid discord by establishing a framework for their own PDI activities, and OPM can be a resource for agencies as they do that. "We are here to assist."

Mr. Filler said there is no need to further complicate the process. If the parties are talking regularly, then "it's not about checking the box." Key leaders on both sides need to regularly engage and discuss substantive issues. If this is happening, management is not going to "forget to tell the union" about a topic, pre-decisionally. He referenced a January 19, 2011 memorandum sent by the then co-chairs of the National Council with the subject, "Executive Order 13522 – Establishing Labor Management Forums and Pre-decisional Involvement."¹ Mr. Filler said, "Here we are three years later—still talking. What is it going to take to change the way we are doing business?" He explained that his concern is not having PDI on traditional labor-management issues but, as Mr. Cox said, the full scope of the issues confronting the agency. He thought this was what the Executive Order really envisioned. He invited the Council to fully engage on this topic.

Ms. Cobert said this sounds like a question of moving from the memo to action. She noted that OMB writes a lot of memos, and that they often need to make phone calls in order to get results.

¹ This document was provided as a handout at the meeting, and it is available on the Council's webpage: http://www.lmrcouncil.gov/meetings/handouts/Predecisional_letter_LMF.pdf.

She pointed out that the authors of the memo, Mr. Filler referenced, are not sitting here right now, but this is part of a broader dialogue of engaging the front line. Ms. Cobert said she believes there are great ideas every day from people working on the front lines, the people actually touching the people and putting policies and procedures into practice. She questioned whether or not there might be a reiteration of the memo that the new co-chairs could put into effect. She said they are open to thinking through the tangible next steps to reinforce ideas that she thinks everyone on the Council shares. Ms. Cobert noted that she and Ms. Archuleta sit on a lot of councils and those provide opportunities for them to reinforce these ideas. She said she believes that showing how this works well is going to be the most persuasive mechanism for expanding the use of PDI, and also offered to take discussion of the tactical maneuvers off-line.

Mr. Filler asked if the performance standards of SES [Senior Executive Service] members and senior managers include the extent to which they engage in PDI. That would be a way to communicate how important it is. Ms. Archuleta explained that each agency creates its own performance standards and framework of performance expectations. She said she is open to sitting down with Mr. Filler and others to discuss training OPM offers to managers and supervisors, both in the field and in D.C.

Ms. Bonosaro pointed out that Mr. Filler had made some specific suggestions and she thought it was important to address them, either at this meeting or at a subsequent meeting.

Agenda Item 3: Employee Engagement Work Group

Mr. Curry introduced this agenda item by reminding the Council that it is partnering with the Chief Human Capital Officers (CHCO) Council on the issue of employee engagement. The engagement workgroup previously broke up into three sub-teams with co-chairs from labor and the CHCO community. He then introduced Ms. Heard, representing USDA, and said she would provide an overview of the work of the engagement work group.

Ms. Heard began by describing the three teams that the work group has divided into:

- (1) Data – this team is evaluating data to identify bright spots, low spots, and trends;
- (2) Best Practices – this team is examining best practices and trying to drill down to find items that can be universally applied; and
- (3) Barriers and Enablers – this team is co-chaired by Ms. Heard and Ms. Candace Archer of AFGE. The team has gone on site visits, and is focusing on why and why not best practices exist in certain places. They are not finished with their work, but this team plans to publish some findings in November 2014.

Ms. Heard then provided more details concerning the work of the data team. This team has been very busy analyzing data going back years, and they have identified some cases of significant improvements that have been made over the years. This team has created a list of questions that can be used in focus groups or interviews with management, labor, and employees. They have also developed methods for collecting data. Ms. Heard then described three major site visits that the work group has made. The first was in Portsmouth, New Hampshire, where they visited the Naval Shipyard. She noted that representatives from that location have previously presented to the National Council related to the work that they are doing to find savings on a daily and hourly

basis. Other site visits were to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration (NASA) and the Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC).

In visiting both of these components, and to a lesser extent the Portsmouth Naval Shipyard, Ms. Heard said she had some skepticism about how any activities that worked well for a smaller agency could be generalized for a department like the U.S. Department of Agriculture (USDA), which has 17 components with widely varying missions. They found that both of the agencies analyzed data and trends so that they could focus actions. However, she found that where they were successful, the agencies had picked a few things to work on to put those things into behaviors. Behaviors are demonstrated at the top. They also learned it is necessary not to simply train managers, but to teach them new ways to act and to expect them to act differently in order to engage their employees. At NRC, the agency trains its managers and then expects them to train other supervisors. This has reduced their training costs. At NASA, training activities conclude with each manager presenting to a small group, as though defending a dissertation. This seems to appeal to the many scientists in NASA's workforce. In Portsmouth, at the conclusion of their training, supervisors are observed by someone who has a checklist. That person essentially certifies that the supervisor is able to demonstrate the skills covered in the training. If not, the supervisor will undergo further training in those areas. Commonalities in the approaches of the Portsmouth group, NASA, and NRC included the importance of listening to employees; some use survey tools or focus groups to do that. Also, when implementing changes, they communicate that the change is the result of employee input and in response to it. Both NASA and NRC are intentional about their workplace communications. NASA plans its messages in advance; in fact, NASA has a person who is in charge of internal employee communication. They look at senders, receivers, and the message. At NRC, talking points are developed at a high level, and then cascade down through the various managerial and supervisory levels.

With regard to what is next for this group, Ms. Heard explained that over the next weeks they will continue to interview high performing organizations. They want to hear from both management and the workforce in these interviews. In November 2014, the group plans to publish a quick start guide. This should help when folks get their EVS scores, as it will provide ideas for things they can quickly do. The guide should assist by identifying what employee engagement is; why employee engagement is important; how employee engagement is measured; and best practices. The work group's work will not be complete until next summer. Prior to next summer, they will continue to identify best practices and to flesh out the guide, especially with regard to organizations with different types of workforces. Ms. Heard then asked Ms. Archer if she would like to add any comments.

Ms. Archer said that in addition to looking at the high performing organizations, they were also looking at those that did not score as high. The group is working out how to identify and approach those agencies.

Ms. Cobert said she could help them out with that last item. She said she believes some data is better than no data. The way to get better data is to use it, and to figure out what it is telling us. If employees think their agencies care about the data in the Employee Viewpoint Survey (EVS) and that it is important, they are more likely to fill it out. If they think no one is paying attention, then they may think there is something more productive to do. Reinforcement of this message is

critical. OMB has asked each Deputy Secretary to identify organizations with low scores and to identify areas for improvement. Low performing scores mean there is opportunity to improve. They have made this part of their cross-agency priority goals. OPM has made the EVS data available one month early, and people are already looking at the results. The combined perspective of labor and management is very valuable, and any suggestions for how to engage labor on this topic would be very helpful. Ms. Cobert asked the work group not to exclude other topics related to best practices in their guide, but stated that focus on this one issue would be very helpful. Also with regard to the guide, she said they would be happy to discuss this off-line; but her preference would be for people to be able to comment on the ideas in the guide, as opposed to making it static. Post the guides to allow people to make comments and to allow input. Allowing comments will enrich the example set that we can pull from. She asked that as the group works through this, and particularly in their interim report, they identify where the Council can help. With regard to timing, November is great because they won't miss the window between when the most recent results were available and when the next EVS is distributed. She noted that they need not include every best practice in the guide, but it will be very important not to miss that window.

Ms. Archuleta said that for their study, it would help to look at agencies that are very different: small, medium, and large agencies might be good. Often, small agencies will have a single focus, whereas a large agency like the Department of Homeland Security or Transportation has many. It would help to look at these and their best practices.

Mr. Cox said that he believes in best practices but he also believes that on this issue it may be necessary to look at the worst practices. He knows that if he drinks and drives, eventually he will have an accident. When management meets, and excludes labor from its discussion, and employees give them low scores, this should not be a surprise. More management meetings without including labor will not achieve a better result. There are some bad practices out there. Those who have a champion engage labor, and do better. Others just have a bad relationship. From AFGE's standpoint, he said he would be glad to lean on some of his folks. For example, at the Department of Homeland Security, as he said Catherine Emerson (DHS) knows that he has done this to help improve those relationships. At the Bureau of Prisons, he said that once they got everyone in a room and made clear they couldn't bully one another to death, then they started to get along.

Ms. Paige Hinkle-Bowles (DOD) said she would be very interested in why best practices work for some organizations but not others.

Agenda Item 4: Report of Problem Resolution Subcommittee

Mr. Curry introduced this topic by saying that at the July meeting, there was some discussion regarding the questions developed for the Council's on-line labor-management reporting tool. This tool is one way for the Council to hear directly from labor and management across the government regarding implementation of the Executive Order. Based on data collected through this tool previously, the Problem Resolution Subcommittee was tasked by this Council to develop additional questions for the reporting tool that would help provide additional critical information for the Council. Council member Colleen Kelley requested that the new questions

be shared with the Council and discussed at a future meeting. These new questions were previously shared with the Council via email following the July meeting and were also provided as a read ahead document for today's meeting.² Mr. Curry then introduced the presenter for this topic, Mr. Phil Roberts of the Federal Labor Relations Authority, noting that Mr. Roberts has played a significant role in developing the questions for the reporting tool and providing the Council some thoughtful analysis of the data that has been collected, and that he would walk the Council through the new questions, and lead a discussion

Mr. Roberts (FLRA) used a PowerPoint presentation titled, "Problem Resolution Subcommittee." He began by displaying Slide 1 and saying that the new questions will not be standalone, but rather will be asked in addition to the questions from last year's version. He then displayed Slide 2 ("2013 LMF Reporting Tool") and explained that the first section of last year's reporting tool contained general questions, such as "Do you have a forum?" "How often does it meet?" and "How often does it engage in PDI?" Mr. Roberts then displayed Slide 3 ("2013 LMF Reporting Tool") and said that the second segment of the 2013 LMF Reporting Tool contained categories, or topics discussed in forums, and asked how often does your LMF work on issues in the following categories: mission accomplishment; employee satisfaction; employee engagement; and labor-management relations. He then described the third part of the 2013 LMF Reporting Tool, barriers to success for LMFs. There is a list of possible barriers. Slide 4 ("2013 LMF Reporting Tool") was displayed at this time. Mr. Roberts explained that last year's reporting tool asked respondents, "What are the most significant barriers presently encountered by the forum?" Respondents could select from answers such as trust or relationship issues; scheduling; process; funding; and others. Mr. Roberts then described the fourth segment of the 2013 reporting tool, which was the demographic section. This section asked respondents to identify their name, address, and phone number, identify whether they represented labor or management, identify their agency/union, provide the geographic area covered by their forum, and provide their bargaining unit status (BUS) code.

Mr. Roberts explained that part of the reason to re-do the survey was the intriguing results produced by the survey. They received disparate responses from labor and management with regard to barriers and with regard to PDI. The group wanted to drill down and get more information about the disparate responses. One way to learn more about what was driving these types of responses was an activity done on the micro level. He explained that they had people do individual meetings and interviews with some of the respondents asking them about their experiences with PDI, as discussed at previous Council meetings. The second thing to do was to approach the issue from the macro level, and that is why they want to add these additional questions. Mr. Roberts also described an opportunity to improve the survey this time around, by making it easier to match labor and management pairs and responses for the same forum. They added questions to assist with that. There is a twofold structure. The topics addressed in questions are in pairs, quantitative and qualitative. Mr. Roberts displayed Slide 6 ("2015 LMF Reporting Tool") and described the PDI questions that have been added. He said they paired quantitative questions (such as how often) with qualitative questions. For example, a union may feel that engaging in PDI five times in a year is abysmal, if there were many more issues where they felt they could have engaged in PDI; while the agency might feel five times in a year is great, if it marks an increase from the prior year. Next, the questions look at the issues addressed

² The questions were also provided as a handout at the meeting.

in PDI. A list is provided in the reporting tool, and respondents are asked to check all that apply. The second part of that is qualitative, asking if these issues were never very important; fairly important; some were important and some were not; very important; or other (please describe).

Moving to Slide 7 (“2015 LMF Reporting Tool”), Mr. Roberts explained that the third pairing of quantitative and qualitative questions focused on when the union is brought in for PDI. He noted that this was a little difficult to capture, but the quantitative question frames it as: as early as managers; after managers had some discussion; after some options are raised; after a tentative decision is reached; or after a final decision is reached. The qualitative question that goes along with this one is, “The union was brought into the decision-making process: early enough that they had meaningful and appropriate input into the decision-making process; early enough that they had some input into the decision-making process, but some decisions were already off the table; so late in the decision-making process that most of the important decisions had already been made; or other (please describe).” Mr. Roberts then discussed outcomes of PDI and displayed Slide 8 (“2015 LMF Reporting Tool”). He explained that the qualitative question comes first in this pair, asking respondents what they think an appropriate outcome is in PDI. What are the parties’ expectations from PDI? Then, the quantitative question asks about what parties have actually experienced as far as outcomes in PDI. Finally, Mr. Roberts displayed Slide 9 (“2015 LMF Reporting Tool”) and said they are also adding new demographic questions that will assist with matching reports covering the same forum. These will include the names of union and agency representatives, what level the forum is at, either above, below, or at the level of recognition. Recognizing that there may be confusion about what the “level of recognition” is, they have developed some information explaining that term. There will also be additional information and instructions about BUS Codes. Mr. Roberts said that, hopefully, this will help with matching the reports received.

Ms. Archuleta asked if there were questions or comments from the Council. Ms. Bonosaro asked Mr. Roberts to go back to Slide 7, specifically the question that asked, “When was the Union brought in to PDI.” She noted that the answer would likely vary depending on what the issue was for discussion in PDI. She asked if they would allow respondents to provide different answers depending on the issue addressed in PDI. Mr. Roberts responded that the questions are still subject to revision based on input they receive from the Council, but for now, they are asking that the response to this question reflect when the union was brought in for PDI “on average.” Ms. Archuleta asked why wasn’t the response more robust in the past? Why wouldn’t more labor representatives respond? Mr. Roberts said he doesn’t know. He said that representatives from the Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service (FMCS) say that the response rate wasn’t so bad. It’s about 50 percent. Then he said he could speculate. Folks who don’t understand the Executive Order might be engaged in PDI but they may not call it an LMF. They may be engaged in PDI outside of a formal structure. Mr. Roberts said they are going to try to encourage the responses this time around, and they plan to send out a message concerning the 2015 LMF Reporting Tool through the CHCO Council and the Federal Executive Boards. Also, he said that for national unions here on the Council, we would like to distribute a link to the reporting tool through your communication framework.

Ms. Cobert stated that matching respondents is really important, and said that the behavioral economist in her says that there is a bias in different response rates; someone who is dissatisfied

with PDI is more likely to fill this out, and that will play into the different perceptions that you see. Also, to the point that Mr. Filler made earlier, Ms. Cobert said we need to think about how to communicate this, and tie it up with some of the other things that had already been discussed. The more people see this can actually influence things, the more likely they are to respond. Mr. Roberts said that would be extraordinarily useful.

Carol Waller Pope said that it will be important to show how the Council uses the data; if there is a link to mission accomplishment and employee engagement, then people will be more likely to fill it out. She said that when looking at the questions, it is important to remember that the Council is trying to institute a value change, not to simply capture an event.

Co-chair Archuleta then asked if there were any other comments or questions.

Mr. Curry then thanked Mr. Roberts for this presentation.

Agenda Item 5: New Business

Mr. Curry said that the Council would now move on to New Business. He noted that Council Members would find included in their handouts proposed meeting dates for calendar year 2015. Consistent with the Council's practice for the last few years, they are proposing to meet on the third Wednesday, every other month. Since this Council is a FACA committee, public notice will have to be provided in a Federal Register notice regarding these meeting dates. Mr. Curry said that OPM anticipates publishing the schedule sometime in December with the first meeting for 2015 occurring on the third Wednesday in January. He asked that Council members review this schedule and provide any feedback. After today's meeting, OPM will circulate the list of dates to Council members via email asking for feedback. The next Council meeting is scheduled for Wednesday, November 19, 2014, from 10:00 a.m. to 12:00 noon. Previously, it was announced that it would be conducted here at OPM. However, due to on-going construction work at OPM, our usual meeting space is not available for the November meeting. Our colleagues at the Office of Justice Programs in the Department of Justice have graciously offered up space for the Council to hold its November meeting. Many of you should be familiar with this venue as the Council has held a few meetings in this space in the past. We will be publishing a Federal Register notice about the new meeting location and will share with you as soon as it is published, but please note this for your calendars since you may have to account for different travel time to and from the November meeting.

Mr. Curry then asked if anyone wished to raise any new business. There was none.

Agenda Item 6: Acknowledgement/Receipt of Public Submissions

Mr. Curry said that as a FACA committee, the Council offers opportunities for members of the public to make brief statements to the Council. He asked if any member of the public wished to make any brief statement to the Council. There was none.

Mr. Curry then turned the meeting back over to the Co-chairs.

Agenda Item 7: Adjournment

Ms. Archuleta said this was a great meeting, and she has several things she wants to follow up on with her staff. She thanked the Council members for attending, and thanked them for their commitment to serve.

Ms. Cobert said she would like to echo Ms. Archuleta's comments. Ms. Cobert said her criteria for a good meeting are action steps and a good discussion, and they had both of those today. She said she wanted to follow up on something that Messrs. Cox and Gibson said earlier. Last week, OMB posted on Performance.gov all the results on agency mission goals. OMB Director Shaun Donovan has a blog³ where he wrote about this, and you can follow it if you want.

Mr. Curry adjourned the meeting at 11:14 a.m.

³ <http://www.whitehouse.gov/blog/2014/09/11/improving-performance-and-delivering-impact>