

**ICR Governing Board Meeting**  
**February 18<sup>th</sup>, 2026, 1:00 – 2:00 pm**  
**Meeting By Zoom**

**Meeting Minutes:**

**In Attendance:** Dr. Chad Kinney, Mr. Sherard Rogers, Ms. Julie Powell, Dr. Jeff Smith, Ms. Justyna Dubey, Dr. John Williams, Dr. John Harloe, Mr. Michael McMaster, Ms. Luna Velar, Dr. Jon Reuter, Ms. Elyse Contreras, Mr. Ean Seeb, Mr. Dieter Raemdonck, Ms. Nathalie Clavette, Dr. Joanna Zeiger, Mr. Chuck Smith, Mr. Mike Hennessy, Dr. Gail Mackin

**Absent:** Dr. Melissa Reynolds, Dr. Angela Bryan

- I. Welcome (1:00-1:02pm) Dr. Reuter
- II. Consent Agenda (1:02-1:05pm) Dr. Reuter
  - a. Jan 21, 2026, Meeting Minutes
  - b. Draft Position Description – Director
  - c. Motion to approve the Consent Agenda
    - Motion passes by unanimous vote
- III. Government Relations Updates (1:05-1:15pm) - Emma Hudson, Dieter Raemdonck, & Nathalie Clavette
  - a. Mr. Dieter Raemdonck: State budget outlook has worsened due to Medicaid spending coming in roughly 6% higher than projected, which will create a larger than expected budget deficit for the next fiscal year. While the budget news is concerning, there have been no indications that the governor's requested amount for ICR is at risk. The team is maintaining heightened vigilance and ongoing conversations with legislators and JBC members; so far, no signs of trouble have emerged. A meeting is scheduled for next week with Representative Brown, the newest JBC member, who has a research background in genetics.
  - b. Ms. Nathalie Clavette: Previously worked for Senator Doherty and has transitioned to Emma Hudson's lobbyist team. She has a background in neuroscience and a deep appreciation for science-based conversations.
- IV. Advancement and Networking Dinner (1:15-1:25pm) – Dr. Harloe
  - a. Dr. John Harloe: The venue has changed to the Baldoria on the Water in Lakewood, which accommodates everyone in a single room. The date is still confirmed for May 28<sup>th</sup>.
    - Dr. Chad Kinney: Confirmed that the venue is the Baldoria on the Water and provided location details.
  - b. Dr. John Harloe: The ICR Award of Excellence awardee has been chosen and will be disclosed in the press release. The keynote speaker will be Ean Seeb. The Save the Date will be going out today/tomorrow and should be reshared on LinkedIn. Encouraged the board to provide contacts for invitations and fundraising and wants help identifying potential donors. Work is underway to prepare donor materials and possibly update/repurpose the ROI one-pager and asked that date-specific language be removed. Emphasized the need for board members to encourage their departments to buy tables.

- Ms. Elyse Contreras: Asked for clarification on table pricing and seating.
  - Dr. Chad Kinney: Clarified that a full table (10 seats) is \$2,500 and that sponsorships may include program ads and seats. Requests contributions for the silent auction, encouraging outreach to colleagues or organizations that could donate items; asks that items be routed to Chad and Daphne.
  - Mr. Chuck Smith: Confirmed the Save the Date timeline and plans to review the sponsorship document.
- c. Mr. Ean Seeb: Asked that promotional materials not include his keynote role yet. Is humbled by the opportunity and questioned whether someone more prominent in cannabis research might draw a larger audience, though he remains willing to participate.
- d. Dr. Jon Reuter: Raised the question about any updates on accepting donations from marijuana industry.
  - Mr. Chuck Smith: Raised questions about how table purchases and sponsorship payments will be accepted under current restrictions. Offered a suggestion as a possible mechanism to accept industry-related funds.
  - Dr. Chad Kinney: Discussed the complexities of accepting funds from marijuana-touching businesses and mentioned that arms of non-plant-touching businesses can purchase tables/tickets more easily. Supported exploring a possible mechanism to accept industry-related funds.
  - Ms. Elyse Contreras: Reminded the group of a possible mechanism to accept industry-related funds and that she can help coordinate this effort if the board wants to pursue it.
    - Mr. Ean Seeb: Offered clarification about Elyse’s proposed mechanism.
      - Ms. Elyse Contreras: Believed Ean is referring to a different statute.

V. Outline of Hiring Process (1:25-1:35pm) – Luna Velar (CSU Pueblo HR)

a. Process Flow

- Ms. Luna Velar: Provided process flowchart and outlined the process as it relates to the board members.

b. Responsibilities for Search Committee Members

- Ms. Luna Velar: The search committee’s work was broken down into four main steps:
  1. Minimum Qualification Review: This was to review all the qualifications that you have decided are essential and vital for this position to have to be a successful ICR Director. The Chair will check all applicants against the minimum qualifications that are listed in the job announcement.
  2. Preferred Qualification Review: The committee will review all the candidates who meet our minimum qualifications and numerically score them based on the preferred qualifications. This gave us a more detailed look at how closely each candidate matches what we’re looking for and which candidate can hit the ground running the best, and who needs the least amount of training to be

prepared for the role.

3. Interview Phase: The highest scoring candidates are then selected and are moved into the interview stage.
  4. Reference Checks: After interviews wrap up, we move into the reference check stage. The Chair will complete reference checks for the proposed finalist. If everything comes back good and clear, the committee's role will be officially complete.
- Ms. Luna Velar: After the four steps are completed, the hiring manager will work with the hiring authority to decide on an offer. Following that are salary negotiations, start date negotiations, etc.
  - Ms. Luna Velar: Each search committee has two main roles:
    1. Chair: Serves as point person for the entire process. They will handle the minimum qualification review, develop interview and reference questions, schedule interviews, and be responsible for pulling together the committee's final recommendation to share with the hiring authority.
    2. Member: Committee members are acting as evaluators for our candidates. They review and score the qualified applicants, bringing in their own expertise in the ICR field into this process. They participate in interviews and will provide feedback and rankings in committee discussions. The final recommendation is a team effort between our Chair and the committee members.
- c. Role for ICR Staff?
- Ms. Luna Velar: Only the committee is involved in evaluating and scoring candidates. Other staff are included strictly in a support role where it's needed. A common example is support being needed in on-campus interviews as they are funded at the department level. The ICR staff would be responsible for paying for the candidate's travel, coordinating the hotel stays, paying any per diem, and coordinating where they will go for dinner as a committee with the candidate.
- d. On Campus Interviews?
- e. Questions
- Dr. Gail Mackin: Offered clarification that due to the projected timeline, the new president will likely be the hiring authority based on state statute.
  - Ms. Elyse Contreras: Asked why a terminal degree is the minimum qualification. Discussion commences.
  - Dr. Jon Reuter: How is the chair of the search committee established? Can interviews be conducted via Zoom and done remotely?
    - Ms. Luna Velar: The chair of the search committee should be chosen by the group and they will require additional training. On-campus interviews are not required; interviews may be done remotely.
  - Dr. Jon Reuter: Is there a system for narrowing down the applicant pool?
    - Ms. Luna Velar: Yes and no. We have the committee review step where you narrow down applicants prior to interviews.
  - Ms. Elyse Contreras: When does HR do the compensation analysis? Do they consider level of education?
    - Ms. Luna Velar: The compensation analysis is purely based on job duties.

## VI. Position Description – Director (1:40-1:55pm) – Dr. Reuter

### a. Board Input on PD

- Dr. Jon Reuter: Discussion commenced about the terminal degree being a requirement vs. preferred qualification.

- Dr. John Williamson: Expressed concern that the current director has a definite end date and that a failed search could prolong the position's vacancy. Asked if there is a plan for an interim director.
- Dr. Gail Mackin: Asked for clarification regarding the terminal degree being a requirement. Discussion commenced.
- Dr. Chad Kinney: Proposed that the board hold a special meeting to further the discussion regarding the position description for the executive director.

VII. Public Comment (1:55-2:00pm) - Dr. Reuter

- a. Dr. Chad Kinney: Asked for the board to consider volunteering to help review the student research award applications.
  - Dr. Zeiger volunteered to review applications.