

CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY, STANISLAUS**ACADEMIC SENATE MINUTES**

April 27, 2004

PRESENT: Andres C., Aronson, Brown, Cunha, Feldman, Filling, Floyd, Gackowski, Garcia, Jensen, Karlstrom, Katsma, Luo, Morgan-Foster, Myers, Nagel, Neufeld, O'Brien, Oppenheim, Peterson, Poole, Regalado, Riedmann, Rios-Bustamante, Sarraille, Senior, Stessman, Tan, Thompson, Watkins, Weddle, Youngblom

PROXIES: Sarraille (Zarling)

ABSENT: Ancres A., Bettencourt, Dauwalder, Everett, Ferriz, Nelson, Paterson, Rumayor, Shipley, Sumser

GUESTS: Brown D., Edmondson, Hughes M., Jaasma, Price, Wendt

Recording Secretary: Diana Bowman

4/AS/04/FAC--Lecturer Rep. on Academic Senate,
APPROVED

5/AS/04/UEPC--Academic Program Review
Procedures, FIRST READING

6/AS/04/UEPC--Assessment of Student Learning
Principles, FIRST READING

7/AS/04/SEC--Apptmt Procedures for GRIF,
APPROVED

8/AS/04/SEC--Workload, FIRST READING

9/AS/04/SA--Faculty in Residence, FIRST READING

10/AS/04/Ad Hoc--Support Unit Review Policy and
Procedures, FIRST READING

11/AS/04/Ad Hoc--Policy on Academic
Reorganization, FIRST READING

Next Academic Senate Meeting:

Tuesday, May 11, 2004
2:30-4:30 p.m., JSRFDC Reference Room

Minutes submitted by:

John Sarraille, Clerk

Speaker Aronson called the meeting to order at 2:34 p.m. The agenda was approved as submitted. The minutes of April 6, 2004 were amended at the bottom of page 5 to read "Filling stated that while he is charged as CFA Charter President with representing lecturers as well as tenure track faculty, and makes every attempt to do so, Senators should be cognizant of the need for informed representation. If at all possible, representation should be direct rather than vicarious." The minutes were approved as amended.

ANNOUNCEMENTS

1. Speaker Aronson advised that tomorrow at noon there will be a dedication of the Carol Burke Conference Room.
2. Thursday, April 29 from 11-2 in MSR 130 there will be an open forum on the budget.
3. Also on April 29 there will be a presentation on Brown vs. Board of Education in DBH 167.
4. Beer B Q on May 15 -- Filling and Peterson will have tickets.
5. Susan MacDonald reported that all Lottery Task Force recommendations were accepted by the President.

6. Election results for faculty governance have been posted over Facnet. It's good to see that there are many new faculty involved.
7. President Hughes reported that at the end of the day today there will be a release on campus and to the media regarding budget cuts. Some things are still in progress, but she shared what has been completed. She stated that they are trying to protect employees. The unions have been outstanding to work with and all procedures have been followed except for one faux pas that has been corrected. General Services budget will be reduced by 6.4 million a 9.6% reduction. The academic side is being protected and there are no major reductions in faculty, full or part-time. There is a support system for employees whose job status is changing. DUR, Student Affairs, EOP & other offices are accepting much of the burden of the cuts. Layoff notices effective June 30 have gone out to nine permanent staff members and three managers - twelve employees in all. Three managers and one staff member face job loss and the rest will be moved to other positions -- some part time. Eighteen persons were told that their temporary positions will not be renewed. Six were told that their temporary positions would be reduced to part time - other positions will not be refilled. Five vacant management positions and twenty-three vacant staff positions will not be refilled. The twenty-eight positions that will not be refilled resulted from managing attrition on campus.

In AY 03-04 we took a \$3.6 million reduction - we operated with thirty-one fewer positions this AY - all absorbed by attrition and strategic planning. As a consequence of the cuts being put in place for AY 04-05 there will be 365 fewer students next AY, an approximate 5% reduction. There will be a budget summit on Thursday. More time may be needed so it may be allowed to run from 11:00 to 14:30 instead of just until 14:00 as originally planned. It will follow the paradigm of the CSU Chancellor's budget summits. First it will bring us up to date and then do 'problem solving.' Please be mindful that we have individuals and families that will be affected by this. There is a thorough support process. That process includes counseling services, assistance with out-placement, discussion of benefits, workshop for resume construction, job search techniques, etc.

Mary Kobayashi-Lee, Director of Human Resources, stated that the support is designed to provide individuals with whatever they need to look for a job. Change workshop -- May and July -- moving people - employee assistance program - 5 free counseling visits - help through difficult times. UEE will help by giving them time on computers and the network. Please give your help and support too. She met with unions yesterday and they are aware. The union will be with Kobayashi-Lee in meetings tomorrow. If you know of someone who needs assistance, let them know.

O'Brien questioned if there is a policy for re-hiring and Kobayashi-Lee replied that permanent employees have rehiring rights. Temps do not have the rights.

8. Peterson announced that tickets to a performance of "You can't take it with you" are on sale. The performance will be followed by an ice cream social.

QUESTIONS ABOUT REPORTS

a. Foundation Report (Thomas)

Thomas reported the Foundation Board met recently in Monterey for a retreat. There was a regional impact report prepared by Jasek-Rysdahl and Lowe. It was an excellent report of the affects of CSU Stanislaus on the region. Foundation board members received the news gladly. The President asked them to take our cause to representatives in the California legislature. Concerns were raised that faculty are generally not as connected with the community as desired.

ACTION ITEM

a. 4/AS/04/FAC-Lecturer Representative on Academic Senate

Floyd advised that questions were raised last time about terms and conditions of electing a lecturer senator. FAC decided to put it forth again without change to the language.

Regalado reiterated about the need of a lecturer representative. Comments from Filling and Nagel suggest tenured faculty do not have appreciation of problems of lecturers. Regalado stated he started out as a lecturer and he feels his colleagues were supportive of him. A good Senator would keep the entire department abreast. The role of senators is to represent their departments.

Nagel replied that this is not the experience of many lecturers. Many lecturers are not able to attend department meetings. They may teach at multiple universities and their schedules conflict with department meetings. Some departments do not communicate well with

their lecturers, and he is not sure that department senators can represent the lecturers. Also departments have interests that are different from the interests of lecturers. Lecturers should speak to their own issues.

O'Brien spoke in favor of the amendment. He appreciates what Regalado said, but why not allow lecturers their own representation? How can we know what their issues are? In O'Brien's department, lecturers seldom participate in department functions.

Oppenheim stated his concern about how the representative will be chosen. There is no wording in the resolution concerning this, so he can't vote for the resolution absent that. All other members of the Academic Senate are selected by some structure, so some structure should be required here.

Peterson voiced that diversity of opinion increases knowledge. Lecturers have a valuable perspective. They will develop an election procedure.

Aronson reminded the body that if the Senate passes this resolution, then the matter will go to the faculty for a vote because it requires a constitutional amendment.

Nagel advised that there really isn't anything in the General Faculty Constitution that requires a particular structure for electing senators. The lecturers can do it with an e-mail list.

Luo asked whether if we select one lecturer, then will this person really represent the lecturers? How will the consensus be achieved?

Regalado questioned if we are setting up a precedent for having representatives for assistant professors, associate professors, and so forth.

Filling called the question. Passed. Vote on the amendment passed with 2 abstentions.

This will be sent to a General Faculty vote.

FIRST READING ITEMS

a. 5/AS/04/UEPC-Academic Program Review Procedures

It was MS Watkins/Filling:

Resolved: That the faculty of California State University, Stanislaus endorse the attached Academic Program Review Procedures.

Rationale: The University Educational Policies Committee, in consultation with the Graduate Council and the Provost's Deans Council, has revised the Academic Program Review Procedures so that the reviews are less frequent and less onerous, while also being more streamlined, more efficient, more decentralized, more forward-looking, more planning-oriented, and more likely to produce meaningful results. In particular, the document implements a review cycle of 7 rather than 5 years; concentrates review procedures at the college level rather than the university level; eliminates an entire level of review and reduces the number of review criteria; and fosters greater linkage of resource planning. The revised Academic Program Review Procedures reaffirms the faculty's commitment to student learning.

Watkins advised that the latest copy is the handout that was distributed. The original document was approved in 1990, followed by revisions in 1996, 1999. An action plan was needed. The document was developed during 2001 and a pilot was developed for 01-02. The choice was made to extend through the current academic year. A group was chosen to draft an update. The present draft has been approved by several senate committees/campus bodies. Page 7 in the packet summarizes the changes between the old and new documents.

QUESTIONS AND CONCERNS:

Oppenheim: This document is an improvement in that it goes to a 7 year cycle. He recommends 10 years because of all the time and effort and minimal benefit-to-cost ratio.

Feldman: What are the objectives and what are they designed to accomplish? There should be a sample questionnaire for each objective and program faculty should be allowed to re-write questions. Also there should be other help to the programs in designing

these instruments. There should be objectives for each survey on page eight of the latest document.

Riedmann; Please explain #5 on page 7 of the packet.

Watkins/Aronson: this is not the language of the document we are considering.

Floyd: What will address support for the review process?

Garcia: Address the role faculty will play.

Riedmann: What about surveys? IRPA used to collect this data. Now what are we supposed to do?

Myers: Under commitment to student learning - other than grades, how is the evaluation done? What does this mean? What is an example of this? How is this to be operationalized?

Thompson: Same page: for graduate programs we are also approving the learning goals as part of APR but they were not a part before were they? - the bulleted list?

Poole: The goals are not new - she thinks they were mentioned before but not bulleted.

Thompson: Were they part of APR before?

Jaasma: Somebody required them.

Thompson: Shouldn't the Senate approve these? If so we should look at them carefully. On page 7 on the update - Academic Senate should be added to the list.

Wendt: Regarding institutional research: we already do exit surveys for graduating seniors. There is an alumni survey. Demetrulias is working on a revision of this document. It has a generic section and a section that the department can customize.

Aronson: Please send further comments to Watkins soon so she can take them to UEPC.

b. 6/AS/04/UEPC-Assessment of Student Learning Principles

Watkins reminded the body that these principles went out over the ASNET e-mail list.

It was MS Watkins/Filling:

Resolved: That the faculty of California State University, Stanislaus affirm the compelling need for meaningful assessment practices in effective education, emphasize the primary role of faculty in developing and implementing assessment measures, and assert the importance of separating assessment of student learning from faculty evaluation; and be it further

Resolved: That the Academic Senate at California State University, Stanislaus endorse the attached statement of Principles of Assessment of Student Learning.

QUESTIONS AND CONCERNS:

Oppenheim: The assessments will wind up being used for RPT.

Peterson: There may not be enough flexibility to put strategies in and see how they are doing. There is still a lot of disagreement about what metrics are appropriate. They may work differently for different groups. Different faculty do not teach a course the same way. That has advantages for students.

Send comments to Watkins before the next meeting.

c. 7/AS/04/SEC - Appointment Procedures for Grant-Related Instructional

It was MS Filling/Thompson:

WHEREAS, Grant-related Instructional Faculty (GRIF) is a classification for faculty whose work involves grants and grantor institutions; and

WHEREAS, CSU, Stanislaus has faculty who might qualify as GRIF, but there are no set criteria or procedures for nomination and appointment; and

WHEREAS, Since the work of faculty is in the framework of academic programs, the process should be regulated through shared governance (i.e., the Academic Senate) with the exception of contractual provisions (i.e., salary and benefits) that take precedence over local policy; therefore, be it

RESOLVED: That the attached Appointment Procedures for Grant-related Instructional Faculty be approved by the Academic Senate of CSU, Stanislaus and forwarded to the President for her approval.

Background Rationale: Grant-related instructional faculty (GRIF) is a classification for faculty receiving compensation from grants that permits such compensation to be processed through the University so that it becomes part of one's base pay (up to 135% of normal pay).

When the GRIF classification was established in 1975, campuses were asked to establish procedures for selection of appointees. While many campuses established such procedures, CSU, Stanislaus did not. As a result, faculty qualified for this classification have been denied its benefits. This resolution proposed by the Office of Faculty Affairs remedies the omission

Filling explained that some faculty engage in grant-funded activity. If a grant pays more than the base salary, then the faculty member gets a second check. The faculty member can get a 135% of the amount of their base that counts as PERS income if we have a policy and an application procedure. There does not appear to be a financial down side to us. The only drawback is it is a statewide program and there is no guarantee faculty will be accepted into the program.

It was MS Filling/Floyd to move to a second reading. Motion passed. There being no further discussion, the question was called. Vote on the resolution passed.

This will be sent to the President for approval.

d. 8/AS/04/SEC-Workload Resolution

It was MS Poole/Sarraille:

Resolved: Faculty teaching load be allocated in a way that recognizes individual contributions toward teaching, research and scholarly activity, and service; and be it further

Resolved: That the following description of a workload be deemed a reasonable distribution: a total of 30 WTUs comprised of a) no less than 6 WTUs assigned time for advising, curriculum development, committee work and other (internal) university service; b) no less than 3 WTUs assigned time for research, scholarship, and creative activities; and c) no more than 21 WTUs assigned to instruction; and be it further

Resolved: That a minimum of 6 WTUs of assigned time for research, scholarship, and creative activities should be considered for probationary faculty and faculty for whom elaborations articulate an emphasis on research, scholarship, or creative activities; and be it further

Resolved: That faculty who teach more than 24WTUs in any calendar year be reimbursed for the overload through, at the faculty member's option, either financial compensation at the faculty member's current rate of pay or banked workload units that can be applied at a later time; and be it further

Resolved: That a task force be appointed to address and monitor the implementation of this resolution, reporting to AS in spring 2005 and as specified in the report thereafter.

Rationale: Increasingly, research and scholarly activity has become an expectation for California State University, Stanislaus faculty.

However, assigned time for these activities has not universally been allocated. *The California State University at the Beginning of the 21st Century: Meeting the Needs of the People of California*, a 2001 report of the CSU Academic Senate, also recognized this discrepancy in assigned time for such activities and recommended redefining the faculty workload to include research, scholarly activity, or creative work explicitly as part of the workload formula. The workload issue was also recognized in the CSU Stanislaus 2003/04 University Strategic Goals & Priorities.

In Spring, 2004, The California Faculty Association filed a grievance on behalf of faculty members who are teaching inequitable units. The grievance seeks equity in distribution of workload. Additionally, faculty have increasingly voiced concerns not only regarding inequities of teaching load distribution, but also for the lack of meaningful workload recognition of the time involved in tasks such as program coordination and project/thesis supervision. Often, these duties are taken as voluntary overloads rather than being formally recognized in workload distribution. WASC and other accrediting bodies have an expectation of faculty participation in research/scholarly activity.

Although the current faculty collective bargaining agreement does not mandate a uniform teaching load for all faculty, it has been past practice to rigidly assign a teaching load of 24 WTUs with little recognition of other activities in which faculty members engage. The faculty collective bargaining agreement [1] is not intended to unreasonably constrain how each campus constructs its faculty workload in its attempt to meet its FTES enrollment obligation, while promoting various professional responsibilities. It provides flexibility in teaching assignments that gives department chairs and deans discretion in determining how FTES targets are addressed. Consultation among all parties can result in the assignment of a total workload that is not excessive, meets university needs, and agrees with faculty contract provisions.

[1] Memorandum of Understanding, Article 20 Changes, attached to the 2002-04 CBA, dated October 16, 1995.

Poole explained that there was recognition that faculty teaching graduate courses should be doing more research. The contract does not mandate a 24 WTU load although that is considered by some to be normative on our campus. We tried to write the resolution to give some flexibility. It recommends 3-6 units minimum for research depending on the need. Also it recommends a banking mechanism for overloads, or additional compensation for overloads. There should be a task force to monitor implementation.

Aronson advised that SEC has been working as a committee of the whole on this with input from a number of faculty.

QUESTIONS AND CONCERNS:

Oppenheim: He presumes that departments will assign the work. What about the impact - the loss of courses? Did the committee do a study on this? Is there indication that the administration will accept this?

Karlstrom: 18 units per year for instruction should be a maximum. It is virtually impossible to teach three classes and do research. Other institutions have dealt with this. Comparable institutions have policies better than ours. We need policies similar to other institutions.

Sarraille – Whether faculty are teaching graduate courses or not, they should have 20% of their time assigned for research. If we call ourselves a University, all faculty should be allowed a day a week to work on research. We will have more to give to our students. We don't necessarily have to cut back on service to students. Maybe put pressure on the State to hire more faculty. We could possibly teach things differently, maybe combine sections. We should go after the changes we want.

Myers: faculty are very interested in this. The banking and overload is the most difficult to achieve. He would like to see more discussion of the value of research to teaching. We become better teachers when we do research and scholarship.

Thompson: On reduction in units: others have done it. On banking: Other CSU's have done this. Thanks for putting everything in resolved clauses. Further, since the campus is going through a visioning process, it is a great time for this concept to become part of the vision of the University.

Nagel: Concern that the 4th resolve could be construed as bargaining a term of employment. Can these provisions be applied to lecturers?

Regalado: When will this become a reality?

Aronson: If the Senate approves it, it goes to the President for approval.

Poole: The language in the contract does not stop us from doing this. In terms of actual teaching load, we have the capacity to monitor the number of WTU's. In the past the right has not been acknowledged. 24 teaching WTU's for faculty is not a mandate. Faculty, departments and deans we have an obligation to address FTE targets. The way we do that is left up to us.

Jaasma: Will the provision of resolution four be required?

Filling: There is nothing in the resolution that violates the contract. It is the view of CFA that faculty should get paid for the work they do.

Wendt: Compensation is the domain of the contract. We should meet and confer on this matter. Although it is true the MOU does not specify teaching 24, it designates 30 WTU's as a full load. There is a consultation going on over this due to the grievance filed, and it is our hope to have a positive conclusion.

Sarraille: Pointed out we do not need approval by the President to do some of the things the resolution talks about. We have the MOU and it allows us to negotiate a workload that has time assigned for research. The MOU provides for this to be done through a consultative process and with the approval of the appropriate administrator. It is already happening in some departments.

e. 9/AS/04/SA-Faculty In Residence

It was MS O'Brien/Riedmann:

WHEREAS: California State University, Stanislaus promotes programs that bring intellectual stimulation to the campus community; and

WHEREAS: The Faculty in Residence program promotes intellectual curiosity by bringing faculty and students together in a positive support program facilitated through CSU Stanislaus on-campus student housing; and

WHEREAS: The Faculty in Residence program should have a positive impact on student success rates; be it

RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate of California State University, Stanislaus supports the Faculty in Residence program as another avenue of positive faculty and student interactions; and be it further

RESOLVED: That the Faculty in Residence program receives the financial and programmatic support from the Provost and Vice President for Student Affairs required to make it successful.

RATIONALE: The Faculty in Residence program is an innovative living-learning collaboration between Student Affairs and Academic Affairs proposed to begin in Fall 2004. In order for the program to be successful, it should be designed with significant involvement from the faculty and should receive the support of the faculty. The job description, application, housing lease and regulations, and the assessment proposal describe this program in more detail and have been developed through a committee comprised of faculty and student affairs professionals.

O'Brien explained that the ad hoc committee wants to collect information on how people feel about this. Vice President Morgan-Foster has participated in discussions here and with various faculty. The ad hoc committee has been working to put structure on what was originally a 'vision'. There is now an application and job description, housing regulations. O'Brien says he is interested or he would not have volunteered to be a member of the ad hoc committee. It would mean interesting interactions with students.

QUESTIONS AND CONCERNS:

Nagel: The first resolve seems to have strange wording.

Sarraille: There is not enough description of what the person would actually do.

Watkins: Are the resources on page 34 the full extent? Who will furnish? Has the matter gone to FBAC? (Answer: no)

Morgan-Foster - Housing will fund it. And the compensation issue has been positively reviewed by the Provost.

Filling: Not enough for the department chair to release the faculty member. The department would have to take on the faculty member's duties.

O'Brien: We took out the whole part about department service based on discussions with FAC.

Floyd: FAC was concerned with the job description - how it described time involved. It seemed that 3 WTU per semester would not be enough, or that the position description should be defined in another way.

Aronson asked that input be sent to O'Brien or Morgan-Foster before the next Senate meeting.

f. 10/AS/04/Ad Hoc-Support Unit Review Policy and Procedures

It was MS Aronson/Poole:

BE IT RESOLVED: That the attached Support Unit Review Policy and Procedures be approved; and be it further

RESOLVED: That the Support Unit Review Policy and Procedures be reviewed by the Academic Senate and the President's Cabinet at least every five years; and be it further

RESOLVED: That the Support Unit Review Policy and Procedures take effect upon approval by the President.

Rationale: Support Units exist to serve the academic function of the university. Therefore, in the periodic assessment of those support units it's important there be opportunities for broad input from faculty and the rest of the university community in the assessment process. It is also important that the results of the assessment be shared with the faculty and the university community as well. Currently, there is no opportunity for open input into the assessment nor are the results made public.

Aronson advised that an ad hoc committee was formed to include Tynan, Provost, Aronson and Vice Provost to work on this policy. We wanted to make sure assessment is open and transparent, and designed to help faculty/students, and help learning. They tried to open up an opportunity for faculty input to this assessment and to have reports come back to the Senate so we would know what is going on. This is not assessment of MPP's. This is assessment of support units - for example student services -- a structured way to get input from faculty and students.

QUESTIONS AND CONCERNS:

Poole: This brings the review to the Senate and gives us an opportunity for feedback we did not have before. What about making the cycle the same as for APR? It will take time to perform reviews. If they are too frequent, it will take away too much from what the support units do for the institution. Also there is a public schedule in the old version but not in the new version. That needs to be put back in the document.

Aronson: On page 57 there is a calendar showing an existing schedule.

Filling: What are the thoughts of the support organizations?

Morgan-Foster: She is pleased there is a procedure. The assessment tools do not necessarily parallel the self-study model that is articulated. Morgan-Foster's area uses a CASS model. VP Stephens is using a different tool. They hope we can support prerogatives to use the models that suit their needs.

Aronson: If we look at APR - there are parallels.

Morgan-Foster: Health care is parallel but not all support offices are concerned with accreditation

Tan: Faculty have IDEA surveys. Would there be a standardized assessment for all support staff?

Aronson: We have individual IDEA and APR too. In support units, we are proposing a parallel structure. Support unit review corresponds to APR.

Floyd: The document should speak to resources. This is going to involve a lot of work. In support of workload issues we should look at how the resources will be allocated so we get quality assessment.

g. 11/AS/04/Ad Hoc-Policy on Academic Reorganization

It was MS Aronson/Poole:

BE IT RESOLVED: That the Policy on Academic Organization be approved; and be it further

RESOLVED: That the Policy on Academic Organization be effective upon approval by the President.

Rationale: Periodically, Universities need to consider reorganization in order to better accomplish their missions. Reorganization can either be done through administrative directive or through a process of open discussion, inquiry and consultation. Currently, we do not have a policy on reorganization or any assurance that faculty perspectives will be considered. The Ad Hoc Task Force on Reorganization researched reorganization policies at sister CSU's and other Universities. After extensive discussions, the Ad Hoc Task Force developed a process that includes open discussion, inquiry and consultation with faculty that should result in the best possible decision-making.

Aronson explained that this resolution comes from an ad hoc task force. There was an initiative being discussed about possible reorganization of the College of ALS. The task force was put together to look at how 'that' should be done. They decided to look at a process for doing it - one that would allow for broad faculty input. We can do it through administrative fiat or through faculty interaction. AAUP does not require that it involve faculty interaction. The ad hoc committee developed a policy that provides for an open process with faculty input.

The Provost stated that it came about as a result of administration and faculty interaction. We were put together as a study group after the fall retreat. The task force came together and said rather than discuss reorganization, let's talk about how we would do it and put a process in place. The task force looked at how things were done at other campuses. They tried to put together a process for how decisions would be made.

QUESTIONS AND CONCERNS:

Floyd: He appreciates the work done. His question that remains is about broader organizational considerations. This document addresses proposals that come in - how to judge them. He is concerned with the pre-proposal period of time. This document does not say how a group might come together and formulate a proposal.

Provost: There was discussion on that and under 2b addresses that concern. It was a recognition of what kind of discussion went on. It requires if a discussion is involved, it be identified.

Sarraille: We can exercise our authority as faculty. According to common principles of shared governance, we should not have to accept either imposition of a policy or limitations on the amount of refinement we may recommend. If we determine that reorganization affects curriculum, we should feel we have the authority to make statements on how it should be done.

Thompson: It is difficult to get faculty to meet according to the schedule in the proposal.

Sarraille: Look at how the committee is formed. It is not quite democratic. The Speaker and Provost decide which faculty are appointed to the committee. Depending on who the Speaker and Provost are this could be a problem.

OTHER

Aronson explained that the JSRFDC Use Guidelines document was given to the Senate for informational purposes. It originally was a policy negotiated and approved by the President in October 2001 before the building opened. A policy interpretation was developed in response to practical needs.

Meeting adjourned at 4:37 p.m.