

<p>Academic Senate November 4, 2008</p> <p>Present: Bender, Bice, Black, Brown, Carroll, Cogan Bailey, Colnic, Cotton, Covino, C. Davis, S. Davis, Deaner, deVries, Dunham-Filson, Eudey, Filling, Flores, Garcia, Hauselt, Hejka-Ekins, Hight, Johnson, Jones, Keswick, Manrique, J. Mayer, M. Mayer, Morgan-Foster, Nagel, Nainby, O'Brien, Peterson, Petrosky, Sniezek, Tan, Thompson, Tuedio, Werling, Young</p> <p>Proxies: Brown (Petratos), Sarraille (Silverman)</p> <p>Guests: Dean Nael Aly, Lauren Byerly, Dean Ruth Fassinger, Jennifer Helzer, David Lindsay, Dean Roger McNeil, Dean Daryl Moore, Priscilla Peters, Ken Schoenly, Armin Schulz, Flora Watson, AVP Ted Wendt</p> <p>Diana Bowman, Recording Secretary</p>	<p>18/AS/08/FAC—Outstanding Service in Faculty Governance, APPROVED</p> <p>19/AS/08/GC—Policy and Procedures for Awarding Graduate Fee Waivers and Employment of Graduate Assistants and Teaching Associates, FIRST READING ITEM</p> <p>20/AS/08/SEC—CSU Stanislaus Academic Senate Statement on Observing Elaborations on the Retention, Promotion and Tenure Criteria, FIRST READING ITEM</p> <hr/> <p>Next Academic Senate Meeting:</p> <p>Tuesday, November 25, 2008 2:30-4:30 pm., JSRFDC Reference Room</p> <hr/> <p>Minutes submitted by:</p> <p>Betsy Eudey, Clerk</p>
--	--

1. **Call to order** at 2:35 pm.
2. **Approval of Agenda**-Approved as submitted.
3. **Approval of Minutes of October 21, 2008**-Page 3, 5A second bullet, remove the word “the;” third bullet, second sentence add “sent” to the sentence. Minutes were approved as amended.
4. **Announcements**
 - a. C. Nagel reported that CFA is hosting a pension and benefits workshop Friday, November 14, lunch available. RSVP to Nagel would be recommended so there is enough food. The speaker is an expert on these issues.
 - b. Mark Thompson announced that today is election day. Position Description/Call for Applications is out for the Director FCETL. The committee is set and ready to begin. He stated that most have seen from the emails from the president concerning RSCA and other topics. Thompson recommended if you haven't had a chance to read them, please take a look.
 - c. Armin Schulz reminded the faculty that on November 13th a faculty member from Sonoma State will be offering workshops on Universal Design for Learning. You can come for the morning, afternoon, or all day. RSVP is encouraged.
5. **Questions about Committee Reports**
None.
6. **Action Item**
 - a. **18/AS/08/FAC—Outstanding Service in Faculty Governance**

April Hejka-Ekins noted that the text of the resolution is in the agenda packet from last time on page 10. This was a resolution regarding an Outstanding Service in Faculty Governance resolution. Hejka-Ekins read the resolution as written in the 10/21/08 agenda. Hejka-Ekins said that the Statewide academic senate supports recognition of faculty governance. The resolution does not include the criteria that will come later for Leaves and Awards to consider. This resolution is the establishment of the award. This is a second reading, so we are entertaining questions or concerns. If we pass the resolution, then the committee can start thinking about criteria and other matters.

Thompson reminded Senators that this is an action item to vote on today. Everything in the resolved clause is open for discussion and amendment. C. Nagel asked about eligibility. Hejka-Ekins responded that at this point they left it open, and FAC is interested in Senate input. Nagel indicated that he was pretty sure that part time faculty are not included as part of the “general faculty,” so the language excludes them. Nagel offered a friendly amendment to the fourth Resolved clause that the award be available to all “general faculty and associate faculty.” There were no objections, so this amendment will be incorporated.

Garcia asked about the award only being able to be received once. Peterson indicated that other awards do not require this, indicating that Fred Hilpert had won an award more than once. Garcia does not believe the statement limiting to one time the number of times the award can be won is needed. Tuedio suggested removing the last resolved clause which reads “That the award is open to all members of the General Faculty.” Garcia moved to remove the third resolved clause which reads “That no one may receive the award more than once; and be it further.” Eudey seconded. Colnic inquired as to why this resolved was included. Hejka-Ekins indicated that it was to spread the award around to allow many to receive the award, but it's not a problem to remove it. Carroll said that he would assume that members of the committee take past awards into consideration when deciding who to award it to. Peterson stated she was on the Leaves and Awards Committee in the past, and indicated that there can be a separate process for addressing repeat nominees when the committee comes up with the criteria. Peterson noted that it used to be that people would put together huge binders but that discourages people who were honored to be nominated from submitting a file because it was too much work to do. Through practice the Committee has reduced expectations for materials to submit. When setting up the criteria L&A could set up something related to review of files of people who have received the award before. Sometimes there aren't a lot of nominees, and we still want to acknowledge someone. Vote to strike third resolved. Passed.

Hejka-Ekins noted that there had been a question in the second resolved clause related to removing “university-wide” as a criteria and wondered if anyone remembered why this was suggested. O'Brien suggested a friendly amendment to strike “primarily in the area of university-wide” Manrique noted inserting ‘in’ before ‘faculty governance’ would read clearer. This was accepted as friendly. Thompson clarified the concept of “friendly amendments” - it means that someone may offer an amendment as friendly and not have to go through making a motion, get it seconded, discussed, voted – if there are objections we need to go back to a formal amendment process. There were no objections to the amendment so the change was made to eliminate reference to “university wide.”

Tuedio questioned whether the fourth resolved was necessary. Thompson said that this makes it absolutely clear that it's open to everyone. It's making it open to part time faculty as well. Sarraile indicated that anyone who is a unit 3 employee has a vote – part time, full time, librarians, coaches, etc. Tuedio asked if we were trying to stipulate these are unit 3 faculty? Hejka-Ekins said that the amended language makes it clearer that it is both full and possibly part time, and lots of part-time faculty have been here many years and have been involved in service. As people in governance change, the language makes it more prominent that we're including all instructors. Young read from the constitution the definitions of general faculty and associate faculty. Thompson noted that the amendment intended to indicate that it includes TT, tenured, full time and part time faculty.

As amended, the Resolution was approved.

7. First Reading Items

a. 19/AS/08/GC—Policy and Procedures for Awarding Graduate Fee Waivers and Employment of Graduate Assistants and Teaching Associates

It was MS Young/Hejka-Ekins:

Resolved: That the Academic Senate approve the attached Policy and Procedures for Awarding Graduate Fee Waivers and Employment of Graduate Assistants and Teaching Associates which replaces 22/AS/01/GC and Procedures for the Hiring of Graduate Assistants and Procedures for the Hiring of Teaching Associates, and be it further

Resolved: That the Policy and Procedures for Awarding Graduate Fee Waivers and Employment of Graduate Assistants and Teaching Associates take effect upon approval by the President.

Rationale: In accordance with the Unit 11 Collective Bargaining Agreement currently in effect, graduate fee waivers can no longer be used as compensation for work performed by Graduate Scholars (graduate students receiving fee waivers). Compliance with the new Unit 11 Collective Bargaining Agreement necessitates revision of policy governing the awarding of graduate fee waivers. Upon examination of existing CSU, Stanislaus policy and procedures governing the awarding of fee waivers, the Graduate Council also reviewed existing Graduate Council procedures governing the hiring of Graduate Assistants and Teaching Associates and has recommended changes to be implemented as university policy. Articulation of and rationale for substantive policy changes is attached.

Discussion:

Young provided some history and explanation of the resolution. Over the summer Ted Wendt noted that due to the Unit 11 Collective Bargaining Agreement, graduate fee waivers can no longer be used to compensate graduate students for work. Wendt drafted revisions for review by the Graduate Council. The information is designed to guide programs in the hiring of employees. On page 21 of the agenda packet is the original policy that was passed in senate in 2002 related to the awarding of fee waivers, with page 23 offering the procedures related to the hiring of graduate assistants and page 26 begins the procedures for hiring teaching associates. After reviewing the documents based on information from Ted Wendt and Unit 11 Bargaining Agreement, the Graduate Council made some additional

changes. The GC felt that the two procedures really ought to be considered policy because qualifications and criteria for hiring are included in them. In an effort to clarify the process and streamline it, Graduate Council has taken the three documents and made them one to be considered here as a policy regarding fee waivers and employment of GAs and TAs. To clarify, there are three classifications we're dealing with. Graduate scholars are those receiving fee wavier scholarships, who are not working for the fee waivers. Graduate Assistants are paid via private fellowship money through the graduate school or via departmental money. Teaching Assistants are funded like GAs. The proposed policy begins on page 10 of the packet, and is the singular policy to be considered. There is one revision on page 9 in the extended rationale of the resolution, as the second line of 3rd bullet should read "teaching associates"

April Hejka-Ekins stated that the Graduate Council was very thorough when developing this policy. Hejka-Ekins thinks the policy change had to be done and Graduate Council did as well. Thompson requested questions/advice to go back to the Graduate Council for consideration.

Al Petrosky directed our attention to handwritten page 18 under minimum qualifications for TAs under education and under range pay. Petrosky indicated that the policy describes someone with an undergrad degree as being allowed to teach. There's a notion on this campus that we're all about the teaching, and the notion that someone goes from being an undergrad to teaching an undergrad class is hypocritical. This is policy language that preexists the tinkering for today, but Petrosky suggests that there be some minimum exposure to classroom management or tutoring, perhaps as a GA focusing on items 1 and 3 on page 13, for one semester before beginning work as a TA.

Young indicated that the rationale for reducing the requirements for becoming a TA was so that we can provide that experience, that teaching is part of the graduate culture that we are trying to foster. Young noted that the Graduate Council felt the transformation from student to teacher is a cornerstone of that process. Programs have limited funding for GAs and TAs, so if they spent that money for one term hiring a GA, that would reduce the opportunity to have someone teaching. If we have the money to fund a graduate student, we'd have to have a GA one year, and a TA another year. That's part of the rationale for the policy as written.

Chris Nagel indicated on page 18, it's repeated throughout, on CSU Stanislaus criteria under the term "appointment" TAs at half-time or more cannot be appointed in a student classification concurrently in another student assistant classification. Nagel asked if TAs may be appointed in a non-teaching classification? Young replied GC didn't discuss this and will need to talk to Ted Wendt about that as well.

Thompson reminded the Senate that this resolution will return as an action item for the next meeting.

b. 20/AS/08/SEC—CSU Stanislaus Academic Senate Statement on Observing Elaborations on the Retention, Promotion and Tenure Criteria

It was MS O'Brien/Filling:

Resolved: That the Academic Senate California State University, Stanislaus reaffirm the importance of department or program elaborations on the university retention, promotion, and tenure (RPT) criteria and be it, further,

Resolved: That the Academic Senate urge all levels of review in the RTP process to exercise great care to ensure that deliberations and comments in evaluative documents concerning research, scholarship, and creative activity (RSCA), teaching, and service adhere to approved elaborations of each department or program.

Rationale: Department or program elaborations on the university criteria for retention, promotion, and tenure have served to facilitate the process of review at CSU, Stanislaus at least since the early 1980s (see 13/AS/82/FAC). Some programs have for many years had elaborations on teaching; university service; and research, scholarship, and creative activity. Other programs may have elaboration in two areas, but all programs have been required to elaborate, to explain in greater detail, their criteria for RSCA (see 7/AS/98/FAC & 15/AS/98/FAC).

The process for creation and approval of elaborations—departmental creation followed by sanction from a committee of the General Faculty, the University Retention, Promotion, and Tenure Committee—enacts two beliefs important to the Faculty: first that evaluation for retention, promotion, and tenure of peers is at its core an academic exercise and, second, that responsibility for carrying out that academic exercise is rightly decentralized to the authority of program faculty and grounded in their disciplinary expertise.

Over the last couple of years, many faculty, departments, and department RPT committees have raised concerns that some levels of

review have in letters made evaluative statements or included requirements for future retention, promotion, or tenure that extend beyond the requirements included in the elaborations. Examples of such statements have been discussed on the senate floor where a number of faculty representing departments noted that statements requiring faculty under review to publish in nationally recognized venues or to secure significant extramural funding went beyond the requirements contained in that department's elaborations. On the other hand, some administrators have asserted that elaborations are not prescriptive enough, quantitatively and/or qualitatively. A mechanism, the URPTC, exists for disseminating suggestions to programs for further consideration of elaborations. It is vital for all to recognize that making evaluative statements in review letters that exceed the expectations of elaborations would be a dangerous and divisive strategy for promoting revision of elaborations.

Adherence to elaborations is adherence to the recognition that disciplinary expertise is the foundation of peer review. The Academic Senate should act to ensure that such recognition continues.

Discussion:

O'Brien acknowledged there had been a lot of discussion about RPT on campus and in this body, and that there seems to be a high level of anxiety among junior faculty and some came to SEC for guidance and information. This resolution is not to be voted on to be sent for the President's approval and signature. It's a sense of the senate for us as faculty to state or re-state how we feel about RPT and what is important. There was recently an email that the President sent out and when O'Brien read it, it seemed that President Shirvani was also supporting the mission of the campus, but others have read the president's message differently. RPT is the core of what we do in our careers and it behooves us to have a clear statement regarding RPT.

Filling read from the AAUP 1940 statement "Faculty status and related matters are primarily a faculty responsibility; this area includes appointments, reappointments, decisions not to reappoint, promotions, the granting of tenure, and dismissal. The primary responsibility of the faculty for such matters is based upon the fact that its judgment is central to general educational policy. Furthermore, scholars in a particular field or activity have the chief competence for judging the work of their colleagues; in such competence it is implicit that responsibility exists for both adverse and favorable judgments. Likewise, there is the more general competence of experienced faculty personnel committees having a broader charge. Determinations in these matters should first be by faculty action through established procedures, reviewed by the chief academic officers with the concurrence of the board. The governing board and president should, on questions of faculty status, as in other matters where the faculty has primary responsibility, concur with the faculty judgment except in rare instances and for compelling reasons which should be stated in detail."

Filling added that 20/AS//08/SEC talks about what we the faculty feel is the best way to implement that statement and SEC urges your support for the resolution. Thompson reminded the Senate that this a first reading, a document put forward by SEC, and we're looking for discussion, questions, and advice to the committee.

C. DeVries asked whether the statement in the third paragraph regarding some programs having elaborations on teaching and university service suggests that programs are required to elaborate in all three. Thompson responded that the intent is that we are only required to elaborate on RSCA, which comes from a resolution in 1998. There is now a requirement that there are elaborations for RSCA, but some have elaborations in all three areas. DeVries asked if it was possible not to have an elaboration on teaching, and Thompson and others responded that it was possible.

Sarraille suggested consideration of another resolved that would call for careful attention and adherence at all levels of review to the principles, criteria and procedures for RPT, and that is the policy document covering RPT decision-making. Some of the concerns voiced have been raised about other things beyond elaborations, and because there are concerns about conformity to that policy, a few more provisions of that policy could be addressed through the addition of this resolved.

Provost Covino suggested revised wording for the sentence in the rationale that reads "on the other hand, some administrators have asserted that elaborations are not prescriptive enough, quantitatively and/or qualitatively." Covino said it would be more accurate to say some administrators have asserted that "some elaborations do not articulate clear requirements or expectations."

John Garcia noted that while fully in favor of this, he was concerned that it doesn't go far enough. The focus on elaborations focused on the RPT process, but there are other issues that have a major effect on RPT. The RSCA support program and the policies of the support program, in many ways define what RSCA is, as opposed to the elaborations doing that. Garcia would like to see this document bigger so that whenever anyone is trying to support RSCA, the focus should be on the elaborations. Thompson replied that this will be an interesting discussion in SEC.

Schoenly said that since we're reasserting the faculty purview for this, we need to remember that those on RPT committees need to police our peers. Maybe police is too strong a word, but perhaps we need a reminder that the RPT committee needs to control the process – there is self-policing going on at the department level.

Eudey followed up on what Garcia stated that we recognize it doesn't address everything, but we need one clear statement, or maybe additional resolutions over time as the rpt process unfolds. But SEC wanted to be sure this was brought up. But we need to incorporate other issues as we go along.

Young drew attention to paragraph 5, line 9 and 10, that indicates there is a mechanism in URPTC to make suggestions regarding the elaborations, and asked if in the past URPTC has made suggestions to programs, and if so what they were based on. Further, Young asked if it would be reasonable for URPTC and FAC to facilitate a dialogue about what elaborations might be like to help people not be confused about what the elaborations might be elaborating. Thompson offered that SEC can bring in a memo from last year of recommendations from URPTC. Schulz noted that in the last 2-3 years, URPTC has created memos that asked departments to consider new innovations for teaching, enhancement of technology for delivery system that might not be as evident 10 years ago. The memos addressed pedagogical and technological changes, shifts, revisions, and new innovations, and sometimes state-wide legislation, for instance recognizing governance via SWAS, URPTC looked at that and felt that campus involvement at all levels was an essential thing to consider adding to elaborations. URPTC was not telling departments what to include, but drew attention to other areas/issues out there that they might consider adding.

Bret Carroll indicated that at a recent college committee meeting, he saw a chart about agreement at levels of RPT review. The chart suggested to him that over the last couple of years the agreement has gone up substantially, suggesting that the system isn't broken. Sarraille responded to Carroll regarding statistical measures of decisions at various levels. If the level of difference has diminished, it is not indicative that there is less of a problem. Sarraille indicated that we need to look at the nature of the differences. As the AAUP suggested, there should be rare instances of differences, and the reasons should be compelling. That's operative for Sarraille. He felt that we should look at what reasons were given and if they were compelling. Carroll wanted to clarify that he was trying to say that the current RPT processes were not broken and therefore didn't need to be fixed, and that he did feel that the areas of disagreement were indeed important problems, but not the system itself.

Young asked Schulz if in those suggestions if there were ever any suggestions at any point that pertain to or address the issue of articulation of or specification of clarity? Schulz responded that in his time with URPTC, the body did not become that directive nor did it tell people to develop them in teaching since they are only required to have elaborations in RSCA. Some departments have developed elaborations in teaching and service, and some departments have had these for years, but URPTC has not encouraged developing guidelines. URPTC has critiqued when changes have come, and URPTC has raised questions as to how a department had hoped to evaluate candidates based on the elaborations, or asked if it was a wise move to have specific statements in the elaborations.

Dean Moore followed up regarding clarity, indicating that it is a struggle when reviewing the files. When he receives a packet and then has the standing elaborations for that particular department but it doesn't list any suggestions of activity to the degree to which one can use that information when the candidate is reviewed. It's a challenge for him as a dean here. If it's not broke, maybe there's not a problem. But he stated his hope that an opportunity is not missed to get to the clarity, defined by the program, to make this is clearer process.

Sarraille wanted to comment on the elaborations and process to construct them. He agrees that we should strive for some specificity and clarity. On the other hand, it is pointless to try to reduce the criteria to the point that anyone, regardless of his or her expertise, could apply these criteria and produce an outcome. Nobody is going to create a test that anyone can apply and decide if someone is a good artist. You can't write a computer program to decide if it's a good painting. That's one extreme. At the other is something so vague that it's meaningless. We need a happy medium, and not go to extremes. Dean Moore noted that he's not looking for extremes, but wants a process driven by the faculty, the experts in the field, as to what the faculty should aspire to in order to move forward.

Filling wanted to speak in response to the chart Carroll mentioned, to note that it deals with decisions, tenure and promotion decisions. If you look at May or September minutes, you'll see references to lots of admonitions being inserted into people's letters that are not in the elaborations and don't make it into the chart. We need to pay attention to those things.

Young was pleased to hear that there is interest in having dialogue about clarity because it's important. If we want to entrust all this weight that is so critical and fundamental to the process to the departments, then it would be beneficial to have some dialogue within departments and on a more broad basis as well about how we can ensure that level of clarity so that everyone involved in the review process understands what the department means – the reviewers and those undergoing review. Young noted that all elaborations are not as helpful as they could be.

Thompson noted that in his role in the self-study inquiry circle he's reviewing all elaborations and will soon be able to speak to that with authority.

Garcia said that it seems that we're dancing around this discussion for fear of bringing up something that can offend someone. There has been great discussion about publication in scholarly journals. All he is reading about RSCA begins or ends with publication in scholarly journals. For his discipline and program publications in scholarly journals may be one way to distribute information, but it's being argued in our discipline that that one vehicle is counter-intuitive to what we're doing in our discipline. We need to be able to disseminate our work outside the academy. What it seems people are talking about is the need to put numbers on publications. Garcia hopes people will resist that.

Young said that she thought that is not that we only need numbers, but that elaborations will specify what is important to you in your discipline that makes that true [value of dissemination other than journal publications]. Can you define that so that it is understandable to whomever is reading it?

Johnson said that she understands both perspectives, but supporting Garcia, she has concerns about the seeming emphasis on academic publications. With our university and our mission, Johnson agrees with Garcia that it is more in keeping with our mission that we're

putting information out in a way that affects the public. Johnson doesn't really care if other academics read it. In general, she has some concerns that elaborations need to be clear enough that all levels of review can reach a conclusion. The individual under review should have a clear understanding of what is required in order to put in a successful application, so there should be detail so that they can feel comfortable while working toward promotion, and enough detail so departmental faculty can arrive at consensus concerning that candidate. Johnson doesn't think you need that kind of detail for other levels of review. Even URPTC members shouldn't be expected to be able to look at a file outside their program and be able to reach a conclusion as to whether the RCSA performed has met the standards, for that they would rely on the faculty within the program because URPTC members don't have that expertise. We need sufficient detail to protect the candidate and inform the DRPTC.

Dean Moore said that what's kind of cool about the elaborations here is that there is departmental specificity. Johnson made the point, that it's important for the faculty putting their information together to help candidates to advance and do well when reviewed by peers. That's the critical thing. The dean's role is to refer to the department process and to follow the criteria in place.

Schulz affirmed the importance of the DRPTC in helping the candidates successfully prepare their files to progress forward. Candidates should not be shy to request of chairs, deans, and colleagues what certain things are expected or what the elaborations really mean. Our DRPTC needs to be supportive of faculty in that process. We have never considered RPT to be adversarial. Schulz hopes that junior faculty are not feeling a lack of support from colleagues. It's the responsibility of every candidate to have clear narratives about teaching, service, and RSCA, to be explicit and detailed and clear enough that if a URPTC person is reading your file and elaborations they understand how everything fits. There is an awesome responsibility to clearly craft a narrative that says what you do and why you do it. You need to show in the narrative the value of your work. If your faculty don't give you the needed support, then avail yourselves of the trainings in the FDC to help people craft their files.

Carroll has a sense that there is not a serious problem with the elaborations as they exist. His sense is that if there is a lack of clarity, it should be evident at every level of review. Carroll hasn't heard concerns at departments that their elaborations were unclear, or from the Deans and URPTC. He doubts that there is a serious problem with the elaborations.

Ken Schoenly noted that another criteria that's showing up in letters is applications for extramural funding sources, but that is intimately tied to your publication record. You may not be good at fundraising if you don't have a record of scholarly-reviewed publication. Granting agencies look for a publication record, without this the applicant is seen as untested in the eyes of the reviewers. We need to see the linkage between the scholarship record and fundraising aspects.

Young returned to the comments offered by Schulz, noting that for junior faculty having dialogue with a department chair or dean about what is expected is bothersome. It's been her experience that the conversation down the hallways, offering the elaboration of the elaborations, is what clarified the expectations, not what was written on the page. The informal conversation is what scares her with regard to elaborations, because much is left to interpretation. That's not to diminish the weight of the recommendation of the department, that's fundamental to the process, but Young still wishes for some more clarity in the elaborations themselves.

Schulz responded that he wants junior faculty to push against the department, to raise the questions to see if more clarity or explicitness is needed. Schulz acknowledge that for junior faculty that's not easy to do, but if you're not certain or clear then he would hope you would ask questions and talk about things. If our department RPT committees aren't being as helpful as they need to be, then they need to work on changing that culture. Schulz can't say that it's true across the campus that junior faculty are or are not being supported. This could be a call for departments to be more proactive regarding help, assistance, and asking questions.

Jennifer Helzer said that in her limited experience in her department, she is concerned now in going up and seeing that this clarification potentially has the outcome of separating, or taking that away from us. Helzer feels that the elaborations have worked well. If we are elaborating within the elaborations we may be pitting ourselves against one another. Like Bret Carroll, Helzer is not sure if things are broken.

Thompson thanked all for their advice and comments.

8. Open Forum

Summarizing the meeting, Thompson noted that we approved recommending to the president an award for governance. We also talked about hiring TAs and GAs and the awarding of fee waivers, and had a good discussion about personnel matters revolving the elaborations. This is what an Academic Senate should be doing. Thompson voiced his appreciation for everyone's participation today, and reminded all to vote if they hadn't already.

9. Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 3:52pm.