

**CSU STANISLAUS
UNIVERSITY BUDGET ADVISORY COMMITTEE
MAY 23, 2014**

**SUMMARY NOTES
(Approved June 2, 2014)**

Present: Ms. Eileen Hamilton, UBAC Chair; Mr. Carl Whitman, UBAC Associate Chair/AVP; Professor Paul O'Brien (Sociology); Professor David Lindsay (FBAC); Professor Stuart Wooley (Biology); Ms. Mariam Salameh (ASI President); Ms. Alissa Aragon (Staff/Campus Life); Ms. Lori Phillips (Staff/CAHSS); Dean James Tuedio (CAHSS); Director Julia Reynoso (Facilities Planning); Budget Manager Michelle Legg (non-voting); Ms. Julia Fahrenbruch (non-voting/volunteer). Not Present: Mr. Marvin Hooker (ASI Vice President).

Chair Hamilton called the meeting to order at 12:38 p.m. Action: It was moved and seconded to approve, as distributed, the draft May 16, 2014 summary notes. The motion passed unanimously.

2014-2015 DIVISION PRIORITIES – COMMITTEE DISCUSSION

The discussion began with a review of the process used by individual Committee members to examine and rank the various Division priorities within the major categories/themes previously identified.

In response to comments about the number of times student advising has been discussed, ASI President Salameh recommended that UBAC identify student advising as one of the top priorities. Chair Hamilton expressed agreement. Dean Tuedio pointed out that one of the reasons student advising is talked about more than others is because it was identified as a concern by various divisions, groups, and individuals. He said it is important for UBAC to think about the higher picture with respect to that, because it suggests that we are not necessarily clear on where the priority resides; we don't even know the scope. Dean Tuedio pointed out that he was not ready to say there should be an advising position in ARC, if that precludes other discussions down the road about other ways to accomplish that goal. He agreed that student advising should be one of the priorities going forward, but urged caution in order to assure that UBAC helps move that process in an appropriate direction.

Subsequent discussion focused on Division requests that are seeking multiple positions and the need to be fair and to begin to slowly rebuild from past budget cuts. In response to ASI President Salameh's request for clarification as to how UBAC might address those issues without talking about the numbers, Dean Tuedio suggested that they could speak to the degree to which that priority has urgency for us or the degree to which it is not as urgent. Ultimately, the Vice Presidents will have to decide whether or not to fund that position. Dean Tuedio expressed his belief that UBAC should not go to that level of detail and try to steer the decisions about positions in general, but should maintain notes that clarify why we said what we said about a strong priority, but only partially supported what was requested. Ms. Phillips noted that the Committee also could take it a step further and recommend a position in the future; that it be considered over a longer time span than just one year, which would also address what they have requested. Indicating this is a good approach, Professor Wooley also pointed out that some of the facilities requests, even if identified as a number one priority, would probably not be done next year—the opportunity is to provide immediate guidance and some future guidance.

Director Reynoso offered a cautionary note, pointing out that some Division requests (e.g., Academic Affairs) simply indicated they wanted to hire additional staff but did not provide a description or number—how do you fairly rank the ones that had a lot of information and the others that did not? In response to Professor O'Brien's question about seeking additional information or justifications, Ms. Reynoso emphasized that her comments were intended as cautionary when discussing specific positions because we don't have the

definition of all the positions being requested; we don't know if it's a small or big number. However, she noted that should not stop the Committee from moving forward. Ms. Reynoso also noted that Athletics did not identify the positions in their written request, but verbalized those during the presentation to UBAC.

Later in the meeting, Provost Strong asked if the Committee had questions for him. During the discussion about actual staff position numbers sought by Academic Affairs, Provost Strong noted that he had a lot of requests from all units that he would not be able to fund and would eventually have to go back and prioritize each individual request based on the dollars available. He noted that most staff positions would be positions lost to budget cuts or net new positions that surfaced as a need. Ms. Reynoso again clarified that her comment was not necessarily that she needed or wanted that information, but just that when the Committee gets into the prioritization process some categories have that very specific information and others do not, so you are not comparing apples to apples.

Professor Wooley asked about the feasibility of preparing a wiki doc that each Committee member could put their rankings in, as a way to visualize what each member is thinking and see if there are ways to coalesce around some priorities. Ms. Aragon noted that this might help to get some conversations going and weed out some of the things that the Committee has questions about in order to get to the top (for example) five priorities. Dean Tuedio agreed that seeing what each member has come up with for rankings would be interesting, but expressed concern about collapsing that information without a common way of ranking. He also said that when it comes time to prepare the report, we are probably talking more about areas of priority than specific lines of priority, although what those specific lines are could become very clear. Dean Tuedio pointed out that the next level is where the tougher conversations will occur and, ultimately, the Vice Presidents are going to have to make the case for the specific things the Committee has in mind.

Professor Wooley agreed that ranking in terms of the top categories or themes would help the Committee focus more on the University mission—teaching students, providing them with a quality education, getting them through in a timely way, supporting them in a low risk, state and federally compliant way, and also assuring that we have appropriate facilities and that staff and faculty are not over worked—this might be a more efficient way to do it and also keep the Committee out of all the complexities involved in each Divisions operation. Professor O'Brien said, in a way, we are abdicating a little bit what we are supposed to do by these rankings, however he agreed with the comment about giving the Vice Presidents the opportunity to look at it again based on the larger categories of what we think are important.

Dean Tuedio pointed out that he did not want to skip some of the intermediate steps, but noted that what Ms. Aragon suggested would be helpful in getting to the point of knowing where our thinking is more generally by looking at which ones rose to the top within a column. Later we can look at the columns themselves as having an impact on us as priorities, which would effect how many of those things carry weight. Some columns might only have one or two things that really carry weight in that context and others might have six, eight, or ten. But, for now, if we had a sense of what are the top five or so in a category, and are we on the same page or looking at twenty different things? If there are twenty, what does that tell us about those categories? Professor Lindsay agreed with Dean Tuedio's comments, but also expressed his belief that the Committee should spend a little time with the details before getting to the broad categories, which he realizes would ultimately be the basis of the Committee report.

PRIORITIES MATRIX REVIEW

During the course of the below discussions, Associate Chair Whitman suggested that each Committee member might list/rank his or her top three or four priorities within each category, but not anything below that number (whatever that turns out to be). He pointed out that one of the categories has 6 items identified, while others have as many as 17 or 33. Given the parameters of the funding available relatively few are going to

rise to the top, so putting a lot of effort into anything other than the highest ranked ones in each category probably would not be of much value. Mr. Whitman emphasized that he was not trying to enslave anyone to a particular number, but just wanted to illustrate that going all the way to 17 or 33 seems unnecessary. He also emphasized that this could still be done in the lens of base and one-time funding as another way to cut this data [referenced by Dean Tuedio under Instructional Support], in addition to how these categories eventually rank order. Professor O'Brien agreed that prioritizing things that never will be funded is not a good use of time. In further discussions, Dean Tuedio suggested (as a guide) listing/ranking the top five in each category.

INSTRUCTIONAL SUPPORT (6 x's in the column)

(The below items rose to the top during the discussion, but are not in rank order)

1. Chair assigned time (AA #1 / FBAC item 5)
2. Faculty positions (AA #4 / FBAC item 3)
3. Dean of Graduate Programs/ORSP (AA #5 / ASI item 4 / FBAC items 6 & 7)
4. Increase O&E (non-personnel) funding (AA #3)
5. Media Production Specialist (B&F #3/OIT #3)

Dean Tuedio identified the first three items listed above. Ms. Aragon added increase O&E, but ranked it #3, and Professor O'Brien said he ranked it #2. Ms. Reynoso added the Media Production Specialist, which was at the top of her list.

Dean Tuedio said that he also reviewed each priority in terms of base and one-time funding—ranked it as either a base-funding problem or as one-time funds where we might address it for a year, see where we are, and maybe continue in that way. As one-time funding it was a high priority, so he gave that item a second priority at that point, but as a base funding priority it was at the bottom of the items listed in that category. Dean Tuedio emphasized that he was not saying it isn't important for a particular priority to be base funded, but if it's the kind of thing that lends itself to one-time funding, in the way we use O&E funds in a given year, then it could be a one-time augmentation directed toward specific needs in an area that would be covered by O&E funding—there are a couple ways these could be distributed to address problems. He also noted that a lot of the requests ask for base or both, and when they are both he views it differently as to how high a priority it is. In response to Professor's O'Brien's question, Dean Tuedio said he would consider increase O&E funding (item 4 above) as one-time, but chair assigned time and faculty positions (items 1 and 2 above) as base funding.

Ms. Aragon said that in ranking all of the categories she took the stance of how can we support the current departments and programs—how do we support the people and equipment already here? She noted that she did not look at these in terms of base or one-time funds. ASI President Salameh agreed that it would be good to look at what we have now and improve it, and then look into areas that are new and see if we have room to make recommendations for funding it later. Ms. Phillips said that she had a hard time with that priority (item 4 above), because the title references non-personnel, but the request includes replacement of faculty on sabbatical. With one-time funds included in the request, it was hard to fit into a specific place, which is why she ranked it lower on her list.

Director Reynoso said that she included the Media Production Specialist at the top of her list, because she thought that position would help many across campus and possibly improve productivity or efficiency. Associate Chair Whitman confirmed that the position is intended to cross disciplines—has direct implications for supporting instructional programs and envision it being used in professional development and training support, as well as in meetings like UBAC.

RISK MANAGEMENT (17 x's in the column)

(The below items rose to the top during the discussion, but are not in rank order)

1. Public safety officers (B&F #1/PS #1a)
2. Campus Compliance and Labor Relations staff (FA&HR #1)
3. Athletics facilities person (AT #1a)
4. Academic compliance person in Athletics (AT #1c)
5. Psychological Counselors (E&SA #2 / ASI item 2 / FBAC item 3)
6. Assistant Dean of Students (E&SA #4a / ASI item 5)
7. Information Security Officer (B&F #3/OIT #2)
8. Athletics trainers (AT #1e)
9. Public safety evening student security officer (B&F #1/PS #3)
10. Public safety dispatcher (B&F #1/PS #2)

Dean Tuedio identified the first five items listed above. Ms. Aragon included Psychological Counselors and the Assistant Dean of Students. Ms. Phillips included the Assistant Dean of Students and the Information Security Officer. Professor O'Brien's list was the same, but for public safety officers he indicated one officer instead of two. Professor Wooley included Athletics Trainers as #4, Psychological Counselors were further down, Assistant Dean of Students, Campus Compliance and Labor Relations was second after Public Safety Officers, and the last one was Public Safety evening student security officer. In response to Dean Tuedio, Professor Wooley said he ranked academic compliance the same as trainers, but did not rank the facilities person. Professor Lindsay ranked Psychological Counselors #1, Public Safety Officers #2, added the Public Safety Dispatcher as #3, Information Security Officer #4, and Campus Compliance and Labor Relations #5.

STUDENT SUCCESS (12 x's in the column)

(The below items rose to the top during the discussion, but are not in rank order)

1. Academic and Career advising (*combined*)—(E&SA #3a / AA #6 / UW #2 / ASI item 1 / FBAC item 3)
2. Psychological Counselors (E&SA #2 / ASI item 2 / FBAC item 3)
3. Dean of Graduate Programs/ORSP (AA #5 / ASI item 4 / FBAC items 6 & 7))
4. Increase partnerships to improve readiness (UW #1 / FBAC item 1)
5. Veteran's Coordinator (E&SA #3b)
6. Staff for Registrars office and Degree Audit (*combined*)—(EA&SA #5a and #5b / ASI item 1)

Professor Lindsay identified Academic Advising as #1 on his list (noting it appears multiple times), Psychological Counselors #2, Dean of Graduate Programs/ORSP #3, Increase Partnerships to Improve Readiness #4, and a Veteran's Coordinator (student advisor) #5.

ASI President Salameh asked if the Committee also looked at the ones that were not on the Vice Presidents lists, like career advising—was career advising considered by anyone? Ms. Aragon responded that she looked at Priority #2 under University-wide, strengthening academic and career advising, which was her #1, and incorporated ASI's career advising priority and the advising ones from Student Affairs and Academic Affairs, and ranked career advising and academic advising as one and two.

Dean Tuedio said his list included strengthening academic and career advising using one-time funds, Dean of Graduate Programs/ORSP, and Psychological Counselors. He said he then added together Staff to the Registrar's Office and Degree Audit, which Ms. Aragon said she did as well. Professor Wooley said he also did that, and then had hire additional academic advisor (E&SA #3a) as his #3, but did not have the Dean of Graduate Programs/ORSP in his top seven. Professor O'Brien said his list pretty much follows Professor Lindsay's, except that he ranked Psychological Counselors #1, Veteran's Coordinator #2, and the Dean of Graduate Programs/ORSP #4. He also commented that student advising keeps coming up and is sprinkled throughout these.

Regarding the reference to one-time funding for academic advising, ASI President Salameh asked, if it is a priority in multiple areas and strengthening is needed, what would one-time funding do? Dean Tuedio responded that it would allow us to conduct some pilot projects and test them out to see what works; or, setting them up for a longer trial period would allow us to determine the impact and then in the following year decide whether it rises to the level of a base funded priority; or, we can say it is an issue and it is time to move to base funding. Professor Wooley said one-time funds also could help fund grant writing and other things that would help us gather some preliminary data, which might also lead to additional grant funding for a longer period of time. Professor Lindsay pointed out that, in 2003, the College of Business Administration's Student Success Center was originally established with one-time funding. The accreditation team was so impressed with it that they worked it into the report; as a result, the administration was happy in the following year to support it from base funds.

WORKLOAD/COMPENSATION (33 x's in the column)

(The below items rose to the top during the discussion, but are not in rank order)

1. Baseline for staff salary increases (Staff proposal)
2. OIT benefits moving to General Fund (B&F #3/OIT #1)
3. Custodial supervisor for facilities (B&F #2/Fac. #2)
4. Assistant Dean of Students (E&SA #4a / ASI item 5)
5. Chair assigned time (AA #1 / FBAC item 5)
6. Hire additional staff in Academic Affairs (AA #2)
7. Public safety officers (B&F #1/PS #1a)
8. Campus Compliance and Labor Relations staff (FA&HR #1)
9. Dean of Graduate Programs/ORSP (AA #5 / ASI item 4 / FBAC items 6 & 7)
10. Academic compliance staff in Athletics (AT #1c)
11. Psychological Counselors (E&SA #2 / ASI item 2 / FBAC item 3)
12. Director of College & Athletic Development (UA #1)
13. Accountant position in Business Services (B&FA #5/BS #1)
14. Temporary employment services staffing (FA&HR #4)

Noting again that she was thinking about taking care of current things with current people, Ms. Aragon said that establishing a baseline for salary increases was #1 on her list, moving OIT benefits to the General Fund was #2, a custodial supervisor for facilities was #3, followed by hiring an Assistant Dean of Students, then Chair release time, and hiring additional staff in Academic Affairs.

Dean Tuedio included Public Safety Officers (as a workload issue), Campus Compliance and Labor Relations staff, Dean of Graduate Programs/ORSP, academic compliance person in Athletics was his #1, and Psychological Counselors ranked #2. Dean Tuedio pointed out that the items that are in other categories pick up weight here, and by ranking them that high he was basically saying this column is one of the places where they are getting a lot of weight—even though we've listed them already, they are getting bolder in his mind because of falling in other categories as well. He also said most of that is about compliance and workload, rather than compensation.

Referencing previous discussions about positions that are already active but may be funded on a temporary basis, Director Reynoso expressed her belief that under this category the Committee could make the statement that the top priority should be to permanently fund permanent positions that are currently funded with temporary funding; say something to that effect without going through and picking which ones, because we don't have the information to make that ranking.

Professor O'Brien's top five list included Public Safety Officers as #1, OIT benefits change #2, custodial supervisor #3 (workload issue), then Psychological Counselors, and Campus Compliance and Labor Relations. He said that although the staff request was compelling, his hesitation about including it was the fact that all the unions are in current negotiations and that process should be finished first.

Noting that he agreed with Professor O'Brien's comments regarding the staff request, Professor Lindsay said the top five on his list were Psychological Counselors #1, Public Safety Officers #2, Public Safety Dispatcher #3, Public Safety evening student security #4, and chair assigned time #5.

Noting her agreement with Ms. Reynoso's comments (above), Ms. Phillips said that was the reason she added the Director of College and Athletic Development as #1 on her list, and also included the accounting position in Business Services, both of which are currently funded with one-time funds. Another one that she included was staffing for temporary employment services, because of the impact on so many people on campus.

Professor Wooley indicated his list was similar to Professor O'Brien's, but also included in his top four or five the staffing request for the temporary employment pool that he found very compelling. Dean Tuedio said he did not rank that one very high in this column, but ranked it really high in the next column because he felt it was about the operations of the units. Ms. Phillips said she included it here, because she was thinking about the workload currently being distributed in Human Resources, but noted that she also ranked it high in operations. In response to Professor Wooley's request, Ms. Phillips again reviewed the complexities of the current process [refer to UBAC 4/11 notes, page 9, F&HR priority #4] and also noted that often times the person you are considering has either left or is leaving shortly, which can significantly extend the process. Ms. Reynoso also noted that we don't have enough information about how they are going to structure it, but the conversation is about what we would love to see it progress to eventually; this is a starting step in moving in a more efficient direction. Professor Wooley said he also had it listed in the efficiency column, where it seems to fit in both workload and operations.

OPERATIONS (11 x's in the column)

(The below items rose to the top during the discussion, but are not in rank order)

1. Communications and other equipment for Public Safety (B&F #1/PS #4)
2. Temporary employment services staffing (FA&HR #4)
3. Improve audio technology in major venues for public events (UW #5)
4. Budget Analyst (E&SA #1)
5. Increase O&E (non-personnel) funding (AA #3)
6. Modernizing and maintaining technology (B&F #2/Fac. #3)
7. Phone system acquisition/maintenance (B&F #3/OIT #4)
8. Deferred maintenance (B&F #2/Fac. #1)
9. Concur Travel System acquisition/maintenance (B&F #3/OIT #5)

Dean Tuedio identified communications and other equipment for Public Safety, staffing of temporary employment services, and audio technology (a one-time funding request), and the Budget Analyst in Enrollment and Student Affairs.

ASI President Salameh raised questions about the need for a budget analyst in Student Affairs. Following some discussion, Ms. Legg clarified that the Budget Office has been doing the E&SA budget centrally and spends a significant amount of time preparing an analysis for the Vice President. The Vice President then needs someone to reconcile those items with all of the departments and managers. In order for it to be meaningful, someone has to follow up on all the analyses and any corrections. She said E&SA used to have a budget analyst, but combined three jobs into a broader administrative analyst category. The budget ends up being the last thing on the list, because the day-to-day operations take a lot of that person's time.

Professor O'Brien identified staffing of temporary employment services as #1, increase O&E funding in Academic Affairs #2, modernizing and maintaining technology #3, deferred maintenance #4, and phone system acquisition #5.

Professor Wooley said his list is similar to Professor O'Brien's, except staffing for temporary employment services along with hiring the budget analyst are first, then deferred maintenance and increased O&E, and then modernizing and maintaining technology.

Ms. Phillips said she listed the Enrollment & Student Affairs budget analyst as #1, but the Concur travel system acquisition was her #2 (because it is something the campus has already committed to and is scheduled to pay for using one-times funds for acquisition and base for annual fees), modernizing and maintaining technology and deferred maintenance were the next two.

Expressing his belief that deferred maintenance projects would be ideal for one-time funding, Professor O'Brien asked about the possibility of moving some of the Library lottery funding there and pulling some base funds into the Library? In response, Chair Hamilton read a section of the CSU Lottery Budget guidelines—"To summarize, the most important criteria governing use of lottery revenue are as follows: 1) Must supplement, not supplant, state funding of instruction; 2) Must be widely acknowledged as a valuable enhancement of the instructional program; 3) Must be widely acknowledged as consistent with the provisions of the California State Lottery Act of 1984; and 4) Must not make long-term funding commitments." [Note: The guidelines also state, "capital outlay, research, and non-instructional activities are specifically prohibited by the Lottery Act."]

As an example, Associate Chair Whitman noted that OIT used to get a \$30,000 allocation from the lottery that was used for one-time classroom enhancements (e.g., audio visual and similar things), but that clearly was the minority investment as OIT put more money in from other sources for that purpose. In response to Professor O'Brien's question about funding computers with lottery, Associate Chair Whitman said that could be done in the context of outfitting a classroom but not for individuals.

OUTREACH (7 x's in the column)

(The below items rose to the top during the discussion, but are not in rank order)

1. Director of College and Athletic Development (UA #1)
2. Dean of Graduate Programs/ORSP (AA #5 / ASI item 4 / FBAC items 6 & 7)
3. Sports Information person in Athletics (AT #1b)
4. Campus diversity and training staff (FA&HR #2 / FBAC item 8)
5. Campus health and wellness staff (FA&HR #3 / ASI item 3)
6. Media Production Specialist ((B&F #3/OIT #3)
7. Improve audio technology in major venues at public events (UW #5)

Dean Tuedio said that he listed the Director of College and Athletic Development at the top, as well as the Dean of Graduate Programs/ORSP because that is another way to get out into the graduate student pools to attract students and connect outside with grant agencies and organizations. The Sports Information person in Athletics also was on his list. Ms. Aragon said, thinking in terms of campus outreach, she listed the campus diversity and training program staff person as #1 and the campus health and wellness staff person as #2. Professor Wooley said he listed the campus health and wellness staff first, the diversity training program next, the Media Production Specialist was third, followed by improving audio technology at major venues for public events, and the Director of College and Athletic Development. Professor O'Brien said his list was basically the same as Professor Wooley's, except that he put improve audio technology last on his list.

RESERVES

Professor Wooley noted that this is one of last year's UBAC recommendations, which the President accepted and is committed to. Associate Chair Whitman referenced the document distributed today by Ms. Legg (compensation pool allocations 2013-2014), indicating that a portion of the reserves (\$90,868) had to be used to fund the shortfall in salary increases.

Dean Tuedio said this reminds him of the conversations about things introduced at the forum and the rather specific one to provide a base funding pool for staff salary increases. He expressed his belief that the process needs to be respected in which in-range progressions are studied, analyzed and appropriately determined. He encouraged Committee members to make sure we say something about the importance of base funding following the determinations that are made, rather than the determination being influenced by concerns about available resources. Once made those decisions obviously are going to be funded and, this year, we dipped into reserves to make that happen. Indicating that he does not disagree with that philosophy, Associate Chair Whitman commented on the other aspect, using his department as an example with respect to reclassifications (rather than IRPs)—OIT had almost \$50,000 worth of reclassifications in this past fiscal year alone that are otherwise unfunded. As it stands today, OIT will have a cut going into next year to fund those reclassifications. Associate Chair Whitman agreed with Dean Tuedio's statement that base funding should follow those judgments, but pointed out that when Human Resources acts on reclassification requests they do so without regard to the funding available. Dean Tuedio clarified that he meant the University's base fund budget should fund any of those increases that are merited by the process. Associate Chair Whitman agreed but said, in the spirit of what the staff was really trying propose, it essentially was just that—the money isn't there necessarily, unless it is set aside in some measure for that purpose or earmarked to come out of reserves. For clarification, Ms. Aragon pointed out that the staff request pool is for in-range progressions, equity, merit, retention, and longevity; more than just IRPs.

BUDGET UPDATE—Budget Manager Legg distributed (via email and at the meeting) two documents: (1) Compensation Pool Allocations 2013-2014 FY and (2) Projected General Operating Fund Base Budget Allocation May 2014 & July 2014. Ms. Legg provided a quick update on the compensation pool and salary increases, noting they knew that there would be a cost to the reserve because all of our new positions, all those positions we paid out this year are not counted; they are not part of the pool. The reserve was reduced by \$90,868 and is now at 2.6%, or a little over \$2.4M of the total budget before the \$1.6M is distributed—right now we have \$1.6M unallocated for next year and that could go up or down based on the final budget. Ms. Legg also noted that it would be later in the year before we would know if there are any augmentations to the budget; late summer at the earliest.

In reviewing the documents provided, Dean Tuedio commented that because of previous decisions we have about \$2,488,000 remaining in a reserve that is unallocated base funds and is there for contingencies. With respect to the \$1,658,700, Ms. Legg said that number is basically what we are talking about in terms of the new (unallocated) money available to allocate for next year, as of today. Associate Chair Whitman asked what accounts for the reduction in financial aid? Ms. Legg said that because we had some changes in our student need two years ago our State University Grants were reduced for this coming year. Professor Wooley noted that the State Assembly is recommending \$100M more to the CSU, which the Governor's Budget did not include, but it would come with strings – higher enrollments.

NEXT UBAC MEETINGS—June 2 (Monday) 1:00-3:00 p.m. and June 4 (Wednesday) 1:00-3:00 p.m.

Ms. Phillips noted that she would revise the matrix based on the discussions and distribute for review at the next meeting.

ADJOURNMENT: The meeting adjourned at 2:10 p.m.