UNIVERSITY COUNCIL MINUTES  
Wednesday, November 30, 2011, 3 p.m.  
Holmes Student Center Sky Room

Disclaimer: These minutes should not be taken as a verbatim transcript but rather as a shortened summary that is intended to reflect the essence of statements made at the meeting. Many comments have been omitted and, in some cases, factual and grammatical errors corrected. The full verbatim transcript is available online at the University Council Web site under Agendas, Minutes & Transcripts.


VOTING MEMBERS ABSENT:  Barth, Bozikis, Coles, Echols, Elish-Piper, Houze, Hurt, Kowalski (on sabbatical), LeFlore, Lenczewski, Lindvall, Long, Mohabat, Rosato, Rossi, Schoenbachler, Thu, Venaas, Walker

OTHERS PRESENT:  Blakemore, Bryan, Cunningham, Freeman, Griffin, Hansen, Hemphill, Kaplan, Williams

OTHERS ABSENT:  Finley, Freedman, Prawitz, Slotsve, Snow, Sunderlin, Waas

I.   CALL TO ORDER

Meeting called to order at 3:07 p.m.

II.   ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA

J. Peters:  We have one walk-in item under VI. A., and that’s Earl’s report.

D. Haliczer:  made the motion.  R. Lopez:  was second.

The agenda was approved with the one walk-in report, without dissent or abstention.

III.  APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES OF THE NOVEMBER 2, 2011 UC MEETING

D. Munroe:  made the motion.  S. Farrell:  was second.

The minutes were approved as written without dissent or abstention.

IV.    PRESIDENT’S ANNOUNCEMENTS
J. Peters: Noted that this is the last meeting of the year, and that he is looking forward to the upcoming commencement exercises. He spoke briefly about the senseless and tragic act of violence in the northwest section of DeKalb that took the life of one of our precious students, Steven Agee, II. He was a senior sociology major, a campus leader, who was on track to graduate in May. Yesterday afternoon, our students organized a beautiful tribute to Steven, which was attended by many hundreds including his immediate family and his close associates, and he had many here on campus. Many of you were there, I see your faces and I saw them in the crowd. As I participated and I heard the tributes and the remembrances, I really did sense a quiet but powerful connection amongst all in the audience and a resolve to move forward and to grapple with this escalation of violence among our young people worldwide and in this nation. I sensed that, a coming together. In my comments, I gave my personal pledge that NIU would do all I could each and every day, and we’ve done a lot, to address this issue. But it’s not enough to say that violence is a societal problem and that no community is immune, including our own. It’s not enough to say that. This is – I’ve thought about this a lot – this is a complex issue for which there is no one answer or solution, and we must all be involved as we move forward. I’ve been so gratified in recent months with the level of attention and cooperation that has existed between our university partners. We’ve been quietly meeting a lot, that is the City of DeKalb, Sycamore, DeKalb County, the state attorney’s office, and, of course, our law enforcement agencies. And they’ve worked diligently to make our community as safe as it can be. But, clearly, we need to do more and we will do more. So, today, I’m asking all of you and all the members of our NIU community to help in your own way and from your own particular disciplinary expertise, to help us develop some innovative solutions to the societal problem that we can implement in our own community.

Now, moving on, tomorrow, at the December Board of Trustees meeting, there will be a resolution that will direct me to review the 1993 role and mission statement of the university. It hasn’t been looked at since 1993 and it is necessary in anticipation and preparation for our higher learning mission reaccreditation process. I want to initiate formally today, the campus conversation on our reaccreditation process and demonstrate the need to update our role and mission statement as part of that process and, of course, Provost Ray Alden has overall responsibility for this, along with Vice Provost Virginia Cassidy.

So, first let me give you some context as I see it. A university of the stature of NIU is not in danger of losing its accreditation. Accreditation is extremely important, as it is to your specialized accreditation, whether it’s the College of Law, ABET in engineering, I think we have 26 different specialized accrediting bodies that certify that what we’re doing is of quality and meets the public interest. There’s a focus on outcomes, measures and assessment and matching what your role and mission statement says to what you do. So, they’re going to parse every word of our role and mission statement, and they say if you’re going to produce globally prepared students, you have to demonstrate that you’ve done that. It’s required that the Board of Trustees be involved in certification of that role and mission. I’m pleased to say that we have a group of people who are going to take this challenge on and it’s going to be a long process.

Anyway, here’s five minutes of a primer on accreditation. There’s a two-part process to accreditation. First is compliance with the criteria and that’s done by self examination and a self study and then a visitation by an off-site team. The other part of it is a consultation where these
outside accreditors meet with us and give us suggestions on how to achieve our goals.

So, let’s focus on some of the tasks that are immediate. One is a self-study process. Doris Macdonald from English has agreed to chair the HLC steering committee, putting together a steering committee and I won’t go over that, but people from all the right shared governance committees are going to be on this steering committee. Now, each member of the steering committee is going to coordinate a subcommittee of faculty, staff, and students to provide evidence that we meet each of the higher ed. learning commission criteria. So, this is really a participatory shared governance process the way we build this. Briefly, here are the criteria:

1. Mission. They assess your mission. The institution’s mission is clear and articulated publicly, and it guides the institution’s operations. Go on websites and do role and missions for universities and black out the name of the university and you can’t tell the difference. They’re pretty similar: We teach, research, and do service.

2. Ethical and responsible conduct. The institution fulfills its mission ethically and responsibly.

3. Academic programs – quality, resources and support. Does the institution provide high-quality academic programs wherever and however its offerings are delivered?

4. The fourth criteria is evaluation and improvement. We got written up in the last accreditation, not because we didn’t evaluate and have outcomes, it’s just we didn’t document it well. So, the institution demonstrates responsibility for the quality of its educational programs, learning environment, support services and evaluates their effectiveness for student learning through processes designed to promote continuous improvement.

5. The fifth criteria is resources, planning, and institutional effectiveness. The institution’s resources, structures, processes are sufficient to fulfill the mission, improve the quality of its educational offerings and respond to future challenges and opportunities. The institution plans for the future. I know the trustees have picked up on Great Journeys and Vision 2020, and that is going to be the thing that is going to guide the plans for the future, we just have to operationalize them and achieve them.

The starting line is today or it’s really already happened. The finish line is spring of 2014 with the HLC site visit. But, between now and then, a lot of work has to be done. This fall, we selected the chair and the steering committee, they’re organized. In the spring of 2012 they’re going to meet and develop their strategy. We’re going to meet our higher learning commission liaison, the appointed individual who’s an expert in this. There’s a meeting of the higher learning commission that this group will attend so they get trained on how to do this. And then we’re going to begin to review the evidence. Then, from summer 2012 to summer 2013, review the evidence, draft responses to the criteria, and discuss and rewrite our self study. Then, the fall of 2013, we make the self study available for public comment, prepare the final version and submit it. Ray [Alden], do you want to add anything to that?

R. Alden: I think just the fact that there are, I think, 9 or 10 people on the committee and each
one of those will be heading up a subcommittee made up of other people, so this is a fairly expansive process that involves the whole university community. And some of the questions that need to be addressed in the criteria, as we understand them, still need to be talked about on this campus, not the least of which is the mission. But other things such as student learning outcomes, how do you know the difference between one at a doctoral level and one at a master’s level and one at a baccalaureate level and so forth. So, there will be a lot of opportunities for talking and through shared governance groups, primarily prompted by these steering committee subcommittees that will be going out and asking different groups for information.

**J. Peters:** Then, tomorrow, we will be charged to do the role and mission and you’ll be hearing more about that. There will be a requirement that we report to them in March. They will give feedback and then their May or June meeting is when that will be accepted. So, that’s going to be a fast track situation.

Lastly, let me update you on the veto session which ended anticlimactically. There was no overall pension reform passed. They passed a pension reform bill that plugged rather egregious exceptions that permitted individuals who had only limited amount of time in one of the five state retirement systems to collect inordinate benefits. That passed. That had very little to do with Senate Bill 512, which was not brought, but will be brought, in the spring.

They did fix up this fiscal 2012 budget, which is a relief in that, not us, but there were state agencies that were going to go dark and many people laid-off but they fixed that up. They did fix up a shortfall in the Monetary Award Program. They added $33 million, which is very good, so there will be no shortfall in what was appropriated. Dr. Williams informs me that we received a disbursement from the state of $6.3 million for fiscal 2011. So, we have an outstanding balance, of $13.8 million with the promise that it will be fully paid by December 31st, which is their mandate, unless they do something about it.

You’ll remember in my State of the University address, I said I was committed to do all I could to provide a salary increment package for this fiscal year; but that it was largely dependent on receipt of last year’s complete appropriation. So, we’re inching our way closer to that decision. So, this is to let you know, at this point in the year, that it remains my top priority and I’m working on it diligently. And every time we get a little more money, it makes that decision easier to make. Of course, we have to have trustee approval and anything we do, when we do, will have to be retroactive.

I think there is some contest, athletic contest, that’s going to happen Friday in Detroit, and I’ve been waiting 12 years for a football championship. Maybe this is our year, but I am equally proud that our men’s soccer team won the Mid-America Conference Soccer Division and our women’s volleyball team is in the NCAA tournament. I’m very proud of those kids and what they do.

**V. CONSENT AGENDA**

**VI. REPORTS FROM COUNCILS, BOARDS AND STANDING COMMITTEES**

A. FAC to IBHE – Earl Hansen – report – walk-in
E. Hansen: On the last page is what came out of our meeting, which was a letter from the Faculty Advisory Council to the Illinois Board of Higher Education to Dr. George Reid, chair of the performance-based funding steering committee. One of the questions raised was the existence of 3+1 degree programs between certain community colleges and certain four-year institutions. When I was asked by the group what I knew about the 3+1 between Northern and the College of DuPage, I told them absolutely nothing. They’re going to ask me again.

P. Vohra: This is with all the community colleges that have associate in applied science programs. The provision is that we give 23 credit hours for the technical component of their associates in applied science and then they can transfer 66 hours as normal credit. So, they can transfer up to 89 hours and then they have to take 31 hours from NIU to be able to complete their degree. This has existed, I think, for the last four years, and it’s a very successful program.

R. Holly: We have been working with the College of DuPage for a little more than a year now, and they have not called it a 3+1, they’re looking for 2+2. We’re not quite there yet, but we’ve been working with them and they understand there’s a quality difference between what they’re able to provide to their students and what we’re providing to our students. But they’re very amenable to seeing our side of things and we’re working on it.

J. Peters: If memory serves me correct, and Anne knows a good bit about this, I was taken aback a couple of years ago on these, what you call the 3+1, when we found out that there were some universities outside the state that would take 90 hours of community college and then they’d top it off with online the last year. Prestigious universities by the way were into this business.

A. Kaplan: Well, I think the larger issue really is, it’s all part of the pressure on community colleges to offer more and more education close to home. What started as a way of serving students who are place-bound because of work or family responsibilities is morphing into a service for students who simply cannot afford a residential education. You probably remember we mounted a fairly major legislative effort a few years ago to discourage the development of four-year programs on community college campuses, particularly at Harper, and we did all right with that, but the community college pushback on that issue is to go for the 3+1 while we’re trying for 2+2. And, basically, there’s something to be said for both sides. If you’re a community college administrator, you are faced, on a fairly regular basis, with a fair amount of pressure from the people who pay community college taxes to provide more education in the district. And on top of that, they like to rent space; and if you, as an institution, will bring your program there, they will be happy to rent you the space for it. We, on the other hand, have an interest in maintaining our claim on the region and getting to these students, who may or may not transfer to Northern faster, and we prefer that the programs be 2+2. To the extent that this can be resolved, it requires a close and civil working relationship with the community college players where we describe what we can do and they describe what they want, and we hope to meet in the middle. Our experience has been that, if we can get the faculty on both sides together, things work out pretty well because, in fact, they tend to work through the curriculum and figure out who does what best and we move on from there.
J. Peters: That’s been my experience. First of all, the NIU criteria is that we’re willing to try and fill these educational gaps programmatically, but we do it in a collaborative way, and we do nothing without the approval of any academic program, without faculty involvement and approval.

B. BOT Academic Affairs, Student Affairs and Personnel Committee – Kerry Freedman and Andy Small – report – Pages 3-4

C. BOT Finance, Facilities and Operations Committee – Alan Rosenbaum and Greg Waas – report – Pages 5-6

A. Rosenbaum: Actually Greg Waas wrote the report, which is in your agenda. There really isn’t anything of note to report other than what’s in the report, so, I’m not going to waste your time by reading it. So, if you have interest in telecommunications voice trunking services, you are welcome to read all of that in the report on pages 5 and 6.

D. BOT Legislation, Audit, and External Affairs Committee – Todd Latham and Rosita Lopez – report – Page 7

E. BOT – Alan Rosenbaum – no report

F. Academic Policy Committee – Karen Brandt, Chair – report

1. Guests in Class Policy proposal – Page 8

K. Brandt: We brought this guests in class policy in our last session and my understanding is that there were some suggestions for us to wordsmith a little bit and clean up our language. So, what we’re bringing to you today is the revised policy, which you can see is bolded. What we tried to do with this policy, just to give you some idea of our rationale behind it, was to keep the integrity of the instructor having control of the classroom. However, we also were concerned that there might be occasions where the instructor is inappropriate or in some way threatens student safety. So, there should be some sort of override for instructors if it comes to the attention to either security or to department chairs that safety is an issue. So, we also put that language in here as well. We are requiring that, if the department chair supervisory personnel and security are coming into the classroom, they must notify the instructor prior to coming in.

K. Brandt: moved the guests in class policy. C. McCord: was second.

R. Lopez: expressed concern with the last sentence.

K. Brandt: We took out that word, “permission,” because what we’re suggesting is that the instructor cannot deny entrance to supervisory people and security. However, we also wanted to have them notified in the case that say supervisory personnel wants to come in to a particular class where the material being talked about is sensitive or personal to the students where it would be inappropriate at that particular class.

One of our thoughts was that there are going to be times when the security issues and safety are
going to override any kind of guests in the policy classroom. So, we didn’t address that because we thought that that security is going to do what they need to do to protect students and instructors.

**P. Vohra:** There could be rare occasions when the content of the class could be in question and the behavior of the instructor or a particular student may be in question. In that situation, you may want to go into the classroom on a surprise basis. You may not be able to notify or may not want to notify the instructor.

**C. McCord:** As we debated this in the committee, we were trying to strike a balance. We recognize that there’s a very natural desire for instructors to have control over their classroom and to not feel that they are subject to unwarranted intrusion. On the other hand, we tried to recognize the reality that there can be situations where you need to see what’s going on. There is no language we could construct that parsed out every possible eventuality and noted every contingency. In succinct language, this was the best we could come up with trying to balance the concern of the instructor and the concern of the institution.

An extensive discussion followed which included a number of suggestions for amendments to the policy. These included:

- That those entering the classroom for security or evaluative purposes “should” rather than “must” notify the instructor in advance. Alternatively, it was suggested that the notification be “whenever possible.”

- That there might be circumstances where security doesn’t want to alert the instructor or the class, for example, in cases where the instructor is the target of an investigation.

- That the last line regarding notification be stricken entirely.

- That an exception for emergencies be appended to the last line. It would thus read: “Those present for supervisory and/or security duties must notify the instructor of their intent to be present prior to class, except in emergency situations.”

**K. Brandt:** accepted the last item as a friendly amendment to the motion as did the seconder.

**J. Peters:** All right, so that’s accepted as a friendly amendment. So, now let’s read it.

**K. Brandt:** “Guests in the classroom must have the permission of the instructor. When deciding whether a guest is appropriate, the instructor should take into consideration the effect the guest will have on the learning environment. Guests do not include those who are present on behalf of departmental and/or security supervisory or security duties. Those present for supervisory and/or security duties must notify the instructor of their intent to be present prior to class except in emergency situations.”

There were continuing concerns about definitions of emergency situations and several more suggestions to change the language to “should” and/or “whenever possible.”
**B. Sagarin:** The problem with a weakening of the language, which I believe the, “whenever possible,” would do, is that instructors who are teaching courses where the tenor or content of the conversation would change or need to be curtailed if there were security personnel in the room, those instructors would really like some assurance that, in most cases, they will be notified if there is a security person in the room. As somebody who teaches a course of that sort myself, I’m comfortable with the necessity of an emergency situation, making an exception. I’m less comfortable with the idea that somebody could define this as being not possible to assure me ahead of time. So, I’m comfortable with that emergency situation or security sensitive type of exception. I’m less comfortable with weakening of the last sentence with a “whenever possible.”

**K. Brandt:** Re-read the policy that the UC would be voting on which was unchanged with the exception of the addition of the last line: “Those present for supervisory and security duties must notify the instructor of their intent to be present prior to class except in emergency situations.”

President Peters called the vote and the policy was approved by a vote of:

Yes – 29  
No – 13  
Abstain – 0

**A. Rosenbaum:** The last item is that we want to place this in the Academic Policies and Procedures Manual. I’ll move that we place it into the manual and that we leave it up to the Academic Policies and Procedures Manual Advisory Committee to determine where it will go.

**T. Latham:** was second.

The motion was approved by a vote of:

Yes – 31  
No – 11  
Abstain – 0

**G. Resources, Space and Budgets Committee –** Laurie Elish-Piper, Chair – report  
November 1, 2011 meeting and November 8, 2011 meeting – Pages 9-11

**J. Peters:** Todd Latham is going to give the Resources, Space, and Budgets Committee report on pages 9-11.

**H. Rules and Governance Committee –** Suzanne Willis, Chair – no report

**I. University Affairs Committee –** Richard Greene, Chair – no report

**J. Student Association –** Austin Quick, Speaker – report – Pages 12-13

**A. Quick:** Thank you. First off, we want to thank the faculty and staff and the university as a whole for coming together for Steven. He was a staff member of ours and will be deeply missed.
It meant a lot to our community yesterday. So, thank you very much on behalf of Elliott and the entire staff of the Student Association.

Onto some pressing issues – I brought up at the last meeting and also at the Faculty Senate meeting the issue that the Student Association and the students have found that there is a lack of a grievance policy for students. And I’ve looked at a couple different options since I met with the steering committee and since I spoke with the Faculty Senate. And one of the options we had talked about was to look at other universities and what type of grievance policies they have. We have researched that and looked at other universities and the thing that we actually liked better than creating our own grievance policy is something that we work under as students, which is the Student Code of Ethics and the Code of Conduct. It came to my attention that we have a similar thing for faculty, operating staff, and supportive and professional staff as well, which is the Code of Ethics that was approved, it looks like 2001-2002.

What we would like to see, instead of creating a grievance policy is to create a little bit better language within the Code of Ethics that’s already in place and to implement some form of mechanism to hold those people accountable. So, just as the students must abide by that Code of Conduct, we would like to see the same thing for staff of this university and faculty as well. So, I don’t know if that is something that gets voted on here to be sent to a committee to work on, if there is an ad hoc committee that is created or how that works, but I’m bringing it to you for action today.

A. Rosenbaum: You could make the motion to send this to University Affairs and let the University Affairs Committee determine whether or not it seems worthwhile to modify that or develop a policy that refers to that in some way.

A. Quick: moved to send the issue of a grievance procedure for students to the University Affairs committee of the UC. The motion was seconded.

J. Peters: All right, so there is the motion to send this issue of the lack of a student grievance process to the University Affairs Committee, specifically to look at the current Code of Conduct to see if it couldn’t be broadened to accommodate student grievances against faculty and staff.

Unidentified: Since we have the ombudsman here, I wonder if, Tim, you could speak to policies that are in place for students. I mean, there is no mechanism for them addressing grievances at the university?

T. Griffin: Depending on how you define the word, “mechanism,” students can certainly express their concerns directly to the faculty or staff member, and they can direct their concerns directly to the department chair, a faculty member, or a supervisor of a staff member. Is what I just said written anywhere? No. Does the department chair or the supervisor therefore by policy have to entertain or respond in some way to such as concern? No. So, from some students’ perspectives, there is no mechanism for expressing such concerns.

A. Rosenbaum: But there are mechanisms for sexual harassment, for discrimination, and for grade appeal.
T. Griffin: Yes. But those are not stipulated, although arguably, sexual harassment would be incorporated into the current Code of Ethics statements, the other two arguably are not.

The motion was approved by a vote of:

Yes – 31
No – 6
Abstain – 3

J. Peters: All right, it’s sent to committee.

A. Quick: The last thing that we have, and I just wanted to give you an update, we’ve been working, both Elliott and I and numerous other students, with the bond fee revenue committee and one of the things I just want to make you aware of is that we’re concerned about the condition of the equipment in the rec center. Elliott [Echols] and I have gotten a few tours by Sandy Carlisle, the director of the recreation center and to say that I was surprised was an understatement. We have equipment in there, treadmills in there from the 1990s. We have equipment that is pushed off to the side because it’s not usable. We have problems with wires all over the floor. There are a lot of problems over there and one of the things that we did last year was we gave $100,000 on top of what we usually fund to the recreation center out of the student fees, we gave to the recreation center to purchase new equipment. We got a list of all the equipment. They have tennis shoes that there are, some type of shoes that they rent out to people that are over 20 years old. So, we would like to see the support of this body and the faculty and staff to support us finding more resources in this tough economic time to put more money into our recreation center, because, when students come to this campus and they look around, they look at where they’re going to eat, where they’re going to sleep, where they’re going to exercise, and we want to make sure that people go into our facility at a campus this large and see that we have the adequate resources for them.

B. Hemphill: I think, just like the rest of the institution, there are a lot of issues that we have to prepare to respond to, but we’ve also made significant investments when the funds have been available. So, I know that there’s been equipment purchased every year, but there are still situations in which this is something that we have to look at. We have to make sure that we’re monitoring it closely, but we do it depending on resources and we’ve just been in some tight times as a university. So, we’ll continue to look at this and monitor this very closely. As we can have additional resources made available, we’ll definitely invest it in that.

K. Operating Staff Council – Andy Small, President – report – Page 14

A. Small: We are currently looking at our bylaws and our constitution. We are revising those documents and as such, we will probably bring some corrections to the University Council to incorporate into the University Council Constitution as changes in our situation occur. The one thing I did want to do is publically thank Jim Lockard and Representative Bob Pritchard for attending our forum last month about the pension reform situation, very well attended. Thanks for any of you who did have the chance to come and attend that particular forum. We plan on trying to do that again in the spring as more information becomes available.
**L. Supportive Professional Staff Council – Todd Latham, President – report – Page 15**

**T. Latham:** We had some concerns about parking garage safety, about the speed at which people travel in the parking garage, as well as going to and from their vehicles. We had a discussion about green initiatives through the campus parking office. For those of you that aren’t aware, we have a purple lot at the Convocation Center that’s a discount rate. We talked about improvements to that location, some type of shelter and rearranging some of the bus schedules to make sure that employees who want to use that certainly could. We’ve been in partnership with the Operating Staff Council about a tiered parking system that would take into consideration employee pay and how fees might be structured to complement them as well as a parking scholarship for those that couldn’t afford the parking cost. Then, the last conversation we had was regarding handicap parking on campus, the use of that as well as possible abuses that might be taking place.

We’ve looked at our SPS salary survey as everybody else has at the other councils are concerned about what other SPS or AP make across the state. We’ve asked about employer recognition system that might be implemented. We’re very concerned about the SUCSS audit, how that might change some of our SPS positions back to civil service positions and how that might impact the mission of the university and our ability to recruit and retain our employees. We have had an ongoing battle to make supervisory training mandatory at the university to assure that supervisors are given every tool that they need to be effective supervisors to oversee our employees. The last issue is we have a difference of employee benefits between our regular and temporary SPS and we’ve been working to get some benefits improved on their behalf.

The last item is we had a discussion about the purpose and use of the NIU One Card as that came up in respect to the fees and whether or not that actually is a university identification card or if it has other privileges associated with that that are independent.

**M. Elections and Legislative Oversight Committee – Abhijit Gupta, Chair – no report**

**VII. UNFINISHED BUSINESS**

**VIII. NEW BUSINESS**

**IX. COMMENTS AND QUESTIONS FROM THE FLOOR**

**X. INFORMATION ITEMS**

A. Minutes, Academic Planning Council
B. Minutes, Admissions Policies and Academic Standards Committee
C. Minutes, Athletic Board
D. Minutes, Campus Security and Environmental Quality Committee
E. Minutes, Committee on Advanced Professional Certification in Education
F. Minutes, Committee on the Improvement of Undergraduate Education
G. Minutes, Committee on Initial Teacher Certification
H. Minutes, Committee on the Undergraduate Academic Experience
I. Minutes, Committee on the Undergraduate Curriculum
J. Minutes, General Education Committee
K. Minutes, Honors Committee
L. Minutes, Operating Staff Council
M. Minutes, Supportive Professional Staff Council
N. Minutes, Undergraduate Coordinating Council
O. Minutes, University Assessment Panel
P. Minutes, University Benefits Committee

XI. ADJOURNMENT

Meeting adjourned at 4:32 p.m.