

FACULTY SENATE MEETING

January 13, 2009

Room SU-216

1:40 P.M.

MINUTES

Present: Chair A. Shub, R. Higginbotham, J. Kaplan-Weinger, T. Libretti, S. Mahootian, E. Makris, M. Maksy, D. Milsky, E. Nyadroh, J. Olson, K. Over, M. Polyashuk, D. Villa, S. Xu

Absent: B. Birnbaum, Lidia Filus, A. Gil-Garcia, F. Perino, T. Puryear

Ex-Officio: President S. Hahs

1. Approval of Minutes

- October 14, 2008
M. Maksy (D. Villa) – Motion to approve as amended. Passed
- October 28, 2008
M. Maksy (M. Polyashuk) – Motion to approve as amended. Passed
- November 11, 2008
M. Maksy (E. Makris) – Motion to approve as amended. Passed
- November 25, 2008
T. Libretti (M. Maksy) – Motion to approve minutes as amended. Passed
- December 9, 2008
K. Over (M. Maksy) – Approve minutes as amended. Passed

2. Report from the Chair

- NTT and At-Large ballots sent out.
- Janet Fredericks would like to visit Senate to present an idea for an ad hoc committee with an (international basis). Discussion at the February 10th meeting.
- Terry Black, IT, would like to visit Senate to gain understanding of what is needed for technology. Discussion at the February 24th meeting.

3. Report from the President's Office

- Lesa Davis is the Presidential Intern. Identifying projects, timing. Facilities, budget, etc.
- \$340k of HIS proposals will be announced soon. 71 proposals (\$2.6mm total) – primarily academic, student affairs, and a student’s project
President Hahs will represent NEIU at the Obama Inauguration. An NEIU alumni event is scheduled in Washington D.C. Of the 400 invitations sent she anticipates that 30-40 alumni may attend.

4. The Bernard J. Brommel Distinguished Research Professor Award: Screening Committee

- Dragan Milonavic and Steven Reese will continue to serve on the Screening Committee. Jian Li and Nicole Holland (COE) are new to service on the committee.

5. Senate Position Paper on: Policy & Procedures Concerning Demonstrations on Campus, Distribution and Display of Visual Communications, and Solicitation of Signatures on Campus (DDS)

President Hahs – The proposed DDS policy document was withdrawn last week. President Hahs would like to receive Faculty Senate’s suggestions. Chair Shub presented a draft of the Senate’s response to her. Originally, she approached four groups for endorsement. Two groups endorsed the proposed policy (A& P and a student group). She withdrew the request for endorsement as conversation was not constructive. The process was temporarily paused to allow reconsideration of how to best advance. The DDS Task Force was formed prior to President Hahs’ tenure at NEIU. The administration holds no negative motives and supports freedom of speech on campus.

President Hahs believes a 3-day advance reservation response time is reasonable for demonstrations on campus, displays of visual communications, and solicitation of signatures on campus. President Hahs suggests endorsement with conditions.

The President will attend the next meeting, or meeting thereafter, to discuss the Senate’s response. Note that policy on DDS is on the record, and that NEIU must have DDS guidelines to protect freedom of speech.

Senators stated they would like to participate in the drafting of a new DDS policy document. Senators are asked to read the Senate’s response before the next meeting, at which time a vote will be taken regarding the Senate’s response (document). Additional details to consider include use of ombuds on campus to act as intermediaries to prevent acts of disruption from unreasonably escalating to arrests.

The Steering Committee will suggest to the President that FCAA participate in the policy development process from beginning.

6 Old Business

No report.

7. New Business

No report.

8. Reports from Faculty Senate Councils

Faculty Council on Academic Affairs

D. Milsky, FCAA Representative, reported that FCAA is deleting and amending 600 titles varies courses (as Banner will not recognize these courses). These courses will be removed from the curricular register if they are not amended by next year. FCAA approved new WIFAC courses. FCAA developed a memo regarding ROTC curricula, and determined that MILS 101, 102, 201 and 202 met academic standards. However, the MILS courses have been challenged. The matter is not yet resolved.

9. Communications and Faculty to be Heard

10. Adjournment

M. Maksy (E. Nyadroh) – Motion to adjourn at 2:54 p.m. Passed

Respectfully Submitted,

Shahrzad Mahootian
Secretary

FACULTY SENATE MEETING

February 24, 2009

Room SU-003

1:47 P.M.

MINUTES

Present: Allen Shub (Chair), Sandra Beyda-Lorie, Rodney Higginbotham, Judith Kaplan-Weinger, Shahrzad Mahootian, Eleni Makris, Mostafa Maksy, Dan Milsky, Emmanuel Nyadroh, James Olson, Kristen Over, Frank Perino, Dario Villa,

Absent: Timothy Libretti, Barry Birnbaum, Denise Cloonan-Cortez, Lidia Filus (on sabbatical), Ana Gil-Garcia (on sabbatical), Marina Polyashuk, Terrence Puryear (on leave), Selina Mushi, Shencheng Xu

Ex-Officio: President Sharon Hahs, Provost Larry Frank, Dean Janet Fredericks, director of the International Program

The meeting was called to order by Chair Shub at 1:47.

1. Approval of Minutes

Motion (F. Perino, D. Villa) to approve January 13, 2009 meeting minutes.

Motion passed.

2. Report from the Chair

NEIU's professional development conference for university employees "Great Service Matters" will be held on March 18 and 19. Faculty members are encouraged to attend one of the dates; the schedule is on the website

Elections will start up again in March for terms expiring on 08-31-09 on the councils and committees. The new terms will end in August 31, 2011. Please encourage interested faculty members to apply.

The response document to the DDS policy was sent to the Provost and to the President. The president noted that the response was helpful and that clarifications need to be made in the DDS document, especially regarding academic freedom vs freedom of speech and times and places for demonstrations. She will give the response full consideration and determine what the next step should be.

3. Report from the President

The President attended the “Legislative Breakfast” yesterday and gave a presentation of the University using the new image and tag-line “Learn in the City... Lead in the World”

The president has read over the response to the DDS policy and is not yet ready to give a formal response.

4. Request for formal faculty participation in International Programs, Dean Fredericks

An advisory committee is recommended to provide faculty input to manage the increased complexity of the international programs that has developed over that past few years. A hand-out of the newsletter “Global Focus” was distributed and examples of present and prospective programs reviewed that involved student exchange on both undergraduate and graduate level.

Discussion: The administratively focused International Program and the academic program Global Studies Program should compliment and support one another.

Motion (M. Maksy, F. Perino): Proposal to create a faculty advisory committee to the office of International Programs in the next election process, consisting of nine two year members with two representatives from Arts and Sciences, two from College of Business, two from College of Education, one Resource Professional and two at-large members, that would be included, as well as announced and promoted in a memo attached, in the self-nomination forms to go out in March. *Motion passed.*

5. Discussion of Logistics of Faculty Senate’s Participation in Evaluation of VPs

The number of council members and who these should be needs to be determined for the evaluation of the Provost and the Vice Presidents. The evaluation of the President is available in the Library as an example of the kind of work required. The evaluating committee comprised of three faculty members.

Discussion: Various members questioned the lack of published description of the job of vice president. E. Makris suggested that three faculty members would provide a greater inter-rater reliability. K. Over suggested that nine faculty members would ease the load on each member. M. Maksy expressed concern over the difficulty evaluating vice presidents with whom faculty may not have direct contact. President Hahs pointed out that even “I don’t know” can provide useful information. Chair A. Shub suggested that, as one option, Chairs of the three major councils be approached regarding volunteering as evaluation committee members.

Conclusion: President Hahs was asked to attempt to provide job descriptions for the Vice Presidents to be evaluated, and it was agreed by consensus that the determination of the evaluation committee would be placed on the next meeting’s agenda.

6. Steering Committee Report

The members of the Steering Committee who were present had to leave for class and therefore the report is to be placed on the next meeting's agenda.

7. Adjournment

F. Perino (D. Villa) – Motion to adjourn at 2:49 p.m. Passed

Respectfully Submitted,

Shahrzad Mahootian, secretary

**FACULTY SENATE
Minutes**

March 10, 2009

Room SU 216

Present: Allen Shub (Chair), Sandra Beyda-Lorie, Denise Cloonan-Cortez, Rodney Higginbotham, Reymiel Kandelman, Judith Kaplan-Weinger, Tim Libretti, Shahrzad Mahootian, Eleni Makris, Mostafa Maksy, Selina Mushi, Emmanuel Nyadroh, James Olson, Kristen Over, Frank Perino, Dario Villa

Absent: Barry Birnbaum, Lidia Filus (on Sabbatical), Ana Gil-Garcia (on sabbatical), David Jordan, Dan Milsky, Marina Polyashuk, Terrence Puryear (on leave), Dario Villa, Shencheng Xu

Ex-Officio: None

Guest: Professor Tim Scherman

Chair A. Shub called the meeting to order at 1:43 p.m.

1. Motion to approve Minutes of February 10th (E. Makris, D. Cloonan-Cortez) and 24th meetings (Maksy, Beyda-Lorie):
Passed, pending corrections.

2. Report from IBHE-Faculty Advisory Council (Prof. T. Scherman):

IBHE has gone in a new direction.

Handout of IBHE website page.

Faculty Advisory Council (FAC) has developed its own website linked to the main site.

Position papers are archived on this site. Position papers have historically been important documents of faculty consensus regarding IBHE issues. Today we have more opportunities to voice our position. The master planning process for IBHE over the next five to ten years has been completed and the agenda for college and career success has been published (see *Public Agenda for Illinois Higher Education* on website). As faculty we may not have taken advantage as much as we should have to speak up during the planning process for liberal arts and a non-economic emphasis in post secondary education credentials and research.

Another concern, on which a position paper has been published, is dual credit for certain high school courses, which means that college credit courses could be taught with no higher education supervision and that qualifies for the use of MAP funding.

Since the FAC will also be part of the dialogue in the task force meetings, a new opportunity to voice faculty concerns has just been created.

IBHE has signed on to the American Diploma Project, an attempt to align high school credentials with readiness for college. The K-12 benchmarks are impressive. The University might want to consider relationships with various high schools to help implement the new standards.

[Questions were asked as to the origin of the FAC and how the faculty and the University could contribute to the agenda.]

The FAC has not been established by IBHE statute and does not have any direct authority. However, we can urge faculty and the University to contribute with our expertise in our various teaching and research fields and working to unify our standards between the colleges. The next step might be starting relationships with area high schools. There is the Teacher Quality Enhancement (TQE) grant that would align with the IBHE agenda goals. Faculty members from different colleges work together a team in a particular high school.

Report finish at 2:15.

3. Report from the Chair

Bylaws:

The President has opened the door for the departmental bylaws to have some teeth. We are trying to collect them and come up with a template for their construction. D. Villa has taken the lead in this effort but has received very few departmental bylaws.

Academic Freedom:

An Academic Freedom clause is to go into the contract rather than the preamble of the contract being bargained; this means that the issue can be grieved. The question remains whether the UPI has taken input from the Academic Freedom Committee to the bargaining table.

Elections:

Self nominations are due March 13th. We have not received any from NTT faculty and are concerned that we have an out-of-date email list. The departmental support staff persons been asked to disperse the nomination forms to NTT faculty.

Lobby Day, April 22

I encourage five to six individuals from the Faculty Senate to go to Springfield.

4. Vice President evaluations (A. Shub)

Chair Shub is working on finding at least three faculty members from each of the colleges to summarize the data of the evaluations. It is still unclear whether the volunteers should work together on the data of all three VP's, or whether each

should collect and interpret the data for one, dividing into three teams if we get more than three volunteers. The number of volunteers could be as many as nine. So far we have not received job descriptions of the VPs from the President to provide criteria for the interpretations.

5. Old Business

Eduardo Arabu Jr., Student Trustee of the Student Government, would like to have a student representative on the Faculty Senate to expand communication and to identify ways that the two representative bodies can work together.

Discussion:

T. Libretti and K. Over stated that the Faculty Senate serves to represent the faculty not students. Students may request to attend for specific reasons. Chair Shub pointed out that Faculty Senate does not fall under the Illinois Open Meeting Act and can ban visitors.

Consensus:

Students will not have a representative as part of the Faculty Senate.

6. Steering Committee (T. Libretti, F. Perino, S. Mahootian)

Steering committee members reported on the December 2nd Steering Committee meeting with President Hahs. A conversation on shared governance, developing a culture of cooperation with the goal of making sound academic judgments, and the importance of fiscal, operational transparency of both union and administrative processes, and greater inclusion of the Trustees in processes. The issues at hand are the collective bargaining process, the HSI initiative and the evaluation of the vice presidents. Also discussed were emergency notification that includes a cell phone system for text messaging and power back-up in the case of a Com Ed outage.

7. Motion to Adjourn 2:58 (Over, Mahootian). Passed.

Respectfully Submitted,
Shahrzad Mahootian, Secretary

**FACULTY SENATE
Minutes**

April 14, 2009

Room SU 216

Present: Allen Shub (Chair) Denise Cloonan-Cortez, Rodney Higginbotham, Judith Kaplan-Weinger, Tim Libretti, Shahrzad Mahootian, Eleni Makris, Mostafa Maksy, Dan Milsky, Selina Mushi, Emmanuel Nyadroh, Marina Polyashuk, Kristen Over, Frank Perino, Dario Villa

Absent: Sandra Beyda-Lorie, Barry Birnbaum, Lidia Filus, Ana Gil-Garcia (on sabbatical), David Jordan, Rey Kandelman, James Olson, Terrence Puryear (on leave), Shencheng Xu

Ex-Officio: Provost Larry Frank

Guest: Professor Rachel Adeodu

Chair A. Shub called the meeting to order at 1:47 p.m.

1. Presentation of grade appeal process case (Prof. R. Adeodu):
Last semester, I was contacted around Christmas by a student who received a grade of a D in one of my courses. I emailed her and wrote that her points as described in the course syllabus totaled to produce the grade. The student then contacted the Chair of the department who emailed me for an explanation of the grade. I explained the grade to her and noted that the fact that she was not prepared for a presentation brought her grade down. The student contacted the chair again and her complaint was sent to the Appeals Committee of the College, which was composed of two students and two faculty members. This committee makes a recommendation to the Dean. The Dean wanted more information from me which I gave. In calculating her grade in advance of receiving it, the student had not received the grade for her units, which has a higher weight, and contributes greatly towards the final grade. The Appeals Committee met on February 5. I emailed the dean inquiring about her decision regarding the appeal on February 27. The Dean replied that she had notified the student that her grade had been changed to a pass and that she would explain the reasons for her decision to me in person. She refused my request that she explain her reasons to me in writing, since I had submitted in writing her request for more information about the issue. In order to follow up the request, I sent an email both to the dean and the chair of the appeals committee, but the dean responded for both of them, stating that grade appeal proceedings are confidential in nature, since it affects personnel matters, and would rather discuss it in person. Up till now, I do not know what the appeals committee recommended to the dean, nor the dean's rationale for changing the student's grade. At a minimum, I would like to have the

rationale for the grade change in writing. It has been a difficult semester for me. What has been most painful is that I had tried to be of assistance to this student by separating the grade for a lesson plan and the lesson plan implementation, so that she will not fail the course. I allowed her to re-submit her revised lesson plan for grading, but allowed her to bear responsibility for not coming prepared to implement the lesson by giving her a zero. In the class of 26 students, she was the only one who did not come prepared to implement her lesson plan. I wonder now if I should have left the grade in one piece as it was in the syllabus, so that she can bear the full consequence for the whole assignment and get an F. She is presently enrolled in one of my classes, and it has been difficult to deal with unprofessional behavior such as passing notes to classmates during class.

Discussion:

Chair Shub stated that the grade appeal policy requires that the student inquire first from the professor, and if not satisfied with the professor's explanation, go to the chair, and the chair is supposed to investigate and respond to the professor and the student in writing. If s/he is not satisfied, the student is then to request in writing that s/he wishes to refer the matter to the appeals committee at the college level.

M. Polyashuk asked if the committee also has to communicate their recommendation in writing.

Chair Shub reported that in this case, the chair, by her own admission, when he spoke to her, sent the complaint to the appeals committee. The student is supposed to request this in writing.

K. Over wondered why both the student and the faculty were not informed of the committee's recommendation.

M. Polyashuk stated that a faculty member needs to get the feedback if a grade gets changed.

Prof. Adeodu admitted that she refused to meet with the dean, and Provost Frank wondered why she had not met with the dean. Prof. Adeodu indicated that she felt that if the dean wanted to talk with her, she should have done so before writing to the student to inform her about the change of grade. Prof. Adeodu also wondered why the dean cannot write her reasons for the change of grade, and why a meeting was required after the fact.

K. Over stated that the greater issue is one of procedure and consistency across colleges. Faculty should be advised of the recommendation of a committee made up of other faculty and students, so that faculty may know whether or not the dean overrode the recommendation of the committee.

Provost Frank indicated that it sounds as if each college implements the policy in its own way.

E. Makris wondered whether the policy could be reviewed and amended and noted that it was irregular that the chair went directly to the dean's appeals committee.

R. Higginbotham and S. Mahootian agreed that the student rather than the chair was to initiate the appeal process.

Prof. Adeodu stated that the chair did not properly investigate the matter and notify the parties involved of her opinion.

S. Mushi added that the issue is one of academic integrity because the process was not followed.

E. Makris stated that two issues seem to be involved in this matter 1) the lack of written explanation to Prof. Adeodu and 2) the implementation of the policy. Provost Frank disagreed about the issue being one of academic integrity but agreed that the chair should have communicated in writing to Prof. Adeodu. He also reminded the committee that a D is a pass.

K. Over disagreed: for courses that are prerequisite courses, a D is not effectively a pass. She recommended that Faculty Senate ask the college committee for their understanding of procedure and ask the committee why Prof. Adeodu was only informed of the dean's decision. She identified the problem as one of a lack of transparency.

F. Perino agreed that the issue was one of academic integrity.

Prof. Adeodu stated that this semester has been particularly difficult for her because she feels that her academic integrity was attacked by the dean's change of the student's grade, and she had no person or place to which she felt she could appeal.

Chair Shub suggested that the Senate take the assumption that process was violated when the chair went directly to the dean's committee.

E. Makris noted that the appeal decision is irreversible but wondered whether the Senate should make a statement of dissent identifying where, in this case, the process broke down and of intention to revisit the grade appeal policy. In addition the Senate should ask that the dean give a written explanation of the decision to Prof. Adeodu.

S. Mahootian agreed.

M. Polyashuk agreed that the policy should be amended and clarified so that the dean is to provide a written explanation and statement of the decision to the faculty member and student involved as well as to the FCAA.

R. Higginbotham said he did not believe that the policy was at fault; rather administration and faculty need to be reminded of the importance of its proper and consistent implementation.

T. Libretti agreed that it may not be a problem of the policy.

D. Milsky disagreed: the policy is at fault. The policy should also have its own enforcement written in: perhaps the faculty member's right to appeal prior to the final decision. Also, the policy should include consequences for not following it, written in.

Prof. Adeodu reminded the Senate that the policy, as written currently, does not explicitly require that the appeals committee communicate its recommendation to the faculty member or that the dean give a rationale for her decision in writing; these are loopholes that can be abused. Thus, to prevent such an abuse, the policy needs to be explicit in its requirements and enforcement.

K. Over pointed out that the difference in a policy's implementation between colleges may not be a problem if the difference is appropriate.

T. Libretti stated that it may be time to ask for an ombudsman who would deal with faculty rights among other things.

Chair Shub suggested amending the policy to require that the dean talk to the faculty member before the letter goes out to the student.

Motion:

K. Over (S. Mahootian) proposed the following **motion**- *The Faculty Senate 1) write a letter from the Faculty Senate to the dean of the College of Education and the chair requesting that a written rationale be communicated to Prof. Adeodu, 2) revisit the existing policy to close all loopholes, and 3) consider the long term goal of hiring an ombudsman that was passed unanimously.*

2. Motion to Adjourn 2:53 (Mahootian, Perino). Passed.

Respectfully Submitted,
Shahrazad Mahootian, Secretary

**FACULTY SENATE
Minutes**

April 28, 2009

Room B 152

Present: Allen Shub (Chair) Denise Cloonan-Cortez, Judith Kaplan-Weinger, Tim Libretti, Shahrzad Mahootian, Eleni Makris, Mostafa Maksy, Selina Mushi, Emmanuel Nyadroh, Marina Polyashuk, James Olson, Kristen Over, Frank Perino, Dario Villa, Shencheng Xu

Absent: Rodney Higginbotham, Dan Milsky, Sandra Beyda-Lorie, Barry Birnbaum, Lidia Filus (on Sabbatical), Ana Gil-Garcia (on sabbatical), David Jordan, Rey Kandelman, , Terrence Puryear (on leave),

Ex-Officio: Provost Larry Frank

Guest: Professor Henry Owen III, Library

Chair A. Shub called the meeting to order at 1:46 p.m.

1. Report from SURS Member Advisory Committee (Henry Owen III)

“SURSMAC Report to NEIU Faculty Senate” and the State Universities Annuitants Association’s “Response to the Governor’s FY 2010 Budget” were circulated.

Prof. Owen III reported that

- SURS is experiencing a lot of administrative uncertainty. First, the executive director of SURS left in December. Second, in accordance with Public Act 96-6, which is part of the ethics reform, there will be a new SURS board of Directors on the 1st of July. Six members will be elected by SURS participants. Not much is going to be resolved therefore until at least July.
- There is also legislative uncertainty relating to the Governor’s proposed budget. The legislature has just reconvened this week. Changes in benefits will affect new employees, and as a result the proposed changes create a two-tiered system. Current employees may expect an increase in contributions from 8% to10% and that SURS participation plan will become irrevocable. SUAA and AFSME are opposing these changes. The reason for the changes is that SURS is experiencing a rising deficit due to the facts that:
 - The State has taken a “pension holiday.” Since March 31st, 2009, the State—one of the three sources of SURS revenue-- has not been contributing funds and, according to Governor Quinn, will carry on the holiday until the end of FY 2010.

-Since last year the financial market have plummeted, and SURS has had its worst month ever in October 2008 when its investment values decreased by 28% for the fiscal year. SURS investment shortfall is 75 million dollars with the result that the base portfolio is shrinking.

In conclusion, Prof. Owens recommended that individual faculty members get a hold of their legislature to protest the proposed changes and request that the State resume its contributions to SURS.

2. Honorary Degree Policy and Procedure

“Final Draft: NEIU Honorary Degree Policy and Procedure” circulated.

Chair Shub reported that the proposed policy was initially presented to the Steering Committee, which does not have any objections to it. The President would like to have the Faculty Senate endorse the policy.

Discussion:

E. Makris asked for clarification regarding whether

- the Honorary Degree Committee Chair is one of the HDC members (section B, part 4),
- one degree is award each commencement date rather than each commencement event since there are two commencement events on a particular commencement date (section D, part 1),
- artistic achievement is a criterion for an honorary degree (section 1), and
- the ethical issue of the exclusion of benefactors and vendors from consideration is a restriction (section D).

E. Nyadroh asked for clarification regarding whether

- “State governmental agencies” (section D, part 2) applies only to Illinois state or the US agencies and not foreign agencies,
- the two categories of honorary degree—Doctor of Humane Letters or Doctor of Laws—includes persons of scientific achievement, and
- The candidate knows of her or his being vetted for an honorary degree so that the committee may be assured of her or his participation.

MOTION (Maksy, Olson) that

THE FACULTY SENATE ENDORSES THE HONORARY DEGREE POLICY WITH THE SUGGESTED CLARIFICATIONS PASSED.

3. Report from the Chair

Chair Shub reports that he and James Olson were part of the group that went to Springfield on April 22 to the state legislature for Lobby Day and met informally with Representative Cynthia Soto, Governor Quinn and Sara Feigenholtz. They went to

support the approval of the budget that includes increased funding for both higher education and this university in particular.

4. Report from the President's Office

Dr. Frank reports that the President intends to make a proactive effort towards an increased public presence of the University that includes lobbying. The NEIU budget proposal has the highest level of support insofar as the Governor is sympathetic towards it. Therefore we support the Governor's budget.

5. Academic Freedom

Discussion:

S. Mahootian complained that shared governance has not been practiced in the case of course revision, referring to undergraduate linguistics courses: the switch of LING prefixes to TESL prefix of certain courses, the removal of courses from the minor requirement and the elimination of others.

KS. Over complained of the lack of transparency in certain decision making processes, referring to being named advisor of a program she knew nothing about and being unable to get information about this program.

Dr. Frank discussed the FCAA's efforts to streamline approval of hundreds of temporary courses which have only gone through administration processes and are due for faculty approval. He noted that an accreditation issue will sometimes result in changes in courses that have not taken the usual consultation and communication pathways.

T. Libretti complained of programs being developed without proper consultation. Chair Shub suggested that the Senate pick up on this topic next year.

6. Chicago State University Presidential Search

Chair Shub suggested that the presentation and discussion of this topic be tabled for the reason that we need to learn more.

7. Motion to Adjourn (Maksy/Nyadroh) 3:00 PM. Next meeting in on September 8.

Respectfully Submitted,
Shahrzad Mahootian, Secretary