The Senate was called to order at 10:08 am.

Approval of the day’s agenda

A motion was made by Bogle and seconded by Thompson to approve the day’s agenda. The motion was approved unanimously.

Approval of the minutes from the meeting of August 28, 2009

A motion to approve the minutes was made by Salela and seconded by Thompson. With the removal of Sista from the list of those in attendance and a spelling correction in line 352 the minutes were unanimously approved.

Announcements

Weisenburn discussing Campus Culture Initiative

Goal #4 of the UIS Strategic Plan addresses enhancement of the campus culture. To address that goal a survey was sent out to supervisors to examine the effectiveness of current supervision. The results from that survey demonstrated a need to work toward team development and to improve morale on campus. He has been working with CSAC,
APAC and other members of the campus including an outside consultant to develop a plan to bridge together the four constituencies on campus: students, faculty, academic professionals and civil service. They wish to create a set of principles to enhance campus culture, including: A) culture of respect; B) a culture of personalized customer services; C) a culture of productive differences and the ability to manage those differences; and D) a culture of sustainability, specifically addressing human resources. A committee with representatives for the four constituencies is being formed. He wishes to have the committee assemble for a full day, perhaps beginning in October, to draft the campus principles. These would be presented to the campus through open forums. Wishes to have the Campus Senate send a delegation to that meeting.

**Martin**
Tonight will be the first Star Party from 8:00 pm to 10:00 pm and will continue every Friday evening through October 30th, weather permitting.

**Hall**
At 1:00 pm today there will be a training session on the personnel review process, including a panel discussing portfolio narratives.

**Kullick**
She has moved to the Dean’s office for the College of EHS as an Office Administrator.

**Thompson**
Today from 12:00 pm to 1:00 pm in PAC G there will be an Academic Integrity Committee workshop.

**Reports:**

**Chair – T. Ting**
Announced Burton is the new senate secretary. At 5:30 pm tonight there is a party for the Campus Senate senators at the Chancellor’s house.

A Furlough Advisory Committee is being formed with representation from three constituencies: 3 faculty; 2 academic professionals; 1 civil service. Currently John Martin and Tih-Fen Ting are on the committee and one more senator is needed to volunteer.

The Chancellor has formed two committees to address the concerns that came from the August 28th Senate meeting in regards to the location of the new public safety building and the day care center. The committees will examine the issue of the current proposed location for these two buildings. Dave Barrows will convene both committees. The makeups of the committees are: 1) Public Safety Building – Chief Don Mitchell, Jay Gilliam, Mike Murphy, Matt Van Vossen; 2) Day Care Center – Stacey Gilmore, Director of the day care and John Martin. One more faculty was needed for the day care center committee and Borland volunteered.
The VCSA is forming a committee to examine the possibility of building a student center and two faculty representatives are needed: Angela Winand has volunteered and they are looking for a volunteer from the faculty or from faculty senators.

Ting, Martin, Chancellor Ringeisen, Provost Berman, and Wojcicki attended the Board of Trustees meeting along with student representative/trustee, Felix, who is the student member of the BoT. Chris Kennedy was elected chair and two new executive board members were Ed McMillan and UIS alumnus Karen Hasara. As the faculty representative for BoT meeting, Martin indicated that he will write a more extensive report that will be sent to the Senators but the meeting primarily was for orientation purposes. His report will contain good data but on the budget side the state owes 20 million however that is shrinking because at the end of the summer the amount was 100 million. There was a four hour closed door executive session of which President White spent two of those hours waiting outside the session.

Felix stated it appears that the culture of the board is changing for the better but the real test will be at the November meeting which will be held in Springfield.

Ting announced that the UIUC Senate tabled their Resolution on Admission Reform that also contained language addressing both the need for reform of the BoT and a change in administrative leadership of the University. On Monday, September 14th they will vote on it. In the original resolution a specific suggestion said the change in administrative leadership should be the most senior person (President White) first and then Chancellor Herman. The revised resolution makes no suggestion of who should go first just that there should be an orderly transition. If UIUC passes the resolution it will be forwarded to the University Senates Conference who will forward it to UIS and UIC senates for our discussion or response.

Provost – H. Berman

Provost Berman reported that UIS hit a milestone this week with a record high fall semester enrollment. A chart was distributed showing enrollment from Fall 1994 to Fall 2009. Berman pointed out some significant dates: in 1995 graduate enrollment spiked somewhat due to a new policy that required only a one credit hour minimum to maintain continuous enrollment; another increase was seen in 1998 with the offering of the first two online programs - education leadership and MIS; the fall 2001 semester saw an increase due to the beginning of the Capital Scholars program; and an increase was also seen in the fall 2006 semester with the expanded Capital Scholars general education program. Prior to 1998 the university only offered upper division, masters, and on-ground courses. With the inclusion online courses, Capital Scholars, and the broader general education program there have been noticeable improvements in enrollment. An additional highlight is that UIS has more than recovered from the decline in enrollment we experienced in the fall of 2008. What the chart does not show is the enrollment of 1300 online students which is up 100 from the fall 2008.

Berman also wanted to make one comment before Vice Chancellor Barnett gave his report on Admissions Reform. The central idea of this report is that “only those people
whose jobs involve making admissions decisions will make admissions decisions”. An article in the Tribune and a report from the Mikva Commission are implying that certain decisions made by people were overruled by senior administrators due to external pressure. For graduate students and some undergraduate programs with admissions requirements, it is part of the faculty’s job to make admissions decisions. This will not change. Only those persons who are given the responsibility for making admissions decisions as part of their job will be able to carry out that responsibility. That includes faculty when there are departmental decisions to be made.

Olivier asked if UIS is accepting more students or receiving more qualified applicants. Berman stated we are receiving more applications. Frueh indicated that applications from freshmen were up this fall by 44, however transfer student applications were down 32. Berman commented that UIS is in the mix of our peer institutions with regard to selectivity.

Hall asked about each department needing to provide more detailed documentation since there are other factors to consider other than those just documented. Berman stated we do not need to deviate from our holistic evaluation that is used in many cases. We need to make it more apparent to students and everyone else what the process is. Ting commented that the Mikva Commission states that admissions information must be documented to the extent practical, and we do not need to spell out every detail.

Fisher stated that at the last Senate meeting Berman reminded us that we needed to take last year’s enrollment shortfall into account with regard to the cut that just came. Fisher asked if the current increase in enrollment affects that. Berman indicated that the increase in enrollment does give us more revenue than was projected. However, Berman stated UIS needs to hold on to the extra revenue because the state’s fiscal situation is so precarious that we may need that money. The state still owes UIS money from the last fiscal year, we’ll be facing a problem with MAP, and there remains an underlying structural deficit to the state budget that has not been addressed. Should we receive a rescission this year our enrollment will help.

Martin asked what the effect on enrollment would be if MAP zeros out for the spring? Berman stated that he’s very concerned that many of our students might choose not to return in the spring if they do not get the financial assistance they need. The institution typically budgets for a 4% decline in the spring, however that number could be higher in light of MAP cuts. Ting and Martin noted that 827 UIS students receive MAP and without that financial help some students might decide not to return.

**Student Government – C. Olivier**

Olivier introduced a new student representative to the Senate, Jamie Casinova, who is the Senator to the College of Liberal Arts and Science. He also noted that the SGA has added a couple of new positions this year. The SGA introduced a new freshman senator position this year. SGA is also looking into what can be done to address the MAP grant situation.
Casinova stated he is a member of a state wide coalition addressing leadership in colleges statewide, and UIS SGA has gotten involved in this coalition as well. Regarding the statement that the Provost made about students might choose not to come back, in actuality several students might not have any choice. The coalition is getting media spots and is planning a large rally on October 15th. Ting noted that the new BoT chair asked about MAP grants several times during the BoT meeting.

Felix stated he had a chance to talk to the Governor about this issue in which the response was the need to increase taxes.

**Committee on Committees – L. Fisher**
Hall made a motion to approve the slate of faculty to committees and Gilliam seconded. Fisher explained the “Faculty Compensation Review Committee” was not a standing campus senate committee but an ad-hoc committee that gets formed every two years according to language in the Personnel Policies and it also needs to come forward to the Senate to be voted on. The slate of candidates was as follows:

**COMMITTEE ON ASSESSMENT OF STUDENT LEARNING**
Li Xiaoqing (B&M) replacing Don Morris whose term ends 2010
Amanda Binder (LIB) remainder of 2008/2010 term

**GENERAL EDUCATION COMMITTEE**
Martin Martsch as Ex-officio representing EHS for a one year term ending 2010

**ACADEMIC TECHNOLOGY**
Natalie Tagge (LIB) two-year term 2009/2011

**CAMPUS PLANNING AND BUDGET COMMITTEE**
Christine Ross (LIB) three-year term 2009/2012

**FACULTY COMPENSATION REVIEW COMMITTEE**
Marcel Yoder (LAS)
Beverly Rivera (PAA)
Carolyn Peck (EHS)
D. Waheedah Bilal (LIB)
Mark Puclik (B&M)

The approval of the slate of candidates was unanimous.

**H1N1 Flu Update**
Ting stated Lynne Price was invited to attend the Senate meeting to give an update on the H1N1 Flu but she was unavailable. However she did write a comprehensive report. Dean Wassenberg is on the Pandemic Preparation Training Committee and questions can be directed to her.
Eisenhart inquired into the date for the immunization of the regular flu. Ting replied that the date for regular flu immunization is September 17, but the immunization for the H1N1 flu would not be available until October.

Berman stated that upon talking to colleagues at Washington State where there was a report of 2,000 cases of H1N1 flu, which is alarming. However, he noted that, while H1N1 is very contagious, those do get the flu recovered in the way Price described in her email.

**Admissions Reform Report – T. Barnett**

The admissions reform report came as a result of a problem in Champaign, and Springfield has had no problems. The Commission came up with seven recommendations then went to the President who then asked that each university respond to each of the recommendations on the checklist. The Chancellor created a Task Force that is comprised of Berman, Ting, Ermatinger, Pardie, Mims, Giordano, and Barnett.

Kline noted since the Senate does not vote on reports, he wished to know if the results of this Task Force will come forward to the Senate for a vote? Ting responded that the report to the President White from each campus is due by September 23rd. This will not be enough time for the Senate to vote; however the university administration has asked each of the senates to endorse the report. She noted that UIUC will not bring their report to the full senate for endorsement due to time constraints. Faculty are invited to give input to the task force. This is a report to the President describing admission policy for admitting students for fall 2010, but it will not be set in stone forever. At the end of the year there will be a review to see if the policy is working or if there are shortfalls.

Martin noted that university *statutes* make clear that it is the Campus Senate that makes admissions policy decisions. Ting agreed and noted that this will not be a change in policy, but rather is a summary. Any changes to admissions policy would need to come through the Campus Senate. This summary is simply to address any possible differences with the recommendations of the Mikva Commission.

Wassenberg explained that at a CARR meeting and after clarification from the registrar that the members came to a general understanding that the catalog is what appears to be creating the problem since it is set two years in advance. UIS is not being asked to make any changes in current policy, as Martin clearly pointed out that the *Statutes* are clear that each university makes their own policy, just that our response is an accurate statement of our policy right now.

Fisher asked if CARR had officially endorsed this report and Wassenberg indicated that it had. Fisher asked if these tables will be published on the web and Berman indicated that they would. Fisher asked if those tables could be sent back to departments for proofreading before they are published. Barnett indicated that that could be done, and stated that Pardie had done a lot of double-checking already.
Eisenhart reported that her department’s practice isn’t consistent with what is in the chart, and that the 2-year lag between submitting catalog changes and having those changes appear in print is a problem. Ting stated that admissions standards can always be changed, even if they are not in the catalog cycle yet.

Olivier asked about laws governing representation on the appeals committee. Barnett reported that it is currently comprised of the director of admissions, the director of the diversity center, the director of first-year students, a faculty member, the associate vice chancellor for undergraduate education, and the associate dean of students. Ting noted that they had discussed the need to formalize the process, especially regarding the selection of the faculty member.

Kline heard from several of the faculty in his college and the language for the code of conduct as written now has made some people nervous. He asked if it would be possible to modify the language to include “…as stipulated in the statutes…” as a way to clarify the language. Barnett indicated agreement regarding the need to clarify. Ting noted that she sent an email out this morning about this precise point. Vice President Rao is aware of the issue and it was not their intention to limit faculty with these changes. This is still a draft and there is still time to provide input. Berman said the committee would welcome all comments to sharpen the language so it is clear that departments/faculty set their own admissions policy.

**Old Business**

**Resolution 39-2 Resolution to Recognize Academic Honors for Graduate Students at Commencement (second reading)**

A motion to approve was made by Eisenhart and seconded by Bogle. Ting explained the modifications made for the second reading came about after the discussion from the last Senate meeting. It was not clear as to how many academic honors students could be included in the bulletin; therefore with the rearrangement of some sentences and some minor changes in wording it might help to reduce confusion. Resolution 39-2 was unanimously approved.

**Resolution 39-4 Changes to the UIS Campus Senate Bylaws Article VI. Section 2. and Section 2.C. 2) (second reading)**

Hall explained how the new Senate voted on the committee appointments at the last meeting before final exams. With the suggested changes committees would be required to meet during final exams week. Ting replied that there is no need to install committees at the last Senate meeting of the year, and that timeline could be moved up.

Hall indicated that one of the reasons for installing committees at the final Senate meeting was because many potential committee members wanted to wait to see who was elected to the Senate before committing to committees. Ting replied the bylaws state that senate elections are run no later than the 2nd Friday after spring break, and therefore we could move the senate elections up to accommodate the need for time to appoint committees and allow them to vote on chairs.
Hall stated that if that is the intent then the language regarding the timeframe for committee appointments and chair elections needs to be clarified. It is a difficult, time-intensive process to get committees staffed. Ting explained that a key motivator for this change is because there is often turnover in committees from spring to fall, and that even in those committees with stable membership they often do not elect chairs until the fall semester. Doing so is inefficient and prevents committees from being productive at the beginning of the semester.

Fisher said during discussions of committee appointments that by electing the chair in the spring would improve efficiency of senate business. It does not state that changes could not be made and a different chair elected in the fall, if needed. Requests from faculty have been to make committee appointments earlier and especially electing a chair since that would affect workload considerations. Another advantage is that there are often complaints that all the committee reports come to the senate after spring break, creating a hefty workload. Having with committees in place at the beginning of the fall semester would allow them to begin conducting business immediately, and ultimately they could get their reports to the senate earlier.

Rutherford commented about running the Grand Marshal and Senate election too close together which may be confusing. Ting raised the possibility of running the Grand Marshal election later in the spring. Rutherford suggested contacting Brian Clevenger to find out the latest date for electing the Grand Marshal since it involves more than just attending the commencements.

Hall stated the language needs to be more clear that it would be the new committee members who would elect the chair. He offered this as a friendly amendment.

The language also needs to be clear that when the new committee members come to a meeting it is clearly to elect a chair only and old committee members would continue until the end of their term. It would also be important to specify that the old committee continues to serve until the end of the term.

Several wording suggestions were offered by Hall, Eisenhart, Martin and Bogle, at which point a motion to table the resolution was made by Eisenhart and seconded by Martin. The motion was approved unanimously. New language will be drafted and it will come back to the Senate Executive Committee.

**New Business:**
 Resolution 39-5 Social Responsibility and Leadership Development Minor by EXS-L (first reading)

Eisenhart made a motion to open discussion and Martin seconded.

Moranski explained that the undergraduate council reviewed the proposal in the spring but did not have enough time to get it to the Senate. The Social Responsibility and
Leadership Development Minor is an interdisciplinary program that addresses much of the mission of UIS. The minor is grounded in engaged citizenship and the 15 to 17 hours for the minor fits in with the hours that are allowed for a minor. This minor would serve students in all colleges and one of the required courses is also an ECCE requirement.

No new resources are needed at this time to offer the minor starting fall 2010. The minor can be staffed by the current fulltime director, Jan Kirkham, full time clinical instructor Ross Garmil, and adjunct faculty Kathy Guthrie. They expect the minor to grow in the next 3 or 4 years; therefore at that time a new faculty would be needed. This full time tenure track faculty would replace Guthrie’s former position. The former CLAS dean, Margot Duley, crafted an agreement with Guthrie such that she will continue to teach in the minor for the next five years. There is an assessment plan for the minor via a portfolio assessment.

Martin asked if the new CLAS dean had any comments regarding this minor. Rundle-Schwark responded that through a conversation between Dean Ermatinger and Jan Kirkham he expressed willingness to continue with the agreement. Moranski commented they could get a letter from Dean Ermatinger.

Wassenberg has some concerns about courses from her college listed as electives for the minor. She stated that neither she, her college’s executive committee, nor department chairs were contacted regarding the use of their courses as electives. She also noted that some of the courses listed are no longer being offered. Rundle-Schwark stated that she spoke to at least one faculty member or the chair in the affected department regarding the courses, letting them know it would probably be no more than two or three students and they did not see that as a problem. Wassenberg stated there was some discrepancy in fact, as she has heard from multiple chairs stating that they had not been contacted. She asked that the process for communicating across colleges regarding these matters be formalized. Moranski commented that this can addressed through revising and updating the governance approval for curricular changes.

Hall stated his colleagues have concerns regarding their minor in management and expressed worries that this minor might impact other minors. They felt some discussions need to take place before this minor is established.

Ting stated that one of the tasks before the Senate this year will be to reform the Governance Approval process for curricular changes, which she indicated was significantly overdue. It was last updated in 2002, and there have been many changes since then that would necessitate a revision. Cross-college proposals would be addressed as well and needs to be formalized.

Berman stated that best practice when cross listing courses from other departments is to get authorization from them.

Bogle wanted to know how the minor proposal would be impacted if the funding for a new clinical instructor does not materialize within the next 3 to 5 years. Moranski said
that the adjunct, Guthrie, will deliver some courses during that time as well as Kirkham and Garmil. Rundle-Schwark indicated that Guthrie has given a verbal agreement to teach for 5 years or longer if needed. If she were unable to do so, or if the funding for a clinical instructor did not materialize, then the minor could continue with current staff if needed.

Fisher expressed her admiration for the proposal. However, she expressed the opinion that EXS-L is in a resource bind because they cannot get full time faculty members until they have a program. But to get a program they also need staffing to deliver the courses. She stated that the curriculum committee’s opinion was that the hiring of that full time person would be feasible once a minor was established. Rundle-Schwark stated that the full time person needs to be hired whether the minor is approved or not.

Moranski added that part of this discussion is tied up in university-level discussions about the coding of programs. Greater flexibility could come about with those coding changes, but that has not yet come to pass.

Resolution 39-6 Changes to the UIS Campus Senate Bylaws – Intercollegiate Athletics Committee (first reading)

Hall made a motion to open discussion and Thompson seconded.

Ryan Williams, Chair of IAC explained that at the time of UIS’ application to the NCAA one of the NCAA’s recommendations was to establish a Chancellor’s Athletic Committee. When members from the NCAA met with IAC it was stated that if more stakeholders were represented on the IAC, specifically student athletes, community members, and donors, this would satisfy their recommendation for a Chancellor’s Athletic Committee. After meeting with the Chancellor and Wojcicki it was decided there would be no need for two separate committees. The charges reflect some NCAA wording.

Ting explained that she became aware of the history behind this yearlong effort to modify the IAC in July. She engaged in discussions with the Chancellor and Wojcicki and IAC members, specifically Williams and Yoder, over the summer. Williams, as IAC chair, would take these bylaw changes back to the IAC for feedback. This came out of the NCAA site visit at UIS and their desire to see a committee appointed by the Chancellor. However, the agreement right now is that the IAC is in place and there is no need for another committee. The new arrangement of the IAC would reflect some of the NCAA’s preferences with regard to expanded membership, including a male and female student athletes.

Williams reported that the IAC had surveyed the Great Lakes Valley Conference members to examine how they constructed their athletics committees and they found no consistency in the arrangements of those institutions. What we have now addresses what
the NCAA wants to see. Ting noted that as they worked on this document over the summer they also referred to the language from the UIUC Athletic Board.

Cass noted that the bulk of the discussion has been about expanding membership and increasing transparency of this process, yet this document would remove AP and CS voting members. She asked why those representatives were removed and indicated she was strongly opposed this arrangement. Kullick indicated that she shared those concerns.

Williams said that the Chancellor can appoint members of the university community to the community member positions. Cass responded that those are non-voting members and that this isn’t consistent with Williams’ previous statement that these would be donor positions.

Martin asked if there was a time horizon or deadline for needing to get this done. Williams stated that they have been working on this for a year and the IAC has not been very productive in the meantime. Martin stated that the IAC needed this change to do their work, and Williams indicated that the IAC would benefit from having a consistent committee. Williams clarified that the IAC did not ask for this change and did not ask to remove APs. However, there is a desire to keep the committee streamlined and not so large as to be problematic. We can still talk about the necessity of an AP seat, and there is no deadline for NCAA that he’s aware of. He stated that he thought the NCAA would be happy with the new composition.

Kline agreed that an AP can bring good insight to the committee and supports the AP’s position that they want a voting representative on this committee. Williams agreed and indicated that was why he hoped that the community member slots would be filled with AP representatives.

Ting noted that AP classifications are very broad, and the last AP member to serve on the IAC was Stacey Gilmore, the director of the day care center. Cass indicated that APAC just selected a new representative to the IAC and she understood that there was a meeting called this morning and neither the past AP rep nor the new AP was notified of the meeting. Ting asked who called the meeting, and Cass said she did not know but that they just got a phone call this morning. Ting asked who made the phone call, and Cass replied that they received a phone call and that their member was not present. Kullick indicated that CSAC learned of this from Cass. Kullick further stated that, while the knowledge bases of AP and CS employees varies wildly, they do have a stake in students well-being and keeping AP and CS representatives on the IAC should not be a burden with the current expansion of the IAC.

Kline addressed Ting’s previous comments by stating that keeping AP and CS on the IAC would allow for continued communication with those groups.

Eisenhart said she used to be on the committee and she found both the AP and CSAC representatives to be extremely helpful. She stated that she would never assume
community members to be anyone except people from outside of the university. AP and CSAC representatives should not be excluded while adding additional members.

Fisher mentioned that when committee composition discussions occurred there was initially a desire to expand the committee tremendously, which resulted in a prolonged discussion that ultimately resulted in a desire to reduce the size. Throughout those discussions a key concern was to keep faculty as the voting majority.

Hall asked Williams about the composition of other institutions. Williams stated that some had APs, while the memberships of others weren’t available. To keep AP and CS representatives while expanding the membership and keep faculty majority would require a very large committee. He acknowledged that AP members have been very helpful in the past. Williams also stated that he is concerned to hear that there was a meeting this morning, as he was not asked to attend.

Siddiquee pointed out that the current composition is for 8 voting members and that really should be an odd number when it comes to a decision therefore by adding one AP, one Civil Service and one more faculty it would give that odd number while maintaining the majority of voting members would be faculty.

Wojcicki explained that many items were weighed when examining the composition of this committee, including keeping faculty as having the majority of voting members, and the size of the committee. They would be willing to go along to accommodate the various groups and increase the committee by three and the problem would be solved. Wojcicki stated he believed the Chancellor would be in favor an additional three voting positions on IAC: one academic professional, one civil service, and an additional faculty member.

Martin expressed appreciation for Williams’ work and patience on this effort. He also expressed the desire for senators to avoid bringing accusations to these discussions without some sort of concrete evidence and a willingness to reveal sources of those accusations. Cass asked Craig if she could reveal who had called this morning, and that information was not made available. Ting expressed the opinion that it was unfortunate that this could not be addressed. Cass apologized for not being able to provide that information, but indicated that the IAC meeting is a separate issue from the current discussion of IAC membership. She stated that APs have been helpful in the past.

Ting asked what the phone call was about and Cass said that it was to inform them of an IAC meeting.

Rutherford asked if someone might have confused the IAC meeting with the investigative task force headed by Hayler.

A motion was made by Eisenhart and seconded by Kullick to amend the resolution by adding 3 more voting members; one academic professional, one civil service, and one faculty appointed by the Senate. Motion to amend was unanimous.
Resolution 39-7 Change to the UIS Campus Senate Bylaws – Committee on Diversity, Equal Rights, Opportunity and Access
Eisenhart made a motion to open discussion and Gilliam seconded.

Ting explained that the process of cleaning up bylaw language is continuing. Hall asked if this change made ex-officios into voting members and Ting answered that it did not do that. Kline stated that last spring language changes were made to Senate bylaws that declared all ex-officio members to be non-voting members unless otherwise specified. The committee bylaws are thus being updated to make them consistent with this change and this resolution is simply removing the now redundant “and non-voting” language.

Eisenhart made a motion to suspend the rules and Kline seconded. The vote was 22 yeas, 1 opposed, and zero abstentions. The motion carried. The resolution was passed.

**Adjournment:**

A motion was made by Felix and seconded by Thompson to adjourn. The motion was approved unanimously and the meeting was adjourned at 12:05 pm.