

Minutes

of the Academic Senate Meeting November 4, 2020

- PRESENT: Anderson, Aragon, Barding, Chase, Chaturvedi, Chen, Coburn, Davidov-Pardo, Fallah Fini, Gonzalez, Hargis, Huerta, Huh, Kumar, Kwok, Lee, Lloyd, Milburn, Myers, Nelson, Osborn, Pacleb, Puthoff, Quinn, Shen, Singh, Small, Snyder, Soper, Van, Van Buer, Von Glahn, Wachs, Welke
- PROXIES: Senator Chaturvedi for Senator Speak, Senator Huerta for Senator Urey
- ABSENT: Flores, Musgrave, Ortenberg
- GUESTS: K. Allain, S. Alva, A. Baski, B. Brown, J. Chong, S. Eskandari, K. Forward, S. Garver, E. Gibson, B. Givens, T. Gomez, I. Levine, L. Kessler, L. Massa, J. McGuthry, A. Neckel, J. Passe, B. Quillian, M. Sancho-Madriz, G. Tejadilla, R. Yeung

1. [Academic Senate Minutes – October 14, 2020](#)

The October 14, 2020 Academic Senate Meeting minutes are located on the Academic Senate website at https://www.cpp.edu/~senate/documents/packets/2020-21/11.04.20/academic_senate_minutes_10.14.20_posted.pdf.

M/s/p to approve the minutes from the October 14, 2020 Academic Senate Meeting.

2. [Information Items](#)

a. [Chair's Report](#)

Chair Nelson reported that there have been on-going conversations with all Academic Senate Chairs regarding the ethnic studies requirement implementation. She stated that there is currently a Chancellor's Office memo that discusses the possibility of extending credit/no credit grades for fall 2020. Chair Nelson added that there is a referral requesting the extension of credit/no credit grading and she will be working on that with the administration.

b. [President's Report](#)

No President's Report was given.

c. [Provost's Report](#)

The Provost's Report is located on the Academic Senate website at https://www.cpp.edu/~senate/documents/packets/2020-21/11.04.20/provosts_report_to_academic_senate_2020-11-04.pdf.

Provost Alva reflected that we are all awaiting the results of the election and that she appreciated the [message from President Coley](#) about staying true to Cal Poly Pomona's core values and being true to the ideals of democracy as well as an inclusive, respectful campus.

The Provost thanked Vice President Christina Gonzales, the team in Governmental and Community Relations, and ASI for the extensive array of resources and the variety of safe places for students to come together and have important and timely conversations.

The annual meeting on the state budget with a focus on Cal Poly Pomona was held on October 29, 2020. The Provost was pleased that so many people attended the conversation. Provost Alva, along with Vice President Gonzales and ASI, is planning a similar event for students so that they can understand the current budget situation and assure students that there is a campus plan

for the budget shortfall.

Provost Alva took the opportunity to dispel a rumor that is circulating that there has been a decision to move away from Blackboard. She stated that the administration is looking at different Learning Management Tools, but no decision has been made. There have been conversations about possible alternatives and suggestions that the campus move to Canvas, which is the Learning Management Tool used by the community colleges.

The Provost shared that the campus has heard back from the regional accreditor, WSCUC, that they have approved the continued use of on-line instruction under an exemption for winter intersession, spring, and summer terms. Provost Alva added that going to on-line instruction usually requires substantive review but, because of the pandemic, the campus has been allowed to move very quickly towards on-line education through the exemption process. She asked faculty who are considering having on-line, or partially on-line, instruction in the future to work with Dr. Laura Massa, Associate Vice President of Academic Programs, to make sure you have approvals in place to continue with on-line instruction post-pandemic.

Provost Alva announced that CPP Connect will now include the new Academic Planning Tool, which is the suite of options under the commercially available EAB Navigate platform. According to the Provost, the Academic Planner will be a game-changer for Cal Poly Pomona. The tool will allow students to input their four-year plan. If a student attempts to take a course out of sequence, the tool will inform them of the error. The tool will also calculate any delays and costs if a student takes a class that is not in their four-year plan. Currently it is expected to have all undergraduate students using the Academic Planner in 2021. This will help colleges and departments have sufficient course sections during the academic year.

The Provost commented that there are several on-going conversations with faculty leadership around the ethnic studies requirement. The ethnic studies requirement is slated to be on the November 18, 2020, Board of Trustees Meeting agenda. That meeting should give the campus a much better indication of what the requirement will look like and how it is being structured. The Provost added that in March 2020, the campus received a memo from Executive Vice Chancellor Blanchard temporarily suspending the California University Graduate Writing Assessment Requirement (GWAR). That memo also directs campuses to work, through the shared governance process, to determine an alternative metric to satisfy the in-person testing requirement via a course or series of courses, beginning with the 2021-2022 academic year. There is a committee with membership appointed by both the Academic Senate and the administration working on recommendations for replacing the Graduation Writing Test (GWT).

Student evaluations of teaching effectiveness for the 2020-21 academic year will be administered online as they were in spring 2020. The unit 3 faculty contract requires that there be student evaluations of teaching. Evaluations will be used in the 2021-22 review cycle per the Collective Bargaining Agreement (CBA) and campus policies [1328](#) and [1329](#). There will be a letter placed in the personnel action file of all faculty (permanent and temporary) to provide appropriate pandemic context for faculty performance and productivity in all areas of teaching, research/scholarly/creative activities, and service.

The Provost went over the following faculty funding opportunities:

- Special Projects for Improving the Classroom Experience (SPICE)
 - This year the focus will be to fund innovative approaches that improve teaching and learning in remote/virtual environments
- Research, Scholarly, and Creative Activities (RSCA)
 - Reporting for 2019-2020 awards has been extending to May 10, 2021
 - 2020-2021 RSCA competition announcement will go out to faculty soon
- Teacher-Scholar Awards
 - Not as many resources will be devoted to Teacher-Scholar Awards but there will still be a significant investment of approximately \$250,000

- Call for 2020-2022 awards will go out in spring 2021

Provost Alva announced the following upcoming events:

- Day of the Advisor Conference
 - Friday, November 6, 2020
 - 12:00 – 3:30 p.m.
- CSU System-wide Student Research Competition
 - Hosted at Cal Poly Pomona in Spring 2021
 - The virtual conference will be held April 30 – May 1, 2021

Question: Will the letter for the personnel action file letter detailing the pandemic context for student evaluations have been reviewed by the California Faculty Association (CFA)?

Provost Alva responded that the pandemic has changed things. Students, faculty, and administrators are quickly learning new technologies and new approaches, and so when faculty members are evaluated for teaching effectiveness it is important to recognize these things that are outside of the control of the faculty. The letter that is currently being worked on will add the larger context of the pandemic, but the faculty contract very specifically states that teaching effectiveness is not determined solely by student evaluations. Associate Provost Eskandari added that the administration has consulted with many other CSU campuses and including a letter in the PAF is an approach that many campuses are choosing. Currently, the administration is considering the exact language that will be included in the letter and when that is determined there will be consultation with the CFA.

Question: How much advance notice will faculty receive regarding the new or redesigned courses that will replace the Graduation Writing Test, and could this approach mean additional unit reductions in programs?

The Provost responded that there is a committee working on this issue and the hope is to get their recommendations soon. The approaches being considered do not envision adding unit requirements. The challenge is how to change existing courses to include appropriate writing requirements. The Provost did not have an exact timeline for implementation.

Question: Will all the SPICE grants be awarded for improving on-line teaching or is there an opportunity for grants to be awarded for improving classrooms and/or labs?

Provost Alva responded that all proposals will be reviewed, but there will be special considerations for proposals related to improving on-line teaching. She added that there is no restriction to the type of proposals submitted or awarded.

Senator Von Glahn stated that if the campus switches Learning Management Tools, he urges the administration to give faculty plenty of time to switch platforms. In his role as CFA Chapter President, he added that the official position of CFA is they are hoping to negotiate with the administration and the Academic Senate the ability of faculty to opt into using student evaluations in a review process given unusual circumstances of teaching during the pandemic. At a minimum, there needs to be something in the PAF that the evaluations were done during the pandemic and done on-line out of necessity without a formal policy having been approved by the Academic Senate.

Question: Is there any chance that the November 23, 2020 deadline for the Ethnic Studies Requirement might be revised since there is still on-going consultation?

Provost Alva responded that the Board of Trustees is meeting on November 18, 2020, to continue the conversation on the Ethnic Studies requirement. The campus should receive information regarding the requirement after the meeting. Currently, there is a lot of engagement in preparation for the November 18th meeting.

d. Vice Chair's Report

Vice Chair Pacleb commented that she appreciated the [letter to the campus from President Coley](#) regarding the election and added that it is a reminder of the values of the university. She stated that she is grateful for the fact that, although everyone comes from different approaches and understanding of issues, the university comes together as a body to find solutions to those issues.

NEW REFERRALS: (3)

AP-002-201	New Self-Support Master of Science in Digital Supply Change Management
GE-002-201	Wait Until Final Version of EO1100R Before Implementing
GE-003-201	Alternative to Elimination of D3

SENATE REPORTS FORWARDED TO PRESIDENT: (1)

AS-2901-201-AA Modification of Semester Final Exam Calendar for Fall and Spring

PRESIDENT RESPONSES TO SENATE REPORTS: (1)

AS-2804-189-AA Request to Modify the Grade Appeals Policy (1605) – **MODIFICATION REQUESTED***

*Executive Committee approved modification

e. CSU Academic Senate Report

No report was given.

f. Budget Report

Senator Lloyd did not have a report but stated that he hoped everyone had a chance to attend the President's budget conversation because it was very informative. He stated that the Budget Committee has scheduled a meeting with Information Technology and will provide a report at the next Academic Senate Meeting on December 2, 2020.

g. CFA Report

Senator Von Glahn reported that the union is currently having discussions on how to respond to efforts, if they become realized, to not count the vote in the Presidential election, regardless of the outcome.

h. ASI Report

The ASI Report is located on the Academic Senate website at https://www.cpp.edu/~senate/documents/packets/2020-21/11.04.20/senator-singh-report_11_4.pdf.

Senator Singh reported that the Cal State Student Association (CSSA) Plenary was on October 17, 2020. The CSSA Executive Committee voted to table a resolution on the Philippine regime to the next meeting. This resolution was eventually voted down in a special session and the CSSA released a letter instead. ASI President Lucy Yu discussed Cal Poly Pomona's Fee Relief Options during the Systemwide Affairs Committee meeting. CSSA also discussed the ASCSU resolution opposing student and peer teaching evaluations for the 2020-21 academic year. CSSA recognizes the concerns of the faculty during these difficult times but was not in support of the resolution.

Senator Singh commented that the Instructionally Related Activities (IRA) Committee has begun to meet. Senator Singh stated that he and Lisa Rotunni, Executive Director, Academic Research and Resources, co-chair the IRA Committee.

For the November CSSA Plenary, Senator Singh has submitted a resolution in favor of flexible grading options to the CSSA Board of Directors and ASI President Yu has submitted a resolution on behalf of the Armenian Student Association regarding the current crisis in Armenia to the Systemwide Academic Affairs Committee. Senator Singh also submitted a referral on grading options to the Academic Senate and there is a petition with over 2800 student signatures in favor of changing the grading options.

Senator Singh stated that the Poly Pantry has reopened. The link for registration is <https://recportal.cpp.edu/Program/GetProgramDetails?courseId=9e907ead-82f5-4b38-8da6-aa88a1233363&semesterId=91921d46-3349-4caf-8bc2-23c5a5e9aadd>.

The ASI Board of Directors developed a proposal to allocate excess funding from the budget to basic needs programs. This proposal will come up for a vote at the November 5, 2020, ASI Board of Directors meeting.

i. Staff Report

Senator Gonzalez reported, on behalf of the Farm Store, that the College of Agriculture recently received 702 cases of their 2017 Zinfandel, 8448 bottles, and therefore the Farm Store is having a holiday flash sale. The 2017 Horsehill Vineyards Zinfandel Red is 40% off through December 23, 2020. The Farm Store is open daily from 10:00 a.m. to 6:00 p.m.

3. Academic Senate Committee Reports – Time Certain 3:45 p.m.

a. AA-001-201, Modifications to the Laboratory Time Modules – SECOND READING

The second reading report for AA-001-201, Modifications to the Laboratory Time Modules, is located on the Academic Senate website at <http://academic.cpp.edu/senate/docs/aa001201sr.pdf>.

Senator Wachs presented the report.

M/s to adopt AA-001-201, Modifications to the Laboratory Time Modules.

RECOMMENDATION:

We propose the inclusion of two modules in the afternoon to maximize the use of the space and increase the flexibility in scheduling courses that include laboratories and a lecture component. We recommend the following modification to the laboratory modules:

8:00 - 10:50 AM
 12:00 - 2:50 PM
 1:00 - 3:50 PM Proposed new module
 2:00 – 4:50 PM Proposed new module
 3:00 - 5:50 PM
 5:00 - 7:50 PM
 6:00 - 8:50 PM
 7:00 - 9:50 PM

DISCUSSION:

Senator Wachs mentioned that the committee has received no comments to the report since the first reading on October 14, 2020.

The motion to adopt AA-001-201, Modifications to the Laboratory Time Modules, passed unanimously.

b. [AP-001-201, Program Review – MA, History – SECOND READING](#)

The second reading for AP-001-201 – MA, History, is located on the Academic Senate website at <http://academic.cpp.edu/senate/docs/ap001201sr.pdf>.

Senator Small presented the report.

M/s to adopt AP-001-201, Program Review – MA, History.

RECOMMENDATION:

The Academic Programs Committee commends the History MA Program on their work, both in the operation of their program and in the preparation of a thorough and thoughtful review that highlights important issues.

DISCUSSION:

Senator Small commented that this was a very non-controversial program review on the MA in History. The review was very positive, and the reviewers were impressed with the new emphasis in digital humanities and how this emphasis was beneficial to students' careers. There was general convergence between the reviewers, the students, and the Dean's Office. The resource recommendations provided by the external reviewers were reasonable. There has been no feedback since the first reading.

The motion to AP-001-201, Program Review – MA, History, passed unanimously.

c. [AP-024-190, Program Review Policy – SECOND READING](#)

The second reading report for AP-024-190, Program Review Policy, is located on the Academic Senate website at <http://academic.cpp.edu/senate/docs/ap024190sr.pdf>.

RECOMMENDATION:

The Academic Programs Committee recommends the adoption of the proposed program review policy, the text of which is placed below. The Academic Programs Committee also recommends the creation of a Program Review Committee, the bylaws of which are placed below.

Cal Poly Pomona Policy on Program Review

1. Introduction and Purpose

- A. An integral component of higher education is inquiry, encompassing reflection, research, and analysis. Using inquiry to drive academic program improvement is essential to advancing the mission of Cal Poly Pomona (CPP.) Through ongoing assessment and systematic program review, academic programs engage in a collaborative process to identify elements that merit continuation as well as needs, priorities, and resources to guide the future direction of programs. With an outcomes-based approach, program review uses data and evidence, and internal and external expertise and perspective to advance CPP's long-term educational impact.
- B. All CPP academic programs shall undergo periodic program review to improve effectiveness and quality. This is achieved by examining, assessing, and strengthening instructional programs on a continual basis to ensure quality. This process evaluates the status, effectiveness, and progress of academic programs, and helps identify the future direction, needs, and priorities of those programs. As such, it is closely connected to

strategic planning, resource allocation, and other decision-making at the program, department, college, and university levels.

- C. Program review must be a candid product of the program faculty since they are poised to raise and respond to strategic and operational questions, and well-positioned to use the results to improve the overall program. Of paramount importance are program goals, plans, and strategies to achieve them.
- D. Program review applies to all academic departments (including all academic programs within a department) and interdisciplinary academic programs (e.g., Integrated General Education, General Education Program, Kellogg Honors College.)

2. Procedures for Program Review

A. Preliminary Steps

- i. The Office of Assessment and Program Review shall determine the schedule in consultation with the College Dean and department chair (refer to section 4 for frequency of program review.)
- ii. The Office of Assessment and Program Review shall initiate a launch meeting with the program to explain the requirements, logistics and timing of the program review process.
- iii. The program, in consultation with the College Dean, is responsible for selecting its external reviewers in accordance with the *Academic Program Review Process and Guidelines* provided by the Office of Assessment and Program Review.

B. Self-study

- i. The program shall prepare a self-study following the *Academic Program Review Process and Guidelines*. The Office of Assessment and Program Review will provide a template to guide the writing of the self-study.
- ii. The Office of Assessment and Program Review shall work with the Office of Academic Research and Resources to provide the program with pertinent data derived from CPP and CSU sources for inclusion and analysis in the self-study.
- iii. The College Dean and members of CPP's Program Review Committee assigned to that program shall review and provide feedback to strengthen the initial draft of the self-study.
- iv. The final self-study shall be reviewed by external reviewers and assigned members of the Program Review Committee.

C. Site Visits

- i. The program shall host two external experts (one from a CSU campus; one from another university or industry) to execute a full review on-site. Special circumstances may warrant exceptions and the program shall discuss these with Office of Assessment and Program Review and the College Dean.
- ii. Assigned members of the CPP Program Review Committee shall meet with the program to address items specific to CPP's strategic priorities.

D. Action Plan

- i. Upon the conclusion of site visits and reports by external reviewers and assigned members of the Program Review Committee, programs shall develop an action plan to strengthen the program including steps that may be accomplished with and without additional resources, a timeline of planned activity, and goals for the work. The program shall consult their College Dean before finalizing their action plan.
- ii. The program shall present their final action plan to the College Dean and Provost. The College Dean and Provost will produce a signed memo outlining the action plan implementation timeline and determined allocation of any resources.

E. Concluding Steps

- i. The Office of Assessment and Program Review shall submit program review completion files to the Academic Senate.
- ii. The Office of Assessment and Program Review shall notify the CSU Chancellor's Office of the program review completion.

3. **Programs with discipline-specific accreditation**

- A. For programs who are currently accredited, the documents prepared for accreditation, visits from the accreditation body, and reports from the accreditor shall satisfy a portion of the program review. The Office of Assessment and Program Review shall work with the program and the Dean to ensure that campus-level program review timelines coincide with accreditation reviews and visits.
- B. Accredited programs shall submit their accreditation documents, an abbreviated program review checklist, and a supplemental report addressing any gaps between accreditation requirements and CPP's program review process. The Office of Assessment and Program Review will provide the abbreviated program review checklist and consult with the program on its completion.

4. **Frequency of Program Review**

A master schedule of program review shall be published on the Office of Assessment and Program Review website.

- A. The typical cycle of program review is seven years.
- B. The cycle of program review for programs with discipline-specific accreditation shall coincide with the accreditation period, not exceeding ten years.
- C. Special circumstances may warrant the frequency of a program's review to be extended or reduced by Office of Assessment and Program Review in consultation with the program and College Dean.
- D. Between formal program reviews, programs will provide a 3-year update to the College Dean on progress made on the agreed upon action plan.

Program Review Committee Bylaws

5. **Purpose**

To provide faculty support for and oversight of Cal Poly Pomona's academic program review process.

6. **Description**

The Program Review Committee is an advisory body to the Academic Senate and the Office of Assessment and Program Review. Members provide feedback to assigned academic programs on matters related to the substantive elements of CPP's program review with emphasis on institutional-specific issues not addressed by external reviewers.

Based on this committee work, the Program Review Committee also provides feedback and suggests improvements to the Office of Assessment and Program Review concerning the program review process. This strengthens the relationship between the two entities to maintain the integrity, significance, and relevance of program review.

7. **Structure and Membership**

The Program Review Committee shall be co-chaired by the Faculty Fellow for Program Review and a senate member from the Academic Programs Committee. Membership includes:

- At least one faculty member from the Academic Assessment Committee (AAC)
- Eleven tenured/tenure track faculty for a two-year appointment (staggered for continuity) with a minimum of four tenured faculty

Ex-officio members shall include the Coordinator of the Office of Assessment and Program Review and the AVP for Academic Programs.

8. **Duties and Responsibilities**

The Program Review Committee implements CPP's policy on program review by providing feedback to programs during the review process. Specific responsibilities include:

- Assign a lead faculty member to work with each program undergoing program review;
- The lead faculty member reads the initial draft of the self-study approximately three months prior to the on-site external visit and provides suggestions for draft improvement to ensure clarity and consistency with program review guidelines.
- The lead faculty member reads the final self-study to review institution-specific topics not addressed by external reviewers and discusses findings with the Program Review Committee.
- The lead faculty member and a second member of the Program Review Committee meet with the program the week after the external site visit to discuss topics specific to internal campus matters.
- The lead faculty member completes a brief summary of their findings and provides this to the program.

The Program Review Committee advises the Office of Assessment and Program Review on the program review process and results, including:

- Review program processes and guidelines on an annual basis and recommend updates.
- Compile an annual summary of strengths and opportunities for CPP based on the program reviews conducted during the academic year.

The Office of Assessment and Program Review shall provide training to the Program Review Committee membership so that members are well-informed of responsibilities and work scope.

d. [AP-025-190, Academic Assessment Committee – SECOND READING](#)

The second reading report for AP-025-190, Academic Assessment Committee, is located on the Academic Senate website at <http://academic.cpp.edu/senate/docs/ap025190sr.pdf>.

RECOMMENDATION:

The Academic Programs Committee recommends consolidation of the existing GE Assessment Committee and Academic Programs Assessment Committee into a single Academic Assessment Committee. The bylaws of the committee are below.

Academic Assessment Committee Bylaws

1. Purpose

The Academic Assessment Committee's purpose is to promote and facilitate meaningful advancements in building an institutional culture of assessment to strengthen teaching and student learning at Cal Poly Pomona. The AAC allows for open communication and coordination of efforts in program learning outcomes assessment, including from the General Education program, thus reducing duplication of effort, and enhancing capacity to engage in meaningful assessment.

2. Description

The Academic Assessment Committee will work closely with the Office of Assessment and Program Review in a collaborative effort to ensure continuous improvement of teaching and learning through assessment. The Academic Assessment Committee plays an essential role in ensuring that assessment of program learning outcomes, including those of the general education program, is supported and implemented, and that CPP nurtures its capacity for the assessment of student learning.

3. Structure and Membership

The Academic Assessment Committee shall be co-chaired by the Coordinator of the Office of Assessment and Program Review and a faculty member elected by the committee. Membership includes:

- 1 College Assessment Liaison from each academic college and University Library (n=9)
- 1 representative from the GE Committee who has a full understanding of the GE and IGE programs (n=1)
- 1 representative from Graduate Studies (n=1)
- 1 representative from Student Affairs (n=1)

Ex-officio: Faculty fellows in the Office of Assessment and Program Review.

4. Duties and Responsibilities

Much of the AAC's work shall take place within smaller working groups and ad hoc task forces as needed to spearhead assessment initiatives.

- The AAC shall meet as a whole committee once a month each semester; additional meetings of smaller working groups shall be scheduled as necessary.
- Review and provide feedback on assessment plans, policies, procedures, and reports.
- Disseminate university-level assessment findings to college constituents.
- Lead and participate in university-related assessment seminars and workshops.
- Participate in institutional-level assessment scoring and norming activities.

Senator Small presented the reports for AP-024-190, Program Review Policy, and AP-025-190, Academic Assessment Committee.

M/s to adopt AP-024-190, Program Review Policy, and AP-025-190, Academic Assessment Committee.

DISCUSSION:

These reports are proposals to streamline the program review process.

The key changes in the proposed program review policy are as follows:

- Program reviews shall now occur at intervals of seven years, instead of five years, unless a program has discipline-specific external accreditation, in which case the program review cycle shall be synchronized with the external accreditation cycle. The only exception is if accreditation review occurs at intervals greater than ten years. This reduced frequency of review should reduce burdens on departments.
- There will be a mid-point check-in for departments, halfway through the seven-year cycle, to talk about progress towards previous recommendations. This provides accountability.
- Accreditation reviews can be used to satisfy most of the requirements of the campus-level program review, including the outside reviewer reports. This should reduce redundancy and duplication of effort.
- A new Program Review Committee shall be formed (as part of a re-organization of university committees further explained in the accompanying referral AP-025-190). Members of this committee will be assigned to work as liaisons with departments through the preparation of their self-study and subsequent steps of the review process. The AP Committee is optimistic that this guidance will bring continuity from year to year about the process and bring about greater consistency of implementation across departments and colleges.

Since there will be the formation of a new committee, it was noted that there are currently two university committees working on assessment, APAC, and the GE Assessment Committee. This report proposes that those two committees be combined into one, so all assessment work is done in one committee. These two reports are not creating any more committees, just reallocating resources so that one committee focuses on assessment at the institutional level and the other committee concentrates on the program review process.

The Academic Programs Committee has received no comments since the first reading and remains very supportive of these changes.

The motion to adopt AP-024-190, Program Review Policy, and AP-025-190, Academic Assessment Committee, passed unanimously.

The November 4, 2020, Academic Senate Meeting adjourned at 3:50 p.m.