

HUMBOLDT STATE UNIVERSITY  
Academic Senate Minutes

04/05:07  
01/25/05

Chair Ken Fulgham called the meeting to order at 4:00 p.m. on Tuesday, January 25, 2005, in Nelson Hall East, Room 102 (Goodwin Forum).

Members Present: Borgeld, Bruce, Butler, Coffey, Dunk, Eichstedt, Farley, Fulgham, Green, Knox, Kornreich, Larson, MacConnie, Meiggs, Mortazavi, Moyer, Mullery, O'Rourke-Andrews, Paynton, Roberts, Sanford, Schwab, Schwetman, Shellhase, Vrem, Wieand, Yarnall, Zeck.

Members Absent: Dixon, Platin, Richmond, Vellanoweth.

Proxies: Mullery for Meiggs (after 5:30 p.m.), Roberts for Thobaben, Boyd for Varkey, Fonseca for Williams-Gray.

Guests: Burt Nordstrom, Bob Snyder, Val Phillips, Donna Schafer.

**1. Adoption of the agenda**

M/S/U (Meiggs/Kornreich) to adopt the agenda.

**2. Approval of minutes from the meeting of November 30, 2004**

M/S/U (Larson/Dunk) to approve the minutes of the meeting of November 30, 2004 as written.

**3. Reports, announcements, and communications of the Chair**

Proxies were announced.

President Richmond approved the Resolution on UCC Recommendation to Double Count Institutions (#02-04/05-EP), passed by the Senate on October 26, 2004. A copy of his email was sent to Senate members. The President also approved the Fall 2004 Graduation List.

The Educational Policies Committee is seeking to fill a vacancy; the term is through spring 2006. Names should be forwarded to the Academic Senate Office by February 2, 2005. The Committee meets on Tuesdays at 1 p.m.

Two Faculty Representatives are needed for a WASC steering committee. If interested in serving on the committee, contact the Academic Senate Office by February 1, 2005. Currently there is no release time; however, there may be a modest amount of summer support available.

The President has invited members of the Academic Senate to a Master Plan/Strategic Plan Reception on February 11, 2005, 3-4:30 p.m. in the Kate Buchanan Room. The reception is to thank and honor all those who contributed to the development of the Master Plan and the Strategic Plan.

The last meeting of the Senate will be on May 10, 2005. Election of Senate officers, the seating of new senators, and approval of the Spring 2005 Graduation List will be on the agenda. A reception will be held following the meeting.

The CSU Faculty Trustee Recommending Committee met on January 19 to review campus nominations. Four names were forwarded to the CSU Statewide Senate; the election will be in March. If members of the Senate are interested in further information, contact statewide senators Cheyne or Thobaben.

Chair Fulgham reported on a meeting he attended regarding HOP. If anyone has concerns about HOP, as an academic advisor, please contact him.

A new campus Field Trip Policy has been forwarded to the Senate Executive Committee for review. The Policy was developed to satisfy the Risk Audit. The auditors have approved it, and it now needs to be formally approved and communicated to the campus.

The University Executive Committee met on January 20. It was announced that the 2005 California Indian Conference will be held at HSU on October 7-9, 2005 (Homecoming weekend).

Chair Fulgham reported on a conference call with individuals from Noel-Levitz, discussing the Academic Program Demand Assessment. A PowerPoint slide presentation is available at:

[http://www.humboldt.edu/~hsupres/SEE/docs/prog\\_demand\\_assessment.pdf](http://www.humboldt.edu/~hsupres/SEE/docs/prog_demand_assessment.pdf)

In the examples given of other academic institutions that have used Noel-Levitz resources, a consistent factor among all institutions was the occupational outlook projection, in terms of influencing demand and how to market.

#### **4. Reports of standing committees, statewide senators, and ex-officio members**

Educational Policies Committee (Chair Kornreich): There are two resolutions from the Committee on the agenda today. Both have appeared on earlier agendas. The Committee continues to look at several issues, some old and some new. One of the newer items is a recommendation from UCC on policies for distance learning.

Student Affairs Committee (Chair Knox): In addition to smaller projects, the big project underway is the work of the Subcommittee on Course Evaluations.

Faculty Affairs Committee (Chair Cheyne): The Committee is dealing with two significant issues. The first is the best practices for mentoring faculty document, which has been drafted and disseminated for comment along with a request for feedback by February 1, 2005. The second major issue is Appendix J and the three primary areas being considered are: 1) areas of review and standards of performance, 2) definitions of rank, and 3) criteria for early promotion and tenure. Members of the committee are gathering procedures from the other CSU campuses and collecting information on their practices and policies in these three areas, putting the data into a spreadsheet, and looking for new ideas.

Senate Finance Committee (Chair Mortazavi): The University Budget Committee met on January 14 and the main topic of discussion was the Governor's January budget and comparison to the Board of Trustee's budget. The Governor is honoring the compact with a 3% increase in state funds, and a 2.5% enrollment increase. There is about \$7 million of unallocated reduction compared to the BOT budget. Historically, about 2.8% of that amount would be shared by HSU (ca. \$196,000). OAA budget presentations began last week, and presentations by the Colleges and the Library will take place this week.

California Faculty Association (CFA Chapter President Meiggs): All Unit 3 members were asked to fill out a bargaining unit survey at the end of fall semester 2004. The surveys have been reviewed, and a presentation of "sunshine proposals" will be made on February 11-12, 2005. "Sunshine proposals" are what CFA will be bargaining for. CFA is gearing up for its first action of the spring which will be a petition for faculty, staff, and administrators, asking the Governor to restore funding, or at least increase funding to education, to help reverse some of the recent devastating budget cuts. Signed petitions will be collected CSU-wide, and sent to the Governor just before the May Revise Budget.

University Curriculum Committee (Chair Eichstedt): The UCC reviewed the resolution on double counting of institutions which was passed by the Senate, and noted that there were a couple of issues left hanging: 1) when would it take effect, and 2) what about the four upper division courses that are taught that are institutions courses and how would they double count (lower division GE?). It was resolved and agreed at UCC that double counting will be available to all students in AY05/06, not just those students coming in under the 05/06 calendar. Transfer students will not be able to double count twice, i.e., they can come in with an institutions double counted as a lower division, but will not be able to double count again. The four upper division courses that are currently institutions courses may be double counted as a lower division GE Area D.

On February 4, the GE subcommittee of UCC is having an all-university meeting to talk about general education reform. Further notice will be sent out.

Statewide Senate (Senator Cheyne): A Plenary Session was held on January 20-21, 2005. Senator Cheyne distributed a written report outlining the resolutions discussed along with their disposition. The resolution on Implementation of the CMS Student

Administration Module was noted with mention that since Banner does a better job than the proposed new system, it is recommended that campuses be allowed to choose the system they wish to use. The Resolution on the USA Patriot Act was also noted. It attempts to address the issue of an institution being asked to divulge confidential information regarding its employees and/or students. It was also noted that USA PATRIOT is an acronym for "Uniting and Strengthening America by Providing Appropriate Tools Required to Intercept and Obstruct Terrorism". Significant time and attention was devoted to the budget, CalPERS and the governor's desire to change the retirement system and California, and issues regarding Lower Division Core Patterns.

Chair Fulgham announced that there is a push by the CSU Chancellor's Office to go through the legislative process to limit outside employment of faculty members employed by the CSU.

Staff Council (Staff Council Representative Bruce): The Council is still pursuing its service pin idea. Brown bag lunches with the President continue, once a month. All staff are welcome to sign up; refer interested staff to the Staff Council web site (<http://www.humboldt.edu/~staff/news.html>) for upcoming dates.

Associated Students (Representative Zeck): Tables have been set up on the Quad to provide information to students on the new smoking policy and feedback has been mostly positive.

CSSA (Representative Fonseca): San Diego State hosted the first CSSA conference of the year. The conference dealt primarily with legislative issues. Three subgroups were created to deal with: 1) federal financial aid, 2) state financial aid, and 3) the California Performance Review (CPR). CHESS (California Higher Education Student Summit) will be held in February, to provide training and an opportunity for lobbying in Sacramento. A lobby core calendar has been created, which will send student senators to the state capital on a weekly basis. The only agenda item for the Legislative Affairs Committee was the ranking of pending bills, with "1" being the highest priority. Position of support has been taken on Bills AB9 and AB58. Bills ACA6 and SB5 have been opposed. Details of the bills can be found at: <http://www.assembly.ca.gov>.

Academic Affairs (Vice President Vrem): A group of four individuals from HSU attended a WASC workshop at Pomona, in order to learn how the re-accreditation process will work over the next few years. A campus proposal must be submitted to WASC, due on October 15, 2005, outlining a plan and a timeline for the next four and a half years. Themes will be identified that the campus will engage in. The first of two visits by the WASC team will be in spring 2008, and the second visit will be in spring 2009.

The Academic Program Demand Assessment mentioned earlier by Chair Fulgham is an attempt to look at courses and programs currently offered and how well they match up with student demand and employment trends in the state of California and beyond. Three primary sources of data that will be used are: 1) financial survey on career opportunities in various disciplines, 2) degrees that have been awarded in California by

discipline, and 3) survey of perspective students to see what majors they might be interested in.

Provost Vrem thanked those who attended the Town Hall Meeting on Educational Quality. The discussion will continue over the next several months.'

Administrative Affairs (Vice President Coffey): There will be an open forum, this evening at 5:30, on the renovation project for the Forbes Complex. This is a \$39 million dollar project, currently in the RFP process. It is expected that bids will be awarded sometime this summer and then the design and construction process will begin.

Student Affairs (Vice President Butler): The recreation center is progressing, and tours can be arranged. It is a little behind schedule, and probably won't open until the end of the semester. A committee has been established to schedule and manage the operation. In the HOP sessions last week the number of freshman was up very slightly compared to last year. The number of transfers was down, almost 25%, in comparison to last year. The Boating Instruction Safety Center is proceeding. This will be a recreational and instructional facility, and should be breaking ground fairly soon.

University Advancement (Vice President Nordstrom): Last week the Advancement Foundation Board of Directors met and received a presentation from its financial consultants. The Board has revised its investment policy and staff have been directed to work with Sponsored Programs on the transfer of endowment funds into the Advancement Foundation.

Chair Fulgham announced that Item 6 [i.e., 7] on the agenda is a TIME CERTAIN, and that the Senate could proceed with Item 6 [i.e., 7], or suspend the rules and deal with Item 5 first.

M/S/P (Fonseca/O'Rourke-Andrews) to suspend the rules and proceed with Item 5, with 1 vote **OPPOSED**.

**5. Resolution on HSU Policies and Procedures for Naming Facilities (#09-04/05-EX)**

M/S (Cheyne/MacConnie) to place the resolution on the floor.

**Resolution on HSU Policies and Procedures for Naming Facilities**  
#09-04/05-EX – January 25, 2005

**RESOLVED:** That the Academic Senate of Humboldt State University recommends the implementation of the attached University Management Letter 04-05 (November 2004) "Policies and Procedures for Naming Facilities" to the President.

*RATIONALE: University Management Letter 97-01, which superseded UMLs 95-5 and 93-1, regarding the naming of campus facilities was not in compliance with the CSU*

*Trustees Policy and Procedure On Naming California State University Facilities and Properties (adopted July 8, 1999 and last updated June 26, 2003). This proposed University Management Letter for naming facilities at Humboldt State University brings campus policy and procedure into compliance with that of the CSU Trustees.*

The revised HSU “Policies and Procedures for Naming Facilities” includes changes needed to bring the campus policy into compliance with the CSU “Policy and Procedure on Naming California State University Facilities and Properties”, which was adopted in 1999 and updated in 2003.

There was no discussion. The resolution **PASSED with 1 Abstention.**

**6. Resolution on Faculty Support for Student Voter Registration (#08-04/05-FA)**

M/S (Cheyne/Eichstedt) to place the resolution on the floor.

**RESOLUTION ON FACULTY SUPPORT FOR  
STUDENT VOTER REGISTRATION**  
#08-04/05-FA – January 25, 2005

**RESOLVED:** That the Academic Senate of Humboldt State University strongly recommend that early in the Fall semester of every academic year all faculty members promote student civic engagement by allocating sufficient time in each of their classes to encourage non-partisan student voter registration.

**RESOLVED:** That this resolution be transmitted via hard copy and campus-wide e-mail to all current Humboldt State University faculty and academic administrators, and that during the first week of classes in each Fall term voter registration forms be distributed to all academic departments by Associated Students, and an e-mail reminder be sent to all members of the campus community by the President or his/her designee.

**RATIONALE:** *The attached Resolution on Collaboration Between the Associated Students and HSU Faculty on Campus Voter Registration Drive, approved by the HSU Associated Students on 9/27/04, offers a compelling argument for faculty involvement in encouraging student voter registration. This Academic Senate resolution affirms and is consistent with the requirements of the 1998 Higher Education Act, the mission of the California State University, the resolve of the HSU student government, and our responsibilities as educators.*

Senator Cheyne introduced the resolution. The resolution follows a resolution passed by the Associated Students in September 2004 and is intended to allow for continuity of the voter registration process during fall term and to help remind faculty to encourage their students to register to vote.

Discussion:

- A couple of issues need to be addressed for the future, including the timing. The forms that go to the Secretary of State's Office are returned to Humboldt County, which can delay their entry into the proper precinct roster. Therefore, the forms need to be distributed early enough, preferably in September, to allow time for them to be sent in and returned, and have registered voters listed.
- The students have done an excellent job, registering over 1,000 voters in the past year. The county elections office has gone the extra mile to establish a polling place in the Jolly Giant Commons.
- CSSA is working with the Board of Trustees at the state level to make this type of action mandatory. The goal at the state level is to have the action taken at the point of student orientation. The students appreciated having the HSU Academic Senate pass this resolution. Having faculty distribute registration forms on the first day of classes will help the effort.

Voting occurred and the resolution **PASSED UNANIMOUSLY**.

**7. TIME CERTAIN: 4:40 p.m.**

**Resolution on Parameters for Time to Completion of Basic Subjects (#06-04/05-EP)**

M/S (Kornreich/Borgeld) to place the resolution on the floor.

**Resolution on Parameters for Time to Completion of Basic Subjects**

#06-04/05-EP – November 30, 2004

**RESOLVED:** That the Academic Senate of Humboldt State University recommend that all undergraduate students be required to complete the Basic Subjects (Area A) and Mathematical Concepts / Quantitative Reasoning (BSMC) requirements in a timely fashion, to wit:

- 1) Native students and transfer students with fewer than 30 transfer units shall complete the BSMC requirements before completion of 60 total semester units;
- 2) Transfer students with 30 or more transfer units shall complete the BSMC requirements before completion of 30 semester units at HSU; and be it further

**RESOLVED:** That the Academic Senate of Humboldt State University recommend that the Registrar's Office shall clearly identify students who are out of compliance with the time to completion of the BSMC requirements on the advising lists sent to advisors at registration time, and shall notify students and their advisors by e-mail of such status, and be it further

**RESOLVED:** That the Academic Senate of Humboldt State University recommend that faculty advisors may not release registration access codes to students who are out of compliance with the BSMC time to completion until they have agreed upon an appropriate course of study to complete the requirement within one semester, and be it further

**RESOLVED:** That the Academic Senate of Humboldt State University recommend that the policy specified within this resolution be included in the Catalog and in all departmental advising materials for the 2005-2006 academic year.

**RATIONALE:** *The GE Basic Subjects and Mathematical Concepts courses, including written and oral communication, as well as critical and quantitative thinking, are the foundations upon which other aspects of a university education are built. It is therefore critical that students successfully complete these courses as early as possible in their academic careers, before attempting upper division level work. The UCC has recommended to the Senate that students complete their studies in these areas before their Sophomore years. However, there is evidence that many students delay these basic subjects until Junior or Senior years. This policy provides for a deterrent to students' delaying these requirements beyond their sophomore years while allowing flexibility to upper division transfer students.*

Senator Kornreich introduced the resolution. The resolution arises from a recommendation from the UCC. It seeks to maintain academic standards by requiring students to take Basic Subjects (Area A) and Mathematical Concepts/Quantitative Reasoning by the end of their sophomore year. There is data from the Registrar's Office that indicates that the number of students who wait to take the Area A GE requirements until their junior and senior years is significant (100-200 students). It is important for students to acquire these Basic Subjects (reading, writing, communication, and mathematical skill) as early as possible in their academic careers, since these skills are absolutely necessary for further educational work.

Discussion:

- A clarification of procedure regarding the second resolve was requested. Rather than requiring faculty advisors to keep track of students who are out of compliance with the BSMC time to completion, would it be possible to have a hold put on the student's registration, requiring the student to register for the class that they are missing first, which would automatically release the hold. The original proposal was to have holds placed, but according to the Registrar's Office, there are serious implementation problems. It would take months and maybe years to make the modifications needed in Banner. And, if the campus moves to PeopleSoft, that software will not be able to handle this feature.
- The EOP summer bridge program is able to limit what students register for. This is done through the Banner system.
- The issue is not necessarily a technological one, but a lack of resources that would be needed for programming to make changes in Banner and that PeopleSoft will not be able to handle it.
- Are there resource implications for the University, i.e., can enough courses be offered to accomplish this goal? According to the Provost, resources will go where

the demand is. In general, Basic Subjects courses are high priority in terms in having them covered.

- The College of Arts, Humanities and Social Sciences fields a lot of these courses. Transfer students will have registration priority over freshman, so they can get the classes needed. Sophomores will have registration priority over Freshmen, and will also be able to get seats in these classes. Some of the backed-up demand has been alleviated this year, and problems handling the demand are not foreseen for the future.
- Students are not taking these courses because they can't get in a class; they are choosing not to take them until their junior or senior years.

The Chair Fulgham called for a vote, and limited the discussion to two more comments.

The Question was called.

- This is an informational resolution; it does not include any means of enforcement. It creates a dialogue between the advisor and student, but it doesn't necessarily prevent students from waiting to complete their requirements.

Chair Fulgham called for a vote.

Voting occurred and the resolution **PASSED UNANIMOUSLY**.

**8. TIME CERTAIN: 5:10 p.m.  
Resolution on Program Review Policy (#03-04/05-EP)**

M/S (Kornreich/Zeck) to place the resolution on the floor.

**Resolution on Program Review Policy**  
#03-04/05-EP – October 12, 2004

**RESOLVED:** That the Academic Senate of Humboldt State University recommend that the University accept and implement the attached policy, "Policy and Procedures for Department Self-Study and Resource Review," Dated 17 September 2004, to supersede the currently existing program review policy, commencing Fall 2005.

**RATIONALE:** *The Senate and UCC have expressed concerns and suggested changes to the program review policy as it is currently implemented. These suggestions have been incorporated into a new policy. The new policy attempts to streamline the process of program review and lessens the workload on faculty during the process. Assessment tools have also been implemented in the new policy that should make the result of the program review more meaningful.*

Senator Kornreich introduced the resolution. The resolution was previously discussed at the October 12, 2004 Academic Senate meeting and referred back to the Educational

Policies Committee. The Provost's Council has since reviewed the document and made changes. The role of the Provost's Council has been specifically outlined and the timeline has been changed slightly. The Provost's Council removed the language on UCC review that had been added by the Senate in October. The Educational Policies Committee added the language on UCC back in, and the Senate Executive Committee voted to remove the paragraph on UCC review.

M/S (Green/Knox) to amend the resolution by re-inserting the paragraph on UCC review, as agreed upon earlier by the Senate and re-inserting the UCC review in the timeline. The paragraph would be inserted after the College-Level Review and before the College Dean's Review and would read:

*Upon receipt of the department's self-study and the report(s) of the college committee(s), the UCC will prepare its own commentary focusing on curricular issues that it deems appropriate. The committee will then forward its comments to the Vice Provost for Academic Programs for review by the Provost's Council, with copies to the college committee(s) and department.*

Discussion on the amendment:

- Why was the UCC review left off? It was eliminated after review by the Provost's Council. The Educational Policies Committee discussed and put it back in and brought to the Senate Executive Committee. The Executive Committee voted to remove the language regarding UCC.
- The UCC review was removed by the Provost's Council because of concerns about 1) the length of time it would take (the process is already a lengthy one), and 2) concerns about the language "that it deems appropriate", which was felt to be too vague. The language needs to be more explicit if the UCC review is left in.
- How much review does a program review need in order to be considered adequately reviewed? What is the benefit of having the UCC review and is it sufficient enough to establish this extra step and create additional workload for UCC?
- One value of having UCC review is to have faculty involved in the review process. However, faculty members are already involved in the review process at different levels.
- The UCC has discussed this and feels that this is not just about faculty oversight. UCC's interest is in the all-university program, that is, it only wants to look at the all-university component of a program review. UCC is also fine not being included in the review process.
- Information on the Program Review Funding Committee was requested, since it has now been included in the document. Program reviews that are passed may request augmentation of funds. The Committee reviews and grants these requests as the

budget allows.

- It is important to have an all-university perspective from a faculty point of view. Every major belongs to the entire university. It was noted that the Graduate Council review remains in the document; if the UCC review is eliminated, then the Graduate Council review should be eliminated as well, since it is also a university committee dealing with curriculum.
- It is important to have faculty who are aware of what is going on in other departments; it gives them a better understanding of what is happening in general education. Discussions at the UCC level would be helpful in that regard.
- It was noted that on page two, under "The Future", the first sentence should state "goals for the next seven years", rather than "goals for the next five years", in order to reflect the current seven year cycle.
- While there are faculty on the Provost's Council, the function of the Provost's Council, according to this document, is primarily to look at resources and funding. Without the UCC review, there would be no faculty review of curriculum at the university level.

A friendly amendment was offered (Eichstedt):

*Upon receipt of the department's self-study and the report(s) of the college committee(s), the UCC will prepare its own commentary focusing on all-university curricular issues, ~~that it deems appropriate~~. The committee will then forward its comments to the Vice Provost for Academic Programs for review by the Provost's Council, with copies to the college committee(s) and department.*

The amendment was accepted as friendly.

- Is the placement of the UCC review most appropriate between the College-Level Review and the College Dean's Review, rather than after the College Dean's Review? Since some of the steps may occur simultaneously, the UCC review may occur simultaneously with the College Dean's review.
- There is a program review process in place for each area of general education, where they are looked at as a whole.
- Concern was expressed at the additional time the UCC review would require; and whether or not the value of the review is sufficient to warrant the time and workload that would be added.

Chair Fulgham called for a vote on the following amendment to restore the elements on UCC review, previously included in the "Policy and Procedures for Department Self-Study and Resource Review", with changes in language as reflected below:

*Upon receipt of the department's self-study and the report(s) of the college committee(s), the UCC will prepare its own commentary focusing on all-university curricular issues, ~~that it deems appropriate~~. The committee will then forward its comments to the Vice Provost for Academic Programs for review by the Provost's Council, with copies to the college committee(s) and department.*

Voting occurred. Chair Fulgham called for a hand vote. The amendment **FAILED with 8 Yes Votes, 15 No Votes, and 2 Abstentions.**

Discussion on the main motion:

- The seven year timeline is articulated in the third paragraph under "The Department Self-Study". The reference mentioned earlier, to "five years" on page 2, is a typo and will be corrected.
- Does the Program Review Funding Committee deals with funding preceding the program review? Is it separate from funding for staff and faculty?
- Money from the Provost's Office is allocated to programs by the Committee, which includes three faculty representatives. Funding is only for equipment, etc.; decisions on staffing are made separately. The Committee looks at legitimate reasons for funding requests and tries to be as equitable as possible.
- It was clarified that the Program Review Funding Committee deals only with recommendations for one-time items; the funding is a line item in the budget for one-time money for the program review process, and therefore it cannot be used for hiring personnel. Recommendations can be made regarding other needs, such as personnel, and forwarded to the Provost's Council, but they cannot be funded out of one-time money.

A friendly amendment was suggested (Larson) to change the heading on page 4 to "Provost's Council Program Review Funding Subcommittee". It was clarified that it is actually not a subcommittee. The committee reports/recommends to the Provost's Council, but it does not consist of members only from the Provost's Council. It was noted that the name of the committee in the Faculty Handbook is the "Program Review Funding Committee". The amendment was withdrawn.

The purpose of the program review as stated is to improve the quality of the curriculum. It is not clear how all of the elements of the review process are relevant to this purpose. In the timeline, the most germane data that is gathered is from surveys of students who have graduated and are professionals in the field. This is essential for a good program review to include.

M/S (Eichstedt/Cheyne) to amend second to the last sentence of the paragraph under "Program Review Funding Committee" on page 4 to:

*“... and recommend to the Provost’s Council the disbursement of one-time the  
funds requested during the program review for departmental equipment and  
operational expenses. allocated for resource review.”*

Discussion of the amendment:

The language should not limit requests to specific items. A friendly amendment (Knox) was offered to end the sentence after “program review”:

*“... and recommend to the Provost’s Council the disbursement of one-time the  
funds requested during the program review. allocated for resource review.”*

The amendment was accepted as friendly.

Voting on the amendment occurred, and **PASSED UNANIMOUSLY**.

Voting on the resolution occurred, and **PASSED with 1 Abstention**.

Meeting adjourned at 5:45 p.m.