

MINUTES OF THE ONE HUNDRED AND THIRTY-SEVENTH PLENARY SESSION
OF THE UNIVERSITY FACULTY SENATE OF THE CITY UNIVERSITY OF NEW YORK

March 12, 1985

Professor Wasser, chairman, convened the session at 6:34 p.m. in Room 1700 at the Graduate School and University Center. Present were: Senators Alsop, Barbanel, Baumrin, Baxter, Beck, Binder, Borneman, Brogan, Canate, Cinquemani, Cooper, Danziger, Davidson, Donleavy, Donoghue, Early, Essoka, Forstall, Friedman, Galub, B. Gerber, Greenbaum, Grossman, Hecht, Henderson, Herzenhorn, Jaffe, Kirsch, Lea, S. Levine, Meister, Muehlig, Muzio, Nelson, Otelsberg, Parkhurst, Picken, Plissner, Reuder, Riley, Rose, Sacksteder, Schreiber, Sohmer, Thaxton, Timoni, Trefousse, Waldinger, Walkwitz, Walter, Wedeen, Weightman, Wimmershoff-Caplan, Wolfe, Yousef, Zades and Zarin; Alternate Senators Karan, Kleinman, Mbugua, and Thompson; Senators Elect Depas, Hayon, and Moreau; Alternate Senators Elect Ginsberg, Glass, Kachuck, and Richter. Dr. Ellis, Executive Director, also attended. Senators Amendolia, Ballabon, Barber, Cantwell, Ercolano, Gelernt, Cluck, Hunte, Isaacs, Jiji, Julia, Rosen, Schneider, Valinsky, and Waldman were excused.

I. Approval of the Tentative Agenda: The agenda was approved as circulated with the omission of Item VI Chancellor's Report because the Chancellor did not attend.

II. Approval of the Minutes of the 136th Session (February 19, 1985): The minutes were approved with the following corrections: Alternate Senator Mbugua was present.

III. Communications from the Chairman: Professor Wasser began his communications with several announcements. He informed the Senate first that letters soliciting nominations for members of the Faculty Advisory Council to the Research Foundation had been sent to all department chairs and chairs of departmental P&B and Executive Committees with the request that the announcement be posted also in the department office. There will be four vacant seats to be filled on the Council - two the result of the expiration of members' terms and two due to retirements. Nominees must be members of the faculty actively engaged in research and must either have been principal investigators or co-investigators or directors of research, demonstration or training grants administered by the Research Foundation or have been the recipients of research grants or fellowships financed by non-University sources and deemed by the Senate to be awards of nationally recognized importance. (Bylaws of the Research Foundation, Art.V, Sec. 2) Professor Wasser asked Senators to check that the call for nominations was distributed and posted in their department. Since one member at least of the four members of the Council who sit on the Board of Directors of the Foundation must be a community college faculty member, the Executive Committee hopes that a large number of nominations will be submitted by those faculties as well as those of the senior colleges and Graduate School. Nominations are due in the Senate Office no later than April 15.

Dr. Wasser announced also that with respect to the University Committee on Research Awards, the policy-making body for the PSC/CUNY Award Program, Chancellor Murphy's acceptance of the modus operandi negotiated by the Senate Research Committee, the screening body for nominations to the University Committee, and the Executive Committee with the Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs who chairs the University Committee on February 14. The call for nominations from the Senate will be circulated to those departments throughout the University who might wish to submit nominations for those discipline areas represented on the University Committee in which vacancies will exist for 1985-86, if a satisfactory modus operandi is approved. Since the entire nominating process has been greatly delayed this year and since the meeting of the Research Committee to screen nominations must be held by the end of April, it is hoped that the appropriate departments will begin now to think about potential nominees so that, if the Senate participates in the selection of members of the University Committee, they may respond promptly to the call. The areas

in which vacancies will exist are: Computer Sciences; Economics and Business; English Theater, and Creative Writing; Health Sciences; History; Performing Arts and Music; Psychology; Sociology; Visual Arts and Art History; and for a one-year term in Engineering. The Committee, as defined under the Contract, should comprise qualified faculty members from all groups within the faculty of all of the colleges. Since the Senate's recommendations must be based on the pool of nominees, it is desirable that the pool include faculty members from all CUNY units who meet the criteria set by the University Committee for service on that body. The criteria are: 1) evidence of scholarship and familiarity with the forefront of the field; 2) experience in receiving and administering grants; and 3) distribution of members among the CUNY colleges. The Senate Research Committee's recommendations are based on academic considerations. It is hoped that department chairs and faculty members individually (since persons may be self-nominated) will begin now to think about potential nominees to fill the vacant seats so that the selection procedures may go forward immediately once the modus operandi is established.

Chairman Wasser's third announcement related to the UFS Newsletter. He said that Editor-in-Chief Gordon Lea planned to have a third 1984-85 issue completed and in the hands of the printer by March 22. It should therefore reach the campuses in early April and, barring the now usual snafus in printing, in no event later than the resumption of classes following the Spring Recess.

Professor Wasser next reported to the Senate on the status of its resolutions. He noted that a full report on their status would, as in the past, be circulated to the membership who might expect that report at the next Plenary Session. In the meantime, he wished to note that the UFS Resolution on Guidelines for the Allocation of Early Retirement Lines and the UFS Resolution on Guidelines for Appointment of Leading Professors had been transmitted to the Chancellor. His response, given orally to the Executive Committee, has been that until the University's Budget for 1985-86 clears the Legislature the funding of Leading Professorships is uncertain; therefore, the development of procedures is premature. With respect to the early retirement lines, he has stated that until analysis of the University personnel who have declared their intent to resign in accordance with the early retirement option is completed, the procedures for allocation of the lines would be premature. The Chairman reported also that the UFS Resolutions on Faculty Service on Committees and on Membership of the College Associations and Student Enterprise Boards are on the agenda of the Board Committees on Faculty, Staff and Administration and on Student Affairs and Special Programs respectively for action at the April meetings of those Committees. Professor Wasser said that he wished to remind the Senate that consideration of those proposals by the appropriate Board Committees was another example of the Senate's advancing in the process of presenting its policy recommendations directly to the Board for consideration and approval. Such a process was not possible in the past but is now possible because of the 1979 Governance Legislation for the University that made the Senate Chairman an ex-officio member of the Board of Trustees as well as the Board's action in enfranchising the faculty and student members of its Committees.

The Association of Community College Trustees' Legislative Seminar, held in Washington D.C. on February 23-25 was the next item in the Chairman's report. The Seminar, he explained, was an annual event sponsored by the Association and the CUNY Trustees who constitute a single Board for all of the University's units participate together with trustees of community colleges throughout the United States. The format of the seminar is meetings with officials and Congressional representatives from both houses - usually those individuals who have a special interest in education such as members of the Congressional Higher Education Committees. Among those who addressed the Trustees this year were Senator Kasselbaum (Kansas), Congressman Rangle (New York), Congressman Ford (Michigan) and Senator Hatfield (Oregon). A number of former members of Congress were present also - apparently serving as lobbyists for higher education issues. Many Congressional staff people spoke also, for example, the Minority Counsel. Another participant was the Assistant Secretary for Education who together with other Executives were there to explain Administration policy. The situation, as it emerged from these meetings, appears to be that Reagan is

terminated to put through the cuts he has recommended, that he meant what he said and is not prepared to give. There is no certainty about what will happen to the recommended cuts and freeze when they reach the Congress although some speculated that the freeze would go through if not the full measure of cuts. The meetings of the Association included also a reception for the Organization of American States as well as a breakfast meeting of the SUNY Community College Trustees and the CUNY Trustees that had been arranged by CUNY Trustee Cenci. Other CUNY Trustees who attended the Seminar included Trustees Bloom, Lowe and White. Chancellor Murphy was there for one day when he was awarded the Association's annual Legislative Award for his work as Chairman of the National Coalition on the Pell Grants. President Smith (Borough Manhattan) who has been and is very active in the association was present also. The CUNY Trustees hosted a reception in honor of the Chancellor as well. Finally, Professor Wasser said, the Trustees heard a familiar complaint from legislators - that the latter do not receive sufficient communications about issues from their constituents - at least not in the volume they would prefer so that it is difficult, in determining their position on those issues, to know whether it is in harmony with the will of their constituents. It behooves us, Professor Wasser opined, to let our Congressional representatives know where we stand by letters, phone calls and so forth especially at this juncture when the impending cuts in the higher education budget threaten to affect not only our students but the faculty as well because of the proposals concerning the funding for research.

The Executive Committee, Professor Wasser continued, had acted on the request made by the Chancellor at the Plenary Session of February 19 that a Committee be constituted by the Senate from among the faculty knowledgeable in the field to analyse the potential impact of the proposed cuts in higher education funding so that he might use it. Accordingly, an Ad Hoc Committee on the Reagan Budget had been appointed to perform that service for the Chancellor and Professors Howard Chernick (Economics, Hunter), Harold Hochman (Economics, Baruch) and William Tabb (Political Science, Queens) will be its members.

Another request to which the Executive Committee has responded, said the Chairman, was made by the Senate Delegation from Medgar Evers College. They have asked for the Senate's support for the College's proposal for restoration of the college's four-year status. Representatives of the delegation will therefore meet with the Executive Committee later this month to discuss the proposal.

The last item in Professor Wasser's communications was the issue of Medical Education at CUNY. He reminded the Senate that he was a member of several of the Committees involved in the planning for the Medical School - the Ad Hoc Oversight Committee appointed by Board Chairman Murphy from among the Trustees; the Implementation Committee comprising representatives from the CUNY colleges - the Presidents of City and of the Graduate School as well as the Dean of the Sophie Davis School, faculty members from Sophie Davis, the Presidents or Chief Executive Officers of the participating hospitals as well as the President of Mount Sinai and Trustee Lowe, chair of the Student Senate, as well as myself; and the Implementation Committee's subcommittees on governance and staffing. The University's plan is being readied for the agenda of the March 25 Public Meeting of the Trustees - the required Public Hearing for the items on the agenda of that meeting will be held on March 18 so that persons wishing to speak to items on that agenda may have the opportunity to do so prior to Board action on the matters that will be presented for its consideration and approval - and it is now completed. This morning the final meeting of the Implementation Committee took place and the Oversight Committee met, presumably in a final meeting, last week. The plan has been developed with great haste. Some of the meetings have been held simultaneously with others that I must attend but I am permitted to send a representative to those of the Implementation Committee and have participated in those of the Oversight Committee. Sending a representative chosen from among the members of the Executive Committee has the advantage of giving them the opportunity to be informed about the school firsthand and both Professor Picken, member-at-large of the Executive Committee, and Professor Sohmer, treasurer, have performed that service for the Senate. The Chancellor has pushed hard to have the Committee's work completed and much of the work has been to

read drafts of material prepared by staff and submitted for review to members only minimal time prior to meetings. For example, the governance document draft, prepared by staff, was delivered by messenger to my home at 6 P.M. on February 19, the evening of the last Plenary Session so that I received it between 10 and 11 P.M. Comments were to be submitted no later than 5 P.M. the following day or my acquiescence would be inferred. I might add that prior to this date the drafting committee on which I sat had not met. At meetings of the implementation committee members found that there was great reluctance on the part of staff to make any changes in the materials they submitted for approval - the need to meet a deadline for submission to the accrediting body this spring being cited as the reason. The entire planning process was conducted in a manner that smacked of highhandedness. At one meeting of the Implementation Committee - originally intended, I believe, as the final meeting of that group - members were asked and, in fact, did approve the Chancellor's proposal even though crucial sections of the document had not yet been made available for review - among these the proposed governance document. Committee members were assured by the chair, the Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs, that the document would be circulated to the membership with the exception of Trustee Lowe and myself who would receive our copies when the other Trustees received theirs. Protests against these procedures subsequent to the meeting resulted in the calling of special meetings of the committee to review that section. Review of the document indicated that there were several provisions such as the naming of a Dean of the Medical School who would report to the President of City College and consult with the President of Long Island Jewish Hospital, the principal clinical facility with the proviso that disputed matters be presented to the Chancellor for resolution that seemed potential sources of difficulty. The issue of the School's name - CUNY Medical School at City College or CUNY Medical School - surfaced at the Ad Hoc Oversight Committee of the Board where the Chairman of the Board indicated that instead of the former the latter was to be substituted - and the issue was settled this morning with the submission to the Implementation Committee of the final document where the name had become City University Medical School - and the President of City College who had earlier seemed to be holding out for the former capitulated without comment. The provisions for safeguarding the tenu- of the faculty of the Sophie Davis School are acceptable but there are questions about the provisions for appointment, promotion and tenure with respect to the clinical faculty.

At this point Senator Borneman (Health and Physical Education, City) who also chairs the City College Faculty Senate requested an opportunity to speak and was granted the floor. She informed the Senate that the City College Faculty Senate at its meeting on March 7 had adopted the following resolution after four hours debate and discussion:

WHEREAS:

The Sophie Davis School of Biomedical Education of The City College of The City University of New York presently offers an innovative seven year program leading to a combined BS/MD degree, and

WHEREAS:

Its goals are to train primary care physicians who will practice preventive and therapeutic care in underserved urban communities, and

WHEREAS:

Its program provides access for careers in medicine for students of Black, Hispanic and other ethnic backgrounds whose communities are historically underserved by primary care physicians, therefore

BE IT RESOLVED THAT:

If there is to be a City University Medical School which includes the Sophie Davis School of Biomedical Education, then it MUST satisfy the following conditions in order for the Faculty Senate of The City College to approve it, in accordance with its rights and obligations under the Bylaws of the Board of Trustees of The City University of New York:

1. The Faculty who vote curricula, degree requirements and the conferring of The City College Baccalaureate degree shall be appointed, promoted and tenured through the same mechanisms as exist and are appropriate for the Faculty of the academic departments at The City College, and

2. The Dean of the Medical School shall report to the President of The City College on all matters pertaining to faculty, students and courses of study at The City College, as do all academic deans. MOREOVER, if such a Medical School is established without the enactment of these provisions, The Faculty Senate [of The City College] records itself as desiring that the Medical School be neither located on The City College campus nor have any special relationship with it.

The resolution, said Professor Borneman, would probably have no effect on the planning for the Medical School and would have to be regarded as an exercise in rhetoric but it set down the views of The City College faculty represented by the college faculty governance body.

Professor Wasser resumed his report and stated, in conclusion, that the Report was now to be submitted to the Board, having been reviewed and approved by the Ad Hoc Oversight Committee of the Board, at the March 25 Public Meeting.

Professor Wasser then responded to questions and comments from the floor. Professor Lea (English, Lehman) said that he found the sense of urgency that infused the planning for the Medical School curious in view of the fact that the Chancellor had stated both in public fora and in private that he and the Dean had been planning the School for at least two years. This was the way, he continued, that things in the University got by while the faculty stood by as observers - not participants in the process. The Chancellor had stated that he was not to be diverted from his purpose, i.e. to establish the Medical School because of high-minded principles such as matters of governance and the like which apparently are no more than high-minded principles according to the Chancellor. The faculty, said Professor Lea, in his opinion, have the right to make a statement consonant with their views. At least a protest might have more effect than tacit acquiescence. The faculty have to find their voice on an issue where the handling is so blatant a violation. Professor Wasser intervened and explained that the Board's Public Hearing on the agenda items for the Public Meeting offered a forum for a public statement. According to the established procedures any member of the faculty might request an opportunity to speak at that hearing as an individual but if there were to be an expression of the position of the University Faculty Senate on the matter, then the speaker must be designated as the Senate's spokesman either by the Plenary Session or by the Executive Committee. Professor Thompson (Special Services in Education, Lehman) said that she believed the faculty ought not to stand by and be bypassed as it was - that it was imperative that it not be put in the position on this and other matters of being asked for a pro forma expression of views only after a plan had been worked out by staff and was, in effect, put in place. She thought this should be stated at the Hearing. There followed a series of statements by members supporting this position. In addition, a number of questions about the plan itself were raised, in particular, with respect to the relationship of the Law School's structure to that of the Medical School. Professor Wasser explained that under the governance document for the Medical School the Sophie Davis School was a part of City College but the Medical School - unlike the Law School which was the City University Law School at Queens College and whose Dean, under the existing governance, communicated with the Central Administration and Board through the President of Queens College although in a case of the awarding of tenure to a faculty member that had been turned down by the President of Queens through the resolution of dispute mechanism in the governance document had been approved by the Chancellor - was to be part of no other unit; it would float in limbo and have a different structure. The head of Long Island Jewish Hospital was to be a member of the Council of Presidents with vote and the Chairman of the CUNY Board of Trustees as well as the Chancellor would be non-voting members of the Board of Long Island Jewish. Expressions of protest against the procedures continued and the possibility of drafting a resolution in the meeting was raised. Professor Cooper (History, Staten Island) suggested that in the interests of

time and efficiency the Senate empower the Chairman and the Executive Committee to prepare such a resolution and statement for presentation at the Public Hearing of the Board based on the sense of this meeting. She then moved that this be done and her motion was seconded. Professor Wasser called for a vote to indicate the sense of the meeting and the motion was adopted unanimously.

IV. Reports of Faculty Members of Board of Trustees' Committees: The reports were submitted in writing to the Senate and a copy is attached to these minutes. Professor Picken (Romance Languages, Queens) requested permission to comment on his report and, that permission having been granted, stated that he had learned that the official minutes of the meeting of the Committee on Faculty, Staff, and Administration discussed in his report stated that the Committee's action with respect to the Student Appeal from a Disciplinary Action at Hunter College was to lay the entire matter over to the April meeting. His report was nonetheless accurate, he continued, according to his notes and his best recollection and he wished the Senate to know this. Furthermore, he continued, this was not the first time that the official minutes had recorded actions or discussion that differed from his own notes and recollection - in fact, this had occurred four or five times since September of this academic year when he became a member of the Committee. It was, of course, possible at times to have different recollections of an action or event, he said, but he remained confident that his own record was the more accurate since it was not subject to revision. Professor Jaffe (Science, Borough Manhattan) said that he was puzzled. Having been a member of such a disciplinary committee at his own college for several years, he had thought that such bodies forwarded their rulings to the Vice Chancellor for Legal Affairs for implementation and did not know that they were presented to a Committee of the Board of Trustees. He was informed that the severity of the penalty recommended by the Disciplinary Committee determined whether or not the Board Committee served as the final review body. In cases of recommended expulsion, for example, it was the Board Committee that must review since it was necessary to exercise extreme care in the handling of such matters. Professor Wasser stated that his own service on the Committee for Faculty, Staff, and Administration confirmed that Board review of such decisions was not unusual and further that the Board necessarily was the final approving body on all University matters.

V. Discussion of Articulation and Proposed Resolution on Articulation: Professor Wasser introduced the item and reported that the Senate Articulation Committee had worked long and hard on this issue since receiving the charge of the Executive Committee at the beginning of January in order to devise the resolution to be considered by the Senate at this session. The resolution together with a cover letter reporting its history and basis had been circulated to the entire Senate prior to the session so that there would be time for members to consult with colleagues and be prepared to comment or raise questions on the many complex issues related to this important matter. The articulation issue was to be the sole action item on the agenda this evening - a decision of the Executive Committee because of the overriding significance of the matter. The Articulation Committee and the Executive Committee had been in regular communication throughout the past months to consult on the Senate's handling of the issue and had jointly decided that it was important to hold open hearings on the resolution presented to the Council of Presidents by President Coldstein (Kingsborough) and on the issue in general. That hearing was held on February 22 and over 40 speakers testified on that date. Arguments were given on one side or the other; the proceedings were taped and a full transcript is being prepared. In addition, a number of pieces of testimony were submitted in writing, and are still being submitted, so that there are currently over 60 persons who have testified to the Senate on the matter. The February 22 hearing was presided over by Professor Baxter (Academic Skills, Hunter), chair of the Articulation Committee, Professor Joseph "Gil" Riley (Chemistry, Bronx), member of the Executive Committee, Professor Marlies Danziger (English, Hunter), liaison member for the Executive Committee on the Articulation Committee, and Professor John Donoghue (Social Science) New York City Technical), member of the Articulation Committee. Professor Wasser and

Other members of the Executive Committee had been present as had members of the Articulation Committee and they had listened to the speakers throughout the day and thus were able on the basis of study of the matter and the testimony presented to develop the resolution presented for action this evening. Finally, he said the Senate's resolution would be forwarded to the Chancellor and the Council of Presidents as well as to the Board so that, in particular, in the deliberations of the Committee on Academic Affairs of the Council based on their charge to revise the resolution presented by President Goldstein, they might be aware, in advance, of the University's faculty governance body's views on the issue. Professor Wasser then introduced Professor Baxter to chair the item.

Professor Baxter said that she could report that testimony had been given orally or submitted in writing from all but four of the undergraduate colleges. The exceptions were Hostos, John Jay, Medgar Evers, and New York City Technical - two state-funded and two primarily city-funded colleges. Although the resolution and cover letter had been circulated to the membership prior to the session, Professor Baxter said, she thought it appropriate to preface the discussion by reading them at this time which she did. (Copies of the resolution and the cover letter circulated to the Senate are appended to these minutes.) Having done so, Professor Baxter opened the floor to discussion.

A motion to adopt the resolution was duly made and seconded and discussion followed. Arguments presented in the discussion included the following. There was objection to the use of the nomenclature "articulation" in relation to movement or transfer among units of the University since, according to the member arguing the point, "articulation" was a term customarily found in biological sciences to describe the relationship between component bones in a joint and was not appropriate to describe what was in reality "transfer policy". The latter was the terminology employed to characterize the relationship between students who entered the University, having studied at another college level institution prior to that time and seeking credit for the work completed at the other institution. The presenter of the argument stated a wish that the term could be eliminated but acknowledged the CUNY use of the term as a deterrent so that no motion was offered. It was argued, however, that the first resolve would not suffer if the final clause "and shall have as their explicit goal the improving of articulation" were deleted and this suggestion was offered as an amendment. The amendment was seconded and brief discussion followed with opponents stating that such a deletion would undermine the thrust of the resolution by eliminating the purpose of the Senate effort. The question was duly moved, seconded and called and the amendment was put to a vote. The amendment was defeated with an overwhelming majority. At a later point in the discussion a second amendment to reword a clause in the third resolve and substitute "as well as the letter of its requirements" for "rather than the letter of its requirements" was accepted by Professor Baxter and the Committee as a friendly amendment. Other arguments presented in the discussion on the main motion included the insistence that there was already in existence a Course Equivalency Guide that had been developed in consultation with faculty members so that the meetings of representatives that the resolution proposed were unnecessary. In response it was argued that the document in question had excluded the chairs of many departments within the University whose courses were offered in virtually all colleges' curricula, e.g. Chemistry and that, therefore, the present document was defective. Further, Professor Wasser stated that the present document which was thought to be a final one through some breakdown in communications was, in fact, no more than a preliminary draft - a fact that he had double-checked when the rumor of its being mistaken for a final document reached him. It was also argued during the discussion that the University Task Force on Articulation had been examining the issue for two years and that it seemed clear that the University's community college graduates were being harmed through the current policy on articulation with the four year institutions in the CUNY system while they were able to transfer to other institutions such as Hofstra, St. Johns, etc. without the same difficulties. The credits of students transferring into CUNY from other undergraduate institutions, furthermore, were not subject to the same kind of scrutiny

as those of students within the system. The point was made, in response, that students could also be harmed, if their credits were accepted without scrutiny and they were permitted to enroll in courses and were unable to complete the work in those courses successfully. There was support for the Goldstein resolution expressed by the first speaker in this exchange but his view was not widely shared. Additional points that were made were that courses often carried the same title but covered totally different material and that the proposed discipline meetings could clarify that situation in the same way as they might clarify that courses with different titles in fact covered the same material. The difficulties that might arise in meetings of representatives of discipline areas in those disciplines such as psychology whose ranks were already divided by different approaches, e.g. the behavioral psychologists who approached the discipline from the vantage point of social science and the experimental psychologists whose approach was rooted in the sciences was also expressed as a concern. The suggestion that the problems in articulation were a concern only of students seeking to enter a four-year CUNY college having completed the work for and having received a degree from a CUNY community college was disputed and it was noted that students who moved from one two-year institution to another or from one four-year institution to another within CUNY often faced the same difficulties and that the proposed resolution was intended to cover all articulation within the system. The problem of credit for work within the major was also raised with the need, indeed the responsibility, of the degree-granting institution's faculty, to set degree requirements being cited as a counter-vailing argument to the proposed Goldstein resolution. The concern that the existed a cap on the number of credits that might be required for the degree was also turned aside and it was noted that the present Board policy as set forth in its Resolution of February 26, 1973 (Calendar 3 A g) stated only that "upon such transfer (to a senior college) they be granted a minimum of 64 credits toward a baccalaureate degree and be required to complete only the difference in credits between 64 and the total credits required in the baccalaureate program in which the student enrolls" set no such cap.

A motion to call the question was made, seconded and passed and the motion was put to a vote. The result was approval of the proposed resolution as amended with three negative votes and three abstentions.

VI. New Business: There was no new business and the chair entertained a motion to adjourn. That motion was duly made and the session was adjourned.

Respectfully submitted,

Jean Ellis
Executive Director