

MINUTES

A Regular Meeting of the Santa Cruz Division February 19, 2003

Meeting

A regular meeting of the Santa Cruz Division of the Academic Senate was held Wednesday, February 19, 2003 in Kresge Town Hall. With Secretary David Belanger present, Chair George Blumenthal called the meeting to order at 2:35 p.m. Due to the number of agenda items, Chair Blumenthal introduced a timeline so that there would be time for all agenda items to be presented.

1. Approval of Draft Minutes

Chair Blumenthal called for changes to the minutes of October 16, 2002. Professor Joe Bunnett proposed a small change to the resolution on page eight, adding the word “members” to the end of the first sentence. A minor correction was made on page five to change the title to “Chair of the Student Union Assembly”.

A motion to approve the minutes, with these changes, was made and seconded. The minutes were thus accepted by a voice vote.

2. Announcements

a) Chair Blumenthal

Chair Blumenthal has devoted a great deal of time to the administrative budget reduction process and appropriate Senate committee access to the data and analysis of proposed options and how consultation on these options will occur before decisions are made. The following statement has been agreed upon by administration and the Senate that expresses the role and importance of Senate consultation during the budget process. “The administration will consult with the appropriate bodies of the Academic Senate during the planning, decision-making and implementation phases of the 2003 budget-cut process. This will consist of discussions of the possible options and strategies as the process goes forward from March through June. The EVC and Chancellor, after discussion with the Chair and Vice Chair of the Senate, will decide when options reach the point of development that consultation with Senate committees becomes appropriate. The EVC or his designee will be the primary discussant with the Senate Advisory Committee, CPB, and other Senate committees as appropriate from their areas of responsibility. The aim of this approach is to maximize the input and opportunity for comment from the Senate in the analysis of data and consideration of various options prior to final decision by the EVC and Chancellor.”

There have also been constructive discussions between the Chancellor and the Senate Advisory Committee concerning the campus climate for the pursuit of research and how our campus community communicates in this area.

Chair Blumenthal noted that he received a letter concerning the CPB reports from a member of the division who could not attend today’s meeting. The letter is available for

viewing in the Senate office and a copy will also be forwarded to CPB for their consideration.

There were two nominees for the two openings on the Committee on Committees. The two nominees, Carol Freeman and Darrell Long, are regarded as elected and will be the new members of the Committee on Committees.

The system-wide Academic Senate is now formally considering a modification to the Faculty Code of Conduct concerning relationships between faculty and students. The proposal, which emanated from the UC Privilege and Tenure Committee, would prohibit faculty from engaging in romantic or sexual relationships with any student with whom the faculty member has, or should expect to have in the future, academic, instructional, evaluative or supervisory responsibility. It would also prohibit academic supervision of any student with whom a faculty member has a sexual or romantic relationship. This proposed policy, which is posted on the system-wide Senate website, is now out for review. Chair Blumenthal invited faculty to comment on the proposal and stated it is his belief that it is the faculty of UC, not the Regents, who should be setting policy in this area. Other issues of system-wide concern are discussed in the bimonthly publication, "The Senate Source", which is available on the system-wide Senate website.

The search is now underway for the next President of UC to succeed Dick Atkinson. Professor Sandra Faber is the UCSC campus representative to the faculty committee advising the Regental Search Committee. Nominations can be sent via email or letter to Leigh Trivette, the Secretary to the Regents.

b) Chancellor Greenwood

Chancellor Greenwood thanked Chair Blumenthal for the good relations that have been maintained between the administration and the Senate over the last year. The University of California is going through difficult financial times. It is a difficult time for the State because the difference between revenues and expenditures is quite enormous. UCSC has been given a series of directions from the governor's budget that, if fully implemented, will have an impact of approximately \$15 million for our campus. Some of the areas targeted include outreach, student affairs, student programs, research and administration. We will have a clearer idea of the shape of our budget and the extent of cuts when the May revision is done. There is a good probability that we will not have a budget when we come back to the next academic year. The biggest challenge for us will be not to lose sight of where we are going while we deal with this year's budget problems. We want to be well positioned when the budget decrease ends. Our capital program continues. If the next bond issue passes, in addition to new buildings for Humanities and Social Sciences, the McHenry project will also move forward.

Chancellor Greenwood called attention to the issues surrounding freedom of inquiry and academic freedom on campus. She commented on recent incidents of public attention that were focused on the research of some of the faculty at UCSC. Posters and web sites drawing attention to the presumed funding sources for certain research projects of our faculty were recently posted. The posters are expressions of protest against the sources of

funding for faculty research and, by inference, against the nature or potential application of the research, more specifically, against participation in military research. The Chancellor's Cabinet met with SAC, (CAB/SAC) on the matter. The Committee on Academic Freedom, and perhaps the Committee on Research have also discussed this issue. While faculty are accustomed to expressions of diverse opinion regarding their research results, there is frustration because faculty do not have the opportunity to engage in open debate with their detractors. As an academic community, we depend upon a safe and open environment for research and discussion. This is an integral and defining feature of public universities. Acts challenging that safe and open academic environment by intimidation, while not necessarily against the law and not crossing the boundaries of free speech, are still incompatible with the ideas of the academy. If we consider the higher purposes of the university, we know we have to affirm the freedom of inquiry. When considering our institutional obligations, we need to ensure the safety of all member of our community. The immediate question being considered by Chancellor Greenwood is how we can create an appropriate venue, a safe place to invite and engage in an intelligent airing of the issues that is inclusive of divergent views, respectful of individuals, and free of intimidation and fear of reprisal. An idea, which emerged from a CAB/SAC meeting, is to convene a joint task force or working group to be active in proposing a venue for engagement in the most positive, constructive ways possible. This will provide the opportunity to reaffirm the academic prerogative of free inquiry and discovery that stands at the very heart of this institution. In summary, the campus needs to work on maintaining a safe environment for research, teaching, and freedom from intimidation. We also have to sustain the intellectual and civil environment that allows and encourages open discussion of issues.

c) Campus Provost/EVC Simpson

The budget issues facing the campus are genuine, significant and urgent. The size of the budget cut is, estimated, at least \$14 million. The implementation of the response will be campus-wide, rather than departmental or divisional. The faculty, through the Academic Senate and its committees, has been valuable in crafting the directions and procedures by which the campus will respond to the budgetary crisis. The faculty, as well as the staff and students, will be critical in implementing the changes to our operations that will result from the ongoing budget planning process. This is a consultative process and CPEVC Simpson has met with each academic division, department chairs, the Committee on Planning and Budget, and the Senate Advisory Committee. Members of the working committees and the project teams have contacted faculty, staff and students as they go forward in crafting the menu from which decisions will be made. A campus website will furnish related material to the budget crisis. It is available from the campus home page by clicking on the "Budget Planning" button.

As the budget process moves forward, CPEVC Simpson will discuss the options to be considered for changes with the various committees of the Academic Senate, particularly the Committee on Planning and Budget. This process of consultation will continue throughout the planning. This will include how we go about implementing the changes that are selected.

The University of California and UCSC are growing and will continue to grow. Faculty hiring will not stop and we will continue investing significantly in increasing our graduate programs. This will include funding fellowships and funding teaching assistantships at the full rate at which we are paid as our enrollments increase. The Chancellor and CPEVC Simpson will be responsible for melding the context of growth with the reality of the State budget cut.

Professor Ben Crow asked that the budget planning website referred to by CPEVC Simpson have a degree of openness, include committee reports, and be posted promptly. CPEVC Simpson responded that this is his intent. Yet at the same time, it would be inappropriate to post every hypothesis and notion. Student representative Chris Amico asked if there will be a formal role for students within the budget process and what it would be. CPEVC Simpson stated that the formal role for students, as well as for many campus constituencies, will be this: They will be contacted formally by the working committees, by the supporting project teams, and, as appropriate, by representatives of the Executive Budget Committee, the Chancellor, or the CPEVC. The success of this process will depend on getting the appropriate input from students, faculty, and staff.

3. Report of the Representative to the Assembly (none)

4. Special Orders: Annual Reports

a. Committee on Research (AS/SCP/1369)

The report was received without comment.

5. Reports of Special Committees (none)

6. Reports of Standing Committees

a. Committee on Committees:

Proposed Change to Santa Cruz Bylaw 13.20, Committee on Faculty Welfare (AS/SCP/1367)

COC Chair Sandy Faber reported that this bylaw change is to enlarge the membership from six to no more than eight. The workload of the Faculty Welfare Committee has expanded greatly in recent years to include ex-officio membership on administrative committees having to do with parking, transportation, childcare, and faculty housing.

The motion was passed by voice vote.

Proposed Amendments to Santa Cruz Bylaw 13.26, Committee on Research (AS/SCP/1376)

This bylaw change consists of two parts: increasing the number of members from five to nine, and providing more detail on the activities of this committee. COC Chair Sandy Faber noted some words were left out of section three in the printed version in the CALL. The new words have been inserted and are in bold below.

- (3) Makes recommendations to the VCR on the establishment of Organized Research Units (ORUs); advises the Chancellor and VCR on nomination procedures for

Directors of ORUs; consults with the appropriate Dean or VCR on the composition of the external committees for quinquennial and sunset reviews of ORUs; reviews and comments on the reports of external **ORU committees**; and **consults** with the appropriate Dean or VCR on the continuance of ORUs.

The activities of the committee are described in four sections. Section two adds to the work of the committee the responsibility of reviewing certain entities on the administrative side and their performance with regard to the support of the research effort. Section three makes explicit the role of the Committee on Research in the organization and review of our Organized Research Units. Research is becoming more formalized on this campus. We now have a Vice Chancellor of Research and we need to make more explicit how Senate committees will interact with this person.

Professor Jody Greene asked why the provision is for no more than three from each division rather than no more than two from each division. COC Chair Sandy Faber stated the reason is to allow a little bit of extra flexibility. In the future it may include representatives from ORUs, not merely faculty members from the various divisions. Professor Donna Hunter pointed out that it should be stated in the amendment that the members can come from divisions or ORUs. COC Chair Faber noted that these people would be coming from the divisions. Student Representative Chris Amico inquired why there are no student representatives on this committee. COC Chair Faber suggested that he bring this up with the Chair of the Committee on Research.

The motion was passed by voice vote.

b. Senate Advisory Committee: Proposed Amendment to Bylaw 8.4.1, Referendum (AS/SCP/1368)

Senate Vice Chair Alison Galloway stated the proposed amendment looks at the deadlines for mail ballots. The first change has to do with the notice of divisional actions. There is a need to change all the sections of the bylaws to fit with the change from divisional notice based on minutes to Divisional Action Reports. It is specified in the amendment that the mailing notification must be made to all of the Senate members, either by mail or by a direct e-mail communication rather than electronic communication. Finally, the bylaw states the same issue cannot be reconsidered for a period of one year.

Professor George Brown proposed that the number of days be changed to 21 calendar days. Vice Chair Galloway accepted this as a friendly amendment.

The motion was passed by voice vote.

c. Committee on Planning and Budget:

Report on University Relations and Development (AS/SCP/1372)

Report on Campus Enrollment Growth and Infrastructure (AS/SCP/1373)

Report on Administrative Accountability (AS/SCP/1374)

CPB Chair Bob Meister pointed out that although these reports are on three separate topics they are all linked, so they will be presented together. The campus is being asked

to consider raising its undergraduate enrollment limits in the context of drastic and immediate budget cuts. Fundamental decisions are yet to be made about where to accommodate the enrollment growth we have already accepted at a time when fundraising from non-state sources has plateaued. The first conclusion reached by CPB is that the Senate should not agree to increase enrollment targets that drive the campus for more than two years, first, below its current level of graduate student enrollments, and, second, below its current rate of compliance with state standards for physical space. The decision to take on increased undergraduate enrollments will be a matter of timing and a matter of planning that is data driven. The second conclusion reached by CPB is that the administration must be held accountable for the effect of this round of budget cuts on the core campus mission of instruction and research. Budget cuts in the early 1990s came primarily at the expense of instruction and research, while growth, particularly savings-related growth, occurred in the administration, institutional support and student services. CPB's central point is that we need to continue to position ourselves to expand and increase our commitment to graduate education. The budget cuts must not be allowed to impair our ability to continue hiring ladder-rank faculty.

CPB member Paul Koch stated that one of the significant strengths of the documents that EVC Simpson produced in October on the ten-year planning process was its emphasis on the need for accountability measures for all aspects of the campus. Such measures have long been in place for the academic units. The formal accountability measures for the administration are not as clear. In the context of campus budget cutting and rethinking how the campus does its business, methods for accountability for all the units of the university, academic and administrative, are essential. CPB would like accountability measures for administrative units that are agreed upon by the Senate and administration. It is particularly important to think about accountability for the University of Relations Office because we are in a time of decreasing state support for universities and increasingly dependent on extramural funding. CPB has been meeting with Scott Nostaja, the principal AVCOR consultant, and communicating ideas about accountability for both academic and administrative units. CPB hopes to report back to the Senate the data that ends up being the basis for making decisions on how to reorganize UCSC. CPB is supportive of the AVCOR process that has been laid out by the administration.

The overall principles of growth, both short-term and long-term, are dealt with in the Report on Campus Enrollment Growth and Infrastructure. The appendix to the report considers four possible strategies for how the campus might grow in the future: further infill in the core campus; growth in the north campus region; growth in the meadow; and growth downtown. The campus needs to commence multi-party discussions with the campus as a whole, the City, and UCOP on the long-term expansion of UCSC. In order for UCSC to accommodate its future growth and maintain it, we need to know how much private fundraising is necessary to offset declining state revenues. We also need to know whether the development of graduate programs, existing and new, is keeping pace to deliver our goal of 15%. Finally, we need to coordinate the large-scale budget cutting and campus reorganization with the short-term budget cuts for next year.

Asked about the possibility of placing instructional activities off campus, CPB member Brent Haddad replied that we are now offering courses off campus at Long Marine Lab. We also have students in the Education graduate program downtown. Professor Sandra Faber asked if CPB has a time scale for answering the question of where the campus physically expands. CPB Chair Meister stated that there are many time scales on which decisions have to be made. One purpose of the report is to get different levels of decisions on different time scales and to get faculty to ask about the cost efficiencies of moving forward on short-term cuts versus the longer time scale in terms of effects on enrollment planning. CPB Vice Chair Susan Gillman stated the different groups who have made preliminary findings should have an informational meeting in the spring to discuss the various options.

Asked about the extent of Senate consultation regarding the budget process, CPB Chair Bob Meister responded that CPB has been assured that it will receive an analysis along with appropriate benchmarks. CPB will report back to the Senate on the data received from the administration and whether they are satisfied with the budgetary decisions made based on the data received.

Responding to a comment that the growth beyond 15,000 is a complicated issue and how will CPB address this issue, CPB member Brent Haddad stated that the committee has tried to create a set of principles in the reports for responding to the pressure for growth and that it is now time to begin the dialog with a number of groups.

Asked how the campus will respond to President Atkinson's letter regarding accelerated enrollment growth, Chancellor Greenwood responded that the Chancellors, as a group, have asked the President to reconsider the deadline and have made it clear that they cannot easily accommodate the pressure that the legislature and the governor are putting on the campuses without full funding of summer enrollment, without the bond issue passing, and without the opportunity to consider the impact of the budget cuts that are coming.

Asked why the campus does not use a 75% as opposed to the 68% benchmark of our UC allocated space in the report, CPB member Don Smith agreed and stated that the report recognizes that we want to improve our CPEC standing.

Ron Suduiko, Vice Chancellor of University Relations thanked CPB for designating University Relations as a fine example of accountability and expressed his intent to deliver a report to the campus. He also stated the need for private fund-raising on campus and encouraged those interested in working on this goal to contact him, the development officer in their division, or Paul Prokop.

**d. Committee on Admissions and Financial Aid:
Report on Comprehensive Review Plan (AS/SCP/1370)**

CAFA member Karen McNally noted that, since the Regents reaffirmed that the faculty are in charge by plenary authority of admissions, as well as curriculum through CEP, the faculty undertook an accelerated effort for a plan pertaining to admissions. UCSC has

agreed that the admissions system should be cost effective and transparent. It is to be understandable and fair to the potential students and their families, as well as to the faculty. Professor McNally presented the following selection criteria established by the committee: academic score; being in the top 4% of local high schools; being in the first generation to attend college; and having special talents, achievements and awards and unusual promise for leadership.

Stevenson College representative Ben Eichert asked, with regard to Item 8, whether 300 is the maximum number of points possible. CAFA member Karen McNally responded that a maximum of 300 is correct and the different categories are scored intermediately. He also asked about what the committee has determined as “U.C. success” on the part of the student. CAFA member Karen McNally stated that it has been institutionalized as being grades in the freshman year at University of California. Lastly, he asked about the Guiding Principles for Comprehensive Review and the emphasis on a balance between high academic achievement and contribution in other ways. The last paragraph states, “We seek to admit and enroll students who have demonstrated a desire to use their education to make a contribution to the cultural, scientific and political life of California, the United States and the broader international community.” He pointed out that the guiding principles seem to put an emphasis on balance and yet the points do not appear to be balanced. CAFA member Karen McNally complemented him on his questions and said that students coming from schools without Advanced Placement (AP) courses would be given extra credit in order to compensate for the lack of AP courses. She also stated that all files will be read individually and that this is a starting point for the UCSC plan which may require readjusting in the future.

Report on the Use of Supplemental Subject Matter Tests in the UC Admissions Process (AS/SCP/1375)

All the SAT tests have been reviewed in the last couple of years. Testing companies have responded and are making changes to the tests. One result is the “verbal analogies” section has been removed. The second change is that a reading test has been added to the SAT test. The reading test will have questions on content and a writing test. These used to be contained within the subject tests and are now in the core tests that everybody takes. There are two parts to the tests that students will take to be eligible for UC. One part is the core tests of reading, writing and mathematics. The second will be a choice from two subject tests that are drawn from the areas that reflect the courses students take to come to UC. CAFA believes the changes are basically a regrouping and an upgrading into a core test and two subject tests.

7. Report of Student Union Assembly Chair

Matt Jones, Chair of the Student Union Assembly, commented that because the new tests are being developed both by the College Board and ACT, there are no statistics for fine-tuning and weighting them. The Student Union Assembly (SUA) is currently fighting hard with the testing companies and will be visiting a company in Iowa to discuss the changes in the testing. SUA is currently conducting revisions of their constitution and elections codes. The Commissioner of Diversity is working primarily with ethnic organizations on campus to provide collaboration between these organizations and the

student union. Ryan Francis, the internal Vice-Chair, handles all the internal happenings of SUA, media relations, and the Student Committee on Committees.

The SUA is working with the University of California Student Association on the campaign for no tuition increase. In terms of the comprehensive review, there is concern regarding the correlation between student organizations, programming, and retention and outreach centers on campus, and sustaining students of color on this campus. There is a sense that there is a decrease in the African-American population on campus due to the decreases in our regional retention. Chair Jones stated he would like to see more students coming from disadvantaged communities and from concentrated areas in different communities. The SUA is working on preserving Student Organizing and Advising Resources (SOAR) and working with the reorganization of the student development of community services clusters. These include the resource centers on campus and the student union. An SUA action item for this year is labor solidarity with CUE and AFSME strikes. SUA passed a resolution to sign on with the campaign on campus known as Sudexo, in order to look at different ways to do dining on campus. SUA has also passed a resolution against CRENO, the Classification of Race Ethnicity and National Origin, against the ban of the boxes. SUA asks that the surveys be filled out and sent back to the student union. The SUA supports publication of the Schedule of Classes and points out that not every student has access to computers. Chair Jones reported that the SUA passed a resolution earlier in the year against war in Iraq and they support the resolution against the war being presented at the meeting today. The SUA in no way supports the actions of the students who posted the fliers targeting faculty members and their research and they are dedicated to fostering relationships with the faculty here on campus.

8. Report of the Graduate Student Association President

Emily Robinson, President of the Graduate Student Association (GSA) reported that they are working on the townhall meeting funding. A small committee is looking into graduate student retention and funding rates across the divisions. They are trying to figure out how many people are on leaves of absence and how many people have dropped out of graduate programs and how many of these falling numbers are due to funding issues. The GSA is also looking at the time to degree of students in departments and how it relates to funding issues. They hope that UCSC can put together a more comprehensive study of these issues and make the information available. The GSA is encouraging UCSC to put as much effort and funding into retaining graduate students as it does attracting graduate students. The housing issue and the ballooning rents at graduate student housing is of particular interest to the GSA. The current rent of \$870 a month is over 60% of a TA's salary. They are working with the administration to come up with creative ideas for alleviating some of the stress associated with high housing costs. The Graduate Student Association also supports the anti-CRENO initiative.

9. Petitions of Students (none)

10. Unfinished Business (none)

11. University and Faculty Welfare

Professor Allen Van Gelder made a point of order regarding quorum. Chair Blumenthal asked all members of the Academic Senate to rise and established that there was quorum. CFW member Roger Anderson represented the Committee on Faculty Welfare, due to the fact that Chair Faye Crosby was at a UCFW meeting.

The campus has recently gone through a process establishing an allocation process for transitional housing and also a long-term allocation process. Provost Simpson is working on the question of what fractions of our housing resources should be allocated to staff, Senate faculty and non-Senate faculty. There are presently 94 people on the transition list and they have been given a chance to decide whether they are interested in the Inclusionary Area D, which is now called Ranchview Terrace, going into Hager Court, or to putting their names up for either Cardiff or Hager Meadows. Out of the 94 on the list, 22 have said they will accept a unit in Hager Court.

An updated slide with for-sale housing and unmet demand was reviewed. North campus housing was omitted from this slide due to the uncertainty of development of north campus at this time. The slide was also updated for the changes in the transition waiting list and for the new list. It is necessary to build additional affordable housing for faculty and staff so we do not put such a big impact on the local community. The Ranchview Terrace is on schedule to admit people around the fall of 2005. CFW member Roger Anderson thanked Steve Hauser and Jean Marie Scott for their wonderful work in facilitating the presentation of this information.

12. New Business

Professor Paul Ortiz thanked senior colleagues in the Senate for their assistance in the mechanics of putting the resolution together. The current resolution has the support of 112 members of the Academic Senate. He commented that the issue of non-violence in our communities, in our campus environments, and the world at large is core to what we do as educators.

Professor Stephen Thorsett made a motion to substitute the text of the main motion in its entirety. Professor Ortiz accepted the substitute resolution.

Professor Bruce Bridgeman offered a friendly amendment to include a “whereas” to the substitute resolution. Professor Paul Ortiz accepted this friendly amendment.

Professor Ronnie Gruhn suggested a friendly amendment, adding “so far” to the first whereas. Professor Paul Ortiz accepted this friendly amendment.

Professor Allen Van Gelder inquired about the proper way to vote if one does not agree with some of the whereases, but agrees with the final resolution. Chair Blumenthal commented that it is a personal decision and one needs to follow one’s conscience. Professor Michael Cowan stated that it would be appropriate to have a resolution with no whereases. Professor Paul Ortiz stated the most important issue is to pass the resolution and he would like it to go through in the form with the friendly amendments. Professor

Joe Bunnett proposed an amendment that the whereases be stricken from the resolution. This amendment failed since the motion was not seconded.

The substitute resolution with all amendments is as follows:

Resolution Against Unilateral U.S. Military Intervention in Iraq

Whereas, No proven link has been established between the attacks on September 11, 2001, and the government of Iraq, and the government of Iraq has so far not been shown to pose a clear and present danger to the security of the United States or its citizens; and

Whereas, Diplomatic efforts and weapons inspections continue in Iraq, the international community has not lent its support for war against Iraq, and unilateral preemptive action against Iraq by the United States would undermine the basic foundations of international law; and

Whereas, A war with Iraq would jeopardize the lives of American soldiers as well as the lives of Iraqi civilians who have already suffered enormously under the current Iraqi regime; and

Whereas, A war with Iraq would further aggravate tensions in the Middle East and escalate anti-American sentiment around the world, increasing support for Al-Qaeda and other extremist groups and increasing the threat of terrorism against Americans and others; and

Whereas, A war with Iraq would significantly impact the University of California, Santa Cruz, through the lives of campus community members and their families and through the diversion of hundreds of billions of dollars to warfare at a time that education funding for the current and next generation of students is being drastically cut; and

Whereas, A war in Iraq would interfere with numerous University international initiatives and programs; therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Santa Cruz Division of the Academic Senate of the University of California urges the government of the United States of America to work with the United Nations to obtain compliance by Iraq with United Nations Security Council resolutions concerning the disarmament by Iraq of nuclear, chemical, and biological weapons and to fully support the work of the international weapons inspectors in Iraq; and

Resolved, That the Santa Cruz Division of the Academic Senate of the University of California opposes unilateral preemptive war against Iraq.

Professor Nancy Stoller spoke in favor of the resolution and urged her colleagues to vote in favor of it.

The motion was passed by a vote of 58 in favor, 0 opposed, and 2 abstentions.

Chair Blumenthal adjourned the meeting at 4:51 pm.

ATTEST:

Dave Belanger

Secretary

April 15, 2003