Consolidation Implementation Committee (CIC)
Minutes
May 10, 2017

Military Science Building
Georgia Southern University Campus
2:00 p.m.

****

I. Welcome and Opening Remarks – The meeting was called to order at 2:02 p.m.

President Hebert welcomed everyone to the meeting and recognized Ms. Kenyatta Johnson (Exec. Director of Enterprise Risk Management) and Dr. Marti Venn (Deputy VC, Academic Affairs) from the University System Office. Dr. Hebert also acknowledged the number of visitors in attendance.

II. Consolidation Business

A. Senior Leadership Team – Dr. Hebert referenced the May 5th announcement on the appointment of the Vice Presidents. He also noted he was in the process of interviewing for the remaining direct report positions and to expect that announcement the following week.

B. Other – Dr. Richard Flynn requested the CIC agendas be available one week prior to the meeting, citing Georgia's Open Meetings Act. VC Fuchko stated he would inquire with the USO's legal team.

III. Review of OWG Recommendations

Dr. Hebert noted recommendations on the agenda are just that; they are recommendations coming from the OWGs and if included on the consent agenda, it indicates there was general consent within the OWGs to move the recommendations forward. Dr. Hebert continued to say if there was no discussion, as well as general consensus, the recommendation would be considered approved by the CIC.

A. OWG 3-1: Organization and Structure – Co-chairs: Jean Bartels (GSU) and Robert Smith (ASU)

The following recommendation was not approved by the CIC and sent back to the OWG for further discussion. Alternative academic structure proposals should be submitted to Randy Stuart by 5:00 p.m. on May 17 and will be presented at the next CIC meeting (May 24).

1. **Recommends that the academic structure of the consolidated university consist of nine colleges: the Allen E. Paulson College of Engineering and Computing, College of Arts and Humanities, College of Behavioral and Social Sciences, College of Business, College of Education, the Don and Cindy Waters College of Health Professions, the Jiann-Ping Hsu College of Public Health, College of Science and Mathematics and the J.N. Averitt College of Graduate Studies, with departments as indicated on the attached organizational chart:**

   The academic organization of the two universities is somewhat different, given our different programs and based on the size of the respective faculties and numbers of majors in each area. The recommended structure retains those colleges unique to Georgia Southern (Colleges of Business, Engineering, Public Health and Graduate Studies), while for the most part, combining the two current universities' Colleges of Education, Health Professions and Science. The proposal includes moving several departments and notably, dividing the liberal arts and social sciences into two new colleges that will be more manageable across the three campuses.

B. OWG 5-2: Faculty Welfare – Co-chairs: Jim LoBue (GSU) and Bob LeFavi (ASU)

The following recommendations, with an edit to recommendation #2, were approved by consensus of the CIC with no objections.

1. **Recommends the continued use of the GS statement in section 201 of the faculty handbook with the addition of an introductory sentence taken from the ARM faculty handbook.:**

   The committee was quite satisfied with the GS statement.

   Reference: Faculty Handbook: GS 201

   Georgia Southern University supports the statement on Academic Freedom by the American Association of University Professors: *http://www.aaup.org/AAUP/pubsres/policydocs/contents/1940statement.htm*

   PREAMBLE The purpose of this statement is to promote public understanding and support of academic freedom. Academic freedom exists within the institutional framework of shared governance in which collegial forms of

deliberations are valued, responsibilities are shared, and constructive joint thought and action are fostered among the components of the academic institution.[1] Institutions of higher education are conducted for the common good and not to further the interests of either the individual or the institution. The common good depends upon the free search for truth and its free exposition. Academic freedom is essential to these purposes and applies to both teaching and research. Freedom in research is fundamental to the advancement of truth. Academic freedom in its teaching aspect is fundamental for the protection of the rights of the teacher in teaching and of the student to freedom in learning.[2] Membership in the academic community imposes on students, faculty members, administrators, and board members an obligation to respect the dignity of others, to acknowledge their right to express differing opinions, and to foster and defend intellectual honesty, freedom of inquiry, and free expression on and off the campus.[3]

ACADEMIC FREEDOM[4] Teachers are entitled to freedom in the classroom in discussing issues relevant to their subject. Pedagogical decisions should be made by the faculty in accordance with the policies of that academic unit. Pedagogical decisions should be consistent with university policies, codes of professional ethics and conduct as well as the educational goals of the course and the evaluation standards held in the academic unit.

Teachers are entitled to full freedom in scholarly activities and in dissemination of the results, subject to the adequate performance of their other academic duties. Scholarly activities for pecuniary return should be based upon policies established by the governing bodies of the institution and the University System.

College and university teachers are citizens, members of a learned profession, and officers of an educational institution. When they speak or write as citizens, they should be free from institutional censorship or discipline, but their special position in the community imposes special obligations. As scholars and educational officers, they should remember that the public may judge their profession and their institution by their utterances. Hence, they should at all times be accurate, should exercise appropriate restraint, should show respect for the opinions of others, and should make every effort to indicate that they are not speaking for the institution.

End Notes:
1 based on the Joint Statement on Government of Colleges and Universities, as it appears in the *AAUP Policy Documents and Reports*, 7th edition, 1990:119.
2 based on the 1940 Statement of Principles on Academic Freedom and Tenure, as it appears in the *AAUP Policy Documents and Reports*, 7th edition, 1990:3.

3 based on A Statement of the Association's Council: Freedom and Responsibility, as it appears in the *AAUP Policy Documents and Reports*, 7th edition, 1990:77.
4 based on the 1940 Statement of Principles on Academic Freedom and Tenure, as it appears in the *AAUP Policy Documents and Reports*, 7th edition, 1990:3-4.

2. **Recommends that the definition of "Faculty" based on the Georgia Southern and Armstrong statements with reference given to the Board of Regents Statement. In addition, the specific responsibilities of the Corps of Instruction are described:**

We simply retain the definition of "Faculty" previously described. The actual recommended statement follows.

Reference: Faculty Handbooks: ARM 101.2.4 and GS 104.4

The university faculty consists of the President, the Provost/Vice President for Academic Affairs, Vice Presidents, Academic Deans, Associate/Assistant Deans, the Director of the Library/Chief Librarian, the Director of Admissions, the Registrar, and the Corps of Instruction. The Corps of Instruction for each undergraduate college consists of the professors, associate professors, assistant professors, instructors, senior lecturers, lecturers, limited-term faculty, clinical assistants, clinical associates, and clinical professors. The members of the graduate faculty are appointed by the President on recommendation of the Provost, the Dean or Director of Graduate Studies, and the Graduate Committee.

http://www.usg.edu/policymanual/section3/C337/#p3.2.1_faculty_membership

It is the responsibility of the Corps of Instruction in each college to establish entrance requirements, define courses of study, establish requirements for degrees offered in the college, provide mentorship to the students in the college, and adopt regulations to govern its own procedures for the orderly and efficient administration of the college. The Corps of Instruction is responsible for regulations affecting academic activities, the general educational policy of the University, the welfare of the faculty, and related matters that maintain and promote the best interest of the faculty and of the University. The representative and legislative agency for these activities is the Faculty Senate (Statutes, Article IV).

3. **Recommends accepting Georgia Southern's statement on the evaluation of administrators:**

   There was little discussion and no contention with this recommendation. All committee members were satisfied with this faculty handbook item. We have added a brief statement to each section (for deans and for chairs) that provides contingency for the possibility that a fifth year review is missed in a given year.

   Reference: **Faculty Handbook: GS 104.3**

   Evaluation of Administrators
   In addition to annual performance appraisals, senior administrators (vice presidents, deans, and directors) undergo in-depth performance review and evaluation every fifth year. In Academic Affairs, the survey portion of this process is carried out for deans, directors, and department chairs annually to provide information for continuous improvement. The review seeks input from subordinates and peers and focuses on the administrator's management and organizational ability, leadership, and progress on the unit's stated goals and objectives.

   Periodic Review of Deans

   Deans shall undergo a comprehensive performance review every five years. A request for an earlier review may be made if asked for by a minimum of 30% of the college's voting membership (as defined in Article 1, *Section 3*, of the University's *Statutes*—Corps of Instruction). In the fifth year of a dean's tenure, and shortly after the fifth annual evaluation, the Provost shall conduct the performance review.

   The performance review will include examination of all responsibilities of the position of dean. The review portfolio will contain at a minimum: the dean's curriculum vitae, summary of the dean's accomplishments over the last five years, the dean's goals for the upcoming five years, the college faculty's annual evaluations (including electronic evaluations) of the dean, and the Provost's annual evaluations of the dean.

   Faculty, staff, and department chairs of the college, and peer deans will be surveyed separately. A copy of the dean's review portfolio will be provided for members of the college to read prior to their participation in the survey. The Provost will also seek input from the Office of University Advancement concerning the dean's fundraising efforts.

At the conclusion of the review, the Provost will provide faculty of the college a written report summarizing the performance review. In addition to the Provost's comments, the report will describe, in general terms, faculty sentiment toward the dean's performance. The Provost will meet with interested faculty to discuss the report. A separate meeting will be similarly held for department chairs.
Approved by Faculty Senate, June 4, 2013; approved by President, June 10, 2013.

Should a fifth year review fail to be completed by the end of the academic year for reasons beyond the administrators' control, the process is to be initiated and completed by the end of the next regular semester.

Periodic Review of Department Chairs

Department chairs shall undergo a thorough performance review every five years. A request for an earlier review may be made if asked for by a minimum of 30% of the department's voting membership (as defined in

Article 1, *Section 3*, of the University's *Statutes*—Corps of Instruction). In the fifth year of a chair's tenure, and as soon as possible after the chair's fifth annual evaluation, the dean of the chair's college shall conduct said review. This review shall include:

1. A review by the department's voting membership of the chair's review portfolio, which shall include at a minimum: the chair's curriculum vitae, the chair's annual reports to the dean, a summary of the chair's accomplishments over the past five years, a summary of the chair's goals for the department for the next five years, the faculty's annual evaluations (including electronic evaluations) of the chair, and the dean's annual evaluations of the chair.
2. A meeting between the dean and the voting membership of the faculty to discuss the job performance of the chair.
3. A vote by the department's voting membership indicating whether they support or not the chair's job performance and including any written comments the faculty wishes to submit.

Voting will be conducted by anonymous ballot at the time of the meeting or by a similar anonymous electronic method. Two members of the department will tabulate votes with the results being presented to department members and the dean. After considering the advisory vote, and following any further consultation between the dean and faculty, the dean will decide if the chair shall continue employment in that role. Whatever the dean decides, he/she will provide to the faculty in writing an explanation of his/her decision.

Should a fifth year review fail to be completed by the end of the academic year for reasons beyond the administrators' control, the process is to be initiated and completed by the end of the next regular semester.

C. **OWG 5-3: Faculty Processes/Resources –** Co-chairs: Diana Cone (GSU) and Donna Brooks (ASU)

The following recommendation was approved by consensus of the CIC with no objections.

1. **Recommends merging Armstrong State University's Xitracs database for faculty credentials into Georgia Southern's Xitracs database and administering through the Provost's Office. Armstrong State University will need to update the Xitracs database prior to merging the two sets of faculty credentials:**

   The faculty credentialing processes are quite similar at the two institutions with both institutions using Xitracs. The committee reached consensus to merge Armstrong State University's Xitracs database for faculty credentials into Georgia Southern University's Xitracs database and administer through the Provost's Office. This recommendation is made with the understanding that Armstrong's Xitracs database needs to be updated for the last three years first.

D. **OWG 6-3: First-Year Programs –** Co-chairs: Chris Caplinger (GSU) and Greg Anderson (ASU)

The following recommendation was approved by consensus of the CIC with no objections.

1. **Recommends that the new Georgia Southern University shall require a two-credit hour First-Year Seminar of all students who enter the university except those who transfer in 30 or more earned credit hours. The Seminar shall be taken by all required students their first term of enrollment:**

   Presently, ASU requires a one credit seminar which focuses on information literacy and campus engagement, and GSU requires a two credit seminar which focuses on information literacy and extended orientation topics including values clarification and goal setting. The primary focus of the new course will be the development and application of information literacy skills within an academic theme or a linked core curriculum course. Furthermore, the seminar will extend the application of information literacy skills to individualized academic planning and a holistic approach to each student's unique educational experience.

E. **OWG 7-1: Research Services and Sponsored Programs –** Co-chairs: Bruxanne Hein (GSU) and Brent Feske (ASU)

The following recommendations, with an edit to recommendation #2, were approved by consensus of the CIC with no objections.

1. **Recommends that all current Georgia Southern policies and procedures for the Office of Research Services and Sponsored Programs remain in place for the new Georgia Southern University:**

   The policies and procedures going forward will be more robust and will utilize software that will streamline grant submissions and awards.

2. **Recommends that a consultant is hired to review Armstrong and GSU IP policies and generate a new policy for consideration by the new Georgia Southern University:**

   Armstrong and GSU lack the proper IP expertise to generate a new IP policy.

F. **OWG 7-2: Research Integrity -** Co-chairs: Bruxanne Hein (GSU) and Brent Feske (ASU)

The following recommendations were approved by consensus of the CIC with no objections.

1. **Recommends that all current Georgia Southern policies and procedures for Research Integrity and Compliance remain in place for the new Georgia Southern University. These policies and procedures will disseminate to faculty and staff through the Office of Research and Sponsored Programs (ORSSP) and the Office of Research Integrity (ORI):**

   The policies and procedures going forward will be more robust, increase accessibility to faculty, remove the burden of administration of research compliance committees from the faculty, and will provide more support to faculty through professional staffing and development.

2. **Recommends that all current Georgia Southern compliance committees for human and animal subject research, biosafety, and other areas will remain in place and functioning for the new Georgia Southern University. The Office of Research Integrity will begin inclusion of faculty members from the Armstrong campus on the committee rosters once the consolidation is complete:**

The committees going forward will be more robust, increase accessibility to faculty, remove the burden of the complex administration of research compliance from the faculty, and will provide better support to faculty on research compliance.

3. **Recommends that the university contract the services of a consultant specializing in export controls to review, evaluate and recommend a course of action and assist with policy development for the new Georgia Southern University to implement once consolidation is complete. Dissemination and education of the new policy and procedures will be the responsibility of the Office of the Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs:**

   The recommendations of experts in the subject matter will greatly benefit the institution in endeavors to remain compliant with federal regulations, as well as to educate faculty, staff and students on the role and importance of export control policies and procedures.

G. **OWG 11-3: University Philanthropic Foundation –** Co-chairs: Melanie Mosley (GSU) and Jessica Henderson (ASU)

The following recommendations were approved by consensus of the CIC with no objections.

1. **Recommends reviewing the current list of properties owned by the Georgia Southern University Foundation and the Armstrong State University Foundation:**

   Georgia Southern University Foundation currently owns the following properties: Botanical garden properties, Fair Road duplex (adjacent to Botanical Garden), Azalea Drive property.
   Armstrong State University Foundation does not currently own any real properties.

2. **Recommends that Building naming will follow USG guidelines listed at*:***
   http://www.usg.edu/facilities/resources/naming_policy_procedures
   Existing building names where naming stems from a BOR approved naming, will not be changed and as previously approved by the CIC, all named buildings currently existing on the Armstrong campus will retain their historic names:

   Naming opportunities on each campus will be restricted to those Colleges, buildings, classrooms, and designated areas that are not currently named (as a result of a naming gift). In compliance with the USG, naming opportunities

will follow procedure as indicated in the following website: http://www.usg.edu/facilities/resources/naming_policy_procedures

H. OWG12-1: Ongoing Consolidation Communications – Co-chairs: Jan Bond (GSU) and Allison Hersch (ASU)

The following recommendation was approved by consensus of the CIC with no objections.

1. **Recommends collaborating on consolidation communications throughout the process, developing external and internal communication plans, scheduling community outreach events for Armstrong and Georgia Southern leadership, drafting/distributing press releases and managing media (to support actions by the Board of Regents and Consolidation Implementation Committee), and organizing Town Hall events in Savannah and Statesboro at key stages:**

   Sharing clear, consistent messaging with target audiences across the region is important to support the consolidation process. By working together and conducting meetings with PR personnel to assess communication needs, Armstrong and Georgia Southern's marketing and public relations team members can share best practices for ongoing internal and external communications efforts.

I. OWG 12-2: Marketing – Co- chairs: Jan Bond (GSU) and Allison Hersch (ASU)

The following recommendations, except recommendation #9, were approved by consensus of the CIC with no objections.

1. **Recommends creating a three-phase plan for a combined marketing strategy, which will run from July 2017 to July 2018 and will consolidate budgets, messaging, creative materials and advertising:**

   Phase 1 (July 2017-December 2017) – Parallel messaging and selective marketing budget partnerships to avoid overlapping advertising placements. Transitional messaging for Armstrong State University will feature Armstrong and Georgia Southern logos with the "Stronger Together" tagline.
   Phase 2 (January 2018-June 2018) – Combined messaging featuring the Georgia Southern logo and coordinated marketing budgets.
   Phase 3 (starting July 1, 2018) - Fully integrated messaging featuring the Georgia Southern logo and fully merged marketing budgets.

A three-phase transition will enable Georgia Southern and Armstrong to coordinate marketing efforts throughout the consolidation process, supporting recruitment efforts and raising visibility in key markets.

2. **Recommend merging advertising strategically in order to increase efficiency, reduce overall costs and increase engagement among target audiences, including prospective students:**

   Phase 1 (July 2017-December 2017) – Parallel messaging and selective marketing budget partnerships to avoid overlapping advertising placements. Transitional messaging for Armstrong State University will feature Armstrong and Georgia Southern logos with the "Stronger Together" tagline.
   Phase 2 (January 2018-June 2018) – Combined messaging featuring the Georgia Southern logo and coordinated marketing budgets.
   Phase 3 (starting July 1, 2018) - Fully integrated messaging featuring the Georgia Southern logo and fully merged marketing budgets.

   A three-phase transition will enable Georgia Southern and Armstrong to coordinate marketing efforts throughout the consolidation process, supporting recruitment efforts and raising visibility in key markets.

3. **Recommends utilizing one centrally controlled, integrated digital signage system at all campuses, working with IT and Net-Tel to evaluate technology and to ensure consistency among digital signage systems:**

   A centrally controlled system capable of managing digital signage at all campuses will offer a convenient, cost-effective, integrated technology solution.

4. **Recommends expanding Georgia Southern's current licensing agreement to include the Armstrong Campus and Liberty Campus:**

   Georgia Southern and Armstrong both contract with Learfield for licensing agreements regarding university-branded merchandise, which will make coordinating efforts for campuses in Statesboro, Savannah and Hinesville locations highly strategic.

5. **Recommends ensuring that Armstrong Alumni-branded merchandise will be available for legacy use through restricted marks and/or a special "Alumni Collection":**

   Georgia Southern and Armstrong both contract with Learfield for licensing agreements regarding university-branded merchandise, which will make coordinating efforts for campuses in Statesboro, Savannah and Hinesville locations highly strategic.

6. **Recommends utilizing current processes and procedures regarding the use of the Georgia Southern logo, in accordance with Georgia Southern's existing Marketing and Licensing Policies:**

   Georgia Southern and Armstrong both contract with Learfield for licensing agreements regarding university-branded merchandise, which will make coordinating efforts for campuses in Statesboro, Savannah and Hinesville locations highly strategic.

7. **Recommends developing a master marketing plan to identify shared goals, target audiences and effective advertising to reach those audiences:**

   Marketing the new Georgia Southern University will require a new strategy which combines the strengths of both institutions. It is important to identify any changes in target audiences as a result of the consolidation and to optimize the marketing plan to promote flagship academic programs as well as programs with capacity.

8. **Recommends combining marketing efforts in order to coordinate messaging and to eliminate redundancy within target markets:**

   Marketing the new Georgia Southern University will require a new strategy which combines the strengths of both institutions. It is important to identify any changes in target audiences as a result of the consolidation and to optimize the marketing plan to promote flagship academic programs as well as programs with capacity.

9. **Recommends adopting the Georgia Southern model of "Communication Officers" representing the various areas of the University. Post-consolidation, the communication officers would be identified by area and would report directly to the Office of Marketing and Communications, similar to the model of Major Gift Officers in Advancement:**

   Expanding and improving Georgia Southern's current plan for Communication Officers will increase coordination with the Office of Marketing & Communications providing more effective and efficient marketing for the new university and its colleges and units.

   Recommendation #9 was not approved by the CIC and sent back to the OWG for further discussion.

J. OWG 21: Enterprise Risk Management (ERM), Ethics & Compliance – Co-chairs: Jana Briley (GSU) and Kelly Crosby (ASU)

The following recommendations were approved by consensus of the CIC with no objections.

1. **Recommends that the Enterprise Risk Management (ERM) framework and processes for the new University replicate those currently in place at Armstrong:**

   While Georgia Southern does participate in risk management activities to identify, assess, manage, and control key risks, Armstrong has fully implemented the process. The new University will need to establish an ERM framework (identify Project Champion and Project Owners; establish a Steering Committee and Work Groups); identify key objectives; identify key risks; and develop mitigation plans to manage risks.

2. **Recommends that the institutions be notified of the consolidated Ethics and Compliance Reporting Hotline (effective January 1, 2018) via email from the University's president during the first week of November 2017 in preparation for International Fraud Awareness Week, November 12-18, 2017:**

   In an effort to promote our ethical culture, USG institutions participate in activities each year during Fraud Awareness week. In preparation for that week, an announcement to both institutions will be made regarding the consolidated hotline. Information regarding the hotline will be distributed to the Armstrong and Liberty campuses during Fraud Awareness week.

3. **Recommends that the Ethics and Compliance Reporting Hotline URL remain the same as Georgia Southern University's current URL:** https://georgiasouthern.alertline.com/gcs/welcome :

   The name of the new institution will be Georgia Southern University, and the current URL is already using the same name.

4. **Recommends that the cost of consolidating both institutional hotlines be paid by Georgia Southern University:**

   The cost of consolidating both hotlines is estimated to be $500–$700 and is the responsibility of Georgia Southern University. The cost of maintaining the current hotline is paid from the GASOU Vice President for Business and Finance's budget.

5. **Recommends that the conversion process be handled by Mr. Wesley Horne – Director of Ethics and Compliance for the USG:**

   Mr. Wesley Horne – Director of Ethics and Compliance for the USG, is the liaison with NAVEX Global, the Ethics and Compliance Reporting Hotline vendor for both institutions. The reports will be forwarded from Armstrong's URL to the consolidated URL for a period of one year. After one year, the Armstrong URL will be disabled.

6. **Recommends that the Ethics and Compliance Reporting Hotline telephone number remain the same as Georgia Southern University's current telephone number: 1-877-516-3445:**

   The name of the new institution will be Georgia Southern University, and the University is currently using the same number listed above.

7. **Recommends that new hotline awareness materials for the consolidated Ethics and Compliance Reporting Hotline be created prior to International Fraud Awareness Week, November 12-18, 2017:**

   The creation of new awareness materials will coincide with the USG's efforts to promote an ethical culture. The University participates in activities each year during Fraud Awareness week and distributes awareness materials. Information regarding the hotline can be shared with the Armstrong and Liberty campuses at that time.

8. **Recommends that new hotline awareness materials for the consolidated Ethics and Compliance Reporting Hotline be distributed during International Fraud Awareness Week, November 12-18, 2017:**

   The University participates in activities each year during Fraud Awareness week and distributes awareness materials. Information regarding the hotline can be shared with the Armstrong and Liberty campuses at that time.

9. **Recommends keeping access to Armstrong hotline cases for the period of one year rather than migrating the cases:**

   Both institutions currently use NAVEX Global. The University will have access to Armstrong's hotline cases for the period of one year rather than migrating the cases because it is not cost effective.

K. OWG 24: Economic Development, Government Relations and Community Engagement – Co-chairs: Kendria Lee (GSU) and Michael Toma (ASU)

The following recommendation was approved by consensus of the CIC with no objections.

1. **Recommends that a structure be established under the office of the Vice President for Advancement and External Affairs that integrates local, state and federal governmental liaison, community engagement, and economic development to build upon existing relationships and advocacy at all levels so as to capitalize on existing partnerships and to maximize potential advocacy:**

   Consolidation will significantly increase the number of business, community, and political stakeholders and potential community and economic development partnerships for the new University. As the fourth largest university in the State, there will be an increased need to monitor and influence support legislative and budget initiatives at the State level. There will also be increased opportunities for federal funding through research and, given the proximity of the campuses to the largest military installation east of the Mississippi, expanded partnerships with DoD. At the local level, the new University will engage and collaborate with the communities in which it serves, while building and increasing business partnerships. A structure that brings together the contacts and expertise of both schools, while taking into account the unique character of governmental relationships local, state, and federal partnerships at each of the three campus, will allow a coordinated effort that maximizes opportunities, minimizes risks, and accomplishes strategic goals.

IV. Future CIC Meetings – Posted on consolidation website.

V. Conclusion - The meeting adjourned at 3:51 p.m.