

**MINUTES**  
Executive Committee  
**Tuesday, January 25, 2022**  
**3:00pm – Microsoft Teams**

**Present:** Sue Doe, Chair; Andrew Norton, Vice Chair; Melinda Smith, BOG Representative; Amy Barkley, Executive Assistant; Mary Pedersen, Provost/Executive Vice President; Jane Stewart, Agricultural Sciences; Sybil Sharvelle, Engineering; Sharon Anderson, Health and Human Sciences; Antonio Pedros-Gascon, Liberal Arts; Linda Meyer, Libraries; Mike Antolin, Natural Sciences; William Sanford, Natural Resources; Jennifer Peel, Veterinary Medicine & Biomedical Sciences

**Guests:** Jonathan Zhang, Business (substituting for Rob Mitchell); Richard Eykholt, University Grievance Officer

**Absent:** Rob Mitchell, Business (excused)

Chair Sue Doe called the meeting to order at 3:02 p.m.

**January 25, 2022 EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE AGENDA ITEMS:**

**I.      Minutes to be Approved**

**A.   Executive Committee Minutes – January 18, 2022**

Chair Doe: Asked: Are there any corrections to be made to the minutes?

Hearing none, minutes approved by unanimous consent.

**II.     Items Pending/Discussion Items**

**A.   Announcements**

1. The Next Executive Committee Meeting will be held on February 8, 2022 – Microsoft Teams – 3:00 p.m.
2. The Next Faculty Council meeting will be held on February 1, 2022 – Microsoft Teams – 4:00 p.m.

Chair Doe: Our next Executive Committee meeting will be on Microsoft Teams on February 8<sup>th</sup> at 3:00 p.m. Next week is our Faculty Council meeting, also over Teams, at 4:00 p.m. Reminded members of the time difference between the two meetings.

Chair Doe: We will be announcing the Harry Rosenberg Award next week. Encouraged members to research what the Harry Rosenberg Award is about and think about who they believe may be eligible. The award is essentially about service to Faculty Council.

Chair Doe: The Faculty Council officers' election will be at our March Faculty Council meeting. We will be asking for people who are interested to send forward their nomination statement by February 18<sup>th</sup> to Steve Reising, chair of Committee on Faculty Governance. Stated that Melinda Smith will be completing final term as Board of Governors representative, and we need to consider who will be replacing her. Asked Andrew Norton to speak to plans as Vice Chair.

Andrew Norton: Stated he is not planning on running again for Vice Chair. The reasoning behind this is because he is not able to commit to becoming the Faculty Council Chair, and feels it is important for the next Faculty Council Chair to have a year in the executive leadership in Faculty Council. Encouraged members, if they are interested in becoming Faculty Council Chair, to put themselves forward for nomination.

Chair Doe: Thanked Norton. All three of the officer positions are open for people to recommend individuals, to nominate themselves or others. Stated she is planning on running for Chair, but that does not prevent others from running. There can also be nominations from the floor. Encouraged members that are interested, or if they know of others, to contact Reising prior to February 18<sup>th</sup> so the platform statements can be integrated into the March Faculty Council agenda, so membership can review them before the meeting.

Melinda Smith: If anyone is interested in the Board of Governors representative position, happy to talk over email about it. Has been a really valuable experience and happy to discuss further.

Norton: Happy to talk to anyone interested in becoming the Vice Chair.

Chair Doe: Expressed agreement, happy to discuss with anyone about chairmanship.

#### ***B. Provost/Executive Vice President Report – Mary Pedersen***

Provost Mary Pedersen: No formal report today. We have been getting ready for the Board of Governors meeting.

Provost Pedersen: We have also been having conversations with the Systems Office about what is happening at the state level with potential funding. We have been using that information to develop various scenarios. We have submitted four different proposal scenarios, so it is all in the formative stage. Understanding is that usually after the February meeting, it becomes a bit clearer how much support the state is willing to provide. We started at a 4.6% state funding support and have gone all the way up to a model incorporating 14%, which is higher than what that has been asked for before.

Provost Pedersen: The report from Academic Affairs is standard. We will report on the new joint masters, the three Faculty Manual changes that legal counsel has approved, and then we have the sabbatical report and the Academic Calendar.

Provost Pedersen: The other main focus we have right now is continuing to communicate and keep up on all the pandemic-related issues. The Teaching Continuity Recovery Team has been meeting frequently, with their goal to get communication out each week with all the updates.

Provost Pedersen: We are also focusing on Courageous Strategic Transformation. This will be presented to the Board of Governors at their February meeting. We are also excited for the Academic Master Planning Workshop on February 11<sup>th</sup>. Materials will be sent soon in terms of details for that workshop day.

Chair Doe: Thanked Provost Pedersen. Asked if there were questions from the group.

Chair Doe: Have a question. Asked: At what point would it be possible for the Faculty Council to hear about the emerging budget scenarios? Wondering if March would work.

Provost Pedersen: Think March would be a good time. Learning about the budget process here and realizing that it is currently extremely fluid, and things change dramatically. Believe it is too early to present anything. Expressed hope that by March we will have more guidance from the System level in terms of what they are anticipating as viable scenarios.

Chair Doe: Thanked Provost Pedersen. Asked if others had questions.

Smith: Asked if Provost Pedersen could speak to the current budget priorities. Thinking of the graduate student stipends that will be increased.

Provost Pedersen: In all four of the budget proposals, there is a 3% increase model for graduate students. There is some funding for Courageous Strategic Transformation. Another priority are salaries for faculty and administrative professional employees across campus. We have a meeting this next week, and we got a comprehensive report from Laura Jensen that looks at faculty salaries across campus and what it would take to bring it to different levels, equivalent to peers. Our goal is to have the data for the entire campus and to share it. Have suggested that this would be a good report for Vice Provost Susan James to provide to this committee once we have it together. Might be a month from now that we have it.

Provost Pedersen: There are a few other key initiatives that we could address in terms of things we have requested. Once we get feedback and have a better idea of the interaction with the Board at the Board of Governors meeting. Think we could give a presentation in March.

Chair Doe: Thanked Provost Pedersen. Hearing no further questions, thanked Provost Pedersen for coming to the meeting.

### ***C. Old Business***

### ***D. Action Items***

1. University Grievance Officer Annual Report 2021 – Richard Eykholt, University Grievance Officer

Richard Eykholt: The report is self-explanatory. One thing that is different from years past was the significant amount of disciplinary activity this year, which is unusual, and people may have

questions about that. Not able to share as much information about that as with grievances due to confidentiality but will answer questions to best of ability.

Chair Doe: Thanked Eykholt. Asked: Would it be fair to say that some of the changes we made to Section E.15 came out of this multitude of disciplinary actions that occurred this past year?

Eykholt: As we went through these disciplinary actions, had a learning experience. Have been the University Grievance Officer for six or seven years, but we have not had many of these. There were problems with the system and the process needed to be corrected. Believe we have gotten most of them corrected. There are a few more changes that we would like to see. Did learn a lot about the process over the past year.

Chair Doe: Does seem like an astonishing number at six cases, with them all being resolved through retirement or resignation. Expressed appreciation for Eykholt's service on this. After looking at Section E.15, realized there is a significant process in putting these committees together. Asked: Were there multiple committees, or did one committee hear all six of these as they came forward?

Eykholt: Clarified that none of these cases went in front of a hearing committee, so those committees weren't convened. It is quite common for Section E.15 cases to be resolved without a hearing, with the faculty member either resigning or being terminated. The reason for this is that people do not initiate this process lightly. Stated that it is not uncommon for this process to end with termination or resignation. What is uncommon is having so many at once.

Chair Doe: Recalling some items that appeared in the newspaper in the past year and a half. Wondered if Eykholt could speak to the role of media coverage and the way it functions in these discussions. Wondering about the level of confidence in how the processes do or do not integrate media coverage.

Eykholt: This is a very important question. Regarding the Section E.15 process, very comfortable. Tenure offers a high level of protection and do not feel media coverage influences the process. Media process can, however, make the process difficult on the faculty member, but do not feel it influences the way the University deals with the process. Cannot say the same for Administrative Professionals. They do not have the protection of tenure or the Section E.15 process. Since they are at-will, the media coverage can put more pressure on the University to wrap up their cases.

Mike Antolin: In regard to the press, unless there is a revelation by the press about the process, it is all confidential, so the press in these cases would only get involved if they were alerted that something was going on. Unless it ends up being a more public case, it can really only be instigated by someone with internal knowledge.

Chair Doe: Unless it is an issue that occurs in the public realm, if it didn't occur on University grounds and made media news. Question is to what extent those items are integrated into the hearing and how media plays a role in the evidence.

Eykholt: With regard to the six cases here, two of them were cases where there was media coverage. In both cases, it is because a faculty member was accused of a felony and there was a police report. Whether or not someone was accused of a felony isn't directly relevant to whether they are terminated. Obviously, however, this means something bad has happened. In these cases, there were questions of ethical behavior. You are right that unless a person goes to the media, they are not generally aware. Reiterated that there were no hearings, and the hearings would be based on evidence that administration would provide, not what the media would provide, but it is possible that the media would uncover something.

Norton: Seems there are a lot of cases where there are inquiries to the University Grievance Officer and their concerns turn out not to be grievable. Wondering what the value would be of a broader education campaign with faculty and administrative professionals. Administrative professionals may not have the Section E.15 process, but they may have other processes and can learn more about what the grievance process does. Wondering if we need to educate faculty more about this process and whether it would help the job of University Grievance Officer.

Eykholt: Education may help make the job easier but thinks that may not necessarily be a better thing. Just because something isn't grievable doesn't mean we can't resolve a conflict. Many things that are not grievable are discussed with administrators to help come to resolutions. It is true that sometimes people reach out and there is nothing to be done, but don't mind talking to people and referring them to the right place to go. Discouraging people from reaching out is not necessarily a positive. Sometimes people reach out simply wanting advice and to know what their options are.

Norton: Was mostly thinking that faculty thought they had a greater level of protection in Section E.15 than they actually might.

Eykholt: Clarified that Section E.15 and the grievance process are two different things, both where faculty have a high level of protection. Will say that the Section E.15 process is serious and is not a small thing.

Chair Doe: In the report, it seems that often there is a conversation and what emerges is that the action is not grievable. What Norton might be getting at is helping people understand that if their challenges are not grievable, that they are aware of their options and what offices may be helpful in those moments. Asked: How are people referred to other offices?

Eykholt: Believe the majority of non-grievable cases fall into one of three categories. One is an Administrative Professional who is being terminated and they are unable to grieve termination. When they are going to be terminated, they are notified and receive a chance to respond. In some cases, am able to help them and they end up being not terminated.

Eykholt: The second is a grievance that is not against a supervisor. You can only grieve actions by a supervisor, whether it is immediate supervisor or someone in a supervisory capacity. In that case, people can be referred to the Ombuds or to the Human Resources solutions partner. Can refer people to student resolution to deal with student conflicts.

Eykholt: The third category that tends not to be grievable is discrimination. In those cases, people are referred to the Office of Equal Opportunity. The grievance process does not deal with discrimination. That has complicated legal definitions and needs to be handled by the Office of Equal Opportunity. There are times when people can be referred to the right place, and am helping them navigate a system that has many different avenues for conflict resolution.

Chair Doe: Thanked Eykholt. This information is helpful. Asked: Do you see gaps that should be addressed? Wondering if there are moments in acting as the University Grievance Officer where it feels like something is needed in those instances.

Eykholt: Do periodically find holes and try to bring these to the attention of the appropriate group, sometimes which is Faculty Council. A good example of this is that non-tenure track faculty were not being treated well, and Faculty Council worked on getting contracts in place. Worked with the Provost's office and Faculty Council to make changes in the Manual or policies. Think we improve things, even if we don't fix everything.

Eykholt: Will say that one hole that is not addressed anywhere is just bad behavior from fellow employees. We have the bullying policy but bullying has a specific definition. But if someone is just exhibiting bad behavior, we don't have a policy for dealing with that. It doesn't necessarily constitute bullying. In principle, if somebody is behaving badly, that ought to be dealt with by a supervisor, and some are not good with dealing with conflict. We don't currently have a good way to deal with bad behavior. For faculty, the bar for Section E.15 is very high, so people are hesitant to go that route unless termination is on the table. The language around Letters of Reprimand might help. Currently don't have a good way for dealing with these inter-employee conflicts that can grow and escalate over a period of time.

Antonio Pedros-Gascon: Expressed concern over the lack of defenses for Administrative Professionals. Specifically thinking about issues of retaliation and not being covered by the federal protection of Title VI.

Eykholt: Had mentioned earlier that Administrative Professionals have very little protection. The University does a little better than the state with protections, but even so, there is very little protection for Administrative Professionals from termination. It cannot be grieved, but this is something we could look at in terms of Manual changes.

Pedros-Gascon: Title VI is a federal mandate. We cannot contravene a federal mandate, so there is no need to state things that are already protected.

Eykholt: Was trying to respond in the context of the grievance process. The grievance process clearly states that the termination of an at-will employee is not grievable.

Pedros-Gascon: Expressed disappointment in a system that is not following federal mandates. Stated that at-will employees are covered under Title VI.

Eykholt: Not disagreeing, just not sure how this fits into the grievance discussion.

Pedros-Gascon: It is the equivalent situation for which people have the right to anti-retaliation. Feels the institution needs to do something more serious.

Eykholt: We could look at Manual changes, putting in protections for Administrative Professionals. This is a conversation that could occur. However, this is something the University needs to do, because the state isn't going to do it.

Chair Doe: Requested clarification on what Title VI is.

Pedros-Gascon: Understanding of Title VI is that the anti-retaliation policies that protect federal workers and any worker is protected from retaliation. Feels it is a bad precedent to set by not following this mandate.

Jonathan Zhang: Going back to the grievance process, thinking generally of the healthy workplace environment. Suggested we look at some of the best practices of other universities. Maybe we can benchmark based on what other universities are doing and can take cues from what they are doing.

Chair Doe: Thanked Zhang. These are great ideas. Think what we are discussing here are other precedents at other institutions and state agencies where we could have comparable questions and see how they managed and were successful.

Zhang: It is entirely possible that these are intractable problems. We cannot, for example, prevent someone from perceiving someone else to be behaving badly, but that may be due to a clash of personalities. Just the reality of the workplace.

Chair Doe: Thanked Zhang. Asked if there were any other questions for our University Grievance Officer in regard to the report provided. Hearing none, thanked Eykholt for joining.

Chair Doe: Question before us is whether we are ready to approve this to go on the Faculty Council agenda for February 1<sup>st</sup>. If we are, requested a motion for this.

Sharon Anderson: Moved.

Pedros-Gascon: Second.

Chair Doe: Thanked Anderson and Pedros-Gascon. Requested a show of hands for approval to place on the February Faculty Council agenda.

Motion approved. Will be placed on the Faculty Council agenda for February 1<sup>st</sup>.

Chair Doe: Stated that once this report is given at Faculty Council, and they have a chance to review it as a matter of record, we will send out the survey for the University Grievance Officer evaluation. This survey is being conducted in a professional way, and Linda Meyer has led the survey processes. Institutional Research is ready to release it and the Institute of Research in the

Social Sciences will be doing the analysis of the open-ended responses. Expressed hope that this would increase confidence in the feedback provided.

Eykholt: Commented that he never sees the evaluation. It goes to department chair. Wanted to make sure everyone was aware that he does not see the feedback.

Eykholt: Wanted to also quickly comment again on Pedros-Gascon's statements regarding the federal mandates. This can sometimes mean going to court, which can be expensive. Suing the University is a difficult thing to do, so if we want extra protections, it will need to come from within the University.

Pedros-Gascon: Requested to engage with that statement. Feels it is immoral for the University to bargain that we may not be willing to engage in suing them. Am a big defender of the idea of having lawyers working for the faculty too and not just the institution. We need to be protected from abusive situations being predicated by administration and it is not right to expect that people are not going to be willing to engage in an expensive and extensive process. The University should have higher standards than that.

Eykholt: Had approached former President Tony Frank as the Chair of Faculty Council on several occasions about the idea of having a public defender for the University to represent the employee. Never went anywhere.

Pedros-Gascon: Thinks it may be a conflict of interest for the President to subsidize a public defender, but feels it is an absolute must to have this protection for faculty.

Eykholt: No disagreement here. This would be one way to approach this, to have a public defender. Thanked Executive Committee for allowing time to discuss this.

Chair Doe: Thanked Eykholt. Expressed appreciation for posing that question to former President Frank. Know this question has been posed several times.

#### ***E. Reports***

##### **1. Faculty Council Chair Report – Sue Doe**

Chair Doe: Based on conversation last week where we were setting priorities and discussing who should come visit Faculty Council, we sorted through the list of priorities and possible visitors, and feel we have a solid plan. Expressed appreciation for Anderson being willing to meet and discuss this. We have a plan to integrate as many voices as possible through a combination of written reports from some entities and some with oral presentations.

Chair Doe: For next week's Faculty Council meeting, we went ahead and invited Vice Provost for International Affairs Kathleen Fairfax and Kim Kita, who is the director of Todos Santos. We also invited Rick Miranda, our Chief Academic Officer for the CSU System, who has designed a new approach for the Todos Santos Center. The three of them have agreed to come. We determined that February was a meeting where we had the space and we did not yet have anyone

lined up, so we looked at who we could get scheduled. Expressed hope that this meets with Executive Committee's approval.

Chair Doe: We are working on the other parties that were identified to get them lined up. Some of the groups could be written reports that would be integrated into the agenda, while others could be full discussion items. Think we have a good sense of what we feel are priorities. We are acting them and trying to get people scheduled. Will keep everyone posted.

Chair Doe: We have been in conversation with the Committee on Faculty Governance and the Committee on Responsibilities and Standing of Academic Faculty around the Extension proposal, which is essentially a restructure of their organization to reflect, among other things, a conversion of their Extension agents to continuing, contract, and adjunct faculty. There are components of the proposal that are more complicated, so we have been in conversations with those two committees, Vice President Blake Naughton, and Vice Provost James. We are trying to get a sense of how the University feels about this. Wanted everyone to be aware that these conversations are ongoing and you may hear more in your colleges.

Chair Doe: Serving on the Teaching Continuity Recovery Team, and as Provost Pedersen mentioned, the group is attempting to get out weekly communications regarding campus circumstances around the pandemic. The emphasis of the Teaching Continuity Recovery Team has moved towards thinking about how best to support faculty and trying to figure out some concrete strategies. Asked members to reach out with any thoughts or ideas about what faculty need at this time. Will pass them along to the Teaching Continuity Recovery Team.

Chair Doe: The University Grievance Officer survey, as we mentioned earlier, will be going out after the Faculty Council meeting next Tuesday. Reported that it is costing the Faculty Council office around \$3,500 to do this. We need to think about this and whether this is the way we want to spend our money. It would be an additional \$3,500 for the Presidential survey as well. Stated she will be reaching out to Anderson, Norton, and Antolin, who expressed interest in helping out with that survey this year.

Chair Doe: Have been called into several meetings with Norton that are relevant to the conversation we had with our University Grievance Officer. There are situations that faculty are facing that may not rise to grievance, but are hard circumstances that they don't know what to do with. We are keen to find ways to help faculty and look at mechanisms that we may not have explored beyond the approaches such as grievance, the Ombuds, or Human Resources mentioned by Eykholt. Asked members to think about this and think about solutions.

Norton: Was surprised to hear that the University Grievance Officer survey feedback only goes to Eykholt's chair. Seems like quite a bit of expense and a lot of work for a line in an annual evaluation. If that is how it is going to be used in the future rather than improving the University Grievance Office, would suggest we drop the free response and just give them the scores.

Chair Doe: We could go back to what we have done in years previous, which was to do a much less formal reading of the open-ended questions. It was a lot of work and you don't want to

misrepresent, which is why we went the more professional route. Expressed agreement that it seems like a big expenditure for something that only goes to the chair.

Smith: Asked if the University Grievance Officer was a Faculty Council construct and whether he is compensated.

Chair Doe: Confirmed that the office is a Faculty Council construct. Believes the University Grievance Officer gets something, like course release or other payment.

Smith: Feels like Eykholt should be able to see this feedback while acting in that role. It seems like the goal of this is to have direct feedback in our decision to have him continue in that role.

Smith: Had a thought going back to statement about faculty needs. Think we are at a point where we can't just be thinking about in-class anymore, we have to think hybrid. Feels we should be able to facilitate a hybrid class as much as we can. This seems like a goal we should try to achieve because it accommodates the current situation of health issues, but also gets to the broader issue of accessibility. We should be trying to help people with various backgrounds who may have kids or other responsibilities. If they want an education and they are paying for it, we should try to help make it possible for them without creating a higher burden on us.

Chair Doe: Requested clarification on Smith's definition of hybrid.

Smith: Defining this as simultaneously in-person and online. Maybe even recording lectures for people who cannot make classes, although for some classes, this may not work and isn't as effective. There is so much that people are dealing with these days, so having the hybrid model built in going forward doesn't seem like a bad idea. Commented that the Board of Governors meeting will be virtual due to COVID risks, and yet faculty are expected to continue teaching their classes in-person.

Chair Doe: Mentioned to the Teaching Continuity Recovery Team that one of the things that faculty are commenting on is that they would like to see more leadership walking around. Had encouraged members to follow faculty around who are teaching back-to-back classes in an N95 and see what their environment is like. Faculty may not necessarily feel they are being heard when others who are making the decisions are not experiencing the same thing.

Pedros-Gascon: Regarding the conversation about evaluations, feels we should continue doing them to try to indicate the culture we want. If we stop doing it, it is counterproductive to the vision we have for how the institution should be working. One thing to consider is whether sharing the evaluation with him is a breach of Human Resources policy. Hadn't seen own annual evaluation until recently, but the information is valuable because you understand how people are seeing you. This kind of thing contributes to a more transparent environment. For that reason, feels we should continue doing these but we should also try our best to have the message being clearly delivered to the person. If it is not a violation of privacy, materials should be shared with the person so they understand what people are saying.

Antolin: Want to speak to the Echo360 business and trying to deal with new technology. Believes the College of Natural Sciences offers workshops on best practices and how to do this all correctly. Sat through some last summer in preparation for various things. The University does provide resources to help get you there, at least in terms of training. Whether we have enough actual infrastructure to carry this out is another question.

Norton: Have a comment about Echo360 experience. While doing hybrid last fall, would record all lectures and make them available. Doing face-to-face with the hybrid is a lot of work. We are trying to engage with very different communities of students, those that are in the classroom and those that aren't, and this is challenging. When we think about embracing hybrid, feel we need to figure out a way to avoid that.

Norton: To follow up on Chair Doe's comment about the additional meetings about issues with faculty, what we are seeing are examples of where departments and sometimes colleges are not following the department code or University code. It is particularly around promotion and hiring, and that is a problem we do not have a good solution for. Think it would be good for us to brainstorm about if we need a structure to review complaints and how to handle issues around departments not following their code.

Norton: Commented that an advertisement for a new Assistant Vice President for strategic initiatives has been posted.

Chair Doe: The Provost's Office often finds themselves in circumstances where they have to look at whether code is being followed. Could potentially discuss this with Vice Provost James, about commissioning a group who would essentially undertake investigations of situations that might not fit under the University Grievance Officer framework but somehow need to be addressed.

Sybil Sharvelle: Want to go back to Pedros-Gascon's comments about the University Grievance Officer. This is an important position in our University, and it is important to have the evaluation and that we think about a process by which it becomes useful and meaningful.

Smith: Think that many faculty don't know that Vice Provost James is there as a resource. Have directed several faculty in the past to that office when they needed a resolution but it wasn't necessarily appropriate to go to the University Grievance Officer. Maybe there needs to be education on that as well. Know her office is busy, but maybe there is a group that can help vet some of these issues.

Pedros-Gascon: Want to comment on Norton's announcement for the Assistant Vice President position. Had indicated to the President in fall that it would be good to understand the costs for these positions in administration. Would like to understand these costs and the reasoning.

Chair Doe: Thinks it would be useful to have specific and concrete accounting for how many positions have been added. Wondering if there is a way to get that information.

Norton: Would probably need an employee roster from a few years ago and then now. Some people are shifting around, so it's not all new positions, but can think of about six Vice Presidents that have been created. Would be nice to know the total compensation budget for the Executive Leadership Team.

2. Board of Governors Report – Melinda Smith

No report at this time.

***F. Discussion Items***

Chair Doe: Asked if there was anything else for the good of the order.

Antolin: There are various awards coming up, and one of the ones coming up is the Provost Awards for Faculty Excellence. Encouraged members to get their departments to nominate people. Several of these awards are geared towards early career. Will be running the evaluation for the group but we need nominations.

Chair doe: The Board of Governors also gives an award for teaching excellence. Will be serving on that committee. It might make sense for us to recognize some of these people at an upcoming Faculty Council meeting. Provost Pedersen is fond of recognizing faculty for various reasons, so we could do something similar. Asked Antolin to keep group updated. Thanked Antolin.

Chair Doe: Asked if there were other announcements. There will be a Parliamentary meeting next Monday, January 31<sup>st</sup> at 1:00 p.m. for those that are able to join. Amy Barkley will send the meeting invitation.

Hearing no further business, meeting considered adjourned.

Executive Committee adjourned at 4:39 p.m.

Sue Doe, Chair  
Andrew Norton, Vice Chair  
Melinda Smith, BOG Representative  
Amy Barkley, Executive Assistant