

University Senate

April 6, 2009

Members Present

Members present at the meeting: 84

Call to Order

Senate Chair Holum called the meeting to order at 3:22 p.m.

Approval of the Minutes

Chair Holum asked for additions or corrections to the minutes of the March 12, 2009 meeting. Hearing none he declared the minutes approved as distributed.

Report of the Chair/Report of the Senate Executive Committee

Chair Holum welcomed everyone. He requested that the Senators keep their interest high and he reminded them of the upcoming meetings [April 23rd and May 4th]. Chair Holum explained that the Senate will soon be addressing the Good Samaritan Policy, among many other important items, including the Nominations Slate for next year's Executive Committee, Chair-Elect position, and other committees and councils. He declared that he is looking forward to the Transition Meeting when Chair-Elect Miller-Hooks will assume her position as Chair of the Senate for the 2009-2010 Academic Year. Chair Holum ended asking the Senate to join him in congratulating Ann Wylie for her recent appointment as Vice President for Administrative Affairs.

Special Order of the Day

Interim Report of the Work of the Climate Action Plan Working Group

Matthias Ruth, Professor, Chair, Climate Action Plan Working Group

Chair Holum welcomed Matthias Ruth, Chair of the Climate Action Plan Working Group. Ruth gave an overview of the Climate Action Plan Working Group and began a formal presentation by the Office of Sustainability.

Ruth explained that the goal of the presentation was to explain why this working group existed and to give highlights of the entire report, which is available on the Office of Sustainability's website www.sustainability.umd.edu. Ruth stated that he would conclude with a question and answer session.

Ruth presented a PowerPoint presentation including information on Greenhouse Gases, Carbon Footprints, and climate-related goals for the University of Maryland. He explained that the plan is now open for a comment period.

Holum invited the Senate to comment on the report of the Climate Action Plan Working Group.

Senator Johnson, Faculty, A. James Clark School of Engineering, asked about facilities management equipment, especially regarding two-cycle engines.

Ruth mentioned a chart from the presentation and replied that research and investigation on strategies associated with reducing usage is ongoing, as well planning for alternatives to the equipment for removing leaves.

Senator McDonough, Faculty, College of Computer, Mathematical and Physical Sciences, stated that he would like to congratulate the Office of Sustainability on the presentation. He stated that it makes it him proud of the University, and that he would like for this action to be shared with members of the community at Maryland Day.

Ruth thanked Senator McDonough for his suggestion and assured him that much dialogue is ongoing, so the community is aware of their work.

Committee Reports

APAS Committee Report Regarding the Arbitrary & Capricious Grading Policy for Undergraduates (Senate Doc. No.06-07-51) (Action)

Claire Moses, Chair of the APAS Committee, gave an overview of the proposal. She explained that changes were made to the current proposal from 1990. Moses explained that the SEC had questions about the policy and asked APAS to review and report. Senator Moses explained that they clarified and narrowed some of the wording in regards to changing grades, as well as made changes to various sections within. She talked about the changes made to the composition of the grievance committee, so as to add credibility to the committee.

Senator Moses stated that APAS did not change the existing timeline, but the timeline did not necessarily meet the needs of graduating seniors, which explains why APAS added a line addressing the needs of second-semester seniors. She also explained that APAS decided to have the records be kept by the Office of Undergraduate Studies.

Chair Holum thanked Senator Moses for the work of the APAS committee and opened the floor to discussion.

Chair Holum recognized Senator Gullickson for discussion of the first proposed amendment.

Amendment #1

Proposed by: Gay Gullickson, Faculty, History, College of Arts and Humanities

Seconded by: Dan Falvey, Faculty, Chemistry, College of Chemical and Life Sciences

Page#: 5

Paragraph: Paragraph 4 of referenced section

Section: Stage 1: Informal Grievance Procedures

Original Text with APAS Committee Changes in Red:

The department chair (or college dean in those cases where the chair is the instructor), in consultation with the department's director of undergraduate studies, will make a

preliminary determination about the grievance, taking into account that a grievance based on the argument that one instructor's grading standards are stricter than another's; or on minor imprecisions in grading, will not be considered appropriate for consideration by a grievance committee.

Proposed Text (Amendment):

(Insert after the words 'undergraduate studies,' in the first line of part 4:)

(or another member of the faculty in those cases where the department's director of undergraduate studies is the instructor)

Page#: 5

Paragraph: Paragraph 1 of the referenced section

Section: Stage 2: Formal Grievance Procedures

Original Text with APAS Committee Changes in Red:

If the department chair and the director of undergraduate studies believe a grievance should proceed to the formal level, the chair will appoint an ad hoc grievance committee to consider the appeal. This grievance committee will consist of 1) **the director of undergraduate studies, who shall be a voting member and chair of the committee;** 2) two additional tenured members of the department (**not to include the instructor**); 3) a tenured member of another department; **4) an undergraduate student.** The student member of the committee will be appointed by the department's undergraduate association. If no such association exists, the department chair will appoint the undergraduate student. Normally, the student representative will be a third- or fourth-year major in the department.

Proposed Text (Amendment):

(insert after the words 'the director of undergraduate studies,')

(or another member of the faculty in those cases where the department's director of undergraduate studies is the instructor)

Chair Holum opened the floor to discussion of Senator Gullickson's Amendment.

Senator Moses declared that while she was unable to query the entire committee, she personally feels that it is a good amendment.

Hearing no further discussion, Chair Holum called for a vote on Senator Gullickson's Amendment.

The result was unanimous in favor of Gullickson's Amendment. **The motion to approve Senator Gullickson's Amendment passed.**

Chair Holum welcomed further discussion on the entire report by the APAS Committee.

Senator Zlatic, Undergraduate, College of Arts and Humanities, declared that she was speaking on behalf of the Undergraduate Caucus. Senator Zlatic proposed a second amendment.

Amendment #2

Proposed by: Lida Zlatic, Undergraduate, College of Arts and Humanities

Seconded by: David Zuckerman, Undergraduate, College of Behavioral and Social Sciences

Page#: 5

Paragraph: Paragraph 3 of referenced section

Section: Miscellaneous Changes

Original Text:

3) Given that we never had any idea whether formal grievances were numerous or very rare, or whether there were many instances of instructors disregarding the grievance committee's findings (the complaint that was brought to the SEC), we have proposed that a record of all formal grievance proceedings be maintained in the Office of the dean of Undergraduate Studies.

Proposed Text (Amendment):

(insert at the end of the paragraph)

and that the APAS Committee should review data on those records within 3 years to evaluate the effectiveness of the new procedures and to make additional recommendations as necessary.

Chair Holum opened the floor to discussion about Senator Zlatic's Amendment.

Senator Moses stated that the Amendment sounded reasonable.

Hearing no further discussion, Chair Holum called for a vote on Senator Zlatic's Amendment.

The result was the majority in favor, 1 against and no abstentions. **The motion to approve Senator Zlatic's Amendment passed.**

Chair Holum welcomed further discussion on the entire report by the APAS Committee.

Dean Hamilton, Ex-Officio, Undergraduate Studies, stated that she had spoken with Mr. Terry Roach (Executive Assistant to the President for Legal Affairs and Chief Counsel) about the proposal prior to the Senate Meeting. She stated that he advised that the proposed definition is contrary to the original Board of Regents policy. As a point of information, Hamilton stated that the original 1990 Board of Regents policy established the limits of the definition. According to the University of Maryland Consolidated Policies and Procedures Manual, under Section III: Academic Affairs, item III-1.20(A) University of Maryland, College Park Procedures for Review of Alleged Arbitrary and Capricious Grading—Graduate Students and item III-1.20(B) University of Maryland, College Park Procedures for Review of Alleged Arbitrary and Capricious Grading—Undergraduate Students, the limits of the definition have been set by the Board of Regents, and it is up to each campus to determine procedures. She also expressed concern with the departmental time specifications and detailed administrative procedures outlined in the proposal. Thus, Hamilton moved to return the proposal back to the APAS Committee for further consideration. The motion was seconded.

Chair Holum explained that the motion can be further discussed and amended. Chair Holum opened the floor to discussion on Dean Hamilton's motion.

Senator Wallis, Faculty, College of Behavioral and Social Sciences, asked whether the definition referred to by Dean Hamilton applies to the arbitrary and capricious grading policy or to grading in general.

Dean Hamilton, Ex-Officio, Undergraduate Studies, explained that the definition is of arbitrary and capricious grading as outlined in Section III-1.20(A) and III-1.20(B). She confirmed that the Board of Regents has set the limits of the definition.

Senator Moses, Faculty, College of Arts and Humanities, stated that she wondered whether Dean Hamilton had given consideration to the possibility of bringing forth an amendment from the floor, instead of introducing a motion to send the proposal back.

Dean Hamilton, Ex-Officio, Undergraduate Studies, stated that she had not given consideration to the possibility of bringing forth an amendment.

Senator Moses, Faculty, College of Arts and Humanities, stated that someone from the office of Undergraduate Studies sits on the APAS Committee and helped to write the proposal.

Dean Hamilton, Ex-Officio, Undergraduate Studies, stated that while that may be, it does not change the fact that there is still a problem.

Chair Holum reminded the constituents that discussion regarding the motion to send the proposal back was still ongoing.

Senator Docherty, Undergraduate, Robert H. Smith School of Business, stated that he was looking at the definition as outlined in the 1990 Policy, and believes that the definition does not seem to differ from the new definition. Senator Docherty declared that the definition as outlined in the new proposal would hopefully be included in the current statement. Rather than send it back to the committee, Docherty stated that he would move that the 1990 definition be included in the new proposal, so that the two would be aligned. He urged a vote against sending it back to the committee.

Senator Zuckerman, Undergraduate, College of Behavioral and Social Sciences, stated that he agreed with Senator Docherty, and he feels that the new language falls within the limits set by Board of Regents. He feels that the new wording reflects what was written in 1990 with greater specificity and does not think that they conflict. If the Senate body feels that they do conflict, he urged that an amendment be offered, rather than send this back to committee.

Senator Cohen, Faculty, College of Computer, Mathematical and Physical Sciences, stated that there are subtle differences between the two policies, and he believes that the new proposal is slightly narrower than the 1990 Policy. He thinks that some students could find that they would have had a cause for grievance under the old policy, but not under the new proposal. He expressed that creating amendments on the fly is not a good idea. He expressed his desire to send it back to the committee for redrafting.

Senator Robert Buchanan, Faculty, College of Agriculture and Natural Resources, asked whether it would be better to take time to get a legal review of the document. He declared that he found that some of the new issues discussed in the proposal by APAS do not fall under arbitrary and capricious grading guidelines. He suggested that the committee go back and have someone from the legal staff review the proposal.

Senator Klank, Faculty, College of Arts and Humanities, stated that it would be a shame to send it back to the committee. He declared that it was a very good report; however, any conflicts with legal implications do need to be reviewed. He asked whether there was a way to vote on its adoption pending any changes that may occur after legal counsel.

Chair Holum explained that the Senate cannot vote on the proposal with the provision suggested by Senator Klank. He stated that the proposal is already on the floor to include the language from the 1990 Policy. He further explained that should the report be passed by the Senate, it would then go to President Mote who, on the advice of his attorneys, would send it back to the Senate if there are any legal implications.

Senator Klank, Faculty, College of Arts and Humanities, reiterated that he liked the draft and felt that it would be a shame that it would have to go back to committee.

Senator Moses, Faculty, College of Arts and Humanities, declared that she wanted to make sure that she understood the process correctly: if the Senate approves the report, it then goes to the President before it is made effective, and the President will run it past the Legal Office. She asked that if it is not legally correct, the President will send it back? She asked that if Senators vote for it in favor and do not think that it is illegal, it still cannot be implemented if it is illegal, and would be sent back?

Chair Holum indicated that she was correct, but that it would delay the process.

Senator Docherty, Undergraduate, Robert H. Smith School of Business, stated that the only discrepancy he could see was under Sections 1, 2, and 3 of the new policy. He stated that if the Senate votes the motion down, and does not send it back to committee, then he would move an amendment to strike Sections 1, 2, and 3 and replace them with the definition from the current 1990 Board of Regents definition word-for-word. He stated that the edit would not change the document or its intent, and may resolve all legal discrepancies.

Senator Wallis, Faculty, College of Behavioral and Social Sciences, said that he was an undergraduate director for eleven years, and that he is not comfortable with the proposal not being correct on a University level, because he feels that parents would threaten to sue. He stated that it would be better to have the policy be very clear. He said that no one was clear when they walked into this meeting, so they should not vote at this time. He believes that it should be sent back to the APAS Committee.

Senator Gullickson, Faculty, College of Arts and Humanities, agreed that it should probably be sent back. She stated that she was Chair of the committee that wrote the first section, which she does not believe that the APAS Committee changed. What her committee did was look to see what peer institutions have written in the area of Arbitrary

and Capricious Procedures. She said that it was not the goal of the committee to change anything to which the University is legally bound. She stated that perhaps the committee members may have inadvertently created legal issues, which they were not aware of at the time. She said that they tried to clarify the standards so that undergraduate students would understand. She then introduced Robert Waters.

Robert Waters, Associate Vice President for Academic Affairs and Special Assistant to the President for Equity and Diversity, stated that he is a little worried about the fact we would have committees debating diversity discrimination or sexual harassment discrimination cases instead of experts to review these types of cases. He thinks that the 1990 version leaves enough room for a wide range of activities to be covered, without committees having to make determination regarding whether discrimination has occurred.

Hearing no further discussion, Chair Holum called for a vote on the motion to send the proposal back the APAS Committee. The result was 57 in favor, 15 opposed, and 1 abstention. The motion to send the report back to the APAS Committee for further consideration passed.

Chair Holum thanked Senator Moses, Senator Gullickson, and their committees for their work on this issue over the past two years.

PCC Proposals pertaining to the reorganization of the biological sciences graduate programs in the College of Chemical and Life Sciences; (Senate Document Number 08-09-23) (Action) including:

Proposal to rename the Ph.D. in Biology as the Ph.D. in Biological Sciences
Proposal to rename the Areas of Concentration in the Ph.D. in Biology
Proposal to rename the M.S. in Biology as the M.S. in Biological Sciences, and eliminate all Areas of Concentration

Carmen Balthrop, Chair of the PCC Committee, gave an overview of the proposals.

Chair Holum thanked Senator Balthrop and opened the floor to discussion.

Senator De Freitas Soares, Faculty, College of Chemical and Life Sciences, stated that she is here to bring up a topic from about fourteen of her faculty constituents who do not think that they are being represented under these areas of concentration. She said that there is a physiological group of people who think that another area of concentration should be added to this proposal.

Dean Allewell, Ex-Officio, College of Chemical and Life Sciences, stated that the objective is to start with this set of concentrations, with the goal of adding more areas in the future. She stated that even now another area is under discussion and may be added. But right now, in the interest of establishing the umbrella program, it would be useful to start with this set, which is clearly absolutely needed, and then to take the next steps once they have the basic steps in place.

Chair Payne, Ex-Officio, Department of Biology, clarified that they have had some colleagues who have proposed a fourth area of concentration to the proposal, and this

proposal does allow for new areas to be created if faculty should so desire, which is one of the strengths of program.

Hearing no further discussion, Chair Holum called for a separate vote on each proposal:

Proposal to rename the Ph.D. in Biology as the Ph.D. in Biological Sciences

Holum called for a vote. The result was a majority in favor, 0 opposed and 2 abstentions. **The motion to approve the proposal passed.**

Proposal to rename the Areas of Concentration in the Ph.D. in Biology

Holum called for a vote. The result was a majority in favor, 0 opposed and 3 abstentions. **The motion to approve the proposal passed.**

Proposal to rename the M.S. in Biology as the M.S. in Biological Sciences, and eliminate all Areas of Concentration

Holum called for a vote. The result was a majority in favor, 0 opposed and 2 abstentions. **The motion to approve the proposal passed.**

PCC Proposal to rename the M.S. and Ph.D. programs in Natural Resource Sciences as the M.S. and Ph.D. programs in Plant Sciences (Senate Document Number 08-09-24) (Action)

Carmen Balthrop, Chair of the PCC Committee, gave an overview of the proposal.

Holum opened the floor for discussion. Hearing no further discussion, he called. The result was unanimous in favor of the proposal. **The motion to approve the proposal passed.**

PCC Proposal to establish a Master of Fine Arts in Performance (Senate Document Number 08-09-22) (Action)

Carmen Balthrop, Chair of the PCC Committee, gave an overview of the proposal.

Holum opened the floor for discussion.

Senator Johnson, Faculty, A. James Clark School of Engineering, asked about the document submitted by the committee; he wondered why the committee wrote about financial risks rather than financial implications. His second question regarded the financial arrangements, including a gift given by the Smith family and the University's commitment for this proposed program. He asked whether the University's commitment was made only for this degree, whether it was made contingent on approval of this program, and whether it took Senate approval into account.

Dean Harris, Ex-Officio, College of Arts and Humanities, replied that the college would never accept money from a donor guaranteeing the creation of any program, nor was

this only for one program; rather, it covers a series of areas in theatre, dance, and music.

Senator Johnson, Faculty, A. James Clark School of Engineering, stated that the proposal lists that the University intends to continue the \$2M set of initiatives permanently. He asked how permanently is permanently, and whether we are talking about no more than \$2M.

Dean Harris, Ex-Officio, College of Arts and Humanities, replied that there is a dedicated \$1M gift from the Smith family for each year for six years. He clarified that the University will raise money to replace that money seven years out; however, we are only talking about the amount of that money that would pertain to theatre. He then read a statement from Brodie Remington, Vice President of University Relations and President of the University of Maryland College Park Foundation, stating Remington's confidence that the University will be able to secure philanthropic support for the MFA program. He also declared that they have already raised some of the money, although it is still seven years out. He also spoke on behalf of the Provost, who has also committed money and believes that this is highly sustainable.

Senator Johnson, Faculty, A. James Clark School of Engineering, clarified that it should then read that there is at least \$2M, which is committed permanently.

Dean Harris, Ex-Officio, College of Arts and Humanities, stated that Senator Johnson's statement is probably more accurate.

Senator Johnson, Faculty, A. James Clark School of Engineering, asked if that commitment is despite any possible economic downturns that may occur in the future.

Dean Harris, Ex-Officio, College of Arts and Humanities, stated that he did not think that would be a problem because of the money from the University that will be ongoing in base budget, which is likely to be permanent.

Senator Johnson, Faculty, A. James Clark School of Engineering, asked whether the new courses have been submitted to the Vice President's Advisory Committee (VPAC) and whether they have passed VPAC.

Dean Harris, Ex-Officio, College of Arts and Humanities, introduced Elizabeth Loizeaux.

Elizabeth Loizeaux, Associate Dean of the College of Arts and Humanities, stated that the Office of Academic Affairs requests that we put through the VPAC proposals for courses after the proposal has been approved. The courses are all ready to go.

Senator Klank, Faculty, College of Arts and Humanities, stated that he was thrilled about this possibility and stated that it goes along with the Strategic Plan. He asked whether the word 'performance' is broad for theatre, as there are more aspects of performance than theatre.

Dean Harris, Ex-Officio, College of Arts and Humanities, stated that the word 'performance' in this particular context is well-established; it was pioneered by other

institutions like Yale and Northwestern University. It talks about performance that can range from Anthropological performance in parades or even to ‘acting out.’

Senator Klank, Faculty, College of Arts and Humanities, asked about the clarification of using performance in other areas, such as visual art.

Dean Harris, Ex-Officio, College of Arts and Humanities, stated that this use of the word is particularly for Theatre.

Hearing no further discussion, Chair Holum called for a vote to approve the creation of a Master of Fine Arts in Performance. The result was the majority in favor, 1 opposed and 4 abstentions. **The motion to approve the proposal passed.**

Human Relations Committee Report-Prayer at Commencement (Senate Doc. No. 07-08-34)

Willie Brown, Chair of the Human Relations Committee, gave an overview of the proposal.

Brown introduced the Reverend Peter Antoci, Episcopal Chaplain of the University Core Board of Chaplains, who was present to speak as a representative of the Chaplains and as an adjunct professor. Reverend Antoci read a statement from the Chaplains regarding their history and involvement in different aspects of diverse University life.

Senator Zuckerman, Undergraduate, College of Behavioral and Social Sciences, declared that he was speaking on behalf of the Undergraduate Caucus. He stated that after considerable debate, the Undergraduate Caucus feels unanimously that the Senate should approve this proposal and remove the invocation from commencement. He stated that it feels that this is primarily a student issue, and he respectfully asked that the body consider his statement when voting.

Senator Johnson, Faculty, A. James Clark School of Engineering, stated that if the University of Maryland had not had prayer at commencement before, then the University would be neutral toward religion, but since there has been prayer at commencement in the past, he declared that the passing of this proposal would imply that the University is anti-religion. Senator Johnson stated that this is the wrong signal to send, and that he certainly disapproves.

Senator Gullickson, Faculty, College of Arts and Humanities, introduced Professor Marsha Rozenblit, Professor of Jewish History in the College of Arts and Humanities.

Marsha Rozenblit, College of Arts and Humanities, expressed her support of the proposal. She stated that prayer at commencement, even when it is utterly non-denominational prayer, feels Christian to non-Christians in this country, which includes a lot of people. She said that even moments of silence feel Christian, because not everyone prays with silence. She stated that her real concern regards the separation of Church and State, which is one of the most important features of our democracy. Therefore, it is best not to have prayer in public space. She stated that this proposal does not demean prayer, but rather it puts prayer where it belongs—in the hearts and

minds of people in religious activities. She believes that it does not denigrate prayer by not having it included in commencement.

Senator Cohen, Faculty, College of Computer, Mathematical and Physical Sciences, stated that he strongly supports the motion on two grounds. He stated that the first reason is practical in the sense of keeping graduation as short as possible. He stated that the second reason is because, as a non-believer, he feels very uncomfortable that the assumption is created at these events that people feel that prayer is appropriate. He stated that he thinks that it is important that religious speech be not only tolerated but encouraged on campus, and that religion is a very worthy topic of scholarly discussion, but that part of that discussion should include skepticism. He stated that when there is a formal procedure where non-secular speech is put up, and skeptical speech is not, it creates an imbalance at commencement. He stated that he feels very strongly that this motion captures correctly the diversity of opinion on campus, and he strongly urged people to support it.

Chair Holum reminded the assembly that six minutes were remaining in the statutory time available for the meeting. He stated that he would like to achieve a vote on this issue prior to the adjournment at 5:00 p.m.

Senator Orlando, Faculty, College of Arts and Humanities, stated that she is also on the Human Relations Committee, and that the committee had been researching this topic for three years. She shared her support for the proposal. Senator Orlando stated that she pointed out early on in the process that even though the University had rotated religious speakers in the past, there was no space for a secular humanist or for someone to support an atheistic point of view. She stated that therefore, if they had suggested keeping the current rotating system, there still would not be a place for non-believers.

Senator De Freitas Soares, Faculty, College of Chemical and Life Sciences, urged that this is a moment for undergraduates, and that she would like to support the view of the previous undergraduate senator speaker on behalf of the Undergraduate Caucus.

Senator Gaskin, Faculty, College of Behavioral and Social Sciences, stated that he is opposed to the proposal on a number of grounds. He stated that he believes the proposal is intolerant of religious speech. He stated that while he can understand that some people may feel uncomfortable with religious speech, but it seemed to him that imposing silence was not the way to deal with the issue. Rather, he suggested discussion, and stated that he would feel better about having someone who is skeptical about religion give an invocation at commencement than not to have an invocation at all. He stated that the University has rotated many different religious voices in the past, and that to include another voice does not seem to be inappropriate. He stated that to silence religious speech appears to be nonintellectual.

Senator Zonies, Staff, College of Chemical and Life Sciences, introduced Marsha Guenzler-Stevens, Director of Activities in the Division of Student Affairs.

Marsha Guenzler-Stevens, Division of Student Affairs, stated that her position is the liaison to all of the Chaplains. She offered a statement: On September 12, 2001, when this University needed to come together as a community, fourteen Chaplains joined in that effort. That is the cadre of recognized Chaplains at the University, who are an

incredibly diverse group of people. She stated that she did not want to leave anyone with the impression that when they put their cadre of colleagues before any type of ceremony, including commencement, that they are not putting forth a beautiful tapestry of diverse faith and secular humanists.

Senator Zuckerman, Undergraduate, College of Behavioral and Social Sciences, called the question.

Chair Holum declared that the motion to call the question was not debatable and required a second. Many Senators seconded the motion.

Chair Holum called for a vote on whether to call the question. The result was a majority in favor, 7 opposed and 0 abstentions. **The vote to call the question passed.**

Chair Holum declared that the body has decided that no further discussion will be held; the question has been called.

Chair Holum called for a vote to approve the proposal, which would put an end to invocation at commencement.

The result was 42 in favor, 14 opposed, and 3 abstentions. **The motion to approve the proposal and end invocation at commencement passed.**

Senate Chair Holum adjourned the meeting at 5:00 p.m.