

MINUTES
UAF STAFF COUNCIL MEETING #214
Wednesday, February 23, 2011
8:00-12:00 p.m.
Wood Center Carol Brown Ballroom

1. CALL TO ORDER AND ROLL CALL

PRESENT

Kerissa Brady
Jodi Baxter
Amy Bristol
Sharon Corbett
Megan Hoffman
Carolyn Simmons
Gary Newman
Ben Tucker
Jennifer Elhard
Naomi Horne
Shelbie Umphenour
Joe Hickman
Pips Veazey
Juella Sparks
Sarah Spurlin
Dawn Dearing
Anne Williamson
Carol Shafford
Ryan Keele
Bradley Krick
Walker Wheeler
Travis Brinzow
Gary Bender
Richard Machida
Catherine Williams

ABSENT

Jon Dehn, Faculty Senate President
Nicole Carvajal, President ASUAF
Jeffrey Werner
Heather Leavengood
Kayt Sunwood

EXCUSED ABSENCE

Robert Mackey III
Sara Battiest
Bryan Uher
Mary Sue Dates
Brad Havel
Forrest Kuiper

GUEST(S)

Brian Rogers, UAF Chancellor
Karl Kowalski, Exec Dir / User Svcs
Julie Larweth, Executive Officer, OIT
Dana Thomas, Vice Provost
& Accreditation Liaison Officer
Florie Wilcoxson, Summer Sessions

OFFICERS PRESENT

Maria Russell, President, Staff Council
Margo Griffith, Vice Pres, Staff Council
Martin Klein, Past President

QUORUM PRESENT

A. Adopt Staff Council Agenda #214, Wednesday, February 23, 2011

Agenda adopted as presented.

B. Approve Staff Council Minutes #213, Thursday, January 20, 2011

Minutes approved as presented.

2. PUBLIC COMMENT

No public comment at the time.

3. OFFICER REPORTS

A. Maria Russell, President, Staff Council

The Board of Regents met Feb. 17th and 18th. As Staff Alliance Chair, Maria presented a report to the BOR. One Motion Staff Alliance passed was a Non-Discrimination Policy. You can find a copy of the motion on the back table. It encourages the Board of Regents to be more inclusive in their non-discrimination policy. The BOR did not take action, but will consider it. The BOR accepted the UNAC Collective Bargaining Agreement presented at the meeting. There was discussion regarding the Life Sciences Building to be built here and the Arena in Anchorage.

Also, on the back table there is a 19 page summary of the Fisher Report. The Fisher Report currently is being vetted by the administration and has been presented to the Legislature. Currently there are a lot of questions and concerns about the Fisher Report. It is being looked at as a general guideline and recommendation rather than “set in stone”. The President wanted us to know it was being used as a jumping board for change, not as the driver behind any changes. This summary lets you see what the administration considered important out of the Fisher Report.

Nominations for the “Staff Make Students Count” Award are now open until March 15th. Each MAU nominates one staff member. Nominations are open to anyone, students, faculty, and staff. Anyone you feel really makes students count. We send forth one recommendation to our Chancellor. The Award is presented at the June BOR Meeting. Please get that information out to your unit.

I attended a mapping workshop. The Administrative Review Committee is working on administrative inventory. If you fall within a strict administrative category and you are paid on unrestrictive funds, then your position is shown on this inventory. That committee is moving on to mapping processes and looking at ways to get those positions trained and Banner accessible within a week of hire.

B. Margo Griffith, Vice President, Staff Council

Electronic timesheet and effort reporting is moving forward. During our Feb. 8th Staff Alliance meeting a presentation was given showing the screens we would use for reporting. The HR folks in the departments have been required to put supervisory information for each employee. This will be concluded by mid March. This will link the employees with the supervisors in this electronic process. Once that is done, they will start testing the process and working out the bugs. It will go live in August. For some groups it will be really slick, and for others it will be very cumbersome. It will hold supervisors responsible for knowing their funding sources. In the beginning it is going to be a rocky road. It will be accessed in the employee's UA online account.

Alaska State Employees Association (ASEA) will begin trying to organize again. They will start the signature process again soon.

The Performance Evaluation form is in its last stages. The Human Resources Council will meet March 24th and if you have any input, now would be a good time to bring it to Maria or me.

4. GOVERNANCE REPORTS

A. Jon Dehn, President, Faculty Senate

Jon is not present to give a report, but the Dependent Audit was a hot topic of discussion at the last Faculty Senate meeting. The security of private information and the short notice for getting the documentation to ConSova were the issues. A Motion was passed regarding the Dependent Audit and he encouraged Maria to have the Staff Council do the same.

B. Nicole Carvajal, President, ASUAF

Nicole was not present to give a presentation.

BREAK

5. GUEST(S)

A. Karl Kowalski, Executive Director of User Services and

B. Julie Larweth, Executive Officer, OIT

Karl and Julie came to talk about how smart classrooms are upgraded. Currently OIT maintains 55 smart classrooms across campus with varying levels of smartness from having just a projector in the classroom all the way to having video conference, smart boards, projectors, and image displays. Over the years, many of these have been created with "*one time monies*" and there were no annual operating funds for upgrades or replacements. As this equipment begins to age, we have classrooms that are increasingly difficult to repair, rebuild or keep going. With budget cuts, we have had to make some tough decisions. As room equipment begins to fail and we didn't have the budget to repair the equipment, we have had to pull the equipment from the classroom.

We get approximately \$60,000 from the Technology Advisory Board (TAB) each year to maintain our smart classrooms and our three public labs for students. That does not cover the cost of equipment replacement. Last year we approached TAB and asked for a larger increase of the student fee money to pick up the pace in upgrading rooms. That was denied, but they did have some “*one time money*” they were willing to give the Chancellor’s FAST (Faculty and Student Technology) committee, provided we lowered the level of those classrooms. (Not build \$40,000 classrooms.) They asked that we put in a basic projector, a place to plug in a laptop and a working screen in the room. So that is what we did. So the next ten rooms that were on the schedule, we upgraded with new projectors and laptop connections, but what it meant was they had less computer equipment than they had the year before. We didn’t put a visual display, or any other equipment you would expect to see in a smart classroom. When people came back in the fall, there was less equipment, it *was* updated, but there was *less*. It was a condition of the funding. Since then we did get a little extra money from UAF. This year we have ordered computers to put back in those classrooms. Chancellor Rogers has announced increased funding for smart classrooms and when it becomes available; we will work with the departments and find out what level of classroom they want in their building. We will aim for lower level classrooms so that there will be more of them.

The question was raised: Have we considered smart classrooms coming under building maintenance. And yes, we have addressed this, however, there is just not enough funding to add smart classroom infrastructure on top of normal maintenance. Network wiring should be part of the critical electrical upgrading.

Gary Newman asked: Are we staying ahead of the curve with regard to video conference services?

Julie Larweth answered this question. Video conferencing is different. It is a recharge center at the statewide level. It supports all the campuses for video conference services. Because that operates as a recharge, it’s the break even type of model where they’re funded at the appropriated level to break even with their expenses at zero. That total amount, whatever it cost to run that operation, is broken out to each MAU at a central level each year so each MAU pays for it. Video conferencing service is a service for video conferencing, we don’t use money from the recharge to go out and build rooms at campuses. Departments typically build rooms for video conferencing; we will provide the specks and equipment. Then we know we can support it. SFOS builds a room for video conferencing and buys equipment; recharge will not refresh that equipment four years down the road for SFOS. Recharge keeps the central equipment up to date. OIT is charged with keeping ahead of the learning curve. It works as a best fit for each department, not cutting edge technology.

Richard Macheda questioned the use of TAB money for operational funding. TAB was seed money for new and innovative things. Karl said that over the past years, TAB monies have been used as a departmental refresh account. UAS and UAA TAB fees go into their general student computing use.

OIT event support and video conference services had to be cut because of this year’s four percent budget cut. There was nothing else available to cut from our budget.

A question was raised about Copier Security: Warren Frazier from Printing Services told us our Black and White Copier are not a security risk. There is not a hard drive installed in them. Our Multi function copiers are at risk. However, they are on a capital lease and at the end of the lease, UAF can buy them for one dollar and once purchased, OIT will remove the hard drives and they will be wiped. Also, facilities surplus department is aware and when a copy machine or a fax machine comes in, they know to check to see if it has a hard drive and they will contact OIT to clean the hard drive. If a department purchased their own copier, then it is the department responsibility to have the hard drive erased. Newer copiers are coming out with the ability to erase the document after the work is done. Some companies are coming out with solid state drives. Solid state drives cannot be wiped clean short of totally destroying the copier.

How is OIT funded? A few years ago there was a merger of UAF and Statewide to gain efficiency in services. It didn't make sense having multiple groups doing the same thing on the same campus. The funding source comes from both sides. It is a little heavier on the statewide side than on the UAF side, but there is not a service boundary. Typically we have 100% funding for any given PCN, either 100% statewide or 100% UAF. This doesn't mean you are a statewide employee or a UAF employee. You are an OIT employee. So at the end of the day when our unit takes a budget cut, we have to look at our unit operations. We have to look at where we have already suffered cuts, we have to look at which departments can sustain a loss, and then within that department we have to look at the individuals that are there, should one or more be laid off, what is the ability of the remaining people to pick up the slack and perform the necessary work to keep that department functioning. And then you have to look at employee past performance. Question: Do you support every computer on campus? No, the majority of OIT funding is spread out over all the units. Our mission is to support the overall education and research goals of the University. At the core we provide network connectivity to the outside. We provide video conferencing for everyone. We provide a chunk of support center services, training and desktop support. There are a lot of individual departments that have their own IT shops. They only use OIT for video conferencing and a network connection for their unit. Desktop managers work with distributed technicians on a daily basis. We work hard to forge a positive relationship. At the end of the day management must make the tough decisions to review operations and reduce redundancy and make changes that will increase efficiency.

Karl was asked to come back and talk about phone system issues at another Staff Council meeting?

C. Dana Thomas, Vice Provost & Accreditation Liaison Officer Two Handouts

There are two kinds of accreditation, Institutional and Specialized Accreditation. Dana is responsible for Institutional Accreditation. Specialized Accreditation is when a professional association puts a stamp of quality on a particular program. For example our Engineering Program have ABET Accreditation stamp on it.

Institutional Accreditation is mandated by the US Secretary of Education. The authority has been allocated to six regional accrediting associations, and they put a stamp of

quality on an institution and not individual programs so our students can receive federal financial aid and our credit hours can transfer from one institution to another. In 2001 we submitted an accreditation report. The commission had a group of evaluators review the report, visit the university and reaffirm our accreditation. This was good for ten years. The process has now changed. We have a full report, much like the one in 2001, due in September and evaluators will come in October. Beginning in 2012 we begin a new seven year cycle and reports will be due every other year as part of that continuous cycle. That will culminate at the end of seven years by having a full report much like we have now but we have a change to build it as we go with those reports every other year.

Many parts of this process is brand new to us. We must define mission fulfillment and as part of that we must identify core themes. Educate, discover, prepare, connect and engage. Those were the five core themes that UAF identified. For each of the themes we had to identify a set of objectives. And for each of the objectives we had to identify a set of indicators of achievement. Indicators must be achievements and not inputs. Broadly represent what we do. Much work has gone into creating the documentation needed for the reports. We are trying to find processes to make things more streamlined.

D. Florie Wilcoxson, Summer Sessions

Summer Sessions will be offering over 300 courses this summer. You are encouraged to get the word out. Please take advantage of your employee tuition waiver to take some courses over the summer. Summer Sessions will have something special each night of the week. The brochures are now available. There will be two really free markets this year.

6. COMMITTEE REPORTS

A. Staff Affairs,

We have two new Co-Chairs: Naomi Horne and Megan Hoffman
Staff Affairs has been reviewing the copyright issue brought to our attention; a computer that had not been owned by our staff member for four years was used to download a TV show. The staff member was charged with a copyright violation because the host address was still owned by that staff person making them liable. That issue has been cleared up however it was referred to Staff Affairs to see if it needed any further attention.

B. Rural Affairs, Brad Krick

Some topics we are going to address will be per diem and COLA, the effect of soft closure, especially on the Kuskokwim campus, and the effect it has on students there. They are required to vacate dorms during closures. I will meet with Bambi Nelson and Ashley Munro regarding the Peggy Wood Award. Our next meeting will be March 1st.

Maria stated that if Rural Affairs addresses COLA and geographic differentials they should work with the Staff Compensation Working Group. That is one of the topics they are looking at. Robert Mackey is on that group. He would be invaluable.

C. Elections, Membership, and Rules, Walker Wheeler

We have not had a recent meeting. We have new members coming in to our committee and this is exciting. I will be announcing a meeting within the next week.

D. Advocacy Committee, Jodi Baxter

We have not had a recent meeting. We will be announcing some staff tours and Brown Bag lunches that will be fun and informative.

BREAK

7. EXTERNAL COMMITTEE REPORTS

A. Master Planning Committee (MPC), Gary Newman

We are basically here to develop and adhere to the Master Plan. We meet every other week. We deal with a wide variety of things, for instance students want to put solar collectors on the SRC complex.

B. Subcommittee on Parking and Circulation Committee (SCP), Martin Klein

This is a subcommittee of the Master Planning Committee. The Master Planning Committee looks at parking issues from a planning standpoint. There is a website up, it is www.uaf.edu/lifescience, (no "s" on the end). There is a link on that page with a link for construction updates. That will be the site where facilities will put out what is happening with Life Sciences. There is also a link to a map. The map shows what's happening as far as construction and closures on west ridge. If you are interested in what is happening on west ridge, please go to that website. On March 14th the staging area goes up. That will shut off Sheenjak parking lot. That lot will be closed for the duration of the project. It is scheduled to be finished in 2014 and at that time the Sheenjak parking lot will reopen with a net loss of one parking space. On about March 14th we will find out if the gravity sewer repair work will happen this year or next. When it does happen the Sheenjak Road will be closed for that work. Go to the above mentioned website for construction updates.

C. Chancellor's Diversity Action Committee (CDAC), Juella Sparks

The mission of this committee is in your handbook. We are appointed by the Chancellor to work toward that mission. CDAC will be launching a campus wide survey assessing the climate of the campus. "Are we a welcoming environment to all race, orientation, age etc?" We are requesting information from HR related to Exit surveys. Are the exit surveys raising any concerns as to discriminations of any sort.

D. Governance Coordinating Committee (GCC), Maria Russell

E. Technology Advisory Board Committee (TAB), Brad Havel

This committee reviews proposals for the use the student fees. Tab redistributes these monies and right now those funds are currently used for tech refresh.

F. Chancellor's Planning and Budget Committee, VACANT

G. Student Recreation Center Board (SRCB), Carol Shafford

We will have a Blood Pressure machine installed at the SRC. Funding was provided through Loss Prevention.

H. Bunnell House Advisory Committee, Walker Wheeler and Heather Leavengood

This committee helps provide guidance to the director of the Bunnell House.

I. Work, Life, Balance Committee, Walker Wheeler and Heather Leavengood

Originally this committee was pursuing and looking at child care capabilities for the university. Visit the website to see the latest updates

J. Staff Healthcare Committee, Carol Shafford and Maria Russell

K. Intercollegiate Athletic Council, Pips Veazey and Heather Leavengood

We have met a few times this year with the athletic director and the assistant athletic director. We work on selecting the scholar athlete of the year. We review policies in the athletic department. We go over the NCAA updates and compliance rules, which are complicated and detailed. We help with the coach search committees.

L. Chancellor's Advisory Committee for the Naming of Campus Facilities, Maria Russell

This is a new committee. Currently we are creating guidelines to handout to all the faculty community about how do we go about naming facilities and how is a facility defined. The final rough draft will be out soon.

M. Accreditation Steering Committee, Kayt Sunwood

Dana Thomas gave us the update on this committee.

N. Meritorious Awards Committee, Maria Russell

The Meritorious Awards Committee will meet later this spring.

8. *ad hoc* COMMITTEE REPORTS

A. Staff Appreciation Day committee & Longevity Awards, Ashley Munro & Amy Bristor

Staff Appreciation Day is coming along very well. We have about 40 different sessions throughout the day. We are working out the details on longevity awards.

C. Staff Make Students Count Committee

Nominations close on March 15th and the committee will meet after the nominations close.

D. Chancellor's Cornerstone Award Committee, Nichole Kloepper

There were 45 nominations for this award and the committee is working on the selection process.

E. Staff Council Recognition Award Committee

This committee will meet later this spring. This is an important award.

9. DISCUSSION ITEMS

The Joint Health Care Committee voted to accept the implementation of the dependent audit. The people who contacted Staff Council members for the most part we not opposed to the audit, however they did have a problem with the way it was carried out. Gary Newman stated the Faculty Senate moved a resolution. They stated several things: (1) the timeline is very short. And (2) It is contracted by Lockton to ConSova. The university is not contracted directly with ConSova, so we are essentially giving personal information to a forth party. This raises many concerns. Faculty Senate thought it could have been done in-house rather than spend the sixty some odd thousand dollars to have ConSova do it. It is understood that ConSova is being paid partly by the number of persons they eject from the program. They also have a waiver of legal liability if you submitted it on the website. They **do not** use a secure website. Faculty Senate wants to see a cost and benefits analysis when it is finished. If you are having trouble with ConSova, contact Mike Humphrey. If you are having issues, be sure to contact ConSova so your insurance will not be dropped. If you submit tax return information, only submit boxes one through seven. Do not submit your financial information. Juella Sparks pointed out there are a lot of unique situations here and there is no safety net from statewide. ConSova is suppose to notify each staff member if their information is rejected.

Gary Newman proposed a motion to endorse the Faculty Senate motion:
(Attachment 214/1)

The UAF Staff Council moves to request that the System Wide Office address the issue of verification of health care dependents for all employees such that:

- (1) Delay the timeline for response to the audit to June 1
- (2) Utilize existing information at UA, through each HR office, rather than inconvenience every employee at considerable cost;
- (3) Accept legal liability for unauthorized release and/or loss of personal information in accordance with state and federal law;
- (4) Set up criteria, such as during open enrollment, to verify this data on a regular basis in house;
- (5) Publicize the requirements in an inclusive and positive manner to ensure compliance with state and federal law and to avoid misunderstandings in the future;
- (6) Include employees in decisions regarding their benefits and employment practices through the shared governance vehicle before costly decisions like this are made,
- (7) Report to the Staff Council the costs and benefits of the audit.

Motion was seconded.

Move to amend item (4) to state: Set up criteria, during open enrollment, to verify this data as needed in house;

The amendment was unanimously passed

Move to amend item (1) to state: delay the timeline for response to the audit to April 15th.

The amendment was passed with one abstention.

The Motion was called to question and Seconded. The vote was taken and the motion was passed unanimously.

One concern that was expressed: ConSova notified a staff member that documentation from the past 60 days was required as proof for a same sex partnership. So that staff member was given time to respond to the added requirement for dependent healthcare. Dependent healthcare was denied to the employee because documentation could not be provided.

One staff council member pointed out that ConSova is not held to our university standards with regard to discrimination. This should be concerning to us. We have anti-discrimination policies for a reason and ConSova being a forth party to us is not being held to those same standards. This is a double standard. The documentation

required is decided by ConSova and not the university. It was stated that Financially Interdependent Partners (FIPs) are having difficulty with ConSova in the verification process. The required paperwork for FIPs by the university is different than the paperwork required by ConSova.

At the health care forum last night with regard to: Loss of insurance or interruption of insurance. In a life changing event, fill out the paperwork and take it to HR, have them stamp it, and you will be covered.

Naomi put forward the motion that statewide work with ConSova to have ConSova accept and use the university's Financially Interdependent Partners documentation verification for the dependent audit.

Much discussion followed.

The Motion was presented:

We move that the University of Alaska statewide Human Resources work with ConSova to accept documentation already accepted by the university as being acceptable for the inclusion of Financially Interdependent Partners as a dependent

AND

We move that the university has the authority to reverse any recommendations made by ConSova on the rejection of dependents from the employees' health care coverage.

The Motion was called to question and Seconded.

Six Ayes

Five Nays

The remainder abstained

The motion failed to pass.

Fy12 Healthcare

Carolyn asked "what is the Staff Council position on the smoking discrimination". Naomi believes it is a slippery slope and despite the fact she don't smoke, she feels that if the university is successful in fining smokers and making people go through smoking cessations, when you single out one behavior, as unhealthy as it may be, it opens up the staff of this university for further discrimination. Many state legislatures have adopted policies that requests universities not to discriminate based on smoking but there is an exception for universities with hospitals. And where does it stop? Will it go to pre-existing conditions or a surcharge if you are pregnant or obese? Federal government prevents discrimination against obesity, but not smokers.

Another group that is targeted: if you pay for insurance for your spouse and your spouse has insurance, whether it is employer provided or through programs like Aflac, you would be charged an extra \$50.00 dollars a month. The Staff Healthcare Committee was

adamantly opposed to this measure because your benefits are being determined by your spouse. Your benefits are being decided by their benefits.

Amy Bristor: I want to share what I have been hearing from our staff and faculty in our area. Addressing how many dependents a person has. They do not feel that it is fair that somebody with one child verses somebody with eight children is paying the same rate.

Maria: That was one proposed change for FY12, but Mike Humphrey said it was too hard to do without hiring Sungard consultants to set up Banner. We challenged them to do it in-house and to start working on it now. It has support. They are increasing it to just three plus children, so it would not address eight children.

ACTION

10. NEW BUSINESS

Draft motion to support OIT dual representation (attachment 214/2)

The Motion was called to question and Seconded.

There were 21 Ayes.

There were three abstaining votes.

The motion passed.

11. ROUND TABLE DISCUSSION

Round table discussion is off the record.

Guest Speaker

Brian Rogers, UAF Chancellor

House Finance subcommittee: we started out with a small budget request and they trimmed it somewhat. Two projects they funded as *one time only* for the current fiscal year, Alaska Summer Research Academy and Summer Bridging Programs for Engineering. These were not funded in the next years' budget.

Collective bargaining contract: for the adjunct contract, generally we receive 60% of the cost of a new contract 40% we have to find ourselves now they decided 50/50 was a better ratio. The United Academics Contract, which has not been approved by either the union or the university, they again approved 50% of the funding, rather than the 60%. They made some general reductions on some fixed cost numbers. It is still a little increase over the current fiscal year but their intent is to continue move us toward a smaller and smaller portion of the university's budget coming from state general funds. About 42% come from state appropriation and they would like to work that number down to where excluding federal funds we would receive \$125.00 from the state for every \$100.00 we generate ourselves. This really pushes the university towards more

money internally. It also leaves us with very little flexibility for program growth or expansion.

Dependent audit: You are aware that a chancellor has no voice in union contracts. We have to continue to look for ways to reduce our costs and not shift our costs. Cost shifting is a game that nobody wins.

Another issue is that some of you have been involved in the initial process mapping workshops. We are trying to chart out how things happen at the university; how each of our key business and support processes work. There are a couple of reasons to do that: First, so that we end up with processes that are similar across units. So that when you move from unit to unit, you don't have to learn a whole new set of processes to do the same job. Second it is a training tool. Third it is an opportunity to look at, are there steps in our processes we can change to reduce time to get a process completed? This has significant promise to bring workload levels down.

The soft closure: The plan for this year is to not have a specific soft closure. The hard closure will remain. It will be up to the individual offices to determine how to staff if there are employees who wish to take additional time off. The soft closure did not have enough support to continue.

We are working on an Emergency Closure policy and we will bring it to the Staff Council for your review. There was a policy circulated in 2003, it is not clear if it ever took effect or was in effect. We made the decision under time duress, we will be reviewing what the process might be, going forward. There is no "*one right answer*" for issues of emergency closure when you have units that are funded with very different funding. We have some units funded with unrestricted funds over which we have flexibility and we have some units funded with restricted funds over which we have virtually no flexibility and we don't have pots of money to address differences between those units. Coming up with a policy that fits an extraordinarily complex institution is a challenge. We are going to try to work to come up with one that will address the biggest issues that we are aware of.

Naomi asked what happens after the 28th? Who does what, and are you aware of who communicates with Premara, does ConSova communicate directly with Premara? Chancellor Rogers responded he has no knowledge of the dependent audit beyond what he has read. He was aware early on, that a dependent audit was under active consideration.

Naomi asked Chancellor Rogers what was his opinion? Chancellor Rogers said he would love to do it over and do it right. Doing it in line with what you are already doing works a whole lot better.

There was a question regarding the implementation of the Fisher Report. The President and the Board of Regents do not see the Fisher Report as gospel or that we must do everything, but they see it much more as pointing to areas we need to work on. What are the issues we need to work on first? High on the agenda is getting more students to graduation faster. This will be the first item we will work on. Another item will be

Alumni giving. The report shows the national average of Alumni giving to be 13% and that the University of Alaska is at 1.7%. This is not an accurate picture. We are a blended institution. We believe we are closer to seven percent in Alumni giving. We do need to do a better job of alumni giving. We are going to work toward that goal.

Announcement:

Chancellor's Reception is today right next door.

12. MEETING ADJOURNED