

**WKU University Senate
Executive Committee (SEC) Meeting Minutes
February 9, 2015 -- 3:15 p.m.
WAB 227 - AA Large Conference Room**

A. Call To Order

- Chair Margaret Crowder called the February 9, 2015 WKU University Senate Executive Committee (SEC) Meeting to Order at 3:15 in WAB 227 - AA Large Conference Room. A quorum was present: Heidi Álvarez, Barbara Burch, Seth Church, Thad Crews, Margaret Crowder, Laura DeLancey, Gordon Emslie, Ashley Chance Fox, John Gottfried, Jennifer Hanley, Kate Hudepohl, Molly Kerby (guest), John Khouryieh, Patricia Minter, Evie Oregon, Julie Shadoan, Beverly Siegrist, Jennifer Tougas (guest), and Andrew West.

B. Approve January Meeting Minutes

- A motion to approve the January minutes by Julie Shadoan was seconded by John Gottfried. There was no discussion. The minutes were approved as posted.

C. Reports

1. Chair (Margaret Crowder)

- There are two new SEC Members: Thad Crews from Information Systems (GFFB) and Seth Church from SGA (Nikki Taylor has a class conflict this semester).

2. Vice Chair (Jennifer Hanley)

- There are four departments with results for the departmental senator elections.
- Vice Chair Hanley will check with current senators this week regarding eligibility for reelection next year.
- February 25 is the election deadline.

3. Secretary (Heidi Álvarez) (no report)

4. Committee Chairs

a. Academic Quality Committee: (No Report)

b. **Faculty Welfare and Professional Responsibility Committee: (Report Posted)**

- There are two action items that were sent back last May.
- Patricia Minter made a motion to approve the revised resolution on Instructor Ranks. Faculty Welfare is still gathering data and wants to move it forward. Julie Shadoan said she cannot remember what the issue was. Minter responded that it was the inability to get tenure and people wondered how this is different from pedagogical ranks. Tenure and Promotion documents make no reference to instructors. The criteria for regular pedagogical track developed by departments would be an addendum for instructor ranks. Julie Shadoan asked why we are creating this ranking system. The Provost stated that this has a 5-6 year history. Discussion began at CADD as a way of

valuing instructors and giving them a way to promote their work. Julie Shadoan mentioned that the South Campus faculty have gone through a lot in achieving tenure. Patti Minter said that the approach should be more through talking about what it is “not”. It is not tenuring. It is not a case for tenuring. It does not alter the terms of employment (annual, three-year, five-year) because contracts are departmental decisions. The only changes are compensation, evaluation expectation. This creates a ladder for advancement, but not for tenure. She added that this causes good and does no harm. It does not alter the power structure within the department. It creates a more valued rank and clear, consistent evaluation.

- Jennifer Hanley said that this acknowledges those who might not have a terminal degree but who serve in instructor ranks.
- Kate Hudepohl said she has a few questions about it.
- Minter stated that there is still an annual renewal process, and if someone is unsatisfactory, this is dealt with at the departmental level. Departments have different needs. Many instructors have been here a long time. Considering time of service versus compensation, the numbers are low.
- Hudepohl commented that instructors are paid low salaries.
- Minter stated that the whole previous discussion was posted for the Faculty Welfare Committee, and stated that helping one group really does lift all groups.
- Hudepohl added that the climate is that everyone is in need of a raise, and it becomes money to spend.
- Minter stated that the university will find money for whatever they want to fund. The proposal was put forth by academic affairs in good faith. Departments will have to make hard choices; it will cost more money to keep people in these positions. The committee thinks this is the right thing to do for our colleagues.
- Minter said she will link previous conversations in her report as a friendly amendment.
- Julie Shadoan asked if the proposal was going to the Handbook Committee? Minter says if the senate approves the report, it will go back to the Faculty Handbook to send it back up the chain. Minter says she wants to send it now to get it moving.
- The Provost stated that there is a clear commitment to it being centrally funded and not at the departmental level.
- Julie Shadoan asked if in section 3B, is the introductory paragraph too vague? Is it intentionally too vague? Areas to be judged on “secondary area of responsibility” will offer a great deal of flexibility. Instructors from college to college would differ in their system of evaluation; two categories, and this fuzzy third category. For example, the third area could be research, or it could be extra service. 5/5 plus service, or 3/3 plus more service, would be a college-to-college decision. This allows for that flexibility.
- This requires no second because it is coming out of the committee. The motion to approve passed unanimously.

c. **Budget and Finance Committee: (Report Posted)**

- There is a possibility of some changes at tomorrow's meeting.
- Andrew West made a motion to approve the Budget and Finance Committee Report as posted.
- One week ago, in a faculty-all email, Dr. Ransdell mentioned a breakdown of costs for the self-insured program. The request includes ten years of breakdown. Dr. Ransdell said he will give them the data, and Ann Mead said she will send any information that is requested. The Provost agreed. A formal resolution is possibly not necessary, but the committee will have to discuss this.
- It was suggested that the committee merely rephrase the resolution in thanking financial affairs for their transparency and rephrase the resolution in asking for steady annual transparency. West stated that he values other opinions and the committee wants the open atmosphere. In the spirit of establishing transparency as a positive way of moving forward, the committee can send the changed wording in a revision that requests "annual" to the SEC via email vote prior to the Senate meeting.
- Jennifer Hanley made a motion to table approval of this report until the revised version and to vote via email. The motion was seconded by Kate Hudepohl. The motion on the floor to table and vote electronically vote was unanimous; the report was tabled and the SEC will vote via email prior to the next senate meeting.
- The Provost asked if the "other" budget and finance committee appointed by the Provost ("Provost's Budget Council") could return to being a standing committee on the Senate. The original idea was to have overlap and communication between the committees (Eric Reed, Indu Chhachhi, and John Gottfried serve on both committees). One committee is supposed to report to the senate. It was created before the charter change and was a faculty-based advisory group. The Provost's question involves the merging of the committees and dissolving the senate ad-hoc committee. Patricia Minter suggested that it should not take place now but the faculty could elect the committee. The overlap between bodies could happen in the next senate caucus in order to have one body speaking for the faculty. Minter added that dissolving committees in mid-year is not a good practice.
- The Senate Budget Committee is more broad-based, and the Provost's Budget Council looks at Academic Affairs only. John Gottfried said that the committees do slightly different things. The Provost's committee asks specific questions. The Senate committee might not always have the knowledge that the Provost's committee has.
- The Provost stated that he would like to meet with both committees at the same time so there is a single story in the books.

d. **Colonnade Implementation Committee / General Education Curriculum Committee: (No Report)**

- The website is being cleaned up. Lloren Foster and Molly Dunkum are in the process of discussing what the changes should be. Any substantive changes

will go to the SEC.

e. Graduate Council: (No Report)

f. **Undergraduate Curriculum Committee: (Report Posted)**

- The UCC pulled the report before last Friday and the changes were made: one number was transposed, and there was one grammar issue.
- The report was approved and it will go forward to senate.

g. Faculty Handbook Committee: (No Report)

h. **Ad Hoc Committee on Research: (Report Posted)**

- Molly Kerby stated that this is an informational report.
- The committee meets every week.
- The committee sent surveys to the colleges and is waiting on results.
- The committee wants to help faculty to know what they need in order to do their jobs well.
- Margaret Crowder thinks the committee will determine the role of the alternates. Every college will have someone at the table.
- There was no discussion; this report will be sent forward to the senate.

5. Advisory Reports

a. Faculty Regent (Regent Burch)

- Following the approval of the Confucius Institute, which was a \$1.5 million gift as a result of a competitive bid, Regent Burch expressed some concerns: (1) It is a significantly growing entity without faculty involvement; (2) Burch questioned the need for this building because of the new international building.
- One concern is that it does not involve faculty. The Chinese teachers are out in the school districts and do not come campus regularly.
- Faculty have expressed concern with the symbolism of the building in light of the human rights issues that are associated with the country. If issues arise other than arts, culture, and language, what does this mean without the significant engagement of faculty?
- Burch added that this did not come to the Board of Regents until it was a done deal.
- She also has an issue with the name of the institute, which is proposed to be the "Center for Training of Chinese Teachers".
- This decision relative to the Confucius Institute and its substantial presence on campus is such that the absence of meaningful faculty involvement and participation should be addressed by the faculty.
- Chair Crowder thinks that Academic Quality could take this up to determine how faculty could become engaged and to discuss how it fits with the mission of our institution.
- Provost Emslie said he would like someone from the College of Education and someone from the Libraries to be on the planning committee. He mentioned Sam,

Connie, and Dean).

- Regent Burch stated that she thinks the library has a significant stake in this, and so do the faculty who teach Chinese, and so does the College of Education.
- Burch stated that she thinks the cultural presence is a good thing, but is concerned if a conversation on campus happened that is not complimentary to culture and art, that it would be problematic.
- John Gottfried stated that this is a difficult partnership for the library due to noise issues and space issues (offices, etc). It has not been a highly compatible situation. It went from being a small display to taking over an entire floor in the library.
- The contract for the new building suggests “in addition to” the space. Regent Burch suggests that faculty voice should try to determine what the space can look like (7000 square feet) and the faculty can suggest that the library reclaim their space.
- Chair Crowder asked how are faculty involved? Faculty is invited to influence what goes into the design and use of the building. How can faculty maximize use of the space in the building for faculty use? The design is not planned yet, though there is talk of classrooms and a kitchen that is designed to accommodate dining for 40, while there is a dining room that will accommodate 150 that is being built just next door.
- Question: Is the article in the Daily News correct in stating that private funds are being used? Answer: Some is WKU foundation. Because some of it is WKU Foundation, the faculty can become involved.
- The University of Chicago campus found that there was a violation of academic freedom issues.
- The cover of the AAUP says they are under investigation by the state for spying. The cover article is titled “Confucius Institutes Threaten Academic Freedom”.
- A motion to refer this issue to Academic Quality by Patricia Minter was seconded by Kate Hudepohl. The motion to refer this issue to Academic Quality was unanimously approved.

b. Academic Affairs (Provost Emslie)

- Provost Emslie commented that WKU has not had to close its main campus due to weather so far this year.
- The 4th Doctoral degree is being worked on for SACS level 6.
- The MFA for Creative Writing is on for this Friday. This would be the 5th terminal degree and still has to go through SACS.
- The QEP exists in something similar to its final form. The February review is currently being worked on. The Provost requests that faculty please do something related to evidence and argument in all of their classes the week before April 5-9.
- The performance-based funding model is being worked on. The most recent model is 24% state funding for comprehensive model (Gatton is not included in this formula), which is 24 cents to the dollar; most are 30 cents to the dollar.
- We are currently weighing in between the existing model and the new model to get all of the presidents in line.

- Illinois is 21.1% up; there are 6 states with negative. Kentucky is poised to get a larger share.
- Keys: Amber is working on changes. The new one will be worked out.
- Nikki met with the Provost today; SGA is drafting a policy for an excused policy from class. There is a tight timeline for this and they are hoping to get it to Senate by May. The Provost and the SGA President discussed what such a policy might contain, and the Provost suggested that Nikki Seay Taylor consult with the Senate for input.
- Faculty Recognition is not on the agenda for today.

D. Old Business:

E. New Business:

1. Policy 1.1121 Part time and Temporary Faculty Qualifications

- Policy 1.1120 is bound by the same rules. The change under number is only a change; a paragraph was added. Not really procedure; it is really a policy. The Provost will send a revised version that will include the same qualifications as #3. The Provost discussed some exceptions, such as “consultant”; for example, if someone in France is giving a grade, then it is part of SACS requirements. For consortium units housed on campus, the process is restrictive to them because they come from other institutions. Patricia Minter said it is consistent, and made a motion to approve policy 1.1121 with the revision (2nd Kate Hudepohl). The policy with revision was approved unanimously.

2. Policy 1.2180 Tuition Reimbursement for Employees Pursuing Doctoral Degrees... (post-Senate substantive change; concurrence with change requested)

- The Provost said this is not approved by Paul yet. It originally said “employees” and now says “faculty members”. Also, the reference to fees was removed in addition to the change of wording to faculty. This makes it consistent at the college level. The title of the policy also changed. It does not exclude staff who are pursuing a doctoral degree; this is only for those outside of the Kentucky system. A motion by Julie Shadoan to approve Policy 1.2180 (2nd Ashley Chance Fox) was approved unanimously.

3. Policy 0.1020 International Travel Registration (post-Senate addition; concurrence with change requested)

- Policy 0.1020, International Travel, is a post-senate substantive change. Paul Mooney discussed it last time. The Provost went over changes with the SEC. It would replace the now required faculty travel request instead of adding to it. Down the road, if you are going internationally and changing planes in a sensitive area, they will want to see your plane ticket; the itinerary will be requested to check for potential intrusions. There will be a software package that will track students and faculty who take weekend trips; for example, if there is a student in Harlaxton to takes a weekend trip to Italy, the software will track them. Julie Shadoan made a motion to approve (2nd Ashley Chance Fox). Patricia Minter said that technically, the students are under the University of Evansville. The Provost clarified that Faculty are not. The motion to approve Policy 0.1020 passed unanimously.

4. Policy 1.4180 Course Related Field Trips

- Kate Hudepohl stated that the link on page 2 to forms does not work yet. She added that a concerned colleague had an issue with 2B, specifying clinical experience. She asked if the specific reference to journalism could be taken out, and could other areas be added as a friendly amendment. The first example is very broad. Patricia Minter said she will double check that it answers all of the questions out of the committee. Julie Shadoan said that all links are to legitimate current links. Patricia Minter said she will check links before Thursday. A motion to approve Policy 1.4180 Course Related Field Trips by Ashley Chance Fox (2nd Julie Shadoan) was approved unanimously.

5. Faculty Recognition Committee report and proposals (Posted)

The report is not a standing committee. The Provost suggested separating it out due to a change of policy; it was left within the report. A motion to accept the Faculty Recognition Committee report and proposals by Laura DeLancey (2nd Ashley Chance Fox) passed unanimously. The approved report along with the policy were passed unanimously.

6. Selection of special Ad Hoc Committee on Faculty Continuance, Promotion, & Tenure (draw 5 members + 2 alternates)

- The Special Ad-Hoc Committee Selection for a one-time service will draw new names from the existing seven people left over from last year's pool. The appeals committee is a new committee that follows process. The Provost asked to verify that there are no conflicts of interest. The names were randomly picked by Chair Crowder in front of the SEC. These new members are: Linda Gonzalez (Agriculture), Cliff Shaluta (Journalism), Michelle Hollis (University Studies), Darby Haynes Lawrence, and Bang Yan. The first alternate is Karin Egloff (Modern Languages) and the 2nd alternate is Hollie Payne (Communications).

7. First New Item of Business Brought up on Floor: Patricia Minter asked that something be referred to Academic Quality. There was an email sent out from AARC to the Potter College Advisory Committee and was sent to faculty members. The Saudi Cultural Commission does not approve courses in Arabic, religious studies, theater, and dance. The email was sent to advisors. Minter would like to refer this issue to Academic Quality because it crosses the academic freedom line. There is a line between advising and advising that is not paid for. Letting who pays the bills dictate what classes the students take is an infringement on academic freedom. Patricia Minter made a motion to have the Academic Quality Committee examine this issue (2nd Andrew West). Minter said that the Saudi Cultural Commission monitors students' schedules and what they can go to. Regent Burch said there is a fine line between what an advisor tells a student and how the student interprets it. Burch added that more and more international presence may result in various students wanting special accommodations, such as a prayer room, for example. Implications and policies need to be to the extent that we are obliged to accommodate these students; what are we required to do to support their needs? The motion to refer this issue to Academic Quality passed unanimously.

8. Second New Item of Business Brought up on Floor: Kate Hudepohl stated that in a previous meeting, it was mentioned that the Graduate Council is not a standing committee of

the Senate and did not have a vote. Hudepohl said that this has remained in her memory, and Hudepohl stated that she would like the SEC to look at this and see what can be done, because the graduate council should have a vote. As an issue of fairness, the Graduate Council should be a standing committee of senate due to curriculum matters, and it is parallel to the UCC. This is a Charter issue and should be brought up. Beverly Siegrist said that she wanted to wait on this, because the Graduate Council has been working on something, and Thursday's Graduate Council meeting will look at the new bylaws. Siegrist said that the Graduate Council was planning to vote on separating itself entirely from the University Senate and that if it passes henceforth, Graduate Council information would only be sent to Senate as an information item. She stated that the Graduate Council would no longer bring items to Senate, but that they would go directly to the Provost for approval after the Graduate Council. She then stated that Graduate Council would become a peer body to Senate. When the comment was made that Graduate Council was more a peer group to UCC, Siegrist stated that was not the case. Julie Shadoan said that this proposal is in conflict with the current Senate Charter and that other issues exist with the current Senate charter as published; for example, it does not mention the Budget Committee as a standing committee of Senate. Beverly Siegrist said the Senate Charter is irrelevant because the Graduate Council was planning on voting itself away from Senate. The issue of whether or not Graduate Council can actually "secede" from the existing governance structure was raised. Siegrist also mentioned that only matters that applied directly to faculty would be sent to Senate. Julie Shadoan made a motion to form an ad-hoc committee to look at the charter, and to consider the status of what Graduate Council is within Senate. Part of the motion included looking at the charter to update it in general and make sure it is consistent with current practices. Beverly Siegrist said the bylaws are being worked on and they do not need Senate approval. She said that the Graduate Council is a sister to Senate and has been working all year on establishing themselves in breaking apart from the Senate. She added that any changes should come from within the Graduate Council itself. Patricia Minter stated that former graduate dean Elmer Gray instigated trying to separate the Graduate Council out back in 2004. It used to be a standing committee of Senate; Gray wanted more autonomy, and that was when Graduate Council decided that it would be a non-voting body at the SEC and Senate. She also said that the SEC would be happy at any point to amend the charter so that Graduate Council had full voting rights at SEC. Minter added that a change such as Siegrist proposes still has to be voted on in Senate. Provost Emslie gave an example of something that should have gone through Senate and agreed that the Graduate Council should come through the process; he said there are some clear inconsistencies and asked if the group would be willing to draft the changes. The Provost told Siegrist that a change in the Senate Charter paralleling the changes to structure potentially being proposed out of Graduate Council would need to come through concurrently, so that the governance structure maintained consistency. It was suggested that Graduate Council then revise the Senate Charter to reflect the necessary changes and bring that to Senate at the same time as their bylaw proposal. Various SEC members questioned the legitimacy of a potential secession of Graduate Council from Senate without Senate approval. Concern was expressed that this would remove a level of faculty-related issues in Graduate Council (curriculum, etc.), as the Graduate Council does not fully represent the university body; for instance, not all departments are included in the membership of Graduate Council). Julie Shadoan said that any changes removing Graduate Council from Senate would have to come through as

revisions to the Senate Charter. Beverly Siegrist said it won't necessarily be changed, and said that Graduate Council could decide on what they could do without coming forth before Senate. Patricia Minter explained the history of the Graduate Council and the SEC, and said that the Graduate Council cannot withdraw from the Charter. Regent Burch said that UCC, Senate, and Graduate Council used to be three bodies. Beverly Siegrist said there are specific policies relating to graduate curriculum that come to SEC. There is academic and graduate curriculum. Julie Shadoan restated her motion to form an ad-hoc committee to look at the charter for overall changes that are needed (2nd Jennifer Hanley). She stated that the ad-hoc committee should look at changes from General Education to Colonnade, Graduate Council, Budget Committee. Patricia Minter mentioned that the Charter Change Committee should include the entire SEC. Beverly Siegrist said that Graduate Council does not have a vote. Regent Burch said that curriculum items are separate. The Senate expressed concern that they did not have input and need to look at how changes would affect the governing body of Senate. Shadoan restated her motion with friendly amendment that the body to review the Charter is the SEC committee as a whole with graduate council chair as a voting member. Shadoan's motion for the SEC to examine the Charter for updates passed unanimously.

9. Third New Item of Business Brought up on Floor: Margaret Crowder stated a concern that all students are not being treated equally according to policy 1.3001. There was a pregnant student who was not going to be able to stay in her dorm and who may not have been offered alternate onsite housing. There are also potential issues with LGBTQ students. Chair Crowder stated that she wants the university to look into these issues. Another larger issue is the absentee policy for a pregnant student. Provost Emslie said that SGA is working on something related to that. There was a question as to whether or not it is a housing issue or a university issue. The VP of Student Affairs and Student Life are under the university.

F. Information Items:

1. Jennifer Tougas, Parking and Transportation, to discuss event parking and related issues
 - Jennifer Tougas came to the SEC meeting to discuss the email regarding Special Events Parking and to give background on what happens on campus with parking. The conversation began 4-5 years ago with Athletics and Special Events, with the main goal of providing a good experience for those who are spending their first time on the WKU campus.
 - Transitions have been occurring over three years in Parking and Transportation, and weekly meetings take place so the experience is good for everyone.
 - As of July 1, 70% of time is dedicated to this, along with assistants.
 - Smaller events are not usually noticed by the campus community; larger events such as the Focus on Western, Championships, etc. tend to be more disruptive to the campus.
 - The primary goals are to (1) manage a minimal disruption; and (2) to communicate with the campus community about accommodations for the guests.
 - Transit has been considered as a list of options. Considerations include (1) there are 13 buses on the fleet; transit for 4 buses would require extra people to drive at \$70 an hour; (2) if guests have to wait an hour and a half to get to campus, this is not good for recruiting; (3) It takes time to move a large volume of people (i.e. KHSA event).
 - 3-500 parking spots were lost to development on Kentucky and Center Street.

- Inconvenience is something that cannot be avoided.
- Question: does parking generate revenue? Answer: public parking helps to cover direct costs but they are not making money. Minter question: ??? Can there be ways of _____ alleviating... \$250,000 is allocated.
- The Alumni Square garage helps; 500 spots, 108 will go to the hotel. When the hotel comes along, some spots will go to that.
- The agreement in 2008 would take \$250,000 out of the base budget each year to pay for the garage; the conversation was uncertain as to whether this was 20 years or 30 years.
- Regent Burch stated that she agrees that events enhance visibility to campus; but asked how much is the disruption? She asked if a fee can be built in for these kinds of events, and whether the money collected from this fee could be considered to help with building another parking garage (instead of tacking it on to student fees)? Jennifer Tougas responded that she does not know if there are enough events. She added that buses cause issues with logistics in moving large numbers of people.
- Regent Burch stated that perhaps a study of what other campuses do might be beneficial.
- Jennifer Tougas said that WKU has suffered a loss in parking. Special Events takes on additional costs (additional staff, signs (putting up/taking down)), and the Symphony is not charged for personnel.
- Kate Hudepohl mentioned differentiating between charging departments for services on campus and cutting down on fees for students.
- Parking Structure 2 was \$10 million for 825 spaces. 18 thousand for parking spaces. In terms of user fees/permit fees, \$90 would have to be added per student.
- With fee comparisons across the state, WKU's is relatively low.
- Last year Parking and Transportation sold 3800 permits last year (this is down from 4300).
- Vice-Chair Hanley suggested having those who live on campus wait to be allowed to have a car. Jennifer Tougas responded that the university wants to make it easier for student on campus to park; it helps with recruiting.
- UK's model for commuters includes buses.
- There are 2200 freshman permit holders. There are 700 freshman commuters. Brian Meredith suggested using the Alumni Garage for parking if it is needed at some point.
- Chair Crowder said that she likes the idea of looking what other institutions are doing to find different options and costs and to see what is feasible for WKU.
- Jennifer Tougas said as the MidSouth Parking Association President, the scope and volume of activities is in touch with her colleagues; but she is open to scoping out some ideas. The number of buses to move 5000 people after a football game would cost a lot of money. The downtown parking garage has been tried.
- Patricia Minter said that there is a positive culture shift. The Regent votes for the garage were 7-4 at \$250,000 a year. The University was promised that that people could be bused, and 300 spaces were supposed to go to the university.
- The satellite garage is closer than Campbell Lane.
- Jennifer Tougas said that we have not yet been able to get the downtown garage to take off yet. Students want to see where they parked their car. The transit program is a culture shift and will take time.

- Seth Church (SGA) said that SGA has not had a senate debate or proposal regarding this. A student fee for a new parking garage and maybe Preston Center was mentioned. When SGA was asked an opinion on the parking garage, students said they might be willing to pay but he does not know how much. Students do not want to assist the university in adding campus fees.
- Question: What percentage of the main campus parking goes to freshmen? Answer: 1000 spaces, and 2200 freshmen.
- Survey results showed that students would be willing to pay \$150 per permit.
- Parking and Transportation is in the process of developing an incentive package to get students to leave their cars at home; they are striving for 63%.
- Permit fees are undervalued for students living on campus.
- Patricia Minter said the idea of adding fees for parking means that this cannot be used toward tuition and it is another form of money going toward brick and mortar.
- Transit might be more sustainable but that location has not been successful yet.
- The redevelopment of downtown, as it begins to grow, transit will become a more viable option.
- Minter stated that an added fee makes her nervous.

A motion to adjourn by Jennifer Hanley (2nd Ashley Chance Fox) passed unanimously. The meeting concluded at 5:40 PM.

Respectfully submitted,

Heidi Álvarez
Secretary