

**Western Washington University Associated Students
Board of Directors Meeting**

Thursday, February 21, 2013

VU567

AS Board Officers: *Present:* Ethan Glemaker (President), Victor Celis (VP Academics), Carly C Roberts (VP Activities), Hung Le (VP Bus Ops), Deng de Duot (VP Diversity), Patrick Stickney (VP Governmental Affairs) and Katie Savinski (VP Student Life)

Student Senate Representative: Christian Correa, AS Student Senate Chair

Advisor(s): Kevin Majkut, Director of Student Activities

Guest(s): Communications Office: Angelica Robinson, Mason Luvera, Jamie Hoover (advisor); Robert Bojorquez (KVIK), John von Volkli (Assessment), Bill Campbell (Student Senate)

MOTIONS

ASB-13-W-17 Approve the funding request for \$3,000 in the form of an underwrite from the Operational Enhancement Fund for the WWU Lip Dub with the stipulation that the AS Communications Office seek out collaborative monetary support and have a very clear and detailed budget proposal. **Failed**

ASB-13-W-18 Table the discussion with the stipulation that the AS Communication Office seek out collaborative monetary support and has a very clear and detailed budget. **Failed**

ASB-13-W-19 Approve the Western Votes contract. **Failed**

ASB-13-W-20 Approve Consent Item A. **Passed**

Ethan Glemaker, AS President, called the meeting to order at 6:04 p.m.

I. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

II. REVISIONS TO THE AGENDA

Stickney moved to strike the Lederai Agenda from the action items. He said that administration wants to move the Lederai Lobby Trip to May because the issue of sequestration will be of highest priority for legislators. He said those cuts are set to happen on March 1st and there is concern that everyone will be too focused on the sequestration and would not be as focused on other issues. Glemaker said that there would be no purpose in passing the Lederai Agenda tonight because so much is bound to change. There were no objections to striking it from the agenda. Glemaker said that language could be discussed later. Glemaker should be the sponsor of the scholarship documents and not Stickney.

III. PUBLIC FORUM (*comments from students and the community*)

IV. ACTION ITEMS - Guests*

A. WWU Lip Dub

Roberts said that Angelica Robinson has been working hard to gather information regarding this event. Clubs have been contacted and outreach efforts have started; there will be an information session and 17 clubs are currently interested participating. Robinson said that the goal is to represent everyone at Western through this project. Mason Luvera said that lip dubs are a great project and that they can really show off Western's campus. He said that this project can promote the University and also highlight diversity of campus and opportunities available. Robinson said that Western would be the first campus in Washington to do a lip dub. Robinson said that there is currently an Orgsync account. She said that the official date has not been set, but they are hoping for early June. She said that the lip dub would be 3-5 minutes long. She said that each group will be responsible for choreographing and performing their section of the video and then there will be a large flash mob component at the end. Robinson also presented a proposed timeline. Luvera said that this is a huge project and that it is challenging to get a lot of students involved. Bojorquez clarified the budget for the rental equipment, there are many free resources available on campus, but that there would be additional, more professional equipment required. Luvera said that if this video will showcase Western, then it

needs to be done well. Celis wondered about the general funding and whether there would be additional funding sources. He said that there is \$4,000 funding from the Board and \$3,000 from the Cold Beverage fund and that other sources are not currently included in the numbers. Robinson said that the Communications Office has not discussed in detail how they are helping out. She said that the office has currently funded the logo and has been helping with fliers. Celis wondered if outside funding would be included. Luvera said that the amount of funding will determine how well the project is implemented. Celis also wondered about the length of the shoot and the time commitment. Bojorquez said that the information meeting will help get a better idea of interested individuals, the level of involvement, and the potential time commitment from people. He said that there will be a well thought out and meticulous shoot schedule. Savinski asked about hospitality numbers and if that was for students or crew. Bojorquez said that it is mostly crew because they will be there all day. He said that it can also be used for the ending flash mob part. Duot wondered how it would be different than the Harlem Shake. Bojorquez said that it will be more professional. Luvera said the Harlem Shake was student produced, but had no affiliation with the AS. Duot wondered why the AS is not working with University Admissions. Luvera said that the tool would not be just for admissions, but the AS could use it. He feels that it would be a great opportunity for the AS to positively influence who applies to Western. Bojorquez said that collaborating with university admissions would mean that the AS might have to give up some freedom of creativity. He said that it is also a great opportunity to be able to market the fact that it was student made. Luvera said that it is a way to engage students. Stickney made a motion to approve the funding request for \$4,000 in the form of an underwrite from the operational enhancement fund for the WWU lip dub. Stickney said that this is a great opportunity and that it should stem from the students to ensure that student voices are being heard. Le said that he is uncomfortable with \$4,000. He had two recommendations: reduce the amount of funding to around \$2,500 or to table the discussion until more collaboration efforts have been made. Duot dittoed. Le said that if the lip dub is going to be a tool for the university, then the university should pitch in as well. Duot and Celis dittoed. Le said that as budget authority, he needs to make sure the money is being well spent, and that \$4,000 is a lot of money and does not leave a lot left over for other expenditures. He said that there is a lot of uncertainty in the lip dub proposed budget. Majkut said that he is concerned about the date because it would be near finals. He also noted that these activities become bigger and that he is worried about the other projects and responsibilities that the AS Communications Office already has and that it might take more time than anticipated. Duot dittoed. Bojorquez said they have considered another date, but that this date is when the MPR was available as a hospitality room. Luvera said the lip dub is a great way to help students understand more about the AS and how the AS is a resource for students. He said that a lip dub can help with the AS brand and determining how future students view it. Stickney dittoed. Le said that he would support funding it if it was more geared towards promoting the AS. He said that there is too much of a focus on other components outside of the AS. Glemaker said that he is excited to see where the project goes and acknowledged the hard work put in so far. He said that he shares some of the same concerns as Le. Glemaker was unsure if the proposal meets the requirements for funding from the Cold Beverage Contract. He said that asking for money from other areas of the university will not affect the creativity. He would like the AS to collaborate and request funding from other sources. Stickney said that if the Cold Beverage Contract has funding restrictions, then the funding from the AS is all that more important. He said that the AS should support this project and get fully behind showcasing campus and everything Western has to offer. Duot expressed concerns. He said that there are many ways to market the AS without spending \$4,000. Luvera said that the AS represents the student body and that this video can be used to do that. He said from a public relations standpoint, people are going to want to watch this video, it is an investment in how people perceive the AS and the University as a whole. Stickney and Savinski dittoed. Robinson said that this is a way to get all of the clubs together. Roberts said that another way to think about this is that if 1,000 students participate,

then it is spending \$4 per person for the experience. She recognized the hard work needed and that funding would be needed. Stickney and Savinski dittoed. Roberts said that a decision should be made tonight because if the Board puts the funding off, then the timeline would need to be altered. She recognized that \$4,000 is a lot of money and that reserving the funds in the Operational Enhancement could be beneficial for future projects. Duot dittoed. However, it would be sad if there was funding left over in the account at the end of the year. Stickney and Savinski dittoed. Roberts suggested reducing the amount to \$3,000 and allocating more funds later if needed. Celis said that he needs more information and that he cannot vote tonight. Duot and Le dittoed.

Motion ASB-13-W-18 by Celis

Table the discussion with the stipulation that the AS Communication Office seek out collaborative monetary support and has a very clear and detailed budget.

Second: Le Vote: 3-3-1 Action: Passed

Stickney said that the issues should be voted on today. Savinski dittoed. Stickney said that the Board should respect the process and the timeline. He said that by not acting tonight, that there will be additional stress on AS employees. He said that the Board should support this project. Roberts said that long term planning is a more organic process. Stickney dittoed. Roberts said that it is important to have a detailed budget, but that will evolve over time. Savinski dittoed and said that by not funding it, it is saying that the AS is not comfortable with the process. She said that some funding should be allocated even if not \$4,000. Glemaker said that he would like to approve funding for \$2,500 with the same stipulation. He said that the AS Communications Office could come back for more funding later. Roberts moved to amend the motion to approve \$3,000 with same stipulation as previously mentioned. Amendment carried 4-3-0.

The AS Board took a break and reconvened at 7p. m.

Le said that this is not relevant to operational enhancement, even though the Board seems to support the lip dub project. Lour dittoed. As a potential solution, Le suggested requesting money from the reserves. He said the lip dub project can be funded by students without draining the funds for operational enhancement. After the motion failed Glemaker apologized that it would be another week, but that the Board was not ready to approve the funding request.

MOTION ASB-13-W-17 By Stickney

Approve the funding request for \$3,000 in the form of an underwrite from the operational enhancement fund for the WWU lip dub with the stipulation that the AS Communications Office seek out collaborative monetary support and have a very clear and detailed budget proposal.

Second: Celis Vote: 2-5-0 Action: Lailed

V. INFORMATION ITEMS - Guests*

A. Assessment Permanence

Le said that this is asking for the institutionalization of the AS Assessment process. Von Volkli said that there are a few pilot programs that needed to return to the Board, including this one. He asked that the Board institutionalize the assessment process, but not the office. He said that the process needs to be institutionalized because the process has helped create clear lines of authority within SPAC and the Budget Committee. Von Volkli said that this would be a change from the current Office of Assessment to a Board employee. He said that being a one person office allows for flexibility, but that it is unsustainable. He said that the process can be managed more efficiently. Von Volkli said that a more workable model would be to fold Assessment into the Board of Directors. He feels this would create more engagement between the assessment employee and the VP of Business and Operations. Celis clarified that this takes away the office name and makes the position a coordinator and not an associate director. He said that the Assessment Office is seen as an administrative office under the Board. Savinski dittoed. Celis said that employees of the Board seem more applicable to Board Assistants. Von Volkli said that this is a new model to have this sort of process. He said that a few options were presented earlier

this year. He feels this process should be carried out by a Board employee. He said that there was no departmental training and that his successor should train with someone. Von Volkli said that the Assessment Office was developed in a haphazard way and that there should be more structure in the future. He said that it would also help give a more consistent workload. Celis said that the Board oversees many offices and therefore to some extent, all of the employees are employees of the Board. He liked the idea of this position being coordinator. Savinski shared similar questions and concerns as Celis. She thought that there could still be a relationship between the Office of Assessment and the Board without dismantling the office. She said that she respects that it should be a part of the Board, but still has reservations about changing it. Stickney said that the proposed changes make the position more efficient and conceptually better. He wondered if the Personnel Office has seen this. Von Volkli said no. In terms of pay, von Volkli said that there would be about a \$1,000 difference. Roberts said that it is a good change. She said that it would be weird to have an employee be a part of the Board, but not in the same office. She recognized that the Board office is already full. Glemaker expressed mixed emotions about it. He said that it is a phenomenal idea to have departmental training. Three dittoed. Glemaker said that he is not sure how effective Board departmental training would be for the position. He said that the Board gets trained in the summer and therefore this position would be training with assistants. He said that he is leaning in favor of this proposal. Le said that he didn't bring this to Personnel first because this was relevant under board restructuring discussion. He said this could be brought with the job descriptions. Glemaker wondered if pilot projects go to the Board or needed to go to Personnel first. Majkut said that there is no good process for this. He said the question is about the Assessment Office which is not a Personnel issue. He said he likes the idea conceptually. He said in these cases, it is appropriate to come to the Board with these changes. Duot wondered about the cost and the vision for the office in the future. Von Volkli said that it would not be an office and that it would be folded into the Board with a more professional process. He said the end goal is to see more input from an elected representative. He said that it is more of a collaborative model. He said that this year and last, it has been a floating office that prepares documents and submits to the VP for Business and Operations. Von Volkli said that he wished that there was more communication and collaboration on the process. He said that these changes would help improve the process. Duot said that he would rather see the job in the form that it is in now. Roberts said that she has some ideas to be presented later. Glemaker said he would like some change in the language.

B. Queer Targeted Programming

Duot said that this program would help connect students who identify as queer and give individuals a way to speak in a safe environment. He said that the coordinator for this event was not present because she was in the Vagina Memoirs. Glemaker said there was a little confusion because the queer umbrella is very broad. He said that it would be difficult to tell people whether they are queer enough. He said that this program targets individuals who identify as queer, but doesn't define queer. Celis said that queer is broad, but the target is specific. Glemaker emphasized that the casting is targeted not the audience. Majkut said that the office is changing the focus of the event. He said that whenever events are made exclusive, then there needs to be a good reason because the AS promotes inclusion. He said that every time an event is targeted, it is a serious decision. He said that anyone with additional questions should contact Briana Fitzpatrick, the QRC Coordinator.

VI. PERSONNEL ITEMS *(subject to immediate action)*

VII. ACTION ITEMS - Board*

A. Western Votes Contract

Stickney said that there was an administrative change, but other than that, the document has not been changed since last week. Glemaker wondered about the language and wondered if “empowering” can be changed to “encouraging”. Stickney said that it is a contract and that

changing the language is a delicate issue. Celis said that the Board has the ability and right to make the change. Stickney said that it is a matter of one word and the language can be changed next year. Glemaker said that he and Roberts talked about the purpose of Western Votes (WV). He said that the current purpose is good, but that there is no mention of higher education. He said that there should be some mention of the Washington Student Association (WSA) since WV is Western's chapter. Stickney said that it does mention legislative advocacy and education programs even though it does not directly reference higher education. Roberts said that it should be explicitly stated that WSA advocates for higher education and that it should be apparent that WV is the campus chapter of WSA. Campbell said that there is a reason for some autonomy and that it is important to maintain that because of the political nature that WV has. Stickney dittoed. Campbell said that if the Board wanted to make changes, then that would be ok to bring it back to WV. Glemaker said that it is important to respect the process and that the changes should be considered. He also noted that the bylaws of WV don't need to be approved by the board. He said that it is important to recognize the non-partisan nature of WV. Roberts dittoed. Glemaker said that the contract is not ready to be voted on. Roberts that there is a way to marry the purpose of WSA with the purpose of WV. She said that it currently very vague and that expectations should be clear. Stickney said that concerns should have been brought to him sooner than this meeting. He said that the contract is not a high priority in representing students especially during legislative session. He said that WV has been able to distinguish itself from every other school and that it is good that the mission is different. Campbell said that WV is more than just the chapter of WSA. He said that WV is its own entity and organization and that it is important that there aren't too many restrictions. Stickney said that it will probably not be considered again for a while due to workload. Glemaker wondered if it is fine to have WV operate without a contract. Majkut said it would be better to approve it, but it is acceptable to not approve it.

MOTION ASB-13-W-19 by Savinski

Approve the Western Votes Contract.

Second: Celis

Vote: 2-1-4

Action: Failed

VIII. INFORMATION ITEMS - Board*

A. AS Scholarships

Savinski suggested striking the word "positively" from the Community Involvement application. Celis said most scholarships require full time enrollment and he wondered if it should be changed to 6 credits because that is when students are eligible for financial aid. Glemaker said that students need to take 12 credits to be on full financial aid. He said that the full time university standard is 6 credits. Glemaker would support changing the requirement to 6 undergrad credits and 4 graduate credits. 3 dittoed. Glemaker suggested a change in the Community Involvement to say affect all people, not just Western students. Duot said that applicants should be based on need of scholarship not financial need. He said that some people may not appear in financial need, but they might be in need of scholarships. Le noted that the Childcare application makes clear that students must demonstrate financial need. Duot said that he would like that language changed on all of the apps. Stickney dittoed. Le said that he wants to make the purposes of money accountable and transparent. He said that it is challenging to make sure there are no biases especially if the reviewers know the applicant. Majkut said the provision of two quarter was a hold over to have students who have been part of the university community. He said that it also corresponds with a requirement to run for the Board. Majkut said that the scholarships are awarded in one quarter, and not over the full year. He said that service based scholarships should be awarded to students who are involved on campus so students are benefited. Roberts said that it is important to sustain people and that scholarships are hard to find once in school. Savinski and Glemaker dittoed. Campbell said that some students have a phenomenal commitment to the community, but may have a low GPA. Glemaker agreed with Campbell and thought that the GPA requirement was not equitable. He

said that it is important to emphasize academic success, but that there might be some students who are heavily involved and have a low GPA. He said he would like to see it down to a 2.0, but that he has a lot of questions that the financial aid office would need to clarify. Savinski said she has had this conversation and that the GPA was a requirement from the financial aid office. Duot wondered about students in Fairhaven without a GPA. Celis noted that there is an academic scholarship that focuses on academic achievement with a higher GPA requirement. Campbell noted that the childcare application has GPA at 2.0. Roberts would still advocate keeping the childcare one at 2.0 even if the requirement is higher. Savinski and Stickney dittoed. Glemaker said that he would email the Board with the information by Monday.

The Board took a short break and returned at 8:15p.m.

B. AS Board Job Descriptions

Glemaker talked about minor clarifying language in his job description. Celis was also wondering how to better word the assessment component of the VP for Business and Operation's job description. Le pointed out a few changes. He said that VP for Activities should be a liaison with KUGS and KVIK and the Communication Office should be taken off. He noted the oversight and liaison language and that he would like standard language for both. Majkut said there is not a current standard. He said that the AS organizational chart might help in developing the language though it might also be too general. Le said that it is important that the director job descriptions matches these job descriptions. Roberts mentioned having a definition for liaison and oversight. She said that it would be appropriate to include that in the job description. Glemaker said there is a work session on Monday morning. He said that there is some work that still needs to be done. Glemaker set a work session tentatively for 7a.m. on Monday. For the VP for Governmental Affairs job description, Stickney suggested taking out "Bellingham" to read "community". He also suggested a change in language regarding the oversight of the legislative liaison budget. He said that there should be mention of organization on campus. He suggested removing "legislative" from "federal legislative issues". Glemaker said that he would like to see changes made before the work session. He said that the VP for Business and Operation's job description said it should be serving all students, but not everyone else's job description did under oversight in job responsibility and they should make it consistent. Savinski said that she hasn't added oversight of the ESP to the VP for Student Life job description. Glemaker noticed that there was a lot of work left to do on the VP for Diversity job description. Savinski dittoed. Glemaker also noted the large committee commitment in the VP for Academic job description. Celis said taking out the Student Senate would relieve pressure. He said that he was looking at the VP for Governmental Affairs, and would like to see more clear direction about the Senate. Duot suggested adding the language of "manage" regarding the VP for Governmental responsibility with ASTAC in addition to other positions relative to their committees and all committees that oversee a budget. Stickney said that part of being a chair is having the vote. He said that managing a committee is different than chairing a committee. Roberts and Le dittoed. Roberts does not feel there are any circumstances under which the language is managing a committee. Duot clarified that he meant managing money. Celis said with regards to the budget, it should be mentioned in another section. He said being the budget authority is different than the committee responsibilities. Savinski noted that a special project belongs in a legacy document rather than a job description. Glemaker said that it would be great to have one or two work sessions to leave a directional document for next year's Board. Celis agreed, but was not sure how that would be implemented. He said that next year is a weird situation with the special project regarding Senate. Stickney said that he would prefer working with the people running for the position to make sure they are aware of the special projects. Glemaker said that he hoped that Stickney could verbally communicate with the successor and include it in the legacy document. Stickney said that this would be for the hiring process and that waiting too long would put it past the time people are being hired. Celis said that it is not ideal, but that it has been done before. He said that there were positions being hired

near the end of the quarter. Savinski advocated for a Board legacy document with information about the Senate reform. She said that the job description should reflect general tasks and responsibilities and that the special project should be taken out. Celis said that it will be a responsibility for a year. Campbell said it is disturbing that the Board is discussing including senate reform as a special project in the VP for Governmental Affairs job description when it has not even been announced and discussed in public. Stickney and Savinski dittoed. Campbell said that he was concerned about putting Student Senate under the VP for Governmental Affairs because it would be challenging to maintain the difference between LAC and Student Senate. Celis said that this is a personnel issues and that it is not something that needs to come to the Student Senate. He said that it will be a discussion at the next Student Senate meeting. Glemaker said that work sessions are announced and open to the public. Le said he would like to see budget responsibilities in the job descriptions. Roberts and Savinski dittoed. Glemaker liked Le’s idea about including budget authority component in the job description. Roberts dittoed.

IX. CONSENT ITEMS *(subject to immediate action)*

A. Committee Appointments

Excellence in Teaching Award Committee

Emma Eliason Music Education Freshman (Budget)

Outstanding Faculty Leadership Award Committee

Sarah King Undisclosed Junior

MOTIONASB-13-W-20 by Stickney

Approve Consent Item A.

Second: Celis Vote: 7-0-0 Action: Passed

X. STUDENT SENATE REPORT

Christian Correa, AS Student Senate Chair reported that there was the Student Technology Fee Forum from 4pm-5pm where students had good feedback and comments. He said that he was not at the last meeting.

XI. BOARD REPORTS

President

Ethan Glemaker reported that four candidates have been selected to bring to campus in order to interview for the Fairhaven Dean Position, and that he has emailed Board members the invitations to the open forum for each candidate. Ben Crowther, the AS Legislative Liaison, testified for the DREAM Act on Wednesday and was met with positive responses overall. There is a Higher Education Legislative Reception in Olympia on Monday for new and valued legislators. Guests include the Board of Trustees, WWU Alumni and faculty/staff, students working in Olympia, and the AS Board of Directors. He and Le gave an informative presentation on the Associated Students to the S&A Fee Committee this morning, and the members were very impressed with the work that has been done. The Men’s Resiliency Group will begin hosting focus groups in the residence halls to gather data about the resiliency climate on campus and to set a clear direction for the group. He and Savinski have been meeting with students regarding a new sustainability initiative, Project Mug, and have proceeded to have conversations with Aramark as well. He is eager to see how the project progresses. Another sustainability idea emerged from a different student interested in exploring an opportunity for curricular growth concerning sustainable food and potentially expanding farm space on campus. Additionally, he will be meeting with students on Friday regarding “Divestments.” Lastly, he has been working with employees from the Veteran’s Outreach Center to look into a new idea for a Veteran’s mentor Program which looks really promising.

Kudos to Kaylee Galloway for her consistent hard work with respect to the WSA and particularly with the WSA Lobby Trip. Massive kudos to Ben Crowther for all his phenomenal

work and advocacy in Olympia. Glemaker continues to hear wonderful comments about him from the administration. Side note: Go to the Vagina Memoirs!

VP for Academic Affairs

Victor Celis reported that the Student Tech Fee Renewal process is coming close to an end, they will be meeting two more times this quarter and a proposal will be brought to the board by the end of the quarter.

VP for Activities

Carly C Roberts reported that Elect Her will be happening this Saturday, and that she is super excited! She said they are anticipating greater attendance this year than last. She will be going down to Olympia on Monday for a legislative reception with Western Advocates, Glemaker is coming and others are welcome as well.

VP for Business & Operations

Hung Le reported that he has been working on the AS Budgeting Process, focusing on making the process as clear, simple and transparent as possible for the proposers and the Budget Committee. He said that Facilities & Services successfully voted on 3 projects from the FCS requests. He said that there was a change to the counter space to the PC, new furniture and office additions to the Club Hub, and the VU 567 Table Request. He said that he is working on updating MC on the Board Structure changes.

VP for Diversity

Deng de Duot reported that Steering decided not to change the name. He also said that the Women Center's event, the Vagina Memoirs, is going on and they need support.

VP for Governmental Affairs

Patrick Stickney reported that WSA Lobby Day was interesting, but that he was able to work with the Human Services Program and the ESC to bring 33 students down to Olympia to lobby their legislators. He said that there will be smaller van trips going down to Olympia to lobby on specific issues on Western's values based agenda. Our future lobby trips are:

Lobby Day: Environment Tuesday, February 26, 2013 9am-6pm

Lobby Day: Health and Safety Wednesday, March 6, 2013 9am-5pm

Lobby Day: Accountability (For Profit Colleges) Tuesday, March 12, 2013

Lobby Day: Diversity (DREAM act) Tuesday, April 9, 2013 9am-5pm

Lobby Day: Access and Attainment in Higher Education, Training: Women's Health
Wednesday, April 17, 2013 Training: 6-7pm VU 462B Lobby: 9am-5pm

Lobby Day: Financial Aid and Revenue Wednesday, April 24, 2013 9am-5pm

He also said that Western Votes will be having another call in day of action tomorrow, Feb. 22nd

VP for Student Life

Katie Savinski reported that at Green Energy Fee, the committee approved funding for two projects and is waiting on additional information before considering the other two. At Recreation Center Advisory Committee, they heard a proposal for the Ree Center to supplement additional, unexpected field costs out of their reserve funds for \$500,000. The concern was that other partners and eventual users of the field have not been asked or participated in the funding process as much as the Ree Center has. She made a motion at the last meeting to approve the \$500,000 with the stipulation that part of the field name would incorporate "students" as with this additional Ree funding, students would have directly paid around 60% of the field costs. The motion was tabled to wait for more input.

XII. OTHER BUSINESS

Roberts is looking into driving to Olympia Monday for the BOT lobby day and there are two spots left. Glemaker requested the Board email Galloway Board reports by 3pm tomorrow.

THE MEETING WAS ADJOURNED BY ACCLAMATION AT 8:50 P.M.