

The Academic Council

March 30, 2004

Members Present: Rev. Edward Malloy, C.S.C., Nathan Hatch, Dr. John Affleck-Graves, Carol Ann Mooney, Maura Ryan, Jeffrey Kantor, Rev. Mark Poorman, C.S.C., Frank Incropera, Eileen Kolman, Joseph Marino, Greg Sterling (in place of Mark Roche), Patricia O'Hara, Carolyn Woo, Michael Lykoudis, Jennifer Younger, Seth Brown, Jay Brandenberger, Nasir Ghiaseddin, Paula Higgins, Patricia Maurice, Carol Tanner, Thomas Noble, Susan Blum, Neil Delaney, Joseph Buttigieg, Cindy Bergeman, Olivia Remie Constable, Carolyn Nordstrom, Mitchell Wayne, Steven Buechler, Mihir Sen, Robert Bretz, Thomas Frecka, Teresa Phelps, Dino Marcantonio, J. Douglas Archer, Ava Preacher, Kenneth DeBoer, Meghan McCabe, Nicole Wykoff, Angela Colmenero

Members Absent: Mark Roche, Kate Schlosser, Vittorio Höhle, Willa Qian

Members Excused: Jacquie Brogan, Joseph Buttigieg, Christian Moevs, Hope Hollocher, Panos Antsaklis, Tim Dale, Angela Colmenero

Observers Present: Mary Hendriksen, Capt. James Shelton, Lora Spaulding (in place of Harold Pace), Kevin Barry

Observers Absent: Daniel Saracino

Observers Excused: None

Invited Guests: Carol Kaesebier, Vice President and General Counsel, Timothy Flanagan, Assistant Vice President and Counsel

The Reverend Edward Malloy, CSC, called the meeting to order at 3:05 p.m. Prof Hatch offered a prayer.

1. Minutes of the Meeting of November 18, 2003. The minutes of the Academic Council meeting of November 18, 2003, were approved without amendment.

2. University Policy for Reproducing Copyrighted Material. Prof. Mooney said that the Provost's Office and the General Counsel's office have developed a University policy governing the reproduction of copyrighted material. (See Attachment A) The policy has been under consideration for some time. An earlier draft came

before the Provost Advisory Committee for discussion a few years ago. Since that time, the policy has undergone updating and revision. The policy is intended to be included in the "University Policies" section of the *Faculty Handbook* and is presented to the Academic Council for discussion prior to taking that step.

Prof. Mooney then introduced Carol Kaesebier, vice president and general counsel, and Timothy Flanagan, assistant vice president and counsel, who were invited to this Academic Council meeting to provide an overview of the policy and to answer questions members may have concerning it.

Ms. Kaesebier said that the policy is fairly simple. It deals with use of copyrighted material by all University employees, including faculty members. Generally, she said, the document sets forth that it is the policy of the University to comply with United States copyright law and to avoid exceeding the bounds of permissible copying under the "fair use" doctrine.

Ms. Kaesebier continued by saying that compliance with copyright law generally requires that if a faculty member plans to use multiple copies of copyrighted material in the classroom, he or she must obtain permission from the copyright holder. An exception is when copying is deemed to constitute a "fair use" of the material. Determining fair use entails consideration of the type of work to be copied and the extent of the copying. Simple and quantitative guidelines for determining fair use are included in Notre Dame's policy as Appendix A.

Ms. Kaesebier said that because fair use can be broader than the guidelines indicate, a faculty member who believes that a contemplated use may be fair use but seems to fall outside the guidelines should consult her office. If counsel agrees that the proposed use is "fair use," the faculty member can proceed. If he or she is then sued, the University will represent him or her in any legal action.

In another instance, Ms. Kaesebier explained, counsel may decide after review that the use is not fair use. Then, before copying the material, the faculty member must seek permission from the copyright holder. If the request is never made—or made and denied—and the faculty member goes ahead with the use and is sued, the University would not undertake a defense in that case.

Ms. Kaesebier noted that Appendix B to the policy

explains how to obtain permission from copyright owners—both in writing and by telephone.

Ms. Kaesebier concluded by saying that the General Counsel's office welcomes questions on use of copyrighted material. They receive them frequently, she noted. The purpose of the policy is to ensure that all people at the University know that copyright law must be followed.

Prof. Higgins asked how the policy differs from current University practice. Is there anything new here?

Ms. Kaesebier replied that it simply puts the current policy into writing. Having a written policy guides faculty and also protects the University. It should be a help to faculty. At times, faculty members may take materials to one of the University's copy centers and then be informed that the copying cannot be done because of copyright law. She wants faculty to know that they can discuss any questions on what constitutes fair use, as well as how to how to obtain permission from copyright owners, with the General Counsel's Office.

Prof. Sterling suggested that the General Counsel Office require all University copy centers to post the policy. He knows that Mr. Flanagan has had conversations with faculty even while they are standing at those centers. While the Arts and Letters copy centers have guidelines, it would be a good idea to make sure that all places on campus where course packets are reproduced have copies of the policy.

Ms. Kaesebier said that would occur. Also, her office intends to hold training sessions for employees of the copy centers.

Dr. Younger asked whether copying for library "reserve" material falls within the policy.

Mr. Flanagan responded that the policy does not deal with every aspect of copying at the University. One area it specifically does not address is library copying. That is covered by Section 108 of the Copyright Act, which pertains to library and archival use. Neither does the policy apply to classroom instructional use. Almost anything can be copied for display—that is, if it is one copy and is displayed in a classroom for discussion or comment. The policy presented today deals with creating multiple copies of materials.

Prof. DeBoer asked Mr. Flanagan to comment on

the spontaneity rule described in the policy. [See Appendix A, Guidelines for Classroom Copying of Books and Periodicals, Sec. II.A.2: Multiple copies may be made if (a) The copying is at the instance and inspiration of the individual faculty member, and (b) The inspiration and decision to use the work and the moment of its use for maximum teaching effectiveness are so close in time that it would be unreasonable to expect a timely reply to a request for permission."] It seems, he said, that the policy offers a defense to a person as long as he or she waits until the last moment to make the copying.

Mr. Flanagan said that every case is fact specific. Thus, if the course a faculty member is teaching takes place three years after the material in question was copyrighted—or 50 years after the copyright date—it would be difficult to make an argument for spontaneity. In contrast, if an article is published one week before a class meeting, spontaneity becomes much more defensible. And, if a faculty member has used an article for four consecutive years, he said, spontaneity ceases to be an argument. Again, every case is fact specific—which is why he is available for consultation.

Prof. Maurice asked how use by teaching assistants is treated in the proposed guidelines.

Ms. Kaesebier replied that the same rules apply. The use would occur in an educational setting.

Seeing no further questions, Fr. Malloy thanked Ms. Kaesebier and Mr. Flanagan for attending today's Academic Council meeting. The policy, he said, is not for action at this meeting. It was presented today for clarification only.

3. Proposal to Amend Article III of the *Academic Articles Concerning Faculty Grievances*. Fr. Malloy asked Prof. Nordstrom, chair of the faculty affairs committee, to outline the changes that committee, along with the Faculty Senate, has proposed to Article III, Section 9 of the *Academic Articles* concerning faculty grievances. (See Attachment B) The proposal has the unanimous approval of the Executive Committee.

Prof. Nordstrom explained that the proposal on grievances originated with the Faculty Senate. It was refined over the course of a year by a joint Faculty Senate/Academic Council committee. It then came

to the Faculty Affairs Committee, which refined it a bit more. She noted that Prof. Higgins, a member of the Academic Council, was the chair of the committee that finalized the amendments in the Faculty Senate.

Essentially, Prof. Nordstrom said, the amended section defines a grievance and outlines the process both the grievant and the University take when one is asserted. She explained that the proposal is the companion piece to the amendments approved earlier this academic year on severe sanctions or dismissal of a faculty member [see minutes of Academic Council meeting of October 13, 2003]. Prof. Nordstrom noted that the sections of the proposal dealing with the composition and responsibilities of the Faculty Grievance Committee passed the Faculty Affairs Committee unanimously.

No members raised any questions on the proposed amendments.

Prof. Nordstrom said that perhaps it is true that the proposal has been through so many hands at this point that it does not provoke much controversy. She believes it to be an improvement over the current language in that it formalizes some procedures, gives examples of grievable actions, and, in general, provides clarity on the entire subject.

Fr. Malloy called for a vote on the proposal to amend Article III, Section 9 of the *Academic Articles* concerning faculty grievance procedures. It passed unanimously. Fr. Malloy said that he approves the amendments as well, but a final step will be approval by the Board of Trustees.

4. Proposal to Change the Title of the “Chair” of the School of Architecture to the “Dean” of the School of Architecture. A second proposal from the Faculty Affairs Committee is to change the title of the “chair” of the School of Architecture to the “dean” of that school and then to make associated changes in the *Academic Articles*.

Prof. Nordstrom said that the proposal is intended to address two issues: improving the School of Architecture’s standing on a national level and improving its representation within the University. She then asked Prof. Mooney, who crafted the proposal in response to the committee’s request, to outline the changes more specifically.

Prof. Mooney explained that the School of Architecture has been an autonomous unit at the University since 1993, when the Academic Council voted to separate it from the College of Engineering. The proposal to change the title of the school’s head from “chair” to “dean,” she said, is rooted in consideration of both external and internal factors.

Externally, the change would elevate the school in the perception of the outside world. Almost without exception, leaders of peer schools of architecture hold the title of dean. All of the graduate architecture programs consistently ranked in the top ten are administered by a dean. At Notre Dame, the title of “chair” makes it unclear what the position of the head of the school actually is.

The proposed change has internal implications as well, Prof. Mooney said. While the School of Architecture is a freestanding school, it is anomalous within Notre Dame in possessing that status yet not being headed by a dean.

Prof. Mooney said that while the Executive Committee unanimously approved the proposal, there was some disagreement concerning it at the committee level. She expects there to be discussion on it.

Prof. Frecka spoke in opposition to the proposal. He noted, though, that he feels as if he has an entirely different perspective on this issue than do many at the University. The proposal has been approved by the Faculty Affairs Committee of the Academic Council and the Executive Committee. Yet, for several reasons, he simply does not understand its purpose.

First, one of the rationales provided in the documentation is to elevate the status of the School of Architecture. Prof. Frecka has looked at some national polls of architecture programs, however, and in one poll, Notre Dame was ranked 14th; in another it was ranked as high as 9th. Given those high rankings, he does not see how the status of the school in the outside world has any relation to whether or not it is headed by a dean rather than a chair. The argument made by proponents of the change that it would elevate the status of the school seems to elevate form over substance. The title of the head of the school appears to have nothing to do with issues that actually affect others’ perception of the quality of the program.

Second, Prof. Frecka said, it is argued that many

architecture programs of similar size have deans as their heads. That is true, but at the same time, it should be noted that Notre Dame's School of Architecture is quite small. During the 1990s, its average graduation numbers were 37 baccalaureate students and 5 graduate students. Beginning in 2001, those numbers began to increase. Now, the average is 45 baccalaureate students and 7 graduate students.

Related to this point is the fact that while many small architecture programs are headed by deans, the prevalent model—particularly common among architectural programs that are highly rated—is that the dean is responsible for multiple departments in a college—not only architecture. For example, at Cornell University, which is ranked first in one national poll, the dean oversees the College of Architecture, Art and Planning. Architecture and the individual departments are each headed by a “chair.” Another example is Harvard University. There, architecture is included within the Design School, which is headed by a dean; yet there are three departments—one of them architecture—that are each headed by a “chair.” At the University of Illinois, the dean heads the College of Fine and Applied Arts; however that college includes seven departments, one of which is the School of Architecture, headed by a “director.” Thus, Prof. Frecka concluded, it appears that at other institutions, the title of “dean” is accorded to administrators who have multi-disciplinary responsibilities. Elevating Notre Dame's chair to the position of “dean” would be entirely different and would give its dean a status unlike that given to Notre Dame's five college deans and the dean of the First Year of Studies.

Third, it is argued that Architecture is a bigger part of the University than is indicated by quantitative measures, such as the number of students that graduate or the number of faculty, and it is essential that the school have a dean to allow it to be involved directly with the deans of the colleges, and with the central administration of the University. This issue relates directly to governance. But, as the proposal stands, even if the title of “chair” is changed to that of “dean,” the provost could still delegate the reporting function of the head of the school to another person, as is the case now. [Currently, the *Academic Articles* provide that the School of Architecture report to the provost

through the vice president and associate provost.] And, the School of Architecture is already represented on the Academic Council. While it is proposed that the dean of the school serve on the Provost's Advisory Committee (PAC), one could easily make the case that even if the head of the school continues to hold the title of “chair,” he or she could serve on PAC.

For these reasons, Prof. Frecka concluded, he has many reservations about the proposal. Finally, he suggested that if Notre Dame wants to add a new dean for the purpose of elevating the status of its architecture program, a far better way of doing so would be to set up a new College of Fine Arts that would include Architecture; the Department of Art, Art History, and Design; the Department of Film, Television, and Theatre; and the Department of Music. That is the model at many other universities. Doing so here would strengthen the remaining Arts and Letters departments, make Arts and Letters a more manageable college, and also give the opportunity for other fine arts units to increase their visibility and to improve their governance.

Prof. Hatch said that he is a pragmatist on this issue. Since he has served as provost, the University has held two searches for the position of chair of the School of Architecture. In the course of both of those searches, he learned that a number of people would not come to Notre Dame unless the head of the school was renamed “dean.” That offers some indication of the significance the title “dean” holds in the profession. Even though Notre Dame's School of Architecture may be small, schools of comparable size, like Rice and Princeton, have deans. Thus, given that Notre Dame has an architecture school of long standing and we want it to prosper, there is a marginal advantage in according its head the title of “dean.”

Prof. Hatch said that as to the issue of the title “dean” being associated with a multidisciplinary unit, that argument could go either way. Notre Dame has a college of law, and it does not have departments.

Also, Prof. Hatch observed, there is the issue of representation. It is critical that the School of Architecture have a voice in certain fora—for example, on the Provost's Advisory Committee. In fact, he has asked the chair of architecture to be present at PAC meetings the last two years because

of his strong feeling on this point.

Prof. Hatch concluded by saying that he understood the arguments against the proposal. There is already tremendous disparity in size between entities such as the Law School and the College of Arts and Letters. Nevertheless, if Notre Dame is to have an independent School of Architecture, we want it to advance. We want it to develop its graduate programs. To do so, it is advantageous to accord its head the title of “dean.”

Prof. Sterling, substituting at this Academic Council meeting for Prof. Roche, Dean of the College of Arts and Letters, said that he and Prof. Roche have discussed the issue and have one concern. It relates to the disparity in size between the College of Arts and Letters and the School of Architecture. The college has 10 departments that are larger in size than the entire School of Architecture. At times, it is appropriate to have uniform representation among units; at other times, however, there needs to be more attention to proportional representation.

Prof. Sterling noted that one example of disproportional representation occurs when the various colleges nominate faculty for awards. Often, Arts and Letters is allowed to nominate the same number of faculty as every other college. That procedure seems unjust when it has over 460 faculty, as compared to the 17 who are in Architecture. Thus, Prof. Sterling said, the point he and Prof. Roche would like to make is that when certain administrative issues at the University are considered, the disparity in size between the colleges should be weighed—or at least given more attention in the future than has occurred in the past. Again, consideration to proportionality has occurred in some instances, and PAC is a good example. Arts and Letters has twice the representation there than that of Science, Business or Engineering.

With those points as background, Prof. Sterling, said, he and Prof. Roche nevertheless support the proposal to change the title of the head of the School of Architecture to “dean.” First, it would remove the current anomaly in the administrative structure of the University. Second, the change would seem to bring Notre Dame into line with peer practice. To see the School of Architecture flourish, a change of title for its head is necessary.

Prof. Hatch noted that at the beginning of the last strategic planning process, he had a conversation with Prof. Roche about whether Notre Dame should consider forming a College of Fine Arts. The issue was discussed quite intensively, he believes, within the college, but the ultimate decision was not to go forward with that idea. Nevertheless, he thinks the idea interesting. In terms of management, that kind of structure would have certain advantages. While the University should keep the option of a future college of fine arts open, Prof. Hatch said, at least at the present, the college chose not to move in that direction.

Prof. Phelps asked if approving the proposal at hand would in any way foreclose the possibility of establishing a college of fine arts at Notre Dame or make it more difficult to form one.

Prof. Hatch said that approving the current proposal would not foreclose the possibility of establishing a college of fine arts. In some ways, because the School of Architecture is independent now, he does not think the proposed title change would complicate to any great degree a future reorganization of the College of Arts and Letters.

Prof. Woo said that when the School of Architecture was spun off from the College of Engineering, the University already went down the path of establishing it as an independent academic entity with its own scope of activity. The title of “chair” has the feel of probationary status—as in the beginning, when Architecture was first made independent and there was uncertainty about its position. Now, Architecture is a central part of the academic enterprise at Notre Dame. Its success is part of the success of Notre Dame. If she were the chair, she would want the connotation of probationary status to be removed.

Prof. Higgins suggested that an intermediate position between “chair” and “dean” might be “director.” That title would not foreclose the possibility of future restructuring of Architecture and other departments into a new college of fine arts. Nor would there already be a dean in the School of Architecture whose status might trump that of the other department heads brought into the college.

Prof. Higgins also asked Prof. Frecka whether his point is that the stature of the School of Architecture has nothing to do with whether its

head holds the position of chair or dean because the school's stature is already high.

Prof. Frecka said that was correct.

Then, Prof. Higgins asked Prof. Frecka what specifically he wants.

Prof. Frecka responded that he does not understand the logic of the proposal and would like it to disappear.

Prof. Mooney asked Prof. Lykoudis, chair of the School of Architecture, to provide members with data on small, freestanding architecture schools with deans.

Prof. Lykoudis said that there are 118 accredited schools of architecture or programs of architecture. Of that number, 27 are stand-alone schools. In terms of the number of faculty and students, five of the 27 schools are significantly larger than Notre Dame's, four are significantly smaller, and 18 are similar in size. All of those 27 stand-alone schools are headed by deans except two—one of which is Notre Dame.

In the stand alone schools, the only administrative structure is dean, associate dean, assistant dean, and so forth; there are no departments. There are some program coordinators, but Notre Dame has a director of undergraduate studies, a director of graduate studies, a director of the Rome Program, etc. Thus, there are some subdisciplines within Notre Dame that are very similar to the subdisciplines of other schools of architecture. Essentially, the point is that approximately one-third or one-quarter of all the schools of architecture are similar to Notre Dame in size and structure and are headed by deans. Those include some of the top schools—Princeton, Yale, and Rice.

Ms. Wykoff asked if there is a general definition in academia for the title "dean," or whether the definition is unique to each institution.

Fr. Malloy responded that the word "dean" is conventionally used for the head of a distinct academic unit of a college or school.

Prof. Mooney noted that many institutions have a "dean of students." Thus, the connection of a "dean" to a certain college or school is not always present.

Fr. Malloy added that the use of the term has much

to do with peer institutions. When Notre Dame introduced the title "provost" for the University's chief academic officer, it replaced that of "vice president of academic affairs." At the time, there was a change occurring in a certain kind of institution in the academy. The concept of "provost" is based on the British model of higher education. It presumes a high level of responsibility. As for the difference between a "dean," and a "director," Fr. Malloy said, there is likely to be controversy on that point. He associates the word "director" with a less complicated organizational structure and a smaller set of responsibilities—although both deans and directors are important in their own right.

Prof. Higgins said that she shared some of Prof. Frecka's concerns about the proposal. Her department, Music, has 17 fulltime faculty and is, in many ways, as much of a "school" as architecture. Within the department of music, there are many subdisciplines that could easily be their own departments. Prof. Higgins said that she, too, favors the concept of a college of fine arts. That preference, combined with her worry that according the title of "dean" to the head of architecture will foreclose options for a college dedicated to the fine arts at Notre Dame, makes her more comfortable with the title "director." Yet, Prof. Higgins concluded, she does appreciate the issues of prestige that have been raised.

Fr. Malloy asked for a vote on the proposal to change the head of the School of Architecture from "chair" to "dean." There was one vote of "no" and two abstentions. All other members voted in favor of the proposal. Fr. Malloy said that he approved the proposal as well, but as with the proposal on faculty grievances, final approval is needed by the Board of Trustees.

Prof. Mooney said that she assumes the approval extends to the amendments to the *Academic Articles*.

Fr. Malloy said that it does.

5. Update on the North Central Association Accreditation Visit. Prof. Ryan said that the March 22–24 visit by the accrediting team of the North Central Association went very well. Notre Dame will not have the final report for some time—probably not until the fall—but all early indications are positive. The University received

good feedback on certain areas of strength, as well as feedback on some areas that will be flagged for improvement. Much effort went into preparing for the visit, and that did not go unnoticed by the team. Prof. Ryan thanked all who were involved in preparations for the accreditation visit. She gave particular thanks to the many faculty and staff who worked long hours during the three-day visit.

Prof. Hatch said that he, too, thought the visit went well. The NCA appointed a good review team to Notre Dame, and they gave much substantive and useful advice. While not final, the team's preliminary recommendation is that Notre Dame be fully accredited for ten years free and clear. That is, there need not be one- or three-year follow-up visits nor follow-up reports for deficiencies. Nevertheless, he said, Notre Dame will be asked to address certain issues. Most of them, fortunately, are known to him.

Prof. Hatch thanked Prof. Ryan and Fr. John Jenkins, CSC, who both directed the accreditation effort. He also thanked Prof. Walvoord for her outstanding work on the self-study. It is on the basis of her work on issues of assessment that the University is further along than it was ten years ago. While Notre Dame will not receive marks at the highest level in the area of assessment, its marks will be good. As an institution, Notre Dame has been thinking more carefully in the last several years about learning goals and how to assess them.

Fr. Malloy, too, thanked all who were involved in efforts leading up the visit and during the days it occurred. The institutions represented on the team are a fine collection of schools, he said, and Notre Dame holds all of them in high regard. The accreditation team's chair, the dean of the college of letters and science at the University of Wisconsin-Madison, was very complimentary of the work that had gone into the self-study and the visit itself. He was complimentary as well about the enthusiasm displayed by many here for Notre Dame's mission.

On the first day of the visit, Fr. Malloy said, the chair asked for an hour of discussion about the issue of Catholic character and identity. That request resulted in very fine presentations on the issue by three deans and others. It appeared that the presentations were well received by the visitors.

Fr. Malloy observed that this last visit marked the third time he has participated in an accreditation

review. He chaired one effort—and that is an extremely demanding task, one filled with anxiety. This visit went very smoothly and was probably the most positive of the three he has experienced. It is nice to hear good things from one's peers as well as to receive good advice from them.

6. Committee Reports

(a) **Faculty Affairs Committee.** Prof. Nordstrom said that after the approval today of two items on the committee's agenda, there are only a few matters left for the committee to complete. One is a request by the University Committee for Academic Technologies to revise the academic charter for that committee. Another is work to clarify and bring consistency to the *Academic Articles* governing faculty elections. A third item is the proposal to make Teacher Course Evaluations public. Work is just beginning on the TCE issue. Prof. Nordstrom said that committee members are investigating the possible impact of disclosure.

(b) **Graduate Studies Committee.** Prof. Marino reported that the Graduate School has begun publicizing its program for graduate student insurance subsidies. The committee has been interested in this topic for a year and a half. Basically, he said, the program is a subsidy for three years of insurance premiums for graduate students. While all involved wished that the subsidy could be larger and that it might extend to family plans, neither was possible at this time. Nevertheless, the current subsidy is a start.

Also, Prof. Marino said, there has been some discussion over the last year about whether the Graduate Studies Committee should be abolished. Thus, it is difficult to know whether the members should go forward or wait to see the outcome of that discussion. He assumes that there will be discussion of possible reconfiguration of Academic Council committees in the near future.

(c) **Undergraduate Studies Committee.** Prof. Preacher reported that the committee has two items remaining on its agenda: the use of Advanced Placement credits for students and the question of departmental honors. Members plan to have a report or recommendation on both items for the April meeting.

7. Prof. Mooney's Departure from Notre Dame to Assume the Presidency of Saint Mary's College. Fr. Malloy congratulated Prof. Mooney on her new

position: president of Saint Mary's College. She will assume office on June 1. He thanked Prof. Mooney for all that she has accomplished at Notre Dame—and said that he knows she will do an extraordinary job at Saint Mary's as well.

Prof. Mooney thanked Fr. Malloy and said that as excited as she is “to move back across the road,” she knows that her last day at Notre Dame will be a sad one. She has been at the University for 24 years. To say that the time has been “a good run” would be a gross understatement. She has had wonderful opportunities at Notre Dame and made many great friends here.

Fr. Malloy noted that Prof. Mooney is already “wearing two hats” and asked faculty to be appreciative of all that she continues to do at Notre Dame even while she is carrying a large load at Saint Mary's during the transition.

There being no further business, Fr. Malloy adjourned the meeting at 4:45 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Carol Ann Mooney