

4-17-2000

## Faculty Senate Minutes, Apr. 17, 2000

Eastern Kentucky University, Faculty Senate

Follow this and additional works at: [http://encompass.eku.edu/faculty\\_senate](http://encompass.eku.edu/faculty_senate)

---

### Recommended Citation

Eastern Kentucky University, Faculty Senate, "Faculty Senate Minutes, Apr. 17, 2000" (2000). *Faculty Senate*. Paper 70.  
[http://encompass.eku.edu/faculty\\_senate/70](http://encompass.eku.edu/faculty_senate/70)

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by the Minutes at Encompass. It has been accepted for inclusion in Faculty Senate by an authorized administrator of Encompass. For more information, please contact [Linda.Sizemore@eku.edu](mailto:Linda.Sizemore@eku.edu).

# Faculty Senate Meeting

## April 17, 2000

The Faculty Senate of Eastern Kentucky University called a special meeting on Monday, April 17, 2000 in the South Room of the Keen Johnson Building. Senator Murray called the eighth meeting of the academic year to order at 3:30 p.m.

The following members of the Senate were absent:

J. Adkins*	O. Hill*	C. Lewis	R. Rink	D. Smith	R. Thompson
J. Brown*	M. Hodge	M. McAdam*	M.A. Robinson	K. Spears	J. Vance
P. Elrod	S. Jones	J. Moreton*	G. Schick	J. Stephens	M. Willingham
J. Harley	T. Knight	R. Powers	G. Schuster	J. Thomas	

\*Indicates prior notification to the Senate Secretary

Visitors to the Senate were:

Jill Allgier, Registrar; Dr. Rita Davis, Enrollment Management; Karen Sue Cain, MSCS; Linda Turner, CHS; Nancy Kenner, CHS; Jacinta Feldman, The Eastern Progress; Stephen Byrn, Admissions; Libby Wachtel, Academic Affairs-Planning and Programming Coordination; Dominick Hart, A&S; David Gale, CHS.

Senator Murray called the special meeting to order.

Senator Miller called attention to several items regarding parliamentary procedure. Senator Miller distributed a document to clarify these procedures.

### UNFINISHED BUSINESS

**[Because of the importance of the new admissions policy and because the extended discussion in this session of the Senate throws valuable light on the final action of the Senate, I have included much of the actual language of the discussion. R. Miller, secretary]**

Senator Marsden made a motion to approve the proposed Admissions Criteria.

Senator Schlomann asked about graduation rates for lower ACT's. Dr. Karen Carey reported the 97-98 graduation class had 40% of graduates had ACT's of over 18 in all five areas. Average ACT score of students graduating was 19. Average of our entering freshman was 19.7. Some graduates had taken six developmental courses, but very, very few. 50% of the 97-98 graduating class transferred to EKU.

Senator Marsden stated that students under the new policy, who previously had been enrolled in full standing, would now be admitted in the several conditional categories. Will there be some students who will not be enrolled in ECU? He stated that some will, but we do not have a definite number.

Senator MacKinnon spoke in favor of the proposed admissions criteria. He said that we should emphasize that this policy does not change our standing as a school of opportunity but that it would make a statement to the world that ECU does have expectations of its entering students. We do not want to retain our image as a school of last resort.

Senator Dilka expressed a concern that this proposal would negatively affect students with special needs.

Senator Falkenberg stated her concern that the new admission policy would require "a minimum ACT composite of 18 with no standard score below 18." This is an excessive dependence on a standardized test alone. She made a motion to table this issue and have the chair of the Faculty Senate appoint a subcommittee to look at this policy and return to the Senate with a revised policy of Admissions Criteria. After parliamentary clarification, she gave notice that she would move to *postpone indefinitely* after further discussion..

Senator. Marsden: Each of these issues is a good one. Your colleagues who have proposed this have taken these issues into consideration. The issue of students who have a hearing problem has been addressed. We believe that what is before the Senate today is a very rational approach to dealing with high-risk students. He urged not to postpone action on the policy.

Senator Yoder spoke in favor of the motion as it stands. She remarked that we do students a disservice if we do not fully advise them of their weaknesses and how to address them. Much of the proposed policy is already mandated by CPE.

Senator Flanagan noted that the Pre-College Curriculum must be fulfilled. He asked how fulfilling this requirement would be taken care of. Dr. Davis responded that according to the current catalog, all students must complete all developmental courses and PCC requirements by the end of the term in which they attempt their 45th hour.

Senator Thompson asked, Do you have any idea how many students will fit in the bridge program?

Dr. Davis responded that this policy is not meant to be exclusive at all. This policy is a requirement saying to students that you will accept our help. CPE has told us that beginning fall,

2001, 18 will be the minimum entrance requirement. We are trying to be proactive. Will have a bridge program to accommodate these students.

Senator Thompson: The 18 is a composite score required from CPE, as I understand it. What happens if we were to postpone for further study?

Senator Marsden: In order for this to be effective for the fall of 2001, the information has to be circulated sufficiently ahead of time. If the Senate does not pass it, we would not be able to implement it fall, 2001. We need to have a year lead-time.

Senator Falkenberg expressed concern that a large majority of our entering students would enter on probation and we would not have an infrastructure to handle them.

Senator Sowders: Is everything under item B in the proposed policy what CPE requires?

Mr. Byrn: CPE is proposing a standard where 18 composite and 18 sub-scores will go into effect, whether or not the Senate votes for it. The advantage allows us be proactive. From a recruitment standpoint, we have to have time to get information out to students. The consultants, Meridian Marketing, state that this program (or a variation thereof) is going to be their recommendation. They report that there is a perception out there that ECU has no admission standards. If you are an unprepared student, you go to Eastern. What we are trying to do is change the public's perception and make ECU an institution of first choice.

After further discussion about the meaning of the policy, the status of entering students, and continuing concerns about students in special categories with special needs, Senator Wasicsko stated support for the policy but saw a problem with the second to last paragraph, noting that criteria for admission to the bridge programs seemed to be missing. How does a student with a special need gain access?

Senator Wasicsko made a motion to add an amendment to the Admissions Criteria as a fourth category for *Bridge Program First Step Admissions*. Raise this to an additional criterion as a possibility for admission with the understanding that these programs are funded and up and running prior to the Fall 2001 implementation. Senator Janssen seconded.

Senator Murray: Senator Wasicsko has now proposed an amendment to have the last two paragraphs rewritten as a category four and an official component of the Admission's Policy.

Senator O'Connor added a friendly amendment to label category four as "Special Admissions" which would include all types of bridge and supportive programs.

Senator Wasicsko asked to add to his amendment to adopt categories 1-3 but in addition to creating category 4, labeled "Special Admission, " to also create a Senate committee to work with Dr. Davis and come up with criteria and address all other concerns by the end of the fall term. Senator Janssen accepted the change.

Senator Rainey asked for clarification regarding which programs are in existence and which are not? Are there criteria already established for the programs?

Senator Marsden responded that many of these programs are state and federally funded and do have criteria established. It is not something that we can articulate in a simple document. The Director of Admissions needs a complete document to circulate to all those who will be affected by it by no later than August 1, 2000 if it is to be in effect by the fall of 2001. This is truth in advertising, as Senator Banks stated. The major issue is whether the Senate should become involved in the articulation agreements between these programs and admissions requirements and so on. The Senate should be aware that a group of dedicated people, who spent the better part of a month, put together a Title III Grant earlier this year. If the grant is funded, it will be in the amount of \$1.5 million dollars for over a five year period to support these efforts. The University is doing all that it can to identify the dollars that are needed to support these programs which includes lobbying in Frankfort.

President Kustra was very successful with the help of a lot of other people in the legislature in getting recruitment and remediation money broken into two parts. So some of it will be available this fall. That is some of the money we need for some of these programs. So there is certainly a little trust that has to go into play here. These are all important programs. These are all programs that this institution will fund to the best of its ability.

Finally, we are not changing the mission of ECU. This institution has a mission and is very proud of it. This is a way of dealing in a responsible way. This is a very clear, straightforward, honest, fair way of dealing with our students. Bottom line is we graduate 26% of the students that come into this institution. Forty to fifty percent of our graduates are transfer students. This is a very significant variable here. The CPE is behind the 18 cut-off with a 17 in English, Math and Reading as the automatic placement. We also know that the Council is going to move toward these admissions criteria. This is getting a jump start. There is no hidden agenda. I speak against the motion.

Senator Janssen wanted to answer a question asked earlier. The Center of Deafness has recently been funded and has not been specifically funded for this purpose. So, it would require for the Center of Deafness to seek additional funds for doing something different than what it was initially funded for and that's why the statements have been made that not all of these programs

are, at the moment, in place. That doesn't mean that it could not be done. It's just that we are in the process of a lot of things and so there are uncertainties filtering in.

Senator Wasicsko: I've been persuaded by some of the arguments of some of my colleagues to ask for one last friendly amendment. I still think that there are four categories, because if you look at the paragraph beginning with "Students now heading probation hearings" then things should be pretty clear that they're talking about different categories. I would be happy to amend my motion one last time to take the suggestion of #4, Special Admissions, leave the paragraph as it's stated, but instead of saying "Bridge Program--First Step, " say "Special Admissions Program. " We can leave the entire first paragraph and say that that precludes having any need for any additional committees to work with the Retention Committee, etc. It does at least have on our historical document that we do know that there are, at times, other categories of individuals that need to be given a hearing. Senator Janssen accepted the revision.

Senator Murray: I believe we went back to the original motion to amend. Basically to substitute "Special Admissions" for the words "Bridge Program - First Step" and leave the rest of it intact without any stipulation for sub-committees and establishment of criteria. Is that acceptable? Any further discussion on the amendment, which is to create a category 4 entitled "Special Admissions, " which would reflect the statement as written on your yellow piece of paper, and substitute "Special Admissions " instead of "Bridge Program--First Step " anywhere that it may apply? Motion passed.

Senator Falkenberg made a motion to postpone the Admissions Policy definitely until October meeting. Senator Dunston seconded. The motion failed.

Senator Schломann: I move that we amend the criteria to delete the parenthesis on 1B and remove the parenthetical with no standard scores below 18. Senator Falkenberg seconded.

Senator Yoder requested clarification on what the CPE standard is going to be. I think it should be in line with CPE. It is in my understanding that CPE is requiring those sub-scores. I could be wrong, but I'm asking for clarification.

Senator Marsden: As I understand, and we've been working with Council on Postsecondary Education for about nine months on this, CPE will require that all students who are entering four year baccalaureate bound institutions beginning in the year 2001 will be required to have scored at least an 18 in English, Math, and Reading, or they will be mandatorily placed into remedial courses. If this amendment were to pass, we would be granting full admission to students who in fact would need to find remediation standards, or course work, as defined by the state of Kentucky. Therefore, I obviously will speak against it. It doesn't make any sense to me to do that, when that

is what we're talking about--granting full admission to individual students who have a deficiency. I come back to Professor Banks. Again, this is truth in advertising. Are we saying to a student, "You can have full admission to this institution, but excuse me, you have to take this reading course or that math course over there." I think it is simply a straight forward approach. I keep coming back to that because it seems so crystal clear to me that this is a way of being honest with people. I would have a hard time granting full admission to any individual that the state of Kentucky says needs remediation.

Senator Murray: Senator Marsden, a point of clarification. You said that the CPE indicates that they must have a score of 18 in English, Math, and Reading, but not in Science Reasoning. So then, would it be acceptable, instead of saying "No Standard Scores " to define what "No Standard Scores " means?

Senator Marsden: Well, if you were tying it directly to the CPE, but my understanding from the admissions office where I asked for clarification is they were talking about all of the standard subscores, not just those three. I'm focusing on those three to answer the question about the CPE, but the action to oppose it came forward for all substandard subscores. That's my understanding. Correct?

Mr. Byrn: Yes, my understanding was that the discussion within the body that developed this was to be cognizant of the CPE standards, use those as a framework around which we built our own standards. So these incorporate both standards of Eastern and standards of the CPE curriculum.

Senator Wascisko: Is there a way to remediate a below-18 Science score? Are we going to require a course in that? I think we're talking about the three areas that we would ask people to take a course in.

Senator Marsden: Are there particular ways to remediate a science course at a particular time? There may be, depending on the program that you're in, you may have to make up a course. The real issue is, will there be other areas of remediation in the future? By 2004, all students graduating from high school in the state of Kentucky will be required to have a minimum of two years of high school language, in a single language, before they can be admitted into a baccalaureate bound institution. That's another remediation problem, but that's a few years off. So I'm simply saying that there are multiple remediations possible. The answer to your question is, there may be some science that would have to be remediated for a particular program.

Senator Dunston I have just one question. If we submit a minimum ACT composite score of 18, with no standard scores below 18, what happens to those students? Do they automatically bounced down? They go down to probationary?

Senator Murray: Yes. And they would then have to fulfill the developmental courses within their first 45 credit hours of enrollment. Yes, they are considered on probationary status.

Senator Janssen: As I understand it, if they don't have an 18 on each of their standard scores, then they could be admitted "probationary " if they have a 2.5 on a 4.0 scale. So that does leave a question regarding those that have an overall fairly high ACT score, but they have one score that falls below 18, and they have a GPA over 2.0, but not a 2.5. They are not probationary.

Senator MacKinnon moved the previous question. Senator O'Connor seconded. Motion to stop debate and vote on the amendment passed.

Senator Murray: We are now voting on the amendment to remove the parenthetical statement with no standard scores on section 1B under "Full Admission". The motion failed.

Senator Murray: We are now back to the original motion, which is the admission criteria proposal as it is before you, with the previous amendment to add Roman Numeral 4, "Special Admissions" .

Senator Flanagan: I rise in favor of the original motion. I think that it is worth our effort to go ahead and pass this document with the understanding that there is going to be still a lot of work to be done to go ahead and make this work. I think that they have indicated that that is indeed the way that business is going to be carried forward. I see two reasons why the Senate deals with it. Number one, to give the Senate s opinion on any substantial item or whatever that needs to be dealt with. Number two, to get information that we didn't have to take back to our faculty.

Senator Yoder: Having just voted down the amendment, I still do have a problem with 1B parentheses where it says "with no standard scores" I would prefer that it only mentions that you must have standard scores of 18 for those things that can be remediated. Otherwise, I don't understand how you get out of probationary status, if you have no way to remediate it. So we know that we're remediating Math, English, and Reading, I think those should be the only four listed there in that parentheses. I move to amend the statement.

Senator Murray: We have a motion to amend 1B to state, "with no score below 18 in English, Math, or Reading." The motion has been seconded by Senator Taylor. Discussion on the amendment.



Senator Janssen: As I understand it, these are admissions requirements, and it's not a matter of status forevermore within the University, but merely admission requirements. So it's not like you move from probationary to full admission. Rather, if you're admitted through the probationary and then to stay in the University, there are requirements that you need to meet. Correct me if I'm wrong. I still have a problem with the discrepancy there with a group of people who may not have an 18 score. They come in probationary, but they can't come in probationary if they don't have a 2.5. It just seems like there is a piece there that is out of sync that I'm not understanding.

Senator Goodwin: I'm not sure that I'm really responding to what she said, but I do have a question of my own. If indeed we're using a Science score, for instance, that is under 18, to put them in this classification, and we don't have the remediation for that particular discipline, why are we putting them into remediation? What are we putting them into remediation for? So that's my question that I hope to have answered.

Senator Marsden: It might be appropriate, if I might, to have the Director of Admissions respond.

Mr. Byrn: Again, my understanding of why it was inclusive across the board was to be pre-emptive in what we think the group that worked on it thought would be standards that could possibly be implemented by the CPE. We can live with the three. That's not a problem.

Senator Murray: I will speak on this, and I do have a question as to if we have them on probationary admission, and they have to fulfill their deficiency within 45 hours, and it's in Science, what are they fulfilling it in? So I think it is a legitimate question at this time.

Senator Jackson: Either third time's a charm or I'm beating a dead horse here, but I would like an answer from the Admissions Office. There is a chunk of people, full admission, at a 2.0 or higher, but composite 18 and as it is right now, an 18 in all levels. When we go down to probationary, the GPA is 2.5. So, let's say I have a 2.3 high school GPA, I have a composite 18 score, but one of those was not at the 18<sup>th</sup> level. Therefore, it sounds reasonable that I would drop down to probationary, but probationary, I have to have a GPA of 2.5. So where do I go in this mix? If I could have a specific answer from the Admissions Office please?

Dr. Davis: Well, that's a good question, but the point would be, I believe, that they would be probationary until they remediate. They would have to remediate. At this point, I think that they potentially could be Special Admittance. That's a good point, but we already have policies in hand that you have to remediate if you're below a certain sub-score.

Mr. Byrn: I think that some of the history of this I don't know about. My understanding is that the reason the 2.5 was used was to compensate for the lower ACT scores. You raise a valid point. I would have to give it a little more consideration before I can give you a reasonable answer.

Senator Strong: I guess what comes to mind, since you're on Probationary Admission, why do you have to compensate? Therefore, it would make more sense to have that as a 2.0 also.

Dr. Davis: Well, the intent there is because we know some people do not test well, so they may not do as well on the ACT. We wanted to give them the benefit of the doubt in having a higher GPA. That's what the NCAA does. This doesn't have anything to do with athletics, but if it did, it would look quite different! I can assure you that! But there is a sliding scale there that is used frequently. So that if it's a lower ACT, it's a higher GPA requirement. That gives the student the benefit of the doubt.

Senator Yoder: I have seen that GPA of 2.5 to balance out that low ACT score. I think that we don't have to fix that necessarily as of yet. Where I would see a fix is having B say "minimum ACT score of 15 or above." That way that covers that person who had that composite score of 18, but had a sub-score below.

Senator Marsden: As the way I understand, that would be an acceptable substitution for a lot of major problems. Except that, Professor Banks is becoming my model here when he keeps raising the issue of truth of advertising, if someone has less than 18 in a particular sub-score, it does indicate that there's a potential problem for that student across our curriculum. That's what that was intended for. While under "Probationary Admission to 2.5 on a 4.0 scale was," as Dr. Davis suggested, a way of compensating for those who would have an ACT composite of 15, 16, or 17. At least 15. They could be placed in this category because of that differential. It was an attempt on the part of those who came to the open hearings to put some correctives in place for those students who did not test well on the ACT scores. I don't think it's a "Catch 22", but if it is, that's very unfortunate. I think it's really good for students.

Senator Taylor: The amendment was just dealing with the three categories, where we do have remediation, be added and that the fourth not be included. I do understand the reason why the fourth was wanted to be included, but since I've been in Kentucky (almost all of my life) and I've seen Frankfort and I've also been a reporter who covered politics in Frankfort, I can tell you that when they put a date, that's just a hopeful date. That's sort of like a temporary tax in Kentucky. It doesn't exist, it will always be there. There are certain things you know. So, I would say that until Frankfort finally passes new standards, and when they pass the new standards for foreign language too, I agree that we need to move into it, but I don't believe that there's any need for us to

move into it, since we do know how slowly things move in Frankfort--just looking at the budget recently. I would suggest that we just vote on this issue, and then bring up the "2.0/2.5" issue after we vote on this amendment.

Senator Murray: We vote now on the amendment, which is to substitute under 1B the parenthetical statement to state that with no score below 18 in English, Math, or Reading?  
Motion carried.

Senator Huebner: I move to amend and add point C under Probationary Admission which reads meets criteria for full admission, but has one or more standard scores on the ACT between 15-18.

Senator Murray restated the motion to add under Roman number III to add C preceded by the word "or " that a student has at least one standard score between 15-18. Senator Jackson seconded.

Senator Wasicsko: There is a problem with the logic that could be fixed to combine A and B and then make one "or ". Instead of having the "and " have a B and move B to A and then have a B that says "or" .

Senator Huebner accepted this as a friendly amendment.

Senator Janssen made a motion to suspend the rules to extend the time of the meeting time. Senator Jones seconded. Motion passed.

Senator Huebner asked to withdraw the motion.

Senator Murray: We now are back to the original motion as amended, the Admission Criteria Proposal with an amendment under 1B which specifies the standard scores to be English, Reading and Math, no score below 18 and an area IV labeled as Special Admissions as described by the paragraph as it is written with the substitution special admissions.

Senator Sowders: I move the previous question. Senator Banks seconded.

Senator Murray: We are voting to stop the discussion, not to vote on the motion. Motion failed. Discussion continued.

Senator Jackson: I move that 3A change the GPA to 2.0. Senator Falkenberg seconded, but asked could you also put a 15 or higher after the 17. Senator Jackson agreed.

Senator Murray: The motion is that 3A change the GPA from 2.5 to 2.0 or a composite score of 15 or higher. So the amendment is 3A GPA 2.5 to a GPA of 2.0.

Motion passed.

Senator Murray called for the vote for the original proposal as it has been amended in the following ways: under number 1-Full Admission B instead of stating with no standard scores it will read with no score below 18 in English, Math, or Reading; and in 3A a grade point average of 2.0 and a category IV to be added "Special Admissions, " which is reflected under the paragraph as it is stated with substitution of "Special Admissions " for the word "Bridge Programs/First Steps " as is appropriate. Motion passed.

## **NEW BUSINESS**

Senator Murray asked to alter the order of business to consider a motion from the Council on Academic Affairs-- Motion to accept the proposed changes for assessing written communication skills for the MBA program. Materials were distributed in the April 3 Senate packet.

Senator Marsden stated that it is really a simple reporting function to you about a change in those requirements which are relatively modest about something we hope that you will receive more in a form of information.

Senator Marsden moved acceptance, seconded by Senator Flanagan. Motion passed.

Senator Marsden: Let me clarify a motion at the March 6 meeting. There were two pieces that were coupled together. I guess they were almost treated like separate motions. One was the handling of the new dismissal policy, which was passed by the Senate, and the other was a series of corrections in the catalogue that was brought to the Senate. As we've gone back and looked at those that came through the Academic Council and were brought to you and probably in retrospect should not have been brought to you, because they were truly catalogue corrections. Some of the senators asked questions about whether these involved substitute changes in programs and so on. My understanding of it is (and I asked the registrar to be with us today) is that these were simply catalogue discrepancies that were being clarified and if anything involved program change of any kind, they would ultimately be brought through the various curriculum changes.

Senator Marsden withdrew the motion to accept those changes since they did not need to be brought to the Senate for a vote.

Senator Murray asked for Senate secretary nominations. Senator Falkenberg nominated Dr. Karen Carey. No further nominations. She was elected.

Senator Thompson moved to postpone to the May 1 meeting her motion proposing a new policy on chair tenure. Motion passed.

## **ANNOUNCEMENTS**

Senator Marsden addressed the topic of *Honorary Degrees and Commencement Speakers*. We don't want to restrict to this particular region, and everyone should be able to submit names of anyone in the world you feel is deserving of an honorary degree. I would, however, caution everyone that just because someone is nominated and received by the Senate Executive Committee, it does not mean that they have been approved for awarding that degree. The main point is certainly to make clear there is no restriction on who you can nominate.

Senator Janssen encouraged the Faculty Senate to fill out the forms that the chairs of the departments have distributed to faculty.

Senator Murray announced that there will be an Open Forum on April 24<sup>th</sup> in the Jaggars Room, Powell from 12:00 p.m. - 1:00 p.m. This is a general open forum.

Senator Murray also announced that the reception for new faculty senators will be held on April 27<sup>th</sup> (also for the senators who will be coming back next year) in the Faculty Club Lounge. A special invitation for the chairs of the standing committees to be present at this meeting also.

Senator McGuire: I would like to make a request that the Admissions criteria be posted somewhere on the web with the new amendments.

Senator Janssen: Please encourage people to read the tenured faculty members review policy because hopefully we'll have a chance to vote on that at the very next meeting in May.

Senator Goodwin: The Ad hoc Committee on Domestic Partner Benefits initially met on January 20, 2000. The members of the committee are Doug Burnam, Elizabeth Hansen, Sherry Jones, Ashland Richardson, and Ron Mink. I was elected to serve as chair. At our first meeting, we assigned responsibilities for research and have discussions established for individual positions and concerns on the various issues concerning extending benefits to domestic partners. We then worked to establish a consensus regarding the goals of our committee. Since our divergent schedules provoked committee meeting, we met virtually through e-mail. As our deadline approached, I wanted to ensure that the details of our activities were agreed upon by the majority of our committee. We submitted a preliminary report, two days overdue to President Kustra, which detailed our research and presented our findings. I hope to bring motions from our committee

before the Senate during the main meeting, pending further committee meetings in whatever form they take. A copy of our preliminary report is in the main library at the circulation desk. If you ask for the report authored by our committee, which is in the black three ring binder, they generally find it very quickly. I encourage all members of the Senate to review our reports, regardless of your viewpoint on this issue. Please communicate any questions, concerns, or reservations you may have to me and/or any other members of our committee. Please additionally share this information with your departmental colleagues. We hope that you will study our works and the motions introduced by our committee can be considered in a timely fashion. Thank you.

## **ADJOURNMENT**

Senator Marsden moved to adjourn. Adjourned 5:50 p.m.