

UNIVERSITY COMMITTEE ON LIBRARY AND SCHOLARLY COMMUNICATION

Meeting Minutes

February 24, 2017

Attending: Eric Bakovic, Chair, (UCSD), Leonard Nunney (UCR), Eileen Zurbriggen (UCSC), Wolf Kittler (UCSB), Dana Peterman (LAUC President), MacKenzie Smith (CoUL Chair) (telephone), John Colicelli (UCLA), Thomas Shannon (UCB), Cynthia Darling (UCSF), Amelia Regan (UCI) (telephone), Hayden Jackson (Undergraduate Student Representative), Yi Hong Sim (Graduate Student Representative), Karl Ryavec (UCM), Brian Eliceiri (UCSD), Richard Schneider (Former UCOLASC Chair, UCSF), Günter Waibel (Associate Vice Provost and Executive Director, CDL), Ivy Anderson (Director, Collection Development & Management, CDL), Catherine Mitchell (Director, Access and Publishing Services, CDL), Jim Chalfant (Chair, Academic Senate), Shane White (Vice Chair, Academic Senate), Brenda Abrams (Principal Analyst, Academic Senate)

I. Chair's Announcements

- *Eric Bakovic, Chair, UCOLASC*

Chair Bakovic welcomed members to the meeting and briefly reviewed the day's agenda.

II. Consent Calendar

Action: The October minutes were approved.

III. Consultation with the Academic Senate Office

- *Jim Chalfant, Chair, Academic Senate*
- *Shane White, Vice Chair, Academic Senate*

Chair Chalfant and Vice Chair White joined the meeting to report on current issues for the Senate and UC. Academic Council supported a letter from the President and Chancellors about campus climate and concerns for undocumented students and the Senate adopted its own statement. It is worth noting that each campus has an undocumented student coordinator. Council also expressed support for the in-state tuition increase approved in January and passed a resolution opposing any policy that would limit non-residents as a percentage or fixed cap on each campus. If some campuses but not others are permitted to be above the set cap, the Senate is concerned that the Regents will adopt a policy where we have more than one quality standard for the campuses. Vice Chair Shane added that all divisions of the Senate and all of the Chancellors are on the same page about limiting non-resident students. In March, the Regents will discuss the revisions to the policy on Professional Degree Supplemental Tuition and there are questions about how this tuition is utilized.

Chair Chalfant explained that ICAS is interested in continuing the California Open Educational Resources Council activities even though the legislation that created the Council has sunsetted. The CSU Chancellor's Office will continue to monitor this and Chair Chalfant indicated it is a way for UC to show that the University is invested in the effort. Chair Chalfant will forward more information to Chair Bakovic about finding UC faculty to participate. Chair Chalfant also mentioned discussions about harmonizing GE requirements and transfer degrees, and also noted that BOARS continues to work on freshman letters of recommendation. The Regents are very focused on the diversity of UC's admits and several have the view that it is a mistake to require letters, and the Regents will have to approve this policy. Chair Chalfant reported that the Senate is pleased with the Chancellor searches, one of which has just been completed. The governor included funding for UC Scout in the budget. The program creates online courses and course materials for high schools focused on a-g and Advanced Placement Courses.

IV. Senate Open Access Policy Status Report

- *Catherine Mitchell, Director, Publishing, CDL*

Director Mitchell provided an update on the Senate's OA policy and its implementation. There is a more pressing issue of how to continue the effort. UCSF's policy on OA paved the way for the Senate policy in 2013 and at this time a manual deposit process was utilized to add content to eScholarship. Deposits increased dramatically when Symplectic Elements was implemented to automate the process. This publication management system collects faculty publication records from indexes, brings them in, and prompts faculty with an email to claim the records and deposit. This has been successful and almost 35k articles that fall under the policy have been collected and deposited, which is a good collection rate. A distributed access picture illustrates that people all over the world are accessing this content, an outcome very much in line with the goals of the policy.

However, there are now worries about the funding for Elements going forward and Director Mitchell will raise questions that need to be asked in terms of how to proceed at this point. The costs of the project are not inconsequential. Some costs are absorbed into CDL's budget without any augmentation, primarily staffing costs related to policy education, outreach and the technical activities of running Elements. The Provost has provided funds to pay for the licensing of Elements: \$284K in 2015-2016 (which included \$34K from CDL) and close to \$300K for 2016-17.

However, this year the Provost is not providing funds. The Provost does not seem convinced that this effort is something her office should fund or that the outcomes justify continuing in this fashion. CDL submitted a request which Provost Dorr considered but was not compelled by, so CDL will absorb this license fee for one time only with funds from its collections budget. CDL has no standing budget for this. The policy has become an unfunded mandate and staff who should be working on other things have been reassigned to this program in support of the Senate OA policy. The first issue to understand is how much the owners of the policy care about it. In addition, the President's OA policy has not been implemented yet due to CDL's lack of resources. The President's policy extends the OA coverage to all employees of UC.

In the absence of funding, the degree to which the policy can and should be implemented needs to be determined. Does the Senate want a UC-owned/managed collection of UC-affiliated published materials? In light of changes in federal funding agencies, should policy implementation re-focus on at-risk disciplines? Should there be a focus on the Humanities, where open access does not have as firm a foothold and where there has not been much progress in collecting publications? Does the Senate still want or expect the libraries to continue facilitating the policy and does the Senate care whether this automated system is used or would it be okay to go back to something that is manual and provide basic support of the policy? Is Symplectic Elements the best solution for implementation of the Senate policy, and for the eventual implementation of the Presidential policy? Do we need a broader stakeholder base via integration with other systems (e.g. academic personnel) on individual campuses?

A final question is whether the Senate would be satisfied with the low level of participation and have a policy that protects the non-exclusive rights of the faculty to their publications but does not focus on the deposit piece and making sure that the public has access to the research. CDL needs an understanding of how important the OA policy is to the system before CDL fights for funding or certain types of solutions. The decision-making process needs to include CDL, campus libraries, and the policy owners which include UCOLASC and the Academic Senate, and a funding model that is informed by these requirements and the resources available to address them needs to be identified.

Discussion: It was suggested that faculty need to be educated about the OA mandates from granting agencies and how they relate to the Senate's OA policy. When UCD came online in January 2016 there

was pushback from faculty because there is a huge difference between claiming the publication and depositing it. The participation rate is around 15%, which is disappointing and is a concern for UCD's Executive Council and it is one reason they are considering signing on to OA2020. Finding the author's final manuscript can be complicated for faculty and CDL. Director Mitchell pointed out that it can take years to build participation but the goals for policy including a goal for the participation rate has not been defined. Director Mitchell asserted that when OA2020 occurs, issues related to the Senate OA policy will become much less relevant. OA2020 and the Senate policy are complementary and until OA2020 rolls out, an interim solution is needed. Unlike other institutions with OA policies, UC has not been able to hire staff dedicated to identifying the author's final manuscript.

The committee discussed how to define the goals of the Senate OA policy. The total number of global downloads can be used to argue that the policy is making a difference, and the data show a positive uptick in access in the global south. However, without a sense of what the policy aims to do, any numbers, related to downloads for example, become abstract. Perhaps the priority could be on the disciplines that are not well represented or lack the opportunities or resources to publish in OA, such as the Humanities. It would be helpful to have baseline data on who wanted access to the publications they did not have before. The overall number of take-down requests from publishers has been low.

V. Preliminary Discussion of Systemwide ORCIDs

- *Eric Bakovic, Chair, UCOLASC*

This topic was not discussed.

VI. Update on Journal Licensing

- *Ivy Anderson, Director, Collections, CDL*

Director Anderson reported that CDL worked on two major journal publisher negotiations for 2017. The agreement with SAGE publications was concluded a few months ago and the terms were what CDL expected. New products were acquired that many campuses wanted with this negotiation with a low increase cap, although this does put a strain on CDL's budget. The Springer Nature merger complicated the negotiation for CDL. CDL was able to preserve its major pricing for existing Nature journals although Director Anderson noted that this agreement is still being finalized. Shaving even a few percentage points off the increases has long term consequences because the increases accumulate over time. Every percentage point that is shaved off the increases has a significant cumulative value for the University. CDL now has a less advantageous annual discount for new purchases but the outcome is better than what Director Anderson expected. Overall it is a good outcome because UC will receive good value for the added money that UC is spending, but UC is spending more money over the course of the next three years. This is another situation that continues to put pressure on the library budgets.

CDL has spoken to these publishers about the implications for shifts to OA. In Europe, many libraries are moving into off-setting deals with large publishers where the costs of article processing charges for OA publications are incorporated into the journal subscription agreements. This has been more controversial at UC where there are different perspectives around OA2020. In the U.S., SAGE does not have experience with these off-setting arrangements while their European arm has been engaged and doing a lot more in this area. There is discussion about hosting a symposium at UC about OA in the Social Sciences so that SAGE can engage with the academic community. These discussions have the potential to be positive and non-adversarial. CDL has delved deeper into these discussions with Springer because it is one publisher that has been aggressive in this arena. In Europe, many organizations are part of what is called the Springer Compact. There are some barriers including that Springer has an APC of \$3K for their journals and getting below this could be a challenge, and UC also wants an agreement that would be cost neutral. Another meeting with Springer Nature will probably take place in Berlin in March.

The Electrochemical Society approached CDL about an initiative called “Free the Science” which is an innovative model where a society endowment would fund OA without any author or institutional fees. A modest increase in their licensing fees will allow OA for all UC authors. This has been discussed with the campus libraries in the context of collection development and it is felt that this could be worth investing in. Authors have to specifically request making their articles OA and CDL is thinking through how to facilitate this step. There are two questions to answer here:

1. Would UC authors want CDL to make their articles OA automatically?
2. Will UC authors find it intrusive if the libraries contact them individually about making their articles OA after publication?

Discussion: Regarding the “Free the Science” initiative, one member voiced support for the non-invasive process where CDL would arrange to make the articles available without consulting with authors individually. Director Anderson clarified that Pay it Forward assumes a world without the licensing agreements, and off-setting arrangements are seen as a transitional model while institutions move away from the large licensing deals. Committee members will take Director Anderson’s two questions back to their divisional library committees for input. Some faculty who support OA may still want to be asked before their publications are automatically made available in OA.

VII. Continued Discussion about Senate Open Access Policy & Systemwide ORCID

- *Eric Bakovic, Chair, UCOLASC*

Chair Bakovic welcomed the University Librarians to the meeting and reported on the committee’s discussion this morning about how the OA policy has become an unfunded mandate and how to proceed, including being more explicit about the goals of the policy and identifying a yardstick by which success might be measured.

Discussion: The Council of University Librarians discussed how to support the OA mandate now that UCOP has decided it will no longer fund an expensive tool (i.e. Elements) that is essential to the way that support has been set up. If providing the most robust solution using Elements is the decision, how will it be paid for and what will be given up collectively to pay for it are issues to figure out. Many libraries feel they have reached a fiscal cliff and have done a great job at doing more with less and hiding the pain, but the libraries are quickly reaching the point where the pain cannot be hidden.

A member asked what the target audience for OA is, whether it is primarily people in the U.S. who lack the ability to pay for these journals or if it is something broader. The Senate OA policy will exist whether or not UC has access to Elements but there will not be as much claiming of articles and the number of deposits will be lower. Questions include whether there are other options for increasing the deposits of articles beyond the tool itself and whether faculty will continue to deposit their articles in OA if Symplectic Elements is no longer funded. The problem is not limited to the U.S. and it is an opportunity to talk to other countries about this matter. There is tremendous concern around the world by scholars, researchers and students who want access to this very expensive material and who lack that access. Many groups are now working to promote OA. Scholarly Publishing and Academic Resources Coalition (SPARC) in North America is now working with a start-up SPARC Africa and nascent organizations in other parts of the world. This is an opportunity to talk to politicians about how we can work with other countries. SPARC has been able to hire lobbyists who spent time with both of the candidates during the presidential campaign.

Vice President Ellis met with the Council of University Librarians this morning and noted that UC authors publish 100 articles a day and that 40% have international co-authors. In the past ten or twelve

years, there has been a 1% increase per year in the number of international authors. A member involved with his Society's publications committee shared that there is pressure from Europeans who cannot publish in journals that do not have OA platforms. To what extent is UC doing something better or duplicating what others are doing is one question. Different fields may feel differently about censorship so this might help prioritize funding. Censorship is a major concern in Oceanography. It has been noted that OA adds to the author's citation count. The OA policy has added to the work required of faculty as a result of multiple places where publications need to be uploaded, so a more integrated approach would be desirable. A conversation is needed about whether more streamlined processes can be created. If faculty want Elements because they do not want to do the work themselves, a key question is whether they are willing to pay for it and sacrifice something in return.

One member reported that the campus's orientation for new faculty in the Fall will include a presentation by the UCOLASC representative and the University Librarian on the OA policy including a demonstration of how the process works. Faculty need to be made aware of what happens when they publish in OA and younger faculty who feel they are under pressure to publish no matter what should be informed that there is a worthy goal. Something that can be measured is needed. UCOLASC could focus on the messaging to faculty and the message needs to go beyond simply stating that OA is good by explaining why. Libraries can continue to provide the staff support but there are use cases and reasons why the faculty think this is worth doing. A member suggested looking at the OA policy as an opportunity to set up a repository in case the lights go out. The Office of Scholarly Communications website is not highly visible and it needs to be integrated into many other venues where the message needs to be consistently and persistently articulated. The overlay on eScholarship makes eScholarship opaque and masking the repository however accidentally is not a good thing.

VIII. Potential Political Interference in Scholarly Communication and Open Access Advocacy

- *Eric Bakovic, Chair, UCOLASC*

The UC Office of Scholarly Communications (OSC) Statement on Commitment to Free and Open Information, Scholarship, and Knowledge Exchange was shared with the committee. The OSC is considering different specific actions and one effort will be to re-engage UC researchers with the OA policy and other data archiving offered by the CDL and other units across the campuses. Similar discussions have occurred at the divisional committees and this discussion at the systemwide level is not intended to subsume those conversations. Chair Bakovic is working with a subgroup of the OSC team which is putting together messaging and materials to distribute to the libraries and library committees which will ultimately be distributed to researchers. Meeting participants were invited to share any similar efforts taking place at their campuses.

Discussion: Government data is the most vulnerable material and there have been UC efforts to download some of this data. There is an integration of library service and computer services in support of maintaining this effort at UCR. The UCR Library and CDL will discuss whether CDL can provide a front-end service to help harvest these data on behalf of faculty who have identified content or already downloaded at-risk material. UCLA is also engaging in this process. There is a risk of data being grabbed and destroyed. Politics aside, the infrastructure is not robust. A question is how to mirror Data.gov. Government data is not copyrighted so UC can copy it and the University Librarians are working on developing a place where the data can be stored.

A coalition of climate researchers from across UC is working on a process to replace federal funding over the next four years. The funding mechanism is likely to be a general obligation bond. A first step is determining how much funding each UC campus receives for climate research. It was noted that there is federal government material and then there is academy-generated research data. An infrastructure, the Digital Preservation Network, has been built by academic research libraries specifically to provide

geographically distributed dark archiving services and the Network has a huge capacity that is just waiting to be used. The Network has over sixty libraries involved and the UC system has deposit rights, and faculty need to be made aware that this exists.

A member suggested that UCOLASC should bring a statement forward to Academic Council expressing concern about various actions taken by the federal government. UCOLASC may endorse the statement from the OSC. A Senate committee might take a more strident tone and list some of the data that has been removed by the new federal administration and state that UCOLASC is opposed to these actions as academics who insist on the free exchange of information. Chair Chalfant indicated that if UCOLASC brought something forward, the Academic Council is very likely to support it. Chair Chalfant pointed out that the Committee on Research Policy would be interested in the efforts related to archiving data.

The federal government might suddenly decide that data currently publicly available is for official use only. UCOLASC might encourage depositing articles in areas that are at risk. A motion was made and approved for UCOLASC to draft a statement to Council that Council will be asked to endorse and a second motion was made and approved to provisionally endorse the OSC statement.

IX. OA2020: Reviewing the State-of-Play

- *Eric Bakovic, Chair, UCOLASC*
- *Jeff Mackie-Mason, University Librarian, UCB*
- *Ginny Steele, University Librarian, UCLA*
- *Ivy Anderson, Director, Collections, CDL*

Chair Bakovic summarized the OA2020 initiative. The issues surrounding OA2020 are very complex and the choice to sign on to the Expression of Interest should be discussed at each campus at COLASC meetings in coordination with the campus libraries and librarians. Director Anderson drafted the helpful pro and con document to facilitate the campus discussions.

UCB's University Librarian indicated that his campus plans to sign the Expression of Interest (EOI). The library committee has discussed it and the Provost and Chancellor have given their approval. The EOI is viewed as a commitment to actively explore ways to move away from the world of subscription journals and into a world of OA, where there is no subscription paywall. It does not commit UCB or other campuses from moving in any particular way. The community that developed the EOI, mostly European institutions, appears to favor a particular model known as the APC model or Gold OA where authors pay a fee to cover the cost of the publication. The cost of funding an article does not change based on where the funds come from. There are other approaches to explore.

The Gates Foundation announced a new initiative which is an agreement with Science that all publications funded by the Foundation will be published in OA in Science and the Foundation has provided the funding to Science for this initiative. This is a funder pre-payment model. The OA2020 EOI is agnostic with respect to this and other models. People at UC interested in signing the EOI have developed a roadmap that describes various different approaches that can be explored and followed. The commitment made by signing the EOI is just to explore how to quickly move away from the subscription model to non-subscription OA and figure out effective ways to fund this. There will be different ways to fund journals depending on the discipline or publishers' different models, but it is important for UC to be part of the conversation about OA2020 and to collaborate with various institutions. OA2020 is an interesting model but it still gives money away to the publishers. Even if faculty have a choice the impact factor will remain critical. UC will want faculty to publish in the most reputable journals.

Discussion: A member shared that some faculty are convinced they will suffer with the move to OA and will be worse off in terms of costs. The University Librarians are talking with President Napolitano about increasing the budget for collections as a way to support some of the transitional costs. For the sciences, if a venue is not OA the faculty still pay page charges and if it is OA faculty pay more. Money previously applied to subscriptions can be redirected to APCs. The impact factor is a central consideration for faculty. The goal is to flip all journals so that the issue of the impact factor becomes neutral. OA2020 is a small part of a larger effort by UC to regain control of scholarly communication and transform it in ways that work much better for what academics want to achieve and break down the control the publishers have over scholarly communication.

One University Librarians stated that the Max Planck Society's version of OA2020 is about APCs. Going the route of APCs still means giving publishers the money. It is good that the conversations the Council of University Librarians and UCOLASC are having are elevating the OA2020 discussion above the APC level. UCLA is looking closely at OA2020 but the campus is also exploring the possibility of pre-prints being adapted as a way of making faculty research available in an affordable way. An examination of pre-prints in arXiv compared to final versions of the articles found virtually no differences in the final articles. What is missing with the pre-prints is that there is no way to do the peer review process and have the full editorial process, so UCLA is looking at investing in some of the pre-print servers, based on discipline, to determine if there is a way to expand pre-prints. There are authors without access to funding such as graduate students. The various different initiatives and approaches to the problem will provide data that will help CoUL and UCOLASC make decisions. Until authors can say that they will stop giving money to publishers, there will not be change. There is a question about whether APCs are the best model. A member suggested that UCOLASC should consider issues related to peer review as faculty have limited time to participate in this and other activities.

There is a question about whether being part of OA2020 will actually strengthen publishers or weaken them. Authors give publishers power when they turn their copyright over to them. Another key issue for faculty is prestige and the last thing faculty think about are page charges. The point was made that for authors in the Humanities page charges are significant. The non-binding nature of the OA2020 statement is important for campuses which are making a decision about supporting the statement. Some campuses might want to experiment with models other than OA2020. Signing the EOI will send an important message to the publishers that faculty are taking OA seriously.

X. AAU/ARL OA Monographs Task Force

- *MacKenzie Smith, CoUL Chair, UCD*

UCOLASC has committed to review and address scholarly communication issues faced by faculty in the Humanities and Social Sciences and Monograph publication has been identified as a key area of concern. UCD and UCLA are representative institutions involved with the AAU/ARL OA Monographs Task Force. The initiative may offer some ideas about experiments that UC might try with Humanities publishing. The initiative ran a call for participation over the last couple of months and ten institutions signed up and three more are pending. The initiative is looking for a five-year commitment for a minimum of \$15K per book for three books.

Right now it is not clear which publishers will participate in the initiative. Luminos at the UC Press is a definite yes, but the initiative is discussing this idea with multiple different publishers but none have made a commitment at this time. The leaders at AAU and ARL are optimistic that publishers will sign on but many of the libraries are indicating that they will not fully participate unless there is significant participation by the publishers. The Luminos project continues to move forward and has been successful so far. The Knowledge Unlatched initiative just announced that it will publish over three hundred books in the Humanities and Social Sciences via their library subvention model. These will be digital-first, print-

on-demand books. Authors are showing a lot of interest in this model and the trick will be to get a sufficient number of publishers to take a chance on it. The publishers are worried about losing revenue and are debating the actual cost to publish. The libraries are particularly concerned about the lack of participation by publishers.

Discussion: There were several assumptions about the \$15K and various figures have been discussed. Chair Smith would like UCOLASC's feedback on the idea of setting up a faculty editorial committee to help the library decide who should receive the \$15K.

XI. NRLF4 Expansion

- *Jeff Mackie-Mason, University Librarian, UCB*

UC has two shared library facilities in the north and south which are systemwide facilities and owned by the system but operated by UCLA and UCB on behalf of the system. It is anticipated that both facilities will be filled by the end of 2018. The facilities are needed because the system continues to purchase materials which are only published in print and because all of the campuses are space constrained and facing pressure to move shelving off campus. The President provided money to study the expansion of the NRLF and since the study has been completed, the librarians have had several discussions with the finance group at OP. The finance group accepts that this is a system facility and it is a system capital responsibility. UCOP has given a tentative agreement to provide \$30M in funding for the expansion. The funding will only cover eight years of the expansion plan. The funding will come out of the 2018-2019 budget. President Napolitano has to make the final approval. The planning team and OP will meet on a bi-weekly basis to develop the materials to submit to the Regents, tentatively for their July meeting to get the approval to move forward with the project.

Discussion: The UCB representative expressed appreciation for the work that has been done to reach this point. Modules five and six are still in the long-term plan. Expansion of the SRLF is off the table for seismic reasons.

XII. Campus Reports and Member Items

Davis: The creation of a library space planning steering committee raised concerns that books would be eliminated. A study found that the library is overwhelmingly an undergraduate research library. The faculty was anxious about what will happen with the library and there is pressure to re-purpose the library space. The subvention project has been endorsed which has allayed fears expressed by faculty in the Humanities. The campus has voted to sign the OA2020 EOI.

Riverside: The Professional Degree Supplemental Tuition policy was discussed and the committee advocated for inclusion of library resources in this policy. The committee discussed affordable class material and ways to encourage professors to use free text books online but there is a question about how to encourage people to write those materials. The campus has a new budget model which is based on last year's budget.

Merced: The campus is in the middle of discussing whether it will sign the OA2020 EOI. The University Librarian has provided presentations to different stakeholders on campus. The Vision 2020 project will double the size of the campus but it does not include space planning for the library, and the collections budget for the library has not increased in 6 years (of the 12 years that the campus has been in existence). Part of the library is still being used by the administration.

Santa Barbara: The new library has been open for a year and is great building. The committee has discussed the storage of large data sets.

Santa Cruz: The committee has just started discussing OA2020 and Pay it Forward. The committee is involved in developing a survey that will be distributed to faculty to assess how important the library is to faculty. An outside design firm has been hired to conduct research that will inform the renovation of the science and engineering library. This is a long term project for which there is no funding, but the work is in the very early stages.

San Diego: The committee has discussed OA.

San Francisco: The library has discussed OA2020 and is signing the EOI. The Academic Senate has now doubled the funding available to help faculty publish in OA. A concern for students is safety so this will be a focus for the committee. The search for a University Librarian is ongoing.

Los Angeles: A big issue for the library is overcrowding. A task force is assessing the use of classroom space. A vote on OA2020 will be taken by the committee in the near future. A portion of a recent large donation will be used to fund an endowment.

Berkeley: The fourth and fifth floors of the undergraduate library have been renovated and students seem happy with the new, open space. The library committee provided input on the planning for future growth. The University Librarian has been engaged in fundraising. The committee discussed and approved signing the OA2020 EOI. Graduate students have expressed concerns, including possible plagiarism, about the requirement to file their dissertations electronically. The graduate division has proposed imposing an embargo of two or three years. The electronic deposit is not mandated at all UC campuses and the UCSC representative reminded the committee that she volunteered to serve on a task force looking at this matter. Director Mitchell reported that seven out of the ten campuses are already making dissertations available. This will formalize what in many cases is already a practice. This will be on the agenda for the spring meeting.

XIII. New Business

There was no New Business.

XIV. Executive Session

There was no Executive Session.

Meeting adjourned at: 4 p.m.

Minutes prepared by: Brenda Abrams

Attest: Eric Bakovic