

BOARD OF HIGHER EDUCATION

August 23, 2021

10:00 a.m.

Livestreamed, via Zoom

Meeting Minutes

A special meeting of the Board of Higher Education ("BHE" or "the Board") was held virtually on Tuesday, May 04, 2021, on the web-conference platform Zoom.

The following Board Members were present:

Chris Gabrieli, Chair

Sheila Harrity, Vice Chair

Cameron Costa, Voting Student Member, University of Massachusetts segment.

Ann Christensen

Alex Cortez

Patty Eppinger

Paul Mattera

Paul Toner

Bill Walczak

James Peyser, Secretary of Education

Cindy Mack, non-voting State University Student Advisor, Bridgewater State University

Carlos E. Santiago, Commissioner and Secretary to the Board

The following Board Members were absent:

Veronica Conforme

Mike O'Brien

Judy Pagliuca

I. CALL TO ORDER

Chair Chris Gabrieli called the meeting to order at 10:03 a.m. and announced that this meeting is being held remotely and in accordance with Governor Baker's recent Executive Order which suspended certain provisions of the Open Meeting Law for the purpose of authorizing public bodies to allow remote participation by all members while the state of emergency is in effect. Chair Gabrieli announced that the meeting is being livestreamed via Zoom and recorded. The Board did not receive any requests for public comment. Department of Higher Education (DHE or Department) Chief of Staff Elena Quiroz-Livanis, then took roll call attendance (see above for attendance roster).

II. WELCOME

Chair Gabrieli took the opportunity to welcome the two new student members joining the Board. The students included: Cameron Costa, a UMass Dartmouth student, who has been elected as the FY22 voting student BHE member representing the University of Massachusetts segment; and Cindy Mack, the State University (non-voting) student segmental advisor, who attends Bridgewater State University. Student member, Jorgo Gushi, will continue as the non-voting student advisor for the Community College segment, but Jorgo could not attend today's meeting.

Chair Gabrieli outlined the purpose of this special meeting, stating that it was to continue the discussion of the Academic Affairs Committee (AAC) June meeting, during which the AAC received the two Equity Agenda-related reports. Chair Gabrieli wanted the full board to have the opportunity to be fully briefed on these reports before the September BHE meeting. The other purpose of this special meeting was to review the BHE By-laws, board structure and processes.

III. DISCUSSION

List of documents used:

[BHE Meeting PowerPoint 8-23-2021](#)

A. FY22 Priority Setting

The discussion began with the FY22 priority setting agenda item. Chair Gabrieli acknowledged the important work done by the Department to actualize the Equity Agenda. Describing the day's meeting as a working session, he encouraged all members to fully engage with comments and suggestions on the presented materials. He then invited Commissioner Santiago to outline the planned presentation.

Commissioner Santiago summarized the presentation saying the 70 slides highlight the Department's key initiatives and were structured such that it started with introductory remarks by him on racial equity followed by recommendations around financial aid and concluded with the New Undergraduate Experience (NUE) report. The focus of the NUE portion of the presentation included admissions and transfer, curriculum, teaching, learning and assessments. He said space would be opened for questions and discussion after each presenter and before the next topic. He said the presentation goals were to allow for Board members to 1) gain a better understanding of the Equity Agenda and related initiatives, and 2) develop consensus on top priorities for FY22.

Following the slides on racial equity, which Commissioner Santiago presented, and financial aid, which were presented by Senior Deputy Commissioner for Access and Student Financial Assistance, Clantha McCurdy, the presentation was paused for the members to consider and discuss the following questions:

1. Considering the substantial amount of unmet need experienced by public college students,

should the MASSGrant Plus program be expanded to include Pell eligible students (low income/EFC) at all public colleges and universities?

2. Will the BHE continue to prioritize continued increases in the annual budget request for financial aid? Increases in FY21 & FY22 were highest in three decades - yet falls short of what is needed to fully eliminate unmet need.
3. Are there questions regarding the role of incentive-based programs and emergency grants (also recommended in the Basic Needs Strategic Framework report), in removing barriers to student success?

Secretary Peyser began the questions by asking if the gap between Mass Grant and Mass Grant Plus left an unmet need with respect to room and board for State University students. He also asked Senior Deputy Commissioner McCurdy if there was any unmet student need at the Community College level after the combination of aid from the Pell and Mass Grant Plus grants for low-income students. Senior Deputy Commissioner McCurdy responded saying she would have her staff research his question but said the Mass Grant Plus grant for the four-year institutions was being designed exactly as it functions with the Community Colleges – meaning that Mass Grant Plus includes tuition, fees, and book allowances but not room and board charges. Associate Commissioner for Research and Planning, Mario Delci, added that there is a slight difference between Mass Grant Plus aid to students at our four-year institutions with gaps in coverage for books and supplies. He added that considerations such as cost of living and some transportation costs are considered in financial aid packages for Community College students. He concluded by saying that campuses traditionally craft financial package towards direct costs. Senior Deputy Commissioner McCurdy agreed, adding that every institution crafts financial aid packages to include cost of living, which includes room and board, or rent for students living off campus.

Cindy Mack, State University Student Advisor, spoke next and asked if the savings that occurs from the wider use of open educational resources (OER) is helping to support more student financial aid packages. Senior Deputy Commissioner McCurdy answered that each individual campus calculates these savings and reduces the cost of books accordingly. Student advisor Mack followed by asking how the campuses ensure they are crafting the right financial packages to cover student books when books costs vary widely depending on discipline. Senior Deputy Commissioner McCurdy responded, stating that campuses estimate book cost allowances which can result in a student receiving more of an allowance than needed and others receiving less. She added when book costs do exceed the student stipend, students often contact the financial aid office for help, and this is where the emergency grant highlighted in an earlier slide could be helpful. Further, all campuses, as well as the Department, conduct research and disseminate surveys to accurately assess actual incurred student costs to make financial aid packages as accurate as possible.

Member Walczak sought clarity on what constitutes an unmet need. An earlier back and forth in the meeting muddied clarity on this point for him. Senior Deputy Commissioner McCurdy responded saying the formula used for calculating the financial package for students is based on direct student costs – tuition, fees, and books - minus family contributions and other financial aid. The unmet need is what is not covered by the financial aid package including cost of living-- room and board, etc. The Commonwealth tries to fill the unmet need through its limited financial resources but, ultimately,

some students may need to take out loans to cover educational costs. In response, Member Walczak commented how black and brown students have fewer financial resources and more need, and when that need is not met then the Department and BHE is failing to address the Equity Agenda. Commissioner Santiago agreed with Member Walczak and put this concern in the context of comparable state support between Massachusetts and New Jersey. New Jersey contributes \$400 million to student financial aid compared to Massachusetts' \$20 million. Without greater financial support, Massachusetts will struggle to fill the gap. Member Alex Cortez added that the Board really needed to address the unmet basic security needs of students if the Board was truly invested in cultivating success outcomes from that population of students. Senior Deputy Commissioner McCurdy shared that the Department was looking at tuition, fees, and book allowances for both 2- and 4-year college students through the use of Mass Grant Plus. Member Cortez asked if the Department was also looking at room and board costs for State University students and Senior Deputy Commissioner McCurdy responded that the Mass Grant Plus is restricted to tuition, fees, and books.

The meeting continued with Deputy Commissioner Patricia Marshall presenting on the development of the New Undergraduate Experience report. She informed the members she would present the report in segments stopping between each to allow space for questions and discussion.

After presenting the first segment on the guiding principles, student bill of rights and "admissions, enrollment and transfer," Deputy Commissioner Marshall paused and presented the following discussion questions:

1. Do you think that using the Student Bill of Rights to organize the recommendation is effective?
2. Keeping in mind that NUE is a vision document for strategic planning, is there anything missing from the Cross-Cutting Equity Recommendations or the Content-Specific Recommendations that you believe should be included?
3. Is there anything fundamental missing from the Admissions & Enrollment Recommendations?

Member Walczak spoke about the medical and behavioral needs of students in economically disadvantaged areas and asked if the Equity Agenda, as represented through the NUE report, has plans for providing medical and behavioral services through some referral system or through some partnership with another branch of government. Deputy Commissioner Marshall appreciated the insightful question and said she would bounce it to Secretary Peyser as EOE recently issued an RFP for behavioral tele-health services. She believed EOE had already contracted with three potential vendors to provide campuses with choices for establishing tele-health services. Secretary Peyser added that his office is offering the campuses a webinar the following day. He said the purpose of the webinar was to allow each campus an opportunity to get to know the contractors better before selecting one of them over the next couple of weeks. Payment for service will not be through insurance but through student fees with inaugural year costs covered by federal COVID funds.

Member Paul Mattera spoke to address the first discussion question about organizing the NUE report recommendations through the Student Bill of Rights framework. Knowing that with any bill of rights comes a corresponding set of obligations, he felt concerned the state would not be able to fulfill the

report obligations to the student, at least not in the short term. He gave the example of the right to a diverse and supportive faculty. While aspirational, such a scenario is not one the campuses can deliver on immediately. A diverse faculty will take years to cultivate. He asked if other members shared his concern. Deputy Commissioner Marshall answered by speaking to the aspirational and visionary purpose of the document with the expressed obligations (*i.e.*, goals) being a responsibility of everyone. Member Patty Eppinger, who chaired the NUE report, added that the report identifies short, medium, and long-term goals/ aspirations allowing flexibility on meeting the identified aspirations.

Chair Gabrieli encouraged the Board and the Department to sort through the recommendations and action items to identify those items which can be acted upon immediately and those items needing more consideration or time. He did not think the Bill of Rights was the right framework to follow though he admired its simple, clear, and urgent messaging for the new undergraduate experience. He expressed pleasure with the framework Commissioner Santiago shared at the beginning of the presentation that spoke to areas of action saying it was a framework more familiar to the Board. He encouraged members to consider the timing and sequence of actions but felt bolstered by the more robust Department budget providing the Board more freedom to act. He also said it would be important for the Board to better identify direct student costs and uncovered costs to better address the issues.

Member Walczak asked about planned goals and timelines for acting on some of the seven recommendations. Deputy Commissioner Marshall responded, stating that task will be part of the strategic planning process and Commissioner Santiago agreed.

Board Member Cortez expressed support for Member Walczak's comment of transforming the NUE document from one of visioning to one of action. The presentation then continued addressing the topic of transfer.

While Deputy Commissioner Marshall was presenting the student transfer slides, Member Cortez expressed concern that the responsible parties would fail to actualize the report recommendations without sufficient resources needed for implementation. Secretary Peyser followed this comment by encouraging the expended use of credit for prior learning and more consistency from campus to campus both vertically and horizontally in the system. Deputy Commissioner Marshall agreed with Secretary Peyser and said the Department is addressing this issue through its HEIF grants. She then continued with the presentation on the transfer slides and paused at the end to pose the following discussion questions:

1. Do you have any questions related to the transfer recommendations?
2. Is there anything fundamental missing in this area?

Student Member Cameron Costa asked if the NUE document included language on supporting students after transfer. Deputy Commissioner Marshall responded saying the report did and mentioned areas such as the reconsideration of a students' unallocated course credits in the transition from a community college to a four-year institution, the analysis of how many transfer students the institution graduates, and the length of time to graduation.

Deputy Commissioner Marshall next moved on to the curriculum slides, and at the conclusion of that section paused and presented the following questions for discussion:

1. What are your thoughts on the recommendations on the previous slide?
2. Is there additional information that we can provide in this area to help advance this work?

Commissioner Santiago invited Deputy Commissioner Marshall to talk about the success of the co-requisite model as the impetus for eliminating the non-credit courses. Deputy Commissioner Marshall spoke about the 5% increase in completion rates for Black and LatinX students in gateway credit bearing math and English courses because of the revised common assessment policy which dispelled the notion of Accuplacer being the only means of assessment. She also spoke about the beneficial psychological aspect of replacing non-credit bearing developmental courses with co-requisite credit bearing ones. Hearing no other questions, Deputy Commissioner Marshall continued the presentation addressing the topic of equity-minded teaching, learning and assessment and concluded with these discussion questions:

1. Is there anything fundamental missing from the recommendations on Equity-Minded Teaching, Learning, and Assessment?
2. Is there additional information or data that we can provide in this area?

Member Walczak commented that his son is currently attending Bunker Hill Community College where the use of OER is dependent on the course and faculty member teaching it. This observation led him to wonder about adjunct professor salaries and salaries for faculty in general. He asked if the Department planned to conduct a study of faculty salaries. In response, Deputy Commissioner Marshall spoke about the time and labor on contingent faculty to create and curate OER as an area often not well compensated. She said the Department was conducting salaries studies but she didn't have all the details at hand though she knows the contractual nature of salaries makes the study challenging. Student Member Mack spoke saying she agreed with the idea of providing sufficient faculty stipends for converting their course materials to OER. On this point, Member Cortez shared his idea of sharing OER content for common courses across the system as a way to both expand the initiative, reduce costs, and save faculty time. He thought such an idea seemed fitting with the statewide effort over common course numbers. He gave the example of an ECON 101 course being taught in multiple campuses where instead of the faculty from each separate school generating their own OER content, the content could be created once and shared without being monolithic. Deputy Commissioner Marshall thanked Member Cortez for his excellent suggestion and moved on to holistic student support, concluding with the following discussion questions:

1. What are your thoughts on the Basic Needs Support recommendations? Is there anything missing?
2. Is there additional information or data that we can provide?
3. Which Content-Specific area recommendations are emerging as priorities for you? Which recommendations do you believe would be most impactful in advancing the Equity Agenda?

Student Member Costa spoke first and asked if the basic needs security recommendations included language covering menstrual equity. Deputy Commissioner for External Affairs, Katy Abel, replied saying the basic needs security design is to provide a student with a one-stop contact for assisting

with all their needs. Thus, while menstrual health is not identified specifically, there will be resources for all students needs including the health of women. Member Walczak offered the aspirational goal of behavioral and mental health care being provided in the same way these services are available to high school students. Member Cortez praised the modern access delivery modes available to students created in the Basic Needs Security plan, such as texting, to meet students' current ways of communication. He also highlighted the value of these modes of access for the easy data collection and market trends it offers. Deputy Commissioner Marshall thanked Member Cortez and said she wanted to take a moment to review the last decision question seeking members responses on which Content-Specific area recommendations are emerging as priorities for them. Student member Mack spoke first expressing a priority in food pantries. He said he would like to see other resources just highlighted available at the food pantries for more centralization and recommended the pantries be available for both morning and afternoon/evening students. Member Walczak identified his priorities being transfer issues. Student Member Mack added the importance of making access to basic needs services as anonymous as possible because of the shame students may feel around needing help.

The presentation then moved back to Commissioner Santiago to discuss the Strategic Plan for Racial Equity. The Commissioner spoke about the funding received by the Lumina Foundation in support of the strategic plan and of the issued RFP and hiring of Deloitte for helping with aspects of the work. He then broadly outlined some of the key pieces of the plan before turning the meeting over to Elena Quiroz-Livanis, Assistant Commissioner for Academic Policy & Student Success and Chief of Staff. Assistant Commissioner Quiroz-Livanis shared the objectives, goals, planned activities and timeline of the plan and then presented these discussion questions:

1. Is the relationship between NUE and the Strategic Plan for Racial Equity clear?
2. Are there additional data categories in the Environmental Scan we should consider?
3. Are there additional questions we should ask in the systemwide survey?

Member Mattera spoke first making the point that he hoped the plan included ways to learn from work already happening on the campus and he gave the example of Salem State University's movement to a one point of contact for all student services called Navigate. He expressed the hope that the strategic plan wouldn't result in the dismantling of good programs or the opportunity to learn from them. Assistant Commissioner Quiroz-Livanis concurred with Member Mattera's comments pointing out that the NUE report was built, in part, on the discovery of effective campus strategies. Just as important, she said the strategic plan also dissuades campuses from following or implementing ineffective strategies. She assured Member Mattera that the Department would be moving forward collectively with the campuses. Member Walczak asked if the stakeholder survey would include BIPOC students who dropped out. Assistant Commissioner Quiroz-Livanis replied that it would not but understood the value of asking questions from students we failed to retain to better understand why. She said she would raise this question with the Deloitte team. Member Cortez encouraged close Department collaboration with the campuses on the survey prevent any blind-siding, especially where the campuses conduct their own surveys. He also made the point that survey questions raise expectations of follow-up actions and for the Department to be cognizant of that in its communications to the campuses. Member Cortez also requested the opportunity for the Board Members to provide feedback after the meeting on the dense content in the presentation making it difficult to provide one's full reaction sufficient time is allowed to consume it all. Assistant

Commissioner Quiroz-Livanis responded outlining the plans that are inclusive of a close partnership with the campuses.

Chair Gabrieli expressed his vision for what he thought would be the best approach for presenting much of the current meeting's information at the September Board meeting. As he saw it, there were recommendations that could proceed directly to action, such as this year's increment in financial aid, there were some recommendations and/or items that would be handled by working committees, and there were some recommendations or/or items that were part of the ongoing racial equity work under the 10-year strategic plan. With the understanding of the different stages of the work and how the Board best engages with the Department, the Chair suggested that the information be presented with the aid of this type of timeline-thinking to help with the Board digestion of the issues to better execute on its guiding role. Assistant Commissioner Quiroz-Livanis thanked the Chair for his feedback and assured him that the Department would be prepared to discuss how the work aligns with the different advisory councils. She then turned the meeting over to Commissioner Santiago for the discussion on finance issues.

Commissioner Santiago said he would be handing the meeting over to Deputy Commissioner for Administration and Finance, Tom Simard, to provide an overview of the Department's different financial levers and how the Department supports the campuses financially in different ways but, before he did, he wanted to piggy-back on the Chairs comments to add the separate issue of the need for the Department and Board to be clear on its authority in relation to the outlined action steps. Some actions are within the purview of the campuses and others lie with the Board. This important consideration will be at the forefront of actions for moving the work forward. With that said, the Commissioner passed the meeting on to Deputy Commissioner Simard. After presenting slides which captured data on current, proposed, and future state funding and funding priorities, Deputy Commissioner Simard presented the following discussion questions:

1. Timing and process to inform and approve BHE FY23 Budget Recommendations?
2. Timing and process to revise Funding Formulas?
3. FAAP AC charge and workplan for a Higher Education Strategic Finance Study effort?

Member Walczak commented about the need for campuses and the Board to understand the impact of any changes to the campus formula funding before it occurs. Deputy Commissioner Simard agreed and reminded members that the current formulas substantially reflect input from campus representatives and that any future changes would as well.

The meeting was then handed back to Commissioner Santiago who discussed preparations for the retreat. Those preparations included taking the Board input from today's meeting, and any follow-up input, for building work plans for each policy lever priority that would include its goals, key stakeholders, and a timeline. He then turned to the Chair and Chief Legal Counsel to present on the next agenda item, related to plans for revised BHE By-Laws.

B. Review of By-Laws, Board Structure and Processes

Chief Legal Counsel, Constantia (Dena) Papanikolaou set the context for the next agenda item stating

that the intention is to spend the remaining time of today's meeting to discuss and hopefully develop general consensus on an implementation plan for the new Advisory Council approach proposed in the amended By-Laws. By way of background, Chief Legal Counsel Papanikolaou referred back to Chair Gabrieli's June 7th memorandum to the BHE, in which he set forth the vision and guiding principles for the new Advisory Council approach, which included seeking to improve Board governance and functioning by supplementing the BHE/ DHE expertise and resources by including non-BHE members in the process.

Chief Legal Counsel Papanikolaou shared that from a legal perspective, her focus as she worked with Chair Gabrieli to capture his proposed vision in the new By-Laws, was to try to help set some clear boundaries on Advisory Council non-BHE-member roles vs. BHE-member roles, noting that while public participation and stakeholder/ consultant input are important, under the statute and as a matter of law, only duly appointed (or elected in the case of segmental representatives) BHE-members have the legal authority to govern. Chief Legal Counsel Papanikolaou further reminded the Board that the statute prohibited the BHE to delegate its authority to any one person or group of people, with the exception of the Commissioner.

With that context, Chief Legal Counsel Papanikolaou indicated that she came up with several options on how to proceed and the proposal offered today is to create three standing Advisory Councils to replace (eliminate) the existing standing committees. The Councils would meet regularly, two weeks before each BHE meeting, and would take up only policy/ strategic matters, as assigned, for comment or recommendation to the full BHE. Core function motions would be handled directly by the BHE, and purely ministerial matters would be delegated to the Commissioner. Under this proposal, the Executive Committee would meet regularly and take on a broader governance function, reviewing agendas and potentially assigning or referring matters to a Council, or to a committee of the whole, for further development.

Chief Legal Counsel then described the composition, charges, and proposed membership of the four proposed Advisory Councils, and the two remaining committees (the Executive Committee required by statute, and the Early College Joint Committee established in BHE/ BESE motions). Finally, Chief Legal Counsel Papanikolaou described the proposed nomination process for non-BHE membership to the Advisory Councils, which would include a formal nomination solicitation period and minimum screening criteria for eligibility (*e.g.*, demonstrated subject-matter expertise; conflict of interest considerations; time commitments).

Chief Legal Counsel Papanikolaou turned the remainder of the presentation, along with the facilitation of the discussion, to Chair Gabrieli who reviewed key issues for considerations. Chair Gabrieli reinforced that the main purpose of the new Advisory Council structure is to allow the BHE to spend more time on strategic issues and less time on ministerial items, and to take advantage of the expertise of non-BHE members in appropriate amounts. He noted that the more ministerial matters would be handled directly by the BHE or the Executive Committee.

He further pledged that the process would be continuously reviewed and if the process is not working the Board can avail itself of other options or approaches. For example, the Board retains the right to

create committees, as may be needed. Chair Gabrieli stated that they would also be looking for explicit input on how the process is working over the course of the year. Chair Gabrieli reviewed the proposed changes and the initial assignments and membership for the newly named Councils and then opened the floor to discussion.

Hearing no questions, Chair Gabrieli moved on to explain what he wanted to accomplish for this meeting. He identified a circular problem, stating that we cannot establish the Advisory Councils until establishing the process, and if we do not establish the leadership of the councils today, then we cannot have productive discussions on how to shape the process and will not be able to accomplish anything in preparation for the September meeting. Accordingly, he asked for a vote on the leadership of the proposed Advisory Councils (the proposed co-chairs) to help advance the thinking on the charges of the Councils before the September meeting.

Chair Gabrieli then put back up the slide which included the table with the four initial Advisory Councils and their proposed membership and co-chairs (slide 68). He said that a vote on the full membership of each Advisory Council could wait until the September Board meeting, but for today's vote he was only looking for confirmation of the co-chairs. To that end, Chair Gabrieli read the following motion into the record:

Pursuant to the BHE amended By-Laws I am moving for BHE-approval of my recommended appointments of:

- Veronica Conforme and JD LaRock as co-chairs of the Finance, Administration and Accountability Policy Advisory Council (FAAP);
- Bill Walczak and Dr. Francesca Purcell as co-chairs of the Strategic Planning Advisory Council (SPAC); and
- Patty Eppinger and Sheila Harrity as co-chairs of Academic Affairs and Student Success Advisory Council (AA&SS).

Subject to the BHE reviewing the full charges and slates of membership for those any other Advisory Councils proposed during the upcoming BHE September retreat.

The motion was duly moved and seconded.

Member Mattera spoke first and stated that he was reluctant and had a level of discomfort about transitioning from the committee structure to a new Advisory Council Structure. He said he wanted to see how it unfolds and said it was important to develop some experience and retain some right to revisit the process—including reviewing what the Advisory Councils are working on and what they bring to the Board. While he stated that he would be voting in favor of the motion, he wanted to be on record that from a good governance perspective he is not 100% sold on the idea of transitioning the current committees to Councils which will include non-BHE members and will eliminate Committee authority to vote. Chair Gabrieli agreed that the process needs to be revisited and stated that he shared Member Mattera's healthy skepticism that we get it right and be willing to adjust it.

Member Walczak sought confirmation that the Councils formed through the new structure would be

bound by the Open Meeting Laws. Chief Legal Counsel Papanikolaou confirmed this understanding, stating that the meetings will be publicly posted, and minutes would be taken.

Hearing no further questions, Chair Gabrieli called for a vote. Chief of Staff Quiroz-Livanis called the roll, and the motion passed unanimously, with all members present voting "yes."

Chair Gabrieli concluded the meeting by noting that one of the reasons for getting the FAAP Advisory Council going is to be positioned to move forward on a strategic review of public higher education financing, as referenced in Deputy Commissioner Simard's presentation earlier today. He reaffirmed a commitment that this review would include a review of student unmet need and tuition retention. He noted that the legislature recently proposed an outside section that would establish a review group that would look at similar issues. That legislative process, however, has not been finalized yet. Meanwhile, Secretary Peyser has worked to identify funds to get the extra resources we need to conduct this strategic review. Chair Gabrieli concluded by stating that there was no decision point for the Board today, but that he was offering this for informational purposes and that he expected to be in a position to update the Board during the September meeting.

IV. OTHER BUSINESS

None.

V. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 1:03 p.m.