

2014-2015 University Senate

**Monday, April 6, 2015
2:45 pm, Assembly Hall**

Joette Stefl-Mabry, Chair

MINUTES

Present: Abraham, Philippe; Almahamid, Ilham; Altarriba, Jeanette; Chengalur-Smith, Indushobha; Sridar, Chittur; Cohen, Marc; Cruz, Jose; Dai, Aiguo; Fessler, Susanna; Fogarty, Rick; Ford, Michael; Fox, Cynthia; Goldfarb, Boris; Griffith, Glyne; Gulatee, Yenisel; Hobson, Janell; Hogan, Steve; Isralowitz, Joshua; Janiszewski, Caitlin; Jaromin, Michael; Jerison, Michael; Kearney, Ann; Kressner, Ilka; Kuznetsov, Igor; Lahiri, Kajal; Leonard, Danielle; Malavasic, Jolene; Mamorella, David; Manjak, Martin; McCaffrey, David; McDowall, David; Moore, Chris; Neori, Klil; Ng, Vivien; Parker, Catherine; Pasquill, James; Pettie, David; Poehlmann, Nancy; Robinson, George; Rorissa, Abebe; Rosenswig, Robert; Scheck, Helene; Schmidt, John; Sherman, Keith; Slade, Leonard; Stellar, James; Tucker, Ian; Vuille, Mathias; Wulfert, Edelgard; Yagelski, Robert; Zemel, Alan

Guests: Chesin, Sorrell; Forsythe, Celine; Wenger, Jessica; Slye, Katherine; Tian, Yan; Benjamin, Bret; VanUllen, Mary; Tchernev, Alexandre; Cheney, Debora; Seery, Sheila; Steigerwald, Barbara Lee; Bartow, Jon; Hedberg, Bill; Trachtenberg, Barry; Phillips, Susan; Reinhold, Karin

The meeting convened at 2:47 pm.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

The minutes of March 9, 2015 were approved with minor changes and the following voting results:
Approved 36, Opposed 1, Abstained 6

Chair Stefl-Mabry requested, and seeing no objections it was accepted by acclamation to change the agenda so that the GOV report would follow the Chair's report, as discussion and debate were anticipated.

The Chair then asked Parliamentarian Howard to discuss the procedures that would follow. The Parliamentarian stated he would like to briefly explain his role in the Senate, as the minutes were amended before voted upon in the meeting. He clarified that he makes suggestions to try to help the meetings run smoother and according to "Robert's Rules of Order". The Chair and others can agree or disagree with them, and he is just here to help. He added that because the previous meeting became contentious, at that time he suggested it would be appropriate to move to the GOV committee report. People can vote to approve or disapprove of the related GOV committee actions, which could allow for debate and discussion at that time to better help the flow of the meeting. The Parliamentarian was asked if a motion was suggested. The Chair's report had not called for any actions, so only questions were deemed appropriate afterward.

PROVOST'S REPORT – JAMES R. STELLAR

Provost Stellar reiterated that the administration has been discussing deepening the already existing affiliation with Albany Law School. There had been a number of fora on the subject run by the President's Office, and Vice President for Strategic Partnerships Sue Phillips had been invited to provide the details as part of the Provost's report. The basic idea, Provost Stellar summarized, is to reshape the way legal education is delivered on this campus, not us bailing out a failed institution, as ALS is doing fine without us. We want this and think the affiliation will help us as well as benefit them. We are proceeding in that direction, and the conversations led by Sue Phillips have been really fruitful.

VICE PRESIDENT FOR STRATEGIC PARTNERSHIPS – SUSAN D. PHILLIPS

Vice President Phillips stated she would refer to handouts provided to walk through where the University at Albany is so far and where we anticipate going next. The process started out with a group called the 'academic synergies group,'

with a couple of people from Albany Law and a couple from the University at Albany. That group did some initial brainstorming about the ways in which we thought our affiliation might grow, as well as concerns about those possible growth areas. Six focus groups of faculty across our schools and colleges and Albany Law were then created, centered on the opportunity pathways Albany Law has constructed in their strategic plan:

- Health and Law
- Civil and Criminal Advocacy
- Government and Policy
- Public Interest Law
- Business, Tax and Finance
- Innovation and Entrepreneurship.

Those 6 focus groups convened just before the holidays and came up with an excellent set of ideas (and concerns) which are incorporated into the larger list shared on the handout. Vice President Phillips indicated each group was then asked to pick 1 thing from these discussions they recommend to pursue first. From that we came up with items identified as “first up” projects. They include potential academic programs, including the following:

- Joint degree program: JD/MA in Criminal Justice
- Joint degree program: MBA/JD and/or MSW/JD in Social Entrepreneurship
- Joint search in Law and Policy in Financial Market Regulation (FMR)

There are also a couple of areas identified (like the Prisoner Health, International Issues, or Non-profit law) that will entail further conversation before a specific project is suggested.

In addition, there were a number of more tactical projects such as combining low enrollment courses, as well as:

- Revitalizing the 3+3 program (Advisement Services/Admissions now has ALS advisors coming to our admissions days to help connect students with the ALS experience while they are here)
- International recruitment – adding a pathway at UA to ALS’s LLM.
- Improve pathways that allow students at each institution to take a class at the other and pay their home school tuition.
- A possible Legal studies minor

There are other new ideas that have emerged from ongoing conversations, including curricular links with Humanities, Art and Art History, and a possible joint program in History, and JD and law. Each of these ideas has a lead from each side to shepherd a lot of people interested.

Vice President Phillips pointed to the summary provided on the handouts of all the opportunities and challenges, and added welcomed individuals to share their thoughts on those projects underway and any new ideas. Provost Stellar thanked Vice President Phillips and added this is the core of the excitement the 2 institutions are developing with each other.

Questions were welcomed. It was asked what is the current mechanism and status of these discussions. The Provost replied that ultimately there will be a memorandum of understanding between the 2 institutions. Vice President Phillips added that Albany Law is and will continue to be a private, non-profit institution and will continue to have relationships with other institutions such as RPI and Union, but will just have a special relationship with our university. The Vice President added that there has been interest in Biology in connection with Forensic Science, and in Patent Law, and the possibility of both institutions offering clusters of courses in an area of practice about which there is a legal context, such as IP or housing, and other relevant areas around a substantive discipline. A suggestion involving Software Engineering and Patent law was made and enthusiastically received.

Provost Stellar added that he and Vice President Phillips were available for conversation and invited individuals to contact them to talk about the subject further.

UNIVERSITY SENATE CHAIR'S REPORT – Joette Stefl-Mabry, Chair

I. Informational

- Senate Chair received a memo on March 13, 2015 from Dan Knox, Director of Student Mobility and Debbie Moeckel, Assistant Provost re: *Seamless Transfer Implementation Update* which she shared with the Provost.
- Senate Chair Stefl-Mabry and Vice Chair Fox met with Dean David Rousseau on March 23rd, 2015 to discuss the development of the new College of Emergency Preparedness, Homeland Security, and Cybersecurity. Dr. Rousseau will share the list of steering committee members and faculty members with the Governance Council.
- Senate Chair Stefl-Mabry and Vice Chair Fox, as Campus Governance Leaders (CGLs) will attend the Spring Plenary Meeting at SUNY Plattsburg April 23rd -24th 2015.

II. Reports of Actions

- The SEC approved that the proposal (Proposal for Graduate Certificate in Homeland Security, Cybersecurity and Emergency Management) be placed on the Senate agenda with the pending name 'Emergency Preparedness, Homeland Security and Cyber Security,' per the UPPC report. UPPC Chair McCaffrey would forward the documents to Chair Stefl-Mabry prior to the Senate meeting.
- It was discussed in the SEC that the Senate has councils set up to handle routine things that fit into various categories. It was debated if UPPC is the appropriate body for the name change of the College of Computing and Information to the College of Engineering and Applied Sciences to have gone through and if that satisfied formal consultation.
- A motion was made and unanimously approved for GOV to consider the issue of the interpretation of the Bylaws, in dialogue with the Charter, as to what constitutes formal consultation.
- It was noted that GOV would then report back to the SEC. Chair Stefl-Mabry stressed that it needs to be clear how information is to be shared back to the Senate to give stakeholders enough time to digest what has been happening.
- From UAC: A request from the Department of Latin American, Caribbean, and U.S. Latino Studies (LACS) to deactivate their program in Puerto Rican Studies. The SEC unanimously approved that the request was ready to move forward to the Senate. It was suggested the Department send a Senate representative to that meeting.

III. Recommended Actions

N/A

On March 24th the CIO notified the Chair about a complaint regarding the letter written by President Jones, Senate Chair Stefl-Mabry and UUP Chapter President Benjamin and distributed through the voting faculty listserv which supports the Bylaws amendment regarding removing the voting rights of ex officio administrators.

Chair Stefl-Mabry stated she would like to respond regarding the use of the voting faculty listserv for this purpose. The e-mail was sent to the voting faculty concerning a matter about which it was appropriate to inform that faculty. ITS policy is, intentionally perhaps, vague, and at the heart of it is the interpretive issue whether the joint letter sent constitutes a political purpose. The Chair stated it was her belief that prohibition is intended to exclude speech relating to electoral politics at the federal and state levels. She viewed that the amendment is not focused on a political issue but on a policy initiative involving the university administration and governance structures, on which the university, Senate Chair and union should be able to take a position. The university has historically sent out messages asking faculty to support its initiatives, which are occasionally explicitly political as in requests to support the 'Invest in SUNY' and NY SUNY 2020. Given the specific nature of the amendment to remove voting privileges from administrative ex officio members, it was important for the campus community to know that the President's Office supports the proposal and that this is not an attack on administrators by faculty. Regarding the issue raised about the Senate Chair's need to be impartial, Chair Stefl-Mabry regarded it is essential that leaders be fair, honest, transparent, open to dissent and to follow the rules of an organization, but that there is no such thing as pure neutrality. In her opinion, a Chair should, summarized as follows: act in what he or she understands to be the best interest of the Senate and the university as a whole; be able to advocate for a position and willing to accept the will of the voters, with no retaliation or exercising of preferential treatment on those who disagree; follow the bylaws and procedures to ensure fairness and balance. She considered this to be an exceptional situation in which the University President, Union Chapter President and Senate Chair all agreed this Bylaws change would serve to improve governance structures on campus.

Senate Bill 1415-02 was approved. On April 3rd the State Education department officially registered Data Analytics as a new concentration. The Chair recommended that the SEC discuss changes to the faculty Bylaws to address how we conduct electronic meetings.

Parliamentarian Howard then invited questions about parliamentary procedure.

An SEC member inquired why an emergency meeting of the SEC was not called regarding the Chair's reference to electronic meetings, why materials received for the Chair's report were omitted, and why the summary of the SEC meeting

omitted both the context and the point of information that Chair Stefl-Mabry would take personal responsibility that formal consultation would occur according to the Charter and Bylaws definition as interpreted by the Chair, and when is the spring faculty meeting. Chair Stefl-Mabry responded as follows: she had not been contacted nor asked to conduct such an “emergency” meeting; the omission of report materials was an oversight probably made in preparing for the SEC meeting; the SEC meeting summary came from the minutes that had not yet been approved but would be shared; the Spring Faculty meeting was being discussed with the administration. The SEC member took issue with the second bullet point in ‘Report of Actions,’ and was invited to address that when those SEC minutes go out.

*It was asked if, under the Chair’s interpretation of the Bylaws, the forwarding of e-mails to members of councils for discussion outside of meetings is not legitimate. Chair Stefl-Mabry responded by citing “Except as authorized **in the bylaws**, the business of an organization or board can be validly transacted only at a regular or properly called meeting – that is, as defined on pages 81-82, a single official gathering in one room or area—of the assembly of its members at which a quorum is present” ... “Thus, if the bylaws provide for meeting by video-conference (but not merely by “teleconference” or “audio-conference”), the meeting must be conducted via technology that allows all participating members to see each other, as well as to hear each other, at the same time. Provisions may also be made for the use of additional collaborative technology to aid in the conduct of a meeting (p. 97). (Robert, H. M., & Robert, S. C. (2011). Chair Stefl-Mabry noted that, while individuals were certainly free to hold discussions amongst themselves by forwarding email, an “electronic meeting” of the SEC was not possible as the current Bylaws do not authorize electronic meetings.*

The Parliamentarian was asked by a participant if committees can have a meeting by e-mail, to which he responded they cannot because Robert’s Rules states meetings have to happen when all participants can speak and be heard at the same time, unless there are specific provisions in the Bylaws.

Seeing there were no further questions, Chair Stefl-Mabry turned the podium to Chair Fox of the Governance Council.

GOV (Governance Council) – Cynthia Fox, Chair

I. Informational

1. GOV met on March 2; next meeting is March 30.
2. Chair Fox served as faculty representative to the University Council on February 26. Associate Provost for Program Development Anne Marie Murray provided an update on the institutional plans to establish a Computer Engineering Program; Associate VP for Government Relations Sheila Seery and Chief of Staff Leanne Wirkkula presented an overview of the 2015 legislative agenda; Chief Information Officer Christine Haile gave an overview of University’s digital platform and strategy. The Council approved revisions to the Community Rights and Responsibilities document relative to sexual violence and response; and two resolutions about naming rights for the School of Business building were passed.
3. Chair Fox met with Senate Chair Stefl-Mabry and David Rousseau on March 23 to discuss the role of governance in the formation of the proposed College of Emergency Preparedness. As part of the formal consultation process, GOV will be looking at the composition of the Steering Committee and “Working Group” that have been put together as advisory groups as the process gets underway.
4. At the meeting of the SEC on March 23, GOV was asked to take up the role of governance in the proposed name change for the College of Computing and Information and in the creation and administration of the Presidential Initiatives Fund for Research and Scholarship (PIFRS).
5. The names of Senators representing the Libraries, SPH, SCJ, and CCI for the 2015-2016 academic year have been forwarded to GOV.

II. Actions taken

1. GOV submitted suggestions for the membership of the search committee for a new Chief Information Officer to replace Christine Haile, who plans to transition out of this role by June 30.
2. The invitation to participate in University Governance was sent to the Voting Faculty on March 3 and again on March 27.
3. Senate Bylaws amendment 1415-01 was distributed to the Voting Faculty on March 10. A reminder was sent March 23.
4. The final slate of candidates for University Senate at-Large Senators, SUNY-wide Senators, and University Auxiliary Services Board members was approved and distributed to the Voting Faculty on March 25.
5. The call for nominations for the position of University Senate Vice Chair went out to the Voting Faculty on March 27.

III. Recommendations for Actions

1. That members of GOV continue to do everything they can to encourage colleagues to volunteer for Senate service and to participate in the upcoming elections.

GOV Chair Fox had received on March 26th an e-mail from Senator McCaffrey raising concerns regarding the fairness of the use of the voting faculty listserv on March 24th by President Jones, Senate Chair Stefl-Mabry and UUP Chapter President Bret Benjamin to send out a message that endorsed the Bylaws change. In a subsequent e-mail dated March 27th Senator McCaffrey stated he had learned a colleague who believed such use was in violation of university policy had filed a complaint with the Chief Information Officer. He asked that GOV look into the matter and, if it was indeed a violation, to consider postponing the Bylaw amendment vote.

GOV considered the question at its March 30th meeting. It was unanimously concluded that although the lines in the emailed letter that called for a specific vote may have been inconsistent with the responsible use policy, the infraction did not rise to the level of calling for the vote to be postponed. The Chair then outlined the steps that led to GOV's determination. She explained that she had not received any other complaints about the letter, nor had any other member. GOV also discussed the practical issues involved with postponement and determined that the vote could not be stopped without stopping the entire election process and starting over; it was agreed this could cause more confusion than by going forward. GOV further noted that the letter did not take away anyone's right to exercise their own opinion, and that the vote was entirely anonymous. GOV agreed that the question of whether it was fair that only one point of view was presented was legitimate; however GOV had not been asked to arrange for an alternate view to be put forward, but rather to stop the Bylaw vote. It was noted that the Bylaws amendment that was proposed two years ago was the first to be put to an electronic vote and that it was handled in the same manner; no one had taken into consideration the fact that when a vote takes place at a meeting at which a quorum is present, there is an opportunity for discussion before the vote takes place. GOV sees a need to make recommendations for how amendments should be put forward differently in the future. Chair Fox stressed, however, that progress on the Bylaws amendment had been regularly reported to the SEC and Senate, and that GOV felt there had been many opportunities for comments, discussion and debate. GOV found the matter unfortunate and wished it had been done differently; but, the Chair reiterated, it was unanimously agreed it did not rise to the level of postponing the vote.

Senator McCaffrey objected to Chair Fox's characterization of the language used in his correspondence with her and asked to read his e-mail aloud to clarify that what was said was "this incident has generated sufficiently intense reaction that we believe needs to be engaged in the SEC as a whole, either in person or electronically. Otherwise we believe lasting damage to the legitimacy of an important decision and to the Senate can occur." Chair Fox replied she would have to review all the threads to address the question of whether she had misquoted him, but that GOV found it difficult to know how to interpret from his messages how widespread the reaction was because the people he alluded to were unidentified, not to delegitimize the concerns raised.

It was asked to review the mechanism for discussion of the amendment, and why when Senate representatives represent constituents that the number of dissenting constituent voices was being considered. Chair Fox reiterated that the Senate GOV reports and e-mail announcements were the mechanisms for encouraging discussion. The Senate member viewed that concerns the member had raised regarding the amendment on many occasions at Senate and SEC meetings had not been well reflected in the minutes, and it was believed several SEC members had brought this to the attention of the Senate officers. Chair Fox responded that the issue GOV was asked to consider was whether to postpone the vote over the message that went out through the voting faculty listserv, but added the Bylaw had been reported since the November 14th letter from the President.

A question of clarification was asked regarding in what context people have been invited to comment on the Bylaws amendment, and it was considered it had not been substantively discussed on the Senate floor. Chair Fox replied the amendment had been given out in conjunction with the Senate report that it was to go to voting faculty in April and was encouraged to be discussed and shared. GOV determined the discussion issue with an electronic vote was not thought of, neither had it been thought of when the previous amendment occurred, and recommends it needs to be addressed in the future. It was argued there had been no venue for an opposing voice, which Chair Fox disputed stating an opposing viewpoint could have been written.

A participant regarded that as an e-mail had been sent to voting faculty who were asked if you had questions to contact GOV members, if somebody opposed or had any position they should have sent an e-mail back. Chair Fox agreed. The member then asked what the problem is, as she felt she was missing something, to which another responded so are all of us.

The earlier question was clarified with the thought an individual could e-mail GOV but it is a 1 to 1 conversation versus an e-mail from 3 to over 1,000 people. There was no way for an opposing view to have that audience.

Senate Chair Stefl-Mabry interjected that the Bylaw amendment had been sent to the Senate body for the March 9th meeting.

It was asked if Chair Fox was saying an e-mail could have been sent with an opposing view as long as not asking for a vote in a direction, but our Senate Chair, university President, UUP President can ask for a vote in a direction. Chair Fox replied no, GOV agreed that they overstepped their bounds; but it could have been asked to be allowed to respond using the same mechanism. We have an example of a Senator who sent out a message to his constituents stating a position on a vote but not asking for a vote in a particular direction. Chair Fox also shared a reply from Lisa Trubitt in the Office of the CIO sent to Bret Benjamin about what one can and cannot do using the listserv. It stated “our counsel would be that your message encourage people to participate in the voting process. That message may certainly include links to additional resources, and those may offer information stating a position on a given issue. For example, in this case you might indicate that more information on the Union President’s position on the by-law amendment is available on the UUP website. Such information, along with a link to that page, would be consistent with University policy. It may also be sincerely appreciated by the UUP membership.”

It was questioned if those 3 people who sent the letter to the voters can retract do that part suggesting the vote, stating it was out of bounds? Chair Stefl-Mabry responded that it was impossible to retract the letter once it was sent.

A member articulated is it possible there are 2 connected but separate things here. One is a perceived infraction that may be addressed in terms of asking for a vote in particular direction and recognizing it won’t happen hereafter. In dealing with the second question of what harm if any has been done, is it possible one might look at the survey to the faculty to discern whether there is a preponderance of weightiness that suggests that the vote encouraged seemed to coincide with the majority faculty response on that survey; if so, might one be able to determine by putting the 2 things together the degree of harm that was done and perhaps conclude no harm was done so that perhaps we can go forward with the vote. Chair Stefl-Mabry noted the many issues the member had just raised. The Chair thought the survey is a separate but important issue to be discussed because per the Bylaws it will go out every 2 years. Every survey, as most of us who are researchers can attest to, assures each project we do is better and stronger. That is separate from the question of whether the survey influenced the President’s position, and the President’s office members can speak to whether that motivated them solely to write the letter.

Parliamentarian Howard interjected he noticed Robert’s Rules was getting a bit in the way of conversation. He suggested Senate Chair Stefl-Mabry now ask for objections to the report. If there are objections it would allow then move to debate, at which time the body can make comments or continue to ask questions to Chair Fox.. To the question how do you object to a report, he responded you are approving the actions of the body.

Chair Fox responded to Senator Fessler’s question if GOV had discussed her April 1st e-mail to the 3 Senate Officers about the ballot being problematic, that GOV had met March 30th and had not. Chair Fox shared the e-mail with the Senate assembly which had alerted that the PeopleSoft ballot set up required a vote must be cast for each item. This was problematic, as 1) if one did not want to contribute to the quorum required for the Bylaw amendment but still wanted to cast votes for candidates, one could not; and 2) RONR holds a member has the right not to vote. She added she did not know if this could be fixed, but wanted to bring it to their attention. The Chair said they looked at the issue to try to fix it. The vote had already begun and would have had to stop and start over, and was felt that would bring a lot of confusion. Secondly, Robert’s Rules does say no one is compelled to vote but also says it is the duty of everyone who has an opinion to express it though they cannot be compelled to do so. It was thought the mechanism for not expressing an opinion was an abstention, which one was able to do on the ballot. Parliamentarian Howard clarified his understanding of Robert’s Rules that he suggested was that abstentions would not be counted towards quorum, while in person number quorum is determined by the number of people present. It was noted this determination seemed inconsistent.

Lead SA Senator Tchernev expressed SA and GSA were under informed and could not properly participate in this discussion. They had not received the letter as they do not vote.

A motion was made to accept the GOV report. There were objections, so the meeting moved to debate where the Chair noted a list of alternating pro and con voting Senators. Parliamentarian Howard clarified that if GOV’s determination as stated in the report is rejected then it would go back to GOV for further discussion with the new information from today’s

meeting. GOV would have further discussion and determination and report at the next Senate meeting. If accepted it would not. Parliamentarian Howard agreed the ultimate authority to postpone or invalidate the vote does not lie with GOV but with the Senate body, and the Senate would vote again on the determination.

Con: The Senator did not accept decision and was surprised GOV thought the infraction did rise to level of an IT responsible use policy but did not call into question the Bylaw amendment vote.

Pro: The GOV Senator was surprised at how much time this was taking and that this Bylaw amendment was construed as a political issue at all. It came to GOV from the President as a request to be discussed. GOV drafted the amendment and did not have to go to SEC, but shared the amendment in the interest of consultation. GOV discussed the issue long and hard and the Senator believed all were surprised at the question if the letter was a political maneuver. As they recalled, GOV determined it could be construed as political but did not believe it intended that way, or even if it were it ought not to affect the vote. The amendment is important. Voting faculty can vote of their own choice and cannot be strong-armed. We thought it showed a spirit of collaboration and the misuse of phrasing could be excused, and going forward be clarified. The electronic ballot and communication also need to be work out, as we are learning. That still was not enough to challenge vote itself.

Chair Stefl-Mabry interjected, and a motion was made and accepted by acclamation to extend the meeting time from 4:15 p.m. to 4:45 p.m.

Con: Senator Fogarty identified himself as having written the letter to constituents not telling you how to vote but how he would vote. His objection was that there had not been any discussion of the Bylaw in the Senate, though it will affect how business is done. A lot of people are aggrieved there has not been this kind of discussion.

Pro: A member of GOV asked to clarify part of GOV's conversation. She recalled the decision that there were a number of ways to address the issue, but as a remedy in the current situation postponement would set a precedent that anybody who opposes an amendment can stall it by speaking about it in an inappropriate place. That was at the core.

Con: How the ballot is structured and how abstention are considered regarding quorum needs to be clarified today and it is hoped that is included in this meeting.

Pro: A Senator desired to simply say they find certain aspects ironic. Whether they find an infraction or not it was thought it is possible, though hoped not, that the Senate faculty might shoot itself in the foot. There is concern that the Senate is nothing but a rubber stamp of the administration. Even if it is an infraction, faculty can oppose the amendment vote. It seems that the administration's request which opens up a sense of autonomy and space for the faculty is more important, not that the infraction is not. As clear thinking people we can recognize that there is value in going forward, and that we need significant numbers so we can decide as faculty.

Con: The strengths of the feeling indicate this is an important decision and process surrounding it. This is a question if the issue has been discussed. The Senator disagreed intensely, because once this goes forward it precludes the opportunity to have that discussion.

Chair Stefl-Mabry stated she did not want to adjourn, and so asked that a vote be taken to determine if the 46 needed for quorum had been lost. Parliamentarian Howard added if that happens the meeting would be adjourned. People could stay and continue the discussion but could no longer vote. GOV's report would be discussed again at the next meeting or GOV could reconsider before the next report. A question of procedure was asked if someone has to object to the question of quorum. The Parliamentarian answered that any member can call for quorum; however, if the Chair notices there is a danger of losing quorum it is the Chair's responsibility as per *Robert's Rules* to call for a vote. Quorum was lost, and the meeting was adjourned.

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting adjourned at 4:37 p.m.

Respectfully submitted by

Elisa Lopez, Recorder