APPROVED MINUTES
Submitted by Rachel Aziminia and Chad Mark Glen

Senator Attendance: Applied Technology & Business (Michael Absher); Counseling (Sally Stickney & Rachel Aziminia); Health, Physical Education, & Athletics (Nancy Cowan & Vacant); Arts & Humanities (Diane Zuliani); Language Arts (Francisco Zermeno & Vacant); Library (Norman Buchwald); Science & Mathematics (Dave Fouquet & Ming Ho); and Social Sciences (Barbara Ogman & Michael Thompson); Adjunct Faculty (Anne Brichacek).

Guests: Dr. Ron Taylor (Vice President, Academic Services); Nolly Ruiz (Curriculum Chair); Yvonne Wu-Craig (Grants Writer); Rachel LePell (Staff Development Chair); Jane Wolford (History/Social Science); Cristina Ruggiero (Political Science/IPBC); Frederick Hodgson (French/Language Arts); Jack Barnwell (Spectator/Student Reporter).

Presiding Officers: President Chad Mark Glen, Vice President Michael Absher.

ITEM
1.0 GENERAL FUNCTIONS

1.1 Call to Order: President Glen called the meeting to order at 2:20.

1.2 Approval of the Minutes: Michael Thompson moved to approve the November 9, 2006 minutes and Mike Absher seconded. One minor correction was made. The motion to approve carried.

1.3 Guests: President Glen thanked the guests for attending this special Senate meeting and asked each person to introduce themselves and let us know what discipline they teach in. (Please see list of guests above.)

2.0 REPORTS

2.1 Senate President’s Report: Chad Mark Glen. I believe what the majority of our faculty are already doing regarding Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs) is outstanding and is enough to meet the new accreditation standards. We’re already doing this thing called SLOs. We need to highlight what Chabot is already doing well. We need to find ways to document the SLOs we already do. To this end the District has
agreed to pay for the SLOACs tracking software at Chabot that LPC is using called eLumen. We will be reviewing this software at an upcoming Senate meeting. We need to define how we will meet the SLOAC mandate. We then need to decide how we are going to implement SLOACs accountability and documentation for accreditation. In order to make SLOACs what we, the faculty of Chabot want it to be, it is important to have an overview of what has driven the SLO movement. Diane Zuliani will present her findings on the Student Learning Outcomes and the Accountability Movement: What Faculty Should Know. I will call on people who have not spoken before those who have already contributed to the discussion.

3.0 ACTION ITEMS

None.

4.0 DISCUSSION ITEMS

4.1 Student Learning Outcomes and the Accountability Movement: What Faculty Should Know: The following talk was delivered by Diane Zuliani at this Special Topic Senate meeting. Because this information was delivered as a talk and not a formal paper, it contains no footnotes. References and/or documentation can and will be provided to anyone who requests them from Diane.

Thank you for coming today. This semester I have become something of a “point person” on the issue of accountability and student learning outcomes. It hasn’t been by design; I felt a resistance to some of the things I was hearing and so I began to look into them, and comment on them in division meetings and senate meetings. Then I gave a special topics talk in my division, and finally I was asked to give a talk two weeks ago at College Council, where my resistance was not warmly received. Today I hope my comments can engender a true discussion; that's my reason for bringing them to this forum.

The reason I care about the issues I’m raising is because to me, seemingly small changes we’re being asked to make in my professional activities actually amount a radical change in the perception and definition of education itself.

Although this talk was advertised with the same title as my college council talk, it isn’t the same talk, although there is some overlap, and for those of you who heard that one, forgive me for repeating myself. I’ve focused on five issues in today’s talk that I believe are in the faculty’s best interest to discuss openly: 1. the increasingly pervasive call for accountability in education; 2. the widespread perception of higher education as failing; 3. the claim of education as invisible and the insistence that legitimate learning must be measurable; 4. the semantical and organizational splitting of teaching and learning in the concept of the Learning Centered College; and 5. the imposition of corporate values on educational values.
I would like to say before I begin that I’m not here to fight some kind of battle, and I certainly do not feel I am battling with anyone here at Chabot. Administrators aren’t the cause of these changes; they are simply trying to help the college survive them. The changes are not coming from inside but outside, and they are already here. I realize my position isn’t a winnable one. But it is my position all the same, and therefore worth bringing to the table. I mainly hope to increase awareness of some issues so we can proceed intelligently.

My talk at College Council began with an account of notable changes in education today, namely the widespread implementation of accountability measures such as No Child Left Behind in K-12 and Student Learning Outcomes in higher education. I cited current political support and even mandate for such measures. I did not say, as was thought, that today’s accountability climate was born solely of our current (though soon to be defunct) presidential administration.

The original call for accountability in education began in the early 1980s with Reaganomics, the general effort by the Reagan Administration to reduce federal domestic spending for social programs while increasing the answerability of those programs to calls for quality assurance.

Today, educators hear that call loud and clear, as NCLB seeks to improve K-12 education by raising teacher accountability, and accountability forms the benchmark of the new standards of higher education accreditation passed in 2002. According to the Council for Higher Education Accreditation, the new standards seek to “strengthen public confidence in accreditation by responding to the current accountability climate...by... provid[ing] direct evidence of performance and student learning outcomes.”

The factuality and tangibility implied by the terms “direct evidence” and “learning outcomes” creates few waves among faculty who train students to perform discreet, observable tasks. But it contradicts what faculty in mainly academic disciplines believe to be the abstract nature of some types of learning. The definition of education as legitimate only when measurable – implied by the new standards – has been opposed by organizations such as the American Association of University Professors, The National Education Association, and many local and statewide faculty senates, including the academic senate for the California Community Colleges. Even the CHEA seems to have hesitated to pass the new standards, stating in their own literature that the changes came as the result of “external pressures.”

We can guess those “external pressures” were to some extent public, but probably to a larger extent political, given Washington’s past and current critiques of higher ed, the most scathing of which can be found in last month’s Report by the Commission for the Future of Higher Education, a group formed by Department of Education, which calls America’s colleges and universities “inadequate,” “declining,” “risk-averse,” “self-satisfied,” “complacent,” “unaccountable,” and
“failing,” even as it calls them “the best in the world,” and states that without serious reform, higher ed will soon go the way of defunct industries like railroads and steel manufacturing.

Where have we failed? According to the Report and other sources on the subject much closer to us at Chabot, it is because what faculty do is invisible. The website of the eLumen software company whose data-collection product has been recently purchased by our district tells us:

“Learning…is the one process about which colleges and universities have little or no data. Most learning is invisible, because our institutions do not have the means to capture or retain the crucial information: what a student has learned – that is, has demonstrated that he or she knows and can do -- while being one of our students. The founders of the eLumen Collaborative have chosen to invest in solving the fundamental issue of the invisibility of student learning.”

In other words, though faculty interact with real students at length in the public sphere and have solid evidence of this interaction in the form of syllabi, notes, exams, papers, assignments and grades, by the new language of accountability, this is merely solid evidence of teaching; not solid evidence of learning. To serve today’s public, we’ve got to prove we do what we say we do.

This focus on learning sounds positive, and even obvious, but it is strikingly dissimilar from past perceptions of education. Teaching and learning have up to now been considered a continuum, inseparable. Today, the act of teaching and the act of learning are being cleaved. This cleaving is at the heart of new language we use, such as in the phrase “Learning Centered College.” The Learning Centered College refers to a new conceptual framework (or new to Chabot at least) in which the college’s central mission is learning alone, as an event distinct from teaching. To prove that learning has occurred it must be quantifiable by statistical means, and, by extension, continually improvable by analysis of those statistics. These are radically new ideas to apply to education. So where did they originate?

They were shaped in large part in the corporate world, in a non-academic production model called quality management, or sometimes TQM (Total Quality Management). TQM comes in several packages offered by several organizations the best known of which are known to many millions of people throughout the world but which I’d never heard of until about two weeks ago: Malcolm Baldrige, ISO 9000, Lean and Six Sigma. In general, these organizations supply CEOs of manufacturing companies with complex systems of controls intended to transform their operations into lean, efficient, flexible, cost-effective, competitive, productive machines. Reading their literature [which isn’t easy to do], I found two central strategies of total quality management. One is to redirect focus from the company to consumers and from producers to product. I found no explanation for this step,
but one can perhaps conclude that rhetorically and ideologically separating laborers from the products of their labor speeds production, by sidestepping messy claims of ownership and entitlement. The second strategy common to quality management is to add the task of data-collection to all levels of an operation, to record product output and to drive continuous improvement in product and product output. It is not uncommon today that the push for continuous improvement compels a company to downsize or outsource its production. This is done in the name of customer satisfaction. It is also considered by many (though not by those actually downsized or outsourced) a sign of health in the organization, and proof of the efficacy of TQM.

One of the most popular and highest ranked of these quality management systems offers a version of itself specifically for educational institutions. This is the “Baldrige National Quality Program Education Criteria for Performance Excellence.” The Program states that these Criteria are “largely a translation of the language and basic concepts of business excellence to . . . concepts in education excellence.” I had personally never heard of Malcolm Baldrige, but after my college council talk I learned of the criteria from Dr. Carlson. Dr. Carlson wrote to me that “these standards and criteria were first drafted by a respected group of nationally recognized educators in the late 1980s.” He also identified them as “the “bible” and starting point of the student centered/SLO movement.” I can only surmise from this that Dr. Carlson advocates these criteria or some version of them for Chabot. For that reason I highly recommend their reading.

I was unable to find a list of the contributing educators Dr. Carlson mentioned on any Baldrige website (I’m sure he can make them available), but Malcolm Baldrige himself was Ronald Reagan’s Secretary of Commerce. Like the Baldrige business model, the goal of the education criteria is to transform educational institutions from the unaccountable failures we are now, heading into the same abyss as the railroads and steel mills, into lean, efficient, agile, cost-effective, competitive and productive education machines. Also like the Baldrige business model, it employs those two strategies I previously mentioned. It redirects focus from production to product – in our case from teaching to learning – and it adds data-collection to all levels of the operation to either record learning outcomes or in some way support the continuous improvement of learning outcomes.

At the base of the Baldrige Criteria is data. Faculty collect data on classroom progress through continual assessments beginning early in the semester. More formally they collect data in the form of student learning outcomes. Staff provide data in the form for frequent self-assessments. [like the data Chabot managers are now asked to provide on an ongoing basis of goals, objectives, strategies, and accomplishments]. The role of administrators is to analyze this data in relation to the college’s learning-centered focus. This focus is defined as “the needs of students, stakeholders and market forces.” Nowhere does it say data will be analyzed in relation to the experiences and expertise of the faculty. Administrators then rely on their analysis make requirements for performance improvement
wherever data shows a perceived deficiency. The point here, to paraphrase the literature, is to align what we deliver with the desires of our clients—students, stakeholders, and market forces. Decision making as it is described in these criteria is top-down; I find little room for shared governance in the learning college.

Based on my reading of the Criteria guidelines, the cycle works like this: data-collection leads to data analysis which leads to performance improvement which leads to data-collection. It also appears to me that the data collected can be used to compare one instructor’s performance to another, one discipline to another, one program to another, one college to another, or even a college to a non-educational entity like, say, an HMO.

This does, in its way, put “learning” first, and has the real potential to make us very popular with our students and stakeholders, who will be on the receiving end of our never-ending attempts to satisfy their desires. It also has the potential to undermine tenure, salaries, full-time employment and job security. If, for example, student/stakeholder/market forces announce that a college education shouldn’t cost so much, administrators might choose to satisfy them by relying on primarily on adjuncts or telecourses or by creating larger classes. I’m not saying this would necessarily happen, but this is not conspiracy theory either. Robert Dickeson, president of the University of Northern Colorado, which supports the Baldrige Criteria and has two other administrators on the Board of the Baldrige Program, fired nearly fifty faculty members—many tenured—because he concluded their salaries were simply too costly. He also submitted a paper to the Commission on the Future of Higher Education proposing to eliminate regional accrediting associations and replace them with a national body. That his paper was also accompanied by $250,000 from his education foundation, which the Commission accepted, raised more than a few eyebrows. Dickeson not only felt his faculty were too costly, he also claimed their tenure was too troublesome for the streamlined operation he envisioned. He said “to many faculty, they are the university. They assume they own all curricular decisions. If too many are tenured, the university loses institutional flexibility.” Incidentally, Dickeson is wrong in his claims about the cost of faculty. According to a recent study by Ronald G. Ehrenberg, professor of labor economics at Cornell, for two years running, faculty salaries have failed to keep up with inflation while growth in presidential salaries have far outstripped faculty salary increases. He also finds that as reliance on contingent or adjunct faculty increases, graduation rates decline and first-year drop-out rates increase.

The student-centered model also has the unfortunate and very real potential of derailing the college’s mission of, say, helping students meet the complex conditions of citizenship. If students, stakeholders and the market undervalue the meaning of citizenship and desire instead training in whatever industry happens to be booming, then job training would flourish, while citizenship would suffer.

The type of data collected in the learning centered model also raises questions.
First, the learning goal to be assessed is determined not by one faculty member but by consulting groups of instructors in the same or similar disciplines who must agree on what the learning goal should be. This has the potential of stimulating collegial discussion, establishing new bonds between disciplines and departments, and engaging adjunct instructors in more fruitful ways. It will also result in a new level of standardization of course content. This might dovetail nicely with the plan suggested by the Commission for the Future of Higher Education to tie eligibility for federal student aid to standardized testing.

Also, as you know, by definition a “student learning outcome” is a skill or a discreet unit of knowledge that should be demonstrable by all the students in your class. This perception is predicated on an assumption of a uniform student body and fails to acknowledge the wide diversity of the actual people sitting in our classrooms. As we know, students’ previous preparation, personal level of interest, socio-economic status, family pressures, job schedules, culture, health, and other factors prevent them from performing at uniform levels. In the learning centered college, ensuring that all students uniformly meet the learning goal is the primary task of the instructor. You will be use all the methods you use now, such as teaching to a variety of learning styles, using a variety of teaching technologies, creating a stimulating learning environment, building learning communities, and applying all the creative but unnamed methods you’ve invented yourselves. You are also required to continually assess the success of your methods. What if it still doesn’t work? The film on reading recently screened here on campus reveals in stark relief (to me anyway) what we already know but rarely say: that some of our students are victims of huge and intractable social problems, including those related to race and class. How can faculty be expected to miraculously eradicate the deep differences in our students and therefore meet, as the Baldrige criteria says we must, “the real needs of every student”?

At this point it worth saying that I am not opposed to student learning outcomes themselves. I readily admit that outcomes have the potential to be useful markers of the many kinds of skills and knowledge that are demonstrable, and all instructors, vocational or otherwise, ought to have such goals for their students. I teach both academic and vocational courses and can easily identify measurable goals in both types of courses. Where I resist is at the point where I am told all learning must be measurable or it didn’t happen. Are we really honestly and thoroughly assessing (or even acknowledging) our students when cases of higher mastery or special accomplishment fall outside the scope of what we are mandated to collect? Or when unmeasurable outcomes such as attitudinal changes or behavioral changes or new ways of thinking aren’t considered educational successes at all? You all have stories of students whose thinking was opened up or whose lives were changed by being in your class. Some of you have had many such experiences. Unfortunately, individual miracles won’t count, and nor will the magic you worked in these cases. Case-by-case assessment is too cumbersome and idiosyncratic for a lean educational machine.
Total Quality Management was originally intended for the private sector. A two-year old study from Penn State on the application of quality management in the public sector raises, in my mind, even more fundamental concerns. One author quoted in the study makes the following points: 1. TQM focuses on minimum standards. 2. TQM develops its own cumbersome bureaucracy. 3. TQM requires continual assessment of work that takes time away from doing the work. 4. TQM delegates quality to quality czars rather than to real people. 5. TQM appeals to faddism, egotism and quick-fixism. 6. TQM drains creativity and innovation from [public sector] culture. 7. TQM has no place for love or passion.

After my college council presentation, Dr. Carlson admonished me for falling into a trap he says many faculty do, of pre-judging an idea solely on the basis of where it comes from rather than on the idea’s merit. I admit, I had little faith in the Report of the Commission on the Future of Higher Education, knowing as I do that the Commission’s Chair, Charles Miller, is deeply committed to the privatization of education, to tuition deregulation, and to standardized testing. Nevertheless I read the report, but the bottom line is that I still found it lacking. Incidentally, Charles Miller, while on the Board of Regents of the University of Texas System, took an unprecedented step towards privatizing a public institution by forming a secret and probably illegal investment fund, UTIMCO, to privately manage the public subsidies the University system received from state and federal sources.

I admit that when I learned that innocent and positive-sounding “SLOs” and the “Learning College” were derived from corporate quality improvement methods I was dismayed. I am dismayed that the Baldrige Program is affiliated with the Department of Commerce, and that I can’t find the name of a single academic anywhere in the education criteria document. Still, I read the criteria and the bottom line is that found it lacking…not just in love and passion for education, but in basic respect for the culture of higher education—the intellectual inquiry and the gratifying interaction with students which are the reasons many of us are here. I know we must remain competitive, I know we cannot jeopardize federal funding, and I see how by adopting something like these criteria we can survive in the “new world order.” I wish it didn’t look or sound like this. I wish real academics—not professional educators—had the opportunity to participate in the redefining of the academic profession. And I want to insist that learning can actually happen even if you can’t measure it, and education might be working beautifully even if it looks inefficient and untidy. Capitalism strives to be streamlined; democracy is content to be messy. Sometimes messy is preferable. And if does matter where ideas come from. Not all ideas are created equal. Few ideas are interchangeable. And no ideas are neutral. Two important bibliographic items are:

http://www.quality.nist.gov/Education_Criteria.htm (this is the Baldrige "Education Criteria for Performance Excellence") and

http://www.ed.gov/about/bdscomm/list/hiedfuture/reports/pre-pub-report.pdf (this is the official report of the Commission on the Future of Higher Education).
DISCUSSION

Dave Fouquet: The SLOACs issue came up at the bargaining table. It is addressed in articles 14, 15, and 18. The contract language states that SLOs could not be used to evaluate faculty. We negotiated to keep all that language out of contract and put academic freedom article 26.1 into the contract. This protects individual academic freedom right, which is not to be infringed upon by SLOs and cannot be used to evaluated faculty!

Rachel LePell has profoundly changed her view about this movement after talking to Diane. She is a great poster child for the seduction of the language of a learning college. She got very excited around the concept because we were going to be exploring what learning is about and the language is very powerful. Eyes have been opened to what is going on here; with it is systematic and deals with the markets. This has to do with long term issues of education. Diane’s analysis of where the accountability ball is moving is good and we have to have some say to say about where it is headed.

Francisco Zermeño: This movement wants us to become a business. My students are not numbers, but I know them individually. I own a business and customers who come in are dollars, but my students are not dollars. Education cannot be run like a profit making business. It’s much more than that.

Dave Fouquet: President Carlson spoke to the Math subdivision and shared programs that have been successful at other schools and was surprised at the resistance by the math faculty. If students did show an improvement, it was by lowering the bar/standards. With the declining success rate of the math classes, how do we know that the students are failing because of the K-12 and the fact they have measured and come less prepared? There can be harm if everything has to be measurable. What about the overall self-reliance of figuring out what to do in a class at the calculus level?

Michael Thompson: This is coming from the business and business schools perspective. I have friends who teach in business schools and faculty spend time trying to get students to like them because they are going to be evaluated. Can we use money for other things? Use resources to talk to my colleagues about teaching and learning. Looking at it as more staff development, because SLOACs is ill defined at this level. This allows us to shape the SLOACs process and we can get something out of it. The district is offering money to do SLOACs tracking with the eLumen software. Let’s see what other ways we can get financial backing to meet this new accreditation standard.

Barbara Ogman: That was fantastic, what you read! Let’s get it down and make it easy for faculty and make it meaningful to faculty. You (faculty) get to measure what is important to you; if we take control of it that way. Educate the educators. Some did not determine early on what was going to be measured. We are at the table and we can be tough and hard about this in order to make it what is meaningful to us.
Chad Mark Glen responded to Dave about playing the “blame game”. Blaming K-12 for the lack of preparedness of our students does not address our students needs at Chabot. The important thing is to know how we can teach these students who are under prepared. There needs to be funding made available to address the SLOACs mandate. We need to dialog with our colleagues and make SLOACs at Chabot, what we want to make it.

Michael Absher: There is value to collaboration with your colleagues and this should be pursued. Auto Technology programs have 200 check boxes about learning outcomes and it is in the world that I live in. We need to address mainly the blame game. We were blaming others because our students were not prepared. We realized that our mistake was complaining and not addressing how to educate the ill prepared and not just by lowering the bar. But those who were not at the college level, we need to work to get them to college level to be able to do the work expected of them.

Barbara Ogman: The danger is the cycle that SLOACs produces. We are accountable in what we do.

Cristina Ruggiero: The accountability movement is in flux because of the changes at the federal level. Given that No Child Left Behind has to be reauthorized next year, and there is new leadership in Congress, there is likely to be changes as to what accountability will look like and what is required. As faculty we need to be involved politically as well to make our voices heard on this issue.

Rachael LePell: We lost the one administrator (Ron Taylor left the room) here for this discussion. The missing link addresses a couple of things. The “cleaving” of the two words teaching and learning is well worded. We need to take control and awe the creditors. Do we have to do SLOs? All agreed that we could lose our accreditation if we don’t do the mandated SLOs. Chabot would be put on the accrediting watch list.

Dave Fouquet: This thinking of the student as client is not a good model of academia. We do our job by not having to engage in a variety of subjects. It is a crucial part of what we do. WASC is more interested in settling out of court and not litigating colleges that challenge their accreditation status. Put our own spin on things. If we thought we had done a good job, that’s all that should really matter.

Michael Thompson: Accreditation wants evidence of what the college is doing on SLOs. We can create what we want to create to show the accrediting team. Other issues are basic skills. Having conversations about students not being prepared, we can shape SLOs to get real dollars for what do we do with those under prepared students, who aren’t ready to be here.
Michael Absher: I'm in agreement about what Diane has said. There hasn't been much disagreement, but what do we do next? How do I deal with the basic issue that my students are not prepared? Chad Mark Glen: It sounds like we agree that a focus of our Student Learning Outcomes Assessment needs to on basic skills.

Barbara Ogman: Basic skills at all levels of the college. I remember my first convocation in 2000 and of student panel and what they said about what a difference Chabot made in their lives. We can make a difference in our students’ lives and SLOACs focused on basic skills can benefit our students.

Rachel LePell: There are Basic Skills monies for staff development. We’ve allocated monies for Basic Skills and channeled through Staff Development. What do we do now? Do we continue to have a discussion or does it end here? In candid terms, that we are so passionate and so involved and engaged in this serious discourse. The information is important and the discussion is important. If we don’t have administration’s support, we don’t have much hope to successful proceed.

Cristina Ruggiero: Basic skills and immigration, any grant basically, what the state government wants, money must be spent under that category. We use the resources to work on basic skills and tie it into Student Learning Outcomes. We want our students to succeed and do things that we think is best for our students, e.g., learn how to learn in math. There may be some administrators on board and can help make things happen.

Nolly Ruiz: This has been a thoughtful discussion. This is bettering what we do. I'm looking forward to doing whatever we are willing to do. Michael Absher: Let’s make this into a Flex day break out session and have a discussion. More people need to talk about this. Chad Mark Glen: We want to keep the dialog open and ongoing.

Dave Fouquet: A specific idea on basic skills would be focus on basic math; jump from arithmetic to algebra. Math 105L is one class I want to do a study to see if this new course will have an impact on what we are doing. Doing the research on how the course work is performing. Would this qualify for basic skills? Most thought that it did qualify as basic skills.

Frederick Hodgson: We are taking this movement that is vaguely threatening and taking control of what we are doing. I have this idea that we have students who I think have an experience with Chabot teachers who are knowledgeable and some students may not care, but for some it creates a spark in the student. We are the medium for the discipline that we teach. People want to turn me into a technology specialist. This has been a wonderful discussion on empowering faculty to make SLOs meaningful. I commend the Senate on today’s thoughtful meeting.
Dr. Ron Taylor: I disagree profoundly that California's education system is behind. The accountability movement started in California's and this is a place to achieve, to demonstrate to ourselves that we do good work. We ask for accountability in our own sake.

Chad Mark Glen: Thanked those who attended for their insightful contributions to the discussion and asked that people bring the information garnered at today's meeting back to their divisions.

5.0 FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS

5.1 Administrator Evaluations— Stephanie Zappa;
5.2 eLumen Assessment Software Overview— Sally Stickney;
5.3 At-Large Faculty Vote on Senate Constitution Changes— Chad Mark Glen;
5.4 District Faculty Hire Procedures— Chad Mark Glen;
5.5 Minimum Qualifications Equivalencies for Faculty— Chad Mark Glen.

Meeting adjourned at 4:15 PM.

Next Meeting— November 30*, 2006
Fall Meetings— 2nd & 4th Thursdays: 12/14.
(*Special Meetings— not on 2nd or 4th Thursday).

RA/CMG