

BOARD OF TRUSTEES

Temple University – Of The Commonwealth System of Higher Education

Thursday, June 22, 2006, at 3:00 p.m.

Feinstone Lounge, Sullivan Hall
Liacouras Walk and Berks Mall

MINUTES

Presiding Officer:

Lewis F. Gould, Jr., Chairman of the Budget & Finance Committee

PARTICIPANTS

Trustees: David Adamany, Joan H. Ballots, Leonard Barrack, Jon A. Boscia, Theodore Z. Davis, Nelson A. Diaz, Ronald R. Donatucci, Loretta C. Duckworth, Richard J. Fox, Lewis F. Gould, Jr., Lacy H. Hunt, Lewis Katz, Susanna E. Lachs, Patrick V. Larkin, Solomon C. Luo, Joseph W. Marshall, III, Christopher W. McNichol, Mitchell L. Morgan, Patrick J. O'Connor, Daniel H. Polett, Robert A. Rovner, Daniel J. Whelan, James S. White, Michael P. Williams

Honorary Life Trustee: Peter J. Liacouras

University Counsel: George E. Moore

Administration and Staff: Frank P. Annunziato, Clarence D. Armbrister, James C. Bausman, Jr., William T. Bergman, Carl Bittenbender, Eileen Bradley, William D. Bradshaw, Bonnie Brennan, David Broadus, Rhonda Brown, Theresa Burt, Janet Carruth, Patrick Day, Martin S. Dorph, Richard M. Englert, Gloria Frager, Linda Frazer, Jessica Giordano, Deborah Hartnett, Thomas M. Healey, Thomas Kupp, Robert H. Lux, Sandra McDade, Vicki L. McGarvey, Timothy C. O'Rourke, Theresa A. Powell, Robert J. Reinstein, Vanessa Rose, Gregory S. Rost, Richard Rumer, Stuart P. Sullivan, Stephen Tustin, Ann VanSant, William Wilkinson, Gregory Zimmaro

In the absence of Chairman Gittis, Trustee Gould called the meeting to order.

INVOCATION: The invocation was given by Trustee Joan H. Ballots.

Introduction of Guests

Faculty: Brian P. Marx, Lois Millner, Karen M. Turner
Students:

Approval of Minutes:

The minutes of the meetings of May 4 and May 9, 2006, were approved as distributed.

* * * * *

PRESIDENT’S REPORT – David Adamany

Mr. Chairman, I appreciate this opportunity to make a report to the Board of Trustees. As you know, this will be my last report to the Board as president. I hope you will indulge me if I make extended remarks to offer my perspective on Temple as it has emerged through the years and as it faces the future.

As I prepare to stand aside as president, I cannot help but reflect on my own education. In September it will have been 52 years since I boarded the now disappeared Milwaukee Road Railroad in Green Bay, Wisconsin to begin a journey to Cambridge where I would enroll as a freshman at Harvard College. It was an unimaginable event. My parents were immigrants to this country. My father ran a small restaurant and our income could surely not support a Harvard education. Nor did the high school I attended, whose students were mostly the children of workers who toiled in the local paper mills, have an accelerated track for college students. I had always planned to go to the University of Wisconsin at Madison, which was the school of choice for the citizens of our state. Indeed, I had applied, been admitted, paid a preliminary fee, and signed up for a dorm room.

The admission to Harvard and the scholarship that went with it were received in my family and in my high school like a lightning strike—an event of utter improbability. Strangely, one other student from my school and one from an adjacent town were also admitted. So were five others from Wisconsin. In prior years, only one or two Wisconsin students had entered Harvard College; and they were virtually all from Milwaukee Country Day School, a fine prep school favored by the wealthy families who owned the big industrial companies located along the lakeshore regions of the state.

Strangely, too, when arriving at Harvard I discovered quite a number of other students from public high schools in small towns and cities in the Midwest and west. And a few from the South. Nonetheless, about 60 percent of the class were still from Harvard’s traditional base—private day or boarding schools in New England and the mid-Atlantic states.

We were outsiders at Harvard, which in those years still had secret quotas limiting the number of Jews and where children from upstart immigrant groups, no matter how wealthy or prominent, such as the sons of Joseph P. Kennedy, were not welcome in the inner circles of student life. (Ironically, the scholarship that allowed me to go to Harvard was the generosity of those who could not have imagined that I would attend there—a family that had endowed a scholarship many decades earlier when Harvard was an elitist institution socially and culturally as well as an elite institution academically.)

I discovered soon enough that my academic preparation was inadequate. Students from private schools had already read many of the classics and delved into the studies of history and economics that tended to predominate in the general education curriculum for freshmen.

So where had the Harvard admissions process gone wrong? Nathan Pusey had become president there in 1953. Educated at Harvard, he was a prototypical Harvard don. I remember well his frosty demeanor on the rare occasions when we would encounter him crossing the Harvard Yard to his office in Massachusetts Hall. A “good morning, Mr. Pusey” would barely be acknowledged with a nod of the head. The mandatory annual reception at the President’s House was, at best, a very stiff affair.

But Pusey was an idealist and smart and courageous. He had left the Harvard faculty to serve a number of years as president of Lawrence College, a small liberal arts college in Appleton, Wisconsin. When called to Harvard’s presidency, he carried with him a deep conviction that if Harvard were to remain the nation’s foremost university, it would need to include in its student body and faculty those from outside the traditional circles. And so very quickly he began vigorously recruiting students from outside Harvard’s traditional bailiwicks and recruiting the finest faculty he could raid from the emerging public universities of the Midwest and west. I suppose in retrospect that I was a product of geographical and class affirmative action—an idea even more controversial today than then.

I tell this story because it throws into relief the role of Temple and the other urban universities. And it holds a lesson for us that I will make pointed in the next few minutes and that affects the work you do as members of the Board of Trustees, especially in your responsibility for the educational program of Temple.

The urban universities—such as the University of Cincinnati, founded by the YMCA, Temple, sponsored by Russell Conwell’s Baptist congregation (though nondenominational from its first days), the College of the City of Detroit (later Wayne State University), created by the local school board—all had one conviction in common: that immigrants and their children, that men—and, yes, shockingly, women—from working class backgrounds could benefit from college education and would, in turn, strengthen our society because of that education. Temple was in its founding aspirations and early years decades ahead of the elite institutions in America that would become more democratic only after World War II, as Harvard did in the early 1950s.

But there are two other features to this tale of two sets of universities, the Ivy League institutions and the urban universities, that need to be remarked upon. First, size. Second, quality.

First, size. When I was asked to say a few words about higher education at my 45th Harvard College reunion, I took the opportunity to remind my classmates that in the last half century’s emergence of American economic, military, and political leadership in the world, Harvard had played only a small role. It is, after all, about the same size—perhaps just a few hundred larger—than it was in the early 1950s. Yet America’s leadership role has been driven principally by the democratization of higher education in the United States. College education was limited to relatively few through World War II. But following World War II access to higher education expanded dramatically.

It started with the GI Bill under which several million returning veterans went to college. But that was only a beginning. Enrollment nationally reached what was then a staggering 2.3 million in 1947. It then rose slowly, reaching only 2.6 million in 1955. Two events followed that truly democratized American higher education: The first was the baby boom—really the children born when American soldiers returned home after WWII, married and had families. The second was Lyndon Johnson’s

Great Society, whose programs of Pell Grants and subsidized student loans put higher education within reach of poor and middle class families as never before. The combination of a huge cohort of 18 year olds, the children of World War II veterans, called the Baby Boom and of government funds to pay for advanced education sent enrollments to 5.9 million in 1965—more than doubled in a single decade. Four years later, in 1969, enrollments reached 8 million. By 2002 they doubled again, to 16.6 million.

There is a story within that story: the rise of the public university. In 1945, before the GI Bill, there were more students in private colleges and universities—843,000—than in public institutions—834,000. Even with the GI bill, in 1947 the private institutions remained slightly larger than the public institutions. By 1955, with enrollments rising only slightly, public university enrollments were about 1.5 million and private institutions about 1.2 million—almost an even draw.

The baby boom and the Great Society financial aid programs fundamentally changed that. A tidal wave of enrollments could not begin to be accommodated in private institutions. By 1965—at the height of the Great Society and with the baby boom well underway—public university enrollments were almost 4 million and private institutions a hair under 2 million.

States expanded their existing universities, converted teachers colleges into comprehensive universities, and sometimes built entirely new institutions. It was at that moment of enormous enrollment growth--1965--that Pennsylvania, with about 150 private institutions and only a modest public higher education sector, consisting largely of Penn State and a network of teachers colleges, adopted the University of Pittsburgh and Temple as Commonwealth-related institutions. Both grew dramatically as the Baby Boom continued.

Fast forward to today: Private higher education has grown impressively---almost doubled since 1965--from about 2 million to about 3.9 million. But the real story of the democratization of higher education has been in the public institutions: about 4 million in 1965, they are about 12.8 million today.

I focus on this history because it both reflects and reveals Temple.

It reflects Temple's mission from its beginnings in 1886: to offer access to higher education to worthy students without regard to background and at affordable cost. And it reflects Temple's modern persona: a public university expanding to serve the rising need for higher education and to contribute to the public good that knowledge brings through research and economic development.

Over the years, Temple has stretched and stretched to fulfill its historic mission and its public mission. Since 1998 enrollments have grown almost 7,000, from 27,000 to 34,000. We have become the 26th largest university in the nation.

More than most, we have also been faithful to the American dream—to the true democratization of higher education. We continue to enroll many students from working class and increasingly from small towns and rural homes. We have created an avenue for students who attend community college to readily transfer to Temple, opening the door of university education to those who may have weak high school records or who are too economically vulnerable to begin their higher education in the university.

We are also among the nation's most diverse universities: ranked second in diversity recently in *Princeton Review's* report on 351 best colleges and universities. We are especially proud of Temple's relationship with African Americans. They are about 19 percent of our student body. And

Temple ranks among the top five universities in America from which African Americans earn bachelor's degrees. Three of the other four are historically black universities and colleges.

But there is a second verse to the epic story of the democratization of higher education. It is educational quality. It is more challenging by far than our willingness or ability to meet the demand for higher education by growing our enrollments and restraining our tuition.

If I may return to my boyhood for a moment. The Harvard I entered may well have been the bailiwick of the well born, well bred, and, usually, well heeled. Those of us from the outlands and from odd social and ethnic backgrounds were plainly outsiders. But in its classrooms, laboratories and studios and within its faculty Harvard remained relentlessly meritocratic. The gentleman's C was for those who believed they belonged by birthright at Harvard, not for those of us who were outsiders. We worked to exhaustion to catch up with those who were better prepared in elite secondary schools, never expecting Harvard to change its standards to accommodate us. The "wonks," as outsiders were derisively called, were also "grinds." And in the end, a very high proportion of those who graduated with honors or Phi Beta Kappa were outsiders who had been permitted only with skepticism to enter the Harvard Yard.

At Temple we now face a challenge that the Harvard of 1950 never faced: Can we adhere to the highest academic standards while pursuing a mission of broad access?

The debate at Temple has changed dramatically in just a decade. In the 1990s, President Liacouras faced the question whether the students we were admitting were good enough for Temple. He made a courageous decision to close a number of remedial programs, which as it turns out were not successful in assisting students to learn and graduate. And he initiated the community college transfer programs--not only to assure access but also to insist that standards at Temple would remain high.

In this present decade we face a quite different challenge. The question is no longer are our students good enough for us, but rather are we good enough for our students? They come with higher SAT scores and higher grade point averages than they have for decades and well above the national average. And they come armed with information age tools for finding information that were utterly unknown to us or even to students entering a decade ago.

But I see danger signs for us. And I have been speaking out recently about those signs and making clear that the University administration will not endure soft academic standards. I regret to say that on too many days I think I am talking to myself.

In truth, it is not at all clear that we are holding students to high enough standards or challenging them to stretch themselves intellectually.

Let me be more specific: Provost Ira Schwartz and I have made clear to deans and faculty that we detect trace indicators of academic weakness. Temple undergraduates who take graduate and professional school entrance exams, for instance, do not do as well as the national average scores on those exams, even though our students' entering SAT scores are well above national averages. Above average on arrival, below average on departure ought to make us uneasy.

In addition, grading practices seem inflated, with between 72 and 75 percent of all grades being A's and B's, in about equal proportion. When we ask students on their course evaluation forms how many hours a week they spend preparing for their course, about 55 percent say three hours or less.

Surely there is some disjunction between average course effort of three hours or less and 72 to 75 percent honors grades.

The Academic Affairs Committee of this Board has been asking the hard questions about educational quality for the past several years. It has scheduled reports from the administration on grading practices, course rigor, and student success on professional school exams. The Committee has taken very seriously its responsibility for the quality of education. Unless there is a significant shift of opinion on the campus toward more rigorous educational standards, it seems inevitable to me that the Board as a whole, with the leadership of the Academic Affairs Committee, will be compelled to meet its overall responsibility for the quality of the University by considering what policies and procedures must be put in place to assure academic rigor in the curriculum and in instruction. I feel sure that you are hopeful, as Ira Schwartz and I have been, that full discussion of this issue will be sufficient by itself to cause faculty and students to move in that direction. That movement has not, however, happened to date.

When I announced my retirement, the student newspaper interviewed students about my departure. Most were complimentary, saying that they thought Temple had improved in recent years or remarking on my accessibility at campus events, in the dining hall, or by email. But one young man said he was pleased to see me go because he thought I was trying to turn Temple into an Ivy League institution. My first reaction was to say: good, why shouldn't the students who come to Temple have as good an education as the young people who go to the Ivy League? But my second reaction was sadness that that young man didn't aspire to the uncompromising academic standards that had characterized my own education. Sadly, that young man's views have echoes from some within our faculty.

There are some voices in our faculty that decry scholarship as inimical to good teaching. And this animosity has been conveyed to students—one of whom asserted at a meeting of Temple Student Government that my appointment of research scholars to the faculty would hurt his education. I could not bring myself to rebuff this young man by pointing out that my own education had probably not been hurt by studying with Henry Kissinger, or Arthur Schlesinger, Jr., or Frank Friedel, the great historian and leading biographer of Franklin Roosevelt, or with Robert McCloskey whose elegant book, *The American Supreme Court*, is still widely read decades after his death.

Scholars know their field because they must work constantly at its frontiers in order to expand knowledge. They care passionately about what they do and transmit their own excitement to the students they teach. They awaken students to the importance of creating knowledge when students encounter their teachers' scholarship as they do their course assignments, write papers, or undertake independent research.

On campus two years ago, a student approached me to tell me that in his course the students were reading a book called *The Semi-Sovereign People*, for which, decades ago, I had written a long introductory essay posthumously reviewing the lifetime work of its author, E.E. Schattschneider, one of the great political scientists of the 1940s and 1950s. The student could scarcely believe that the president of his university was engaged in thinking and writing about political affairs. (I hope his astonishment was that Temple faculty are among those pressing the frontiers of knowledge rather than about my own personal abilities.)

In a more practical vein, in science, engineering, and similar fields, productive scholars obtain the major grants that purchase state-of-the-art equipment on which students learn their fields, that support the salaries of undergraduate and graduate students who work in their labs, and that generate the

indirect cost income that supports libraries, laboratory facilities, and other “infrastructure” necessary for teaching and learning.

And so the struggle associated with the democratization of higher education, begun more than seven decades ago with the GI Bill of Rights and accelerated during the Baby Boom of the 1960s, goes on. We have made enormous progress in creating access for capable, motivated students. But we are still in transit in the understanding that broad access cannot mean lowered expectations or modest standards, either for students or for faculty. This is not an issue at Temple alone, but also at many, many of the public universities so important in democratizing access to higher education.

My own conviction, unshakeable after more than four decades as a faculty member and university administrator, twenty-one as a university president, is that we can—indeed must—have both broad access and unyielding rigor in academic expectations and performance. We will not have fully served the sons and daughters of working class and immigrant backgrounds, of those whose forbearers came here in chains, indeed of all of our students from every background, until the democratization of access is matched with elitist standards of academic performance—as they were for that son of immigrant parents who boarded a Milwaukee Road train in the fall of 1954 to go far away to an unknown place to struggle to gain an education.

We should take enormous pride in what all of us and our forbearers have made at Temple. But we should all know that our work is far from done. It is my belief that in this Board of Trustees rests the ultimate hope and the final responsibility to assure that, by standing firm in the conviction that we will have both access and excellence in these halls, we will fully serve the generations now entering Temple and those generations not yet imagined who will someday cross our doorstep.

It has been my privilege to serve. As you begin anew, with a different president, I hope that you will not relent from Temple’s commitment to guarantee our students as good an education as that young boy received so many years ago when he left his small town to venture east to go to gain an education.

* * * * *

1. **Amendment to Article XII of the Bylaws**

Upon motion duly made and seconded, the Board of Trustees approved the amendment to Article XII of the Bylaws, to provide as follows:

Section 12.1 Presidents Emeriti

The Board may designate the honorary title “President Emeritus” to one or more retired presidents, who will have such rights and privileges that the Board deems appropriate.

Section 12.2 Chancellor

The Board may designate the honorary title “Chancellor” to one or more retired presidents, who will have such rights and privileges that the Board deems appropriate.

And it is further resolved by the Board of Trustees that the adoption of this amendment does not change the honorary titles previously granted.

2. Designation of Chancellor

In recognition of his service as the eighth President of Temple University, the Board of Trustees hereby designates David Adamany as “Chancellor” of Temple University, effective July 1, 2006, with such rights and privileges as the Board of Trustees may confer from time to time.

REPORTS AND RECOMMENDATIONS FOR ACTION - STANDING COMMITTEES

Committee on Trustee Affairs – Lewis F. Gould, Jr.

RECOMMENDATIONS FOR ACTION:

3. Election of Chair of the Board

“The next item for Board action is the election of the next Chairman of the Board.

“It gives me great pleasure to present the unanimous recommendation of the Committee on Trustees Affairs, at its meeting on June 13, 2006, that Daniel H. Polett be elected to serve as Chair of the Board of Trustees for the 2006-2007 year, effective July 1, 2006, to serve until the following Annual Meeting of the Board and until his success shall have been duly nominated, elected and qualified.

“The members of the Committee of Trustee Affairs who participated in the June 13 meeting were Anthony J. Scirica, Nelson A. Diaz, Milton L. Rock, David Adamany, myself and Daniel Polett, who abstained on the discussion and vote on this nomination.

“All members of the Board previously received Judge Scirica’s letter dated June 9, 2006, announcing his intention to nominate Dan Polett, and his strong endorsement of Dan and his confidence in Dan. The Committee on Trustee Affairs did not receive any other requests for others to be considered.

“You all know of Dan Polett’s long-standing service to the University and to the Hospital and Health System as well. Dan has proven himself to be a leader with the talents and attributes, including integrity, determination and fairness, that will help guide us in taking Temple University to the highest levels of accomplishment in all that it does.

“I will now call for a voice vote to elect Daniel Polett as the next Chair of the Board of Trustees, effective July 1, 2006.

“All those in favor, please say “aye.” Any opposed, say “no.”

“By unanimous vote, I declare that Daniel H. Polett has been elected Chair of the Board of Temple University.”

Chairman Polett expressed his appreciation and thanks to the Board for their support for the opportunity to serve as Chairman of the Board.

(Secretary’s Note: Trustee Polett abstained and did not participate in this action.)

4. **Election of University Trustee—Ann Weaver Hart**

Upon motion duly made and seconded, the Board of Trustees approved the recommendation of the Committee on Trustee Affairs (6/13/06) and elected Ann Weaver Hart for the term beginning July 1, 2006, to the Board of Trustees of Temple University – Of The Commonwealth System of Higher Education.

Executive Committee and Budget & Finance Committee –
Lewis F. Gould, Jr., Chair of Budget & Finance Committee

On June 13, the Budget & Finance, Executive and Student Affairs Committees of the Board of Trustees participated in a 2.5 hour briefing on the proposed University, Practice Plan and Health System budgets. Principal among the matters discussed is a current shortfall among those budgets of approximately \$19.4 million dollars in funding support for the Practice Plan clinical programs. The Health System's budget, approved by its Board of Directors after extended discussion, includes a net reduction from FY 2006 in its programmatic support of the Practice Plan from approximately \$80 million in FY 2006 to \$60 million in FY 2007, in response to its own revenue projections for the coming year. After much discussion, the members of this Board of Trustees agreed that a Special Committee of the Board would be charged to work collaboratively with representatives of the Health System and the Practice Plan, together with incoming President Ann Hart, over the next three to four months to propose a resolution of this FY 2007 budgetary issue and to fashion a comprehensive, long-term strategic plan to address the challenges inherent in the health care market in which the Practice Plan and Health System operate.

PriceWaterhouseCoopers, who has been engaged by the Health System, to address the Health System's and Practice Plan's financial challenges, will be asked to assist in these efforts. All entities involved, the University, Practice Plan and TUHS, are committed to his collaborative process, not only to resolve the FY 2007 budget issues but also to address the long-term financial challenges. To the extent necessary at the conclusion of this process, the University and Health System budgets being considered for approval today may be reviewed and submitted for approval by the respective Boards in the fall.

RECOMMENDATIONS FOR ACTION

5. **University Operating Budget for 2006-2007**

Upon motion duly made and seconded, the Board of Trustees adopted the University Operating Budget and the Operating Budget Policies and Procedures for 2006-2007, as set forth in Agenda References 5.1 and 5.5.

6. **Tuition Schedule for 2006-2007**

Upon motion duly made and seconded, the Board of Trustees approved the Proposed Tuition Rates for 2006-2007, as set forth in Agenda Reference 5.3.

7. **General Activities, Computer and Technology, Student Health Services, Student Recreation and Student Facilities Fees, 2006-2007**

Upon motion duly made and seconded, the Board of Trustees approved the General Activities, Computer and Technology, Student Health Services, Student Recreation and Student Facilities Fees for 2006-2007, as set forth in Agenda Reference 5.3.

8. **Spending Rule for Endowment of Assets**

Upon motion duly made and seconded, the Board of Trustees approved the Resolution to Select a Spending Rule for Endowment Assets, as set forth in Agenda Reference 5.6.

Board of Directors, Temple University Health System, Inc. –
Joseph W. Marshall, III, Chair & Chief Executive Officer

RECOMMENDATION FOR ACTION

9. **Temple University Health System, Inc., Final Budget 2006-2007**

Upon motion duly made and seconded, the Board of Trustees approved the recommendation of the Board of Directors of Temple University Health System, Inc. (6/2/06), and adopted the Temple University Health System, Inc., Final Operating Budget for 2006-2007.

Academic Affairs Committee – Leonard Barrack, Chair

RECOMMENDATIONS FOR ACTION

10. **Consideration of Tenure**

Upon motion duly made and seconded, the Board of Trustees approved the recommendation of the Academic Affairs Committee (6/21/06) and the President regarding the granting of faculty tenure.

11. **Item Withdrawn**

12. **Modify General Education Program Requirements (Policy 02.10.02)**

Upon motion duly made and seconded, the Board of Trustees approved the recommendation of the Academic Affairs Committee (6/21/06) that the officers be authorized to modify the General Education Program Requirements in Board Policy #02.10.02, as specified in Agenda Reference 12.

13. **Eliminate Department of Podiatric Orthopedics and Biomechanics in the Temple University School of Podiatric Medicine**

Upon motion duly made and seconded, the Board of Trustees approved the recommendation of the Academic Affairs Committee (6/21/06) that the officers be authorized to eliminate the Department of Podiatric Orthopedics and Biomechanics in the Temple University School of Podiatric Medicine, with its becoming a section of “Podiatric Orthopedics and Biomechanics” within the Department of Podiatric Medicine.

Development Committee – Richard J. Fox, Chair

RECOMMENDATIONS FOR ACTION

14. Naming of the Ambler College Healing Garden

Upon motion duly made and seconded, the Board of Trustees approved the recommendations of the Development Committee (6/22/06) and the Gift Acceptance Committee (6/6/06) that the healing garden being built by the Ambler College Department of Landscape Architecture and Horticulture be named the Ernesta Ballard Healing Garden, in memory of Mrs. Ernesta Ballard, a tremendous leader in the field of horticulture, an alumna of Ambler College, and a founding member of the Ambler College Board of Visitors. The healing garden is based on Ambler College's 2006 Philadelphia Flower Show Exhibit - - Nature Nurtures: Mind, Body, Spirit. Such naming opportunity will be contingent upon the raising of sufficient funds by Ambler College to construct the garden.

15. Naming of the Ambler College Dwarf Conifer Garden

Upon motion duly made and seconded, the Board of Trustees approved the recommendations of the Development Committee (6/22/06) and the Gift Acceptance Committee (6/6/06) that the new dwarf conifer garden in the space adjacent to the greenhouse be named the Colibraro Conifer Garden, in honor of Michael Colibraro of Colibraro Landscaping and Nursery, Inc., a member of the Arboretum Advisory Committee of the Landscape Arboretum of Temple University Ambler, in recognition of his generous support of Ambler College and his intention to donate all plant material for the garden. Such naming opportunity will be contingent upon this donation and upon a binding pledge of financial support from Mr. Colibraro.

Facilities Committee – Mitchell L. Morgan, Chair

RECOMMENDATION FOR ACTION

16. Upgrades/Renovations – Unit 7A, 1820 Rittenhouse Square

Upon motion duly made and seconded, the Board of Trustees approved the recommendation of the Facilities Committee (6/15/06) that the officers be authorized to proceed with the upgrades and renovations to Unit 7A, 1820 Rittenhouse Square, with the funding and financing source being the President's Carry-Over Funds (10-3100-000), as set forth in Agenda Reference 16.

* * * * *

OFFICERS' REPORTS

17. Secretary's Report – George E. Moore

Upon motion duly made and seconded, the Board of Trustees approved the presentation of degrees-in-course dated October 28, 2006, to candidates approved by the appropriate academic committees of the faculty in the Tsinghua LLM Program in Beijing, China.

18. Treasurer's Report – Martin S. Dorph

The Investment Report for the Three Months Ended March 31, 2006, was accepted as identified as Agenda Reference 18.

**OLD BUSINESS
NEW BUSINESS
ADJOURNMENT**

(Secretary's Note: Minutes revised to correct date typo on page 8 of 12.