

MINUTES - JOINT MEETING

Executive Committee and Business and Finance Committee
(To Which Meeting All Board Members Were Invited)

Board of Trustees

Temple University - Of The Commonwealth System of Higher Education

Tuesday, November 27, 1990

3:30 P.M., Feinstone Lounge, Sullivan Hall
Park and Berks Malls

Attendance:

Executive Committee Members - Richard J. Fox*, presiding;
Patricia J. Clifford, Paul A. Dandridge,
Clifford Scott Green, Peter J. Liacouras*, R. Anderson Pew
Edward H. Rosen, Anthony J. Scirica, Isadore A. Shrager
(* - member of both Committees),

being a quorum of the Committee;

Business & Finance Committee Members - Harry P. Begier, Jr.,
Richard J. Fox*, D. Donald Jamieson, Peter J. Liacouras*,
Francis R. Strawbridge, James A. Williams
(* - member of both Committees)

Other Invited Board Member Attending - Francis J. Catania

Non-Voting Trustee Members - Kenneth R. Cundy (Faculty Senate),
William Duncan (General Alumni Association),
Randall Gaboriault (Temple Student Government)

Business and Finance Committee NVA Members - John Hagopian
(Alumni), Leroy Dubeck (Faculty)

Administration and Staff - Barbara L. Brownstein, Richard A. Chant
Steven R. Derby, Jack E. Freeman, C. Robert Harrington,
Leon S. Malmud, Jesse Milan, Timothy O'Rourke,
Arthur C. Papacostas, Kent Rayburn, Robert J. Reinstein,
Larry J. Remillard, William G. Sites, Valaida S. Walker,
Stephen C. Zelnick, Beverly L. Breese

General Counsel - Peter M. Mattoon

University Counsel - George E. Moore

Executive Committee Absentees - Louis J. Esposito, Lacy H. Hunt*,
Irving K. Kessler, Milton L. Rock, Clare L. Wofford
(* - member of both Committees)

Business and Finance Committee Absentees - John J. Contoudis
Peter D. DePaul, Chaka Fattah, Lacy H. Hunt*,
Brian J. O'Neill, William W. Reiger
(* - member of both Committees)

Executive Committee NVA Absentee - William Woodward (Faculty)

PRESIDENT'S REPORT

With the seating of the elected Presidents of the Faculty Senate, the Student Government, and the General Alumni Association, the Board of Trustees has taken an important symbolic step to begin the healing process at the University. We now have an official forum where the Presidents of the students, faculty and alumni associations may present their views and, to the extent they reflect them, the views of their constituencies directly to the Board and public.

We have nine standing Board Committees on which faculty members, alumni, and students are represented and participate. Most of these committees meet monthly on the broad range of University issues (Educational Policies; Student Affairs; Business and Finance; Campus Planning and Plant Management; Athletics; Development; Honorary Degrees; University and Community Relations; Executive). Now, the Presidents of our students, faculty, and alumni associations have the privilege of participating directly in the plenary sessions of the Board of Trustees and in the Executive Committee of the Board of Trustees.

These developments are in addition to structures and fora for participation and communication in decision-making which already exist: (a) faculty participation at every level of collegiate and departmental decision-making--where the great majority of decisions directly affecting faculty, students, and educational policy are made; (b) faculty participation on virtually every education issue within the portfolio of the Provost -- the University's chief academic officer; (c) full administrative cooperation with the standing Faculty Senate Committees on the total range of University-wide issues; and (d) faculty participation on searches for administrators. These democratic processes rival those at virtually any other national institution.

There are additional developments I would emphasize today.

First, we have resumed this past Wednesday the meetings between an ad hoc committee of Board leaders and the leadership of the Faculty Senate. These meetings have been held an average of three times each academic year during the past four years. The agendas for these meetings are open and usually set by the faculty members. Those informal, off-the-record meetings have led to formal Board and Faculty Senate resolutions. On at least one major issue, the retrenchment issue, which dominated the faculty strike in 1986, these discussions led to a formal decision by the Board of Trustees to consult the Faculty Senate leadership prior to taking action on the retrenchment of faculty.

Second, the Faculty Senate President participates fully in the University Cabinet. The Cabinet is composed of University officers charged with considering all University-wide issues which require administrative approval by the President in Cabinet. It meets twice a week. The President of the Student Government and other leaders he may choose have also been invited for five years, as has the Faculty Senate President, and will continue to be invited to participate in Cabinet.

Beyond the Cabinet, the most energetic administrative committee is the University Budget Review Committee. Two faculty members recommended by the Faculty Senate have been sitting as full members of the Committee for the past three years. That committee, chaired these past two years by the Provost and consisting of all University officers except the President, has hearings with every administrative unit of the University--every college, every administrative unit. At every hearing and at all follow-up meetings by the Cabinet where the Committee's recommendations are considered by the President, these two faculty members participate fully and will continue to participate. The Budget Review Committee is a "power" Committee by any definition, and faculty members have served with distinction as full participants.

Third, at its meeting on November 6, the Student Affairs Committee of the Board of Trustees heard directly from the President and other leaders of Student Government, from leaders of the "Concerned Black Students" who raised certain issues this past Spring, and from representatives of the graduate student association who have raised other concerns during the past year. Those meetings between this Board Committee and students are ongoing.

Fourth, just yesterday, at the first meeting this academic year of the Educational Policies Committee of the Board of Trustees, a representative of the graduate student association presented the concerns of graduate students directly to that Board committee.

Fifth, following up those two Board meetings, we established today in Cabinet a joint administrative-student-faculty-committee, chaired by the Executive Vice President, to recommend to me by the eighth of December a policy on health insurance for our approximately 1,100 graduate student assistants.

(You will note in today's Final Budget no change from July's Tentative Budget on the increase of \$750,000 that we allocated in stipends and \$352,000 in additional tuition remission for our graduate student assistants. The health insurance issue is an additional consideration.)

Sixth, at their request, Executive Vice President Jack Freeman and I met two weeks ago with a small group of respected faculty members to hear directly from them how we can help in the healing process. Following the first meeting, Jack Freeman has convened other administrators (the Provost, deans, and other officers) to continue this dialogue. Their agenda is to determine a process for repairing the damage inflicted on cordiality, rationality, and collegiality at the University and to revive committee activity in a constructive way.

For example, many Faculty Senate and Provost committees did not meet in September, October, and part of November. The tenure and promotion process did not begin on time this year because of the aftermath of the strike. Such processes must resume, and Jack Freeman's forum (and others simultaneously developing) is attempting to gather as much faculty input on how to improve our overall situation. That process of exploration and discussion, and the resumption of normal committee processes, will themselves help in the healing.

Three areas for serious consideration are -- (a) Revisiting the structures of the Faculty Senate: the Faculty Senate has been virtually unchanged since a Presidential Summer Commission in 1968 recommended the Senate substantially in its present form. Since 1968, however, we have undergone a major change in the academy at Temple -- the Unionization in 1972 of a substantial portion of the faculty. So within four years of the establishment of a stronger Faculty Senate, a new legally-recognized and competitive faculty entity -- the union -- came on the scene. Despite national debate on the compatibility of Faculty Senates with Faculty Unions, I have always sided with their co-existence. But the faculty has not comprehensively re-examined the role of the Faculty Senate in two decades. This may be the time to do so; it's up to the faculty.

(b) Revisiting the structures of student participation and student life: the same can be said about student participation in University governance. I had forgotten until reminded recently by Temple Student Government leaders that I served during the whole summer of 1968 on a parallel Presidential Commission on Student Participation. That summer was one of the most stimulating and enlightening I have spent as a faculty member at Temple. We were in the midst of "student unrest" on campuses stemming from the Vietnam War, the civil rights movement, and political convulsion. Our Student Commission eventually led to the Student Code on rights and responsibilities. That Code is still in force substantially as recommended in 1968 and has not been revisited in a major way for a generation.

Recommendations for change, we hope, will come from the faculty and students rather than from administrators or the Board -- although we will help in any way to facilitate such discussions and possible change.

(c) Revisiting the concept of a University Council: Chairman Fox has pointed out, as has Executive Vice President Freeman when he arrived last month, that our fora at Temple are confrontational in structure -- the Faculty Senate and its Steering Committee are faculty fora with faculty participants. At the same time, on the administrative side the Cabinet has welcomed regular participation by faculty and student leaders, but it is still predominantly an administrative forum. The Council of Deans is an exclusively administrative group. Again, the structure tends to be insular, at arms-length with the faculty, and, like the Senate, confrontational in nature.

A University Council would bring the leadership of faculty, students, and administration together in one forum to discuss and make recommendations to the President on all University-wide issues. It would, in effect, facilitate the work of the Faculty Senate, Council of Deans, and Student Government, by permitting, in a relatively small representative forum, an exchange of views and a forging of consensus in a collegial, non-confrontational setting. I am not today advocating such a council, but I am suggesting that the informal meetings now taking place specifically explore these and other possibilities to improve communication and participation at the University.

Seventh, the revised Final Budget presented today is also, I believe, an important step in the healing process. The revised budget represents a reduction of \$12.9 million from the Tentative Budget approved in July.

It avoids lay-offs.

It maintains the integrity of the academic sector and support for students.

It is a balanced budget.

It is therefore part of the healing process.

Eighth, the Board of Trustees has resolved, for the timebeing, to keep "on the table" the tentative contract settlement negotiated and approved by the State head of the AFT, the Chief Negotiator of the Temple TAUP, the President of TAUP, and recommended for adoption to the members of the Negotiating Team of TAUP and by the Executive Committee of TAUP. Nevertheless, this tentative contract was voted down earlier this month by voting members of TAUP to our profound disappointment.

That offer no doubt contains provisions that both sides may not like, but it was a negotiated settlement. Time is running out. There is increasing evidence that we may not be able to afford that offer. Enrollments in January must appreciably increase from their present projections for the Board's tentative agreement to continue to be fiscally prudent. In view of that pressure, the Board's action in keeping the negotiated offer on the table despite the November 1 vote is another important sign of friendly intent and should be recognized as such.

The willingness of individual Board members to meet informally with interested students and faculty at every opportunity is another sign of caring and good faith. This is all part of the healing process.

I salute Chairman Fox, the Board of Trustees, and Dr. Freeman for their initiatives, and Faculty President Ken Cundy, Student President Randy Gaboriault, and General Alumni Association President Bill Duncan for their leadership.

* * *

There is an enormous amount of support for Temple University in the larger community. There is a feeling out there that "we want to help the University and get over these terrible three months of downing, downing, downing, the students, the faculty, and the University."

The process now underway to restore reasoned discussion is what a University is all about. Temple has always been open to honest differences of opinion on every imaginable subject. That environment must be resumed fully for everyone at the University.

We owe everyone who has any stake in Temple the obligation to preserve the special mission that Temple historically has maintained for working men and women with enormous motivation and perseverance, who work two jobs to get through college, who work in the day to afford going to classes at night, who sacrifice to become graduate students and have to support their families with meager resources, and for those minority and women students who are breaking new paths for their families.

We know that many of our students have made hard decisions to become graduate students, law students, medical or dental students, and undergraduates. All of them of have chosen to sacrifice financially and personally in the present to get an excellent education and greater financial rewards later on. Our faculty and administrators have had an historical love affair with our students, and our students have always known it. We lost some of that magic for a three month period, an aberrational period in Temple's 106 year history. We must quickly restore that very precious Temple link of solidarity and love for our students.

It's time to turn away from self-interest and move to the common interest. We must build on and strengthen this mission and keep in good repair this home of minorities, of women, and of those who have historically not had the opportunities to realize quality higher education.

It is clear from our external review -- in particular, last year's review by the Middle States Association Commission on Higher Education -- that academically Temple has improved markedly during this decade. That is the true test of whether the Board is succeeding in its stewardship. Our graduates, our research, and our service to our communities is stronger than ever. This is not a criticism of earlier periods. We know that Temple has turned out graduates who became leaders in virtually every area of human enterprise. But we are now doing even better academically, while serving students from all walks of life in larger numbers than ever before.

Minority students enrollment had increased at Temple while going down nationally; and women now comprise the majority of students at Temple. Every major demographic and academic index suggests that Temple is a great success. That success is a reflection on the caring and ultimate responsibility of the Board of Trustees.

That blend of excellence and Populism, that special mission is what we all want passionately to support and retain.

I am happy, therefore, to announce that our most famous graduate, Trustee Bill Cosby, has agreed to contribute a series of televised public appeals on behalf of Temple. In them, Bill Cosby will speak to the public and to the Temple community about Temple. He plans to record television and radio messages a week from this Thursday, and we anticipate airing them sometime thereafter. We expect to remind ourselves and others of what is good about Temple and what it means to have this fine institution in this region and in this country. Along

with Valaida Walker, our Vice President for Students; Jack Freeman; the Provost; and Vice Provost Julia Ericksen; as well as staff and administrators from throughout the University; and faculty and students; we will pursue an aggressive approach to recapturing the students who have left us and attracting new students to Temple.

Our students can get just about everything they really want at Temple. Sometimes students get even more than they bargained for -- witness the last couple of months. But that too shall pass. The practical, real-life education one receives by being in the City of Philadelphia can not be matched.

Our campaign for Temple will emphasize our strengths. We will tell the truth; we won't hide anything. With the cooperation and help of our faculty and students, we will succeed.

In this spirit, I appeal to all Temple persons: whatever our personal differences or personal agendas, it is now time for all of us to act on the following:

"Ask, what can I do for my students? And ask, what can we do for our University?"

* * *

At this point, I would like to summarize the budget, and then have Dr. Freeman make a more detailed presentation.

We lost some 3,555 students, the bulk of that number as a direct result of the TAUP strike and actions of the last three months.

We are faced with the need to trim three percent, or \$12.9 million from the Tentative Budget approved in July. The total budget, excluding the Hospital, was \$423 million, so we had to reduce cost to \$411 million.

To reach this objective, we assumed the recapture of 60% of the 3,555 students. Based on present pre-registration figures, which we think may be less reliable than usual (because there is still some uncertainty in student's minds), we will not recapture 60% of those students. That is why we are undertaking a vigorous marketing campaign. We will need the cooperation of our faculty and of all other constituencies at the University. The Bill Cosby appeals will help, but they are not a panacea. We must all work together.

If we do not recapture 60%, we will be back here in late January or early February with other as yet undetermined cuts. As of now, there are no lay-offs in this budget. We do not plan to lay-off persons who are regular employees of the University, at this point.

Another caveat, on this budget: the Temple University Hospital is not included. Two weeks from today, at the Quarterly Meeting of the Board of Trustees, we will have a Final Temple University Hospital Budget for your consideration. There is an anticipated deficit of between \$8 and \$12 million.

It is important to understand that there is one Temple University and one consolidated University budget. Today, we are considering only that part dealing with operations other than the hospital. We will present the hospital final budget in December, along with the consolidated budget, for your consideration. The challenge is to bring in a consolidated budget in balance, despite the deficit in the hospital budget.

At our December 11 meeting we will have a resolution formally to authorize the two specific contractual phases for an external consultation (already authorized by the Joint Committee), which will include the possible incorporation of the Hospital as a legal entity separate from the University. Right now, all of Temple University is one corporation (a unitary legal entity): so, whatever happens financially to one part affects all others. We have faced deficits at the Hospital the past three years, but we have not yet realized them, thanks to strong management. This year, however, the entire University could be threatened financially because of the unitary legal relationship of the Temple corporation. One of the phases of this external consultation will therefore, be a separately incorporated status for the Hospital.

A second phase of this consultation will be to help capitalize this possible new corporation. To do so, complicated changes in the present bond structure and our relationship to FHA (which guarantees the bonds) will be required.

Other issues which have been raised in the past, such as merging the Hospital with other Institutions or the sale of the Hospital, will not at this time be part of the charge to our external consultant.

Despite the uncertainties of this pending consultation, we will present a Final Hospital Budget for 1990-91 for your consideration on December 11.

I want to repeat the earlier caveat to the University's final budget. The University (excluding the Hospital) has today cut \$12.9 million from the Tentative Budget and achieved thereby a balanced budget. But in doing so, we have assumed that we will regain 60% of the students who recently dropped out, and we have assumed other things going well. We cannot incur further disruptions. Everyone connected with Temple must understand the stakes and our opportunities.

In addition, the Board is faced with approximately \$10 million in a potential deficit at the Hospital for the current year. There are no reserves to cover a \$10 million deficit.

The University cannot continue paying the costs of treating patients at our teaching hospital. We have an obligation to treat all patients -- rich or poor, insured or uninsured -- and we do so happily and expertly. The reason we face a deficit at the Hospital is simple: the Government does not reimburse us for our actual costs in treating the poor and uninsured. Our hospital has always been open to everyone, in practice as well as in theory. We are very proud of that highly ethical and moral fact. But why should the university pay those costs? from what non-existent funds? should it be the Temple students at large

who pay through higher tuitions? Should it be the academic programs? Should it be extracurricular activities?

We believe that by providing this medical and hospital service to our community, we are fulfilling our community responsibility as a University to our neighbors. Temple University provides excellent and caring service to more financially poor persons in our community than virtually any other university with a hospital in a community setting.

We cannot continue to bear the weight of these costs. We cannot let this problem fester any longer. We must solve it this year.

That, in a nutshell, is the problem at the Hospital. How we solve it will tell us very much about the kind of legacy we will leave behind.

* * *

Finally, I would like to emphasize that the cuts we are recommending today will not affect our students, our faculty, or our academic programs in any appreciable way. We will, however, defer some administrative support such as the purchase of a major computer, delay the completion of the computerized human resource (personnel) management system, defer certain physical plant initiatives and operations, defer an increase in the return of our overhead recovery on research grants, and reduce spending on travel, entertainment, and other equipment expenses.

We have squeezed as much as we can without reaching personnel. Unless we work together from now on, we will soon be faced with much more painful decisions. And time may be running out.

We all must give our best, put aside our differences and local grievances, and see the whole picture of Temple University in order to take us through this difficult time.

RECOMMENDATIONS FOR EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE ACTION

1. Election of Executive Committee Chairman and Vice Chairman

With Mr. Fox presiding and on motion duly made and seconded, the Executive Committee, in keeping with the By-Laws (Article IV, Section 1-A), voted to elect Anthony J. Scirica as Chairman and Patricia J. Clifford as Vice-Chairman of the Executive Committee.

2. Ratification of the Nomination of Trustees to Serve on the Committee on Trustees

On motion duly made and seconded the Executive Committee, in keeping with the By-Laws (Article 6-A), voted to ratify the nomination for election by the Board of Trustees, the following five members of the Board to serve on the Committee on Trustees for one-year terms, effective 10/9/90:

Patricia J. Clifford
Louis J. Esposito
Milton L. Rock
Isadore A. Shrager
Clare L. Wofford

3. Appointment by Executive Committee of Two "Appointive" Directors of Temple University Law Foundation

On motion duly made and seconded the Executive Committee in keeping with the Law Foundation By-Laws approved by the Executive Committee on 9/28/89 (Article VI), voted to appoint the following two persons as Appointive Directors of the Temple University Law Foundation for the 1990-1993 term:

Harry P. Beiger, Jr.
Isadore A. Shrager

RECOMMENDATIONS FOR JOINT COMMITTEE ACTIONS

4. Authorization for the Presidents of the General Alumni Association, the Faculty Senate and the Temple Student Government to Participate in Public Meetings of the Board of Trustees and of the Joint Meetings of the Executive and Business and Finance Committees

On motion duly made and seconded, the Business and Finance Committee and the Executive Committee, the latter acting on behalf of the Board, voted to approve the recommendation of the Committee on Trustees (11/20/90) that the Presidents of the General Alumni Association, the Faculty Senate and the Temple Student Government be authorized to participate in the public meetings of the Board of Trustees and of the Joint Meetings of the Executive and Business and Finance Committees, with this understanding:

that the three Presidents shall be seated with Trustees and shall have the privileges of Trustees in public meetings, except the right to vote.

5. Approval of Minutes of Joint Committee of 8/13/90

Without objection, the captioned Minutes were approved as distributed.

6. Next Joint Meeting Date

The usual fourth-Thursday date is December 27. Because the full Board will meet on December 11 and because of the proximity of the fourth-Thursday to Christmas, there may not be a need for a December meeting. The Committee stands subject to a call to meeting on the approval of the Chair.

The fourth-Thursday date in the following month is January 24. Advance notice of the next meeting will, of course, be given.

7. Borrowing Authority - 1/1/91 - 3/31/91

On motion duly made and seconded, the Business and Finance Committee and the Executive Committee voted to recommend that the Board of Trustees authorize the officers to borrow for operating purposes of the University \$30 million on terms which the officers believe best for the University, such authorization to cover the period from January 1, 1991 through March 31, 1991. (Resolution is attached as SUPPLEMENT I. The borrowing authority for the preceding quarter was also for \$30 million.)

8. Final University Budget for 1990-91

Executive Vice President Freeman, presenting the Final University Budget for 1990-91, said the primary efforts were to avoid layoffs, to present a balanced budget, to preserve academic programs and to have a minimum impact on students. Many elements of this Final Budget reflect one-time savings, he said; they are just that and cannot be repeated.

The total Final University Budget is \$484 million which is 4% higher than the budget for last year. That figure does not include the Hospital. If the Hospital, Woodhaven, the Medical School Physician's Practice Plan and externally designated funds are excluded, the total Final 1990-1991 Budget figure becomes \$332 million which is 1.8% above the final budget for last year.

This Final Budget includes the use of \$5.5 million of the unrestricted quasi-endowment.

Tuition and fees revenues are up 1%, Mr. Freeman said. This Fall term, we are looking to a reduction of only 6.9%. The Final Budget is built on a 40% decline in enrollment for next Spring. If that is so, it will come to a loss of \$2.5 million. That thinking, the Executive Vice President said, might be an optimistic assumption. We are working hard to draw back to the University every student who left this Fall.

The Computer Technology Fee will give us \$1.7 million in revenues.

The Commonwealth appropriation, exclusive of the Tuition Challenge Grant, increased by 3.75%. The Tuition Challenge Grant increased by \$790,000. Mr. Freeman said, we expected the Tuition Challenge Grant to be double the \$2.2 million in last year's budget. However the State this year, used a different method for calculating the distribution of funds. This has a severe negative impact on Temple University and the University of Pittsburgh. The Pennsylvania State University and the State College System benefited from it. Temple University and the University of Pittsburgh, because of larger graduate enrollments, did not. We are going to work hard this year to rationalize the Tuition Challenge Grant.

Mr. Freeman said the Tuition Challenge Grant is an important, creative policy. It must be recognized that it is a replacement for dollars that would otherwise come to the University from tuition and cannot be regarded as a way of funding the University's base program.

Our Indirect Cost Recovery is up 5% over the 1989-90 budget.

Transfers for the quasi-endowment equal \$5.5 million.

Auxiliary Enterprises revenues are down due to losses in food services and housing. This is a result of the faculty strike. The loss will equal \$600,000.

The Intercollegiate Athletics Budget was built on an anticipated \$900,000 in private gifts; but the actual was lower than that. We expect, the Executive Vice President said, to receive \$400,000 in private gifts. To offset, we have targeted a .5 million reduction in the current Intercollegiate Athletics budget.

Unrestricted Expenditures are 1.8% over the final budget for last year. One significant increase is that of energy costs. That increase totals \$3.5 million which is something on the order of a 10%-12% increase. Compensation increases equal \$10 million. Employee benefit costs equal \$1.2 million.

Restricted Revenues and expenditures equal \$67.2 million. It reflects a variety of increases from private and public sources. The largest amount comes from Federal research and other sponsored programs.

Dr. Freeman pointed out that expenditures for the Office of the Provost reflects a 2.8% increase. This is a net figure which reflects a number of reductions, one of which is a \$2.5 million reduction in faculty salaries due to the strike. There have also been other efforts made in the academic area mostly related to reduced enrollment.

Expenditures in the portfolio of the Executive Vice President are down because the acquisition of a major computer has been deferred. Expenditures in the area of the Vice President - External Affairs are due to the special programs to improve our public relations and to recruit students back for the Spring Term. The increase in the Office of the President is only 2% once the amount added for strike related legal fees is deducted. The increase in the area of Vice President - Operations is 11.2% and is mostly energy related.

During general discussion, Mr. Dandridge questioned this presentation as a Final University Budget since it did not include the Hospital Budget. President Liacouras responded that it is the Final University Budget without the Hospital. The consolidated budget will be presented in two weeks, he said.

Mr. Rosen praised the performance of the new Executive Vice President in his mastery, so quickly, of the budget and expressed, for the Board, its appreciation for his perspicacity.

On motion duly made and seconded, the Business and Finance Committee and the Executive Committee, the latter acting pursuant to the Board authorization of 10/9/90, voted to adopt the Final University Budget for 1990-91, said Budget being attached as SUPPLEMENT II.

9. Final Hospital Budget for 1990-91

The Final Hospital Budget will be presented at the quarterly meeting of the Board of Trustees, December 11, 1990.

10. Joint Meeting Schedule for Committees for 1990-91

Chairman Scirica asked that the Secretary of the Board send the usual schedule to members of the Joint Committee.

The meeting of the Joint Committee was adjourned at 4:40 P.M.

(Secretary's Note: From 3:00 P.M. to 3:30 P.M., the Committees met in Executive Session regarding collective bargaining matters, and the Minutes for that Executive Session are recorded separately.)

W. C. L.