NUMBER: 28-1990
STATUS: APPROVED
PLACE: ROCKVILLE, MARYLAND
DATE: JUNE 19, 1990
TEXT:

APPROVED
28-1990

Rockville, Maryland
June 19, 1990

The Board of Education of Montgomery County met in special session at the Carver Educational Services Center, Rockville, Maryland, on Tuesday, June 19, 1990, at 8:05 p.m.

ROLL CALL Present: Dr. Robert E. Shoenberg, President in the Chair
Dr. James E. Cronin
Mrs. Sharon DiFonzo
Mr. Blair G. Ewing
Mr. Bruce A. Goldensohn
Mrs. Catherine E. Hobbs
Mrs. Marilyn J. Praisner
Ms. Alison Serino

Absent: None

Others Present: Dr. Harry Pitt, Superintendent
Dr. Paul L. Vance, Deputy Superintendent
Mr. Thomas S. Fess, Parliamentarian
Mr. David Chang, Board Member-elect

#indicates student vote does not count. Four votes are needed for adoption.

RESOLUTION NO. 389-90 Re: BOARD AGENDA - JUNE 19, 1990

On recommendation of the superintendent and on motion of Mr. Goldensohn seconded by Dr. Cronin, the following resolution was adopted unanimously:

RESOLVED, That the Board of Education approve its agenda for June 19, 1990.

RESOLUTION NO. 390-90 Re: AMENDED AGREEMENT WITH THE MONTGOMERY COUNTY COUNCIL OF SUPPORTING SERVICES EMPLOYEES

On recommendation of the superintendent and on motion of Mrs. Praisner seconded by Dr. Cronin, the following resolution was adopted unanimously#:

WHEREAS, Section 6-510 of THE PUBLIC SCHOOL LAWS OF MARYLAND permits the Board of Education to enter into negotiations with the designated employee organization concerning "salaries, wages, hours, and other working conditions;" and

WHEREAS, The Montgomery County Council of Supporting Services Employees was properly designated as the employee organization to be the exclusive representative for these negotiations; and

WHEREAS, On February 28, 1990, the Board of Education approved the agreement for the period of July 1, 1990, through June 30, 1993, if the County Council funded said agreement; and

WHEREAS, The County Council did not fund the agreement; and

WHEREAS, The Board of Education voted on May 21, 1990, to enter into renegotiations; and

WHEREAS, Such renegotiations occurred, agreement was reached, and the agreement has been accepted by the union; now therefore be it

RESOLVED, That the president of the Board of Education be authorized to sign the amended agreement, all according to said amended agreement and law.

Re: STATEMENTS BY BOARD MEMBERS

1. Ms. Serino made the following statement:

"According to state law, my vote as a student Board member does not count in the areas of budget and negotiated agreements. Throughout these last months, however, I have participated in all sessions, budget and negotiations, and contributed the same as any other Board member. The road has not been easy, and it was very difficult for me to cast my silent vote in favor of renegotiations for MCEA. We are now at a different stage. The new agreement is not perfect. No one is completely satisfied, and there is $9 million left to cut. The most important factor is that we have reached an agreement and have the potential for a contract. This is the deciding factor. I will vote in favor of the renegotiated agreement and hope that my fellow Board members and I can reduce the budget in ways that will have the least negative impact on the educational services to our students."

2. Mrs. Hobbs made the following statement:

"I am going to reluctantly approve the MCEA contract, and I would just like to say that it has been a long and difficult process, a process that started in September. It hasn't been altogether pleasant. It has been frustrating and disappointing, and we have a long evening yet ahead of us. We will have to live with the decisions that we make this evening in the months ahead."

3. Mrs. DiFonzo made the following statement:

"I am not going to be supporting this agreement. I have looked at the cuts that we are going to have to make, and I am convinced that taking those cuts is going to cause irreparable damage to the school system. I feel that I have an obligation to the students in this school system. I also have an obligation to the parents of students in this school system. I am sorry

that I cannot support this agreement, but I feel that to do so would be to devastate programs and to devastate services, and I cannot in good conscience support it."

4. Mr. Ewing made the following statement:

"The agreement that we have reached with MCEA is, in my view, the product of a series of miscalculations beginning with those of the Council and continuing with those of the Board. I think it is a terrible agreement, but I suppose it is a contradiction but I am going to vote for it because I think the option of not adopting it is worse. I think the Board would then move to make even further reductions in teachers' salaries, and I couldn't support that. I think this agreement while it will give us an agreement will also give us nothing but continuing pain, and we will find I think that it has poisoned the atmosphere of school system/teacher relationships for years to come, and I regret that deeply. I am very angry about it. I do not think that the cuts we will have to make need to affect program in any kind of negative way. I said that. I repeated that. I believe that, and I will be proposing motions to make that happen. We will see whether they get adopted of course, but I think that can be done."

5. Dr. Shoenberg made the following statement:

"I, too, will be voting to support the agreement. I regret the kinds of cuts we are going to have to make, whatever those cuts may be. They are somewhat beyond my tolerances, what I can feel comfortable with, what I can feel is fair to students, and to the public, and to the quality of instruction in the schools. But I think it is important that we have an agreement. Both sides worked hard at this. We have agreement, an uneasy one, at a level that makes no one particularly happy -- no one in the county, I think, the County Council, parents, school Board, teachers. The fact is that we are someplace where we can agree and given the process we have been through, it seems to me that that has to be enough. And, therefore, I plan to vote in support of the settlement."

6. Mr. Goldensohn made the following statement:

"I also intend to vote for the agreement. I have supported the concept of full funding of the contract due to the fact that I thought it was a fair agreement in its original form and the product of a long period of honest negotiations between this Board and its negotiating team and MCEA and their negotiating team. When that became obviously not feasible any longer, I became agreeable to the concept of salvaging as much as possible for our employees. I think this contract will do that. The teachers are giving up some items. The Board is, in effect, going to be giving more than it had originally thought it would

have to. No one is going to walk away happy. Programs are going to suffer, but it is a balancing act that we are obligated to do, and we will do to the best of our ability. I wish that the budgetary process was different and that our budgetary approval authority, that being the County Council, did not have such an influence on line-by-line cutting into the subject area of our budget. We might not have had the problem of funding of the contract if that had not been the case. Something clearly needs to be done to realign how school system budgets are funded and what percentage of the county's money in fact goes to support education. As I said before I will vote for the agreement because at this point it is the best possible that we can come up with and let our staff get back to work and to their jobs."

7. Mrs. Praisner made the following statement:

"During the vote for renegotiations, much was said about the reason why we found ourselves in that situation. Some comments have been made again this evening about the County Council and Council culpability in this area. I think it is important to stress that again this evening. If we had an independent-thinking Council and there had been some recognition of the efforts that had been made in the process up to the delivery of the budget to the Council, all this would not have been necessary. I have been told by some that they believe the County Council vote on the 5.2 percent was as far as it could go because Council vote required five votes in order to save it from a county executive veto. I think it is important to state that that is not correct. There is no veto authority by the county executive over the MCPS budget. All that having been said, I think politically it would be very easy for me now to vote for this raise knowing that this proposal has the votes to pass, but tomorrow I have to look at myself in the mirror. While I do not believe that the Board should accept the County Council's salary figures and I have during the negotiations process supported more than the 5.2 percent for teachers, I cannot support a raise that when compounded will amount to more than 7 percent. Because of the significant negative effect on the classroom and on the school system, I will not be voting for the contract."

8. Dr. Cronin made the following statement:

"As a number of other Board members, I will go back to the origin of the dilemma we are in. I am not sure whether we have come to this point because of the taxpayers revolt, because of election year politics, or because of County Council bargaining with County Council employees. However we have come to this point, we are here. We were cut by the Council in same services, in improvements, as well as in the contracts. So there were three levels of cuts that had to be taken, not simply one. A question has been raised about what I said publicly to the community about full funding. I meant exactly that. If there were ways beyond

simply do full funding, cut the budget, and if we could have found those ways, I think it could have been possible. A part of the way goes by the staging of the process, 5 and 2 percent. There were other ways that could have been out there, which I do not think were there which were not possible to be there. So I will vote on this budget as it stands before us at 6 percent. What I am looking at is perhaps a $15 to $20 increase for teachers per paycheck. I am not sure that is sufficient to go beyond July 1 without a contract, to take a number of the risks of other elements that were in the contract that would be lost, which would have to be regained. I think the cost would have been far worse than what we are talking about in 1 percent. That is why I was prepared to go for this contract. Mr. Ewing talks about poisoning the system. I think the only way we poison the atmosphere is if we choose to do that. If we choose to put it at the stakes of this or our reputations or the education of our children and in one sense our professional reputations, and if we want to trash the system and poison the well, we can do that very easily. But I would hope on both sides that we don't do it for the benefit of all ourselves. While I reluctantly will vote for this contract, I would hope that we don't destroy a very good school system in the process."

RESOLUTION NO. 391-90 Re: APPROVAL OF AMENDED AGREEMENT WITH THE MONTGOMERY COUNTY EDUCATION ASSOCIATION

On recommendation of the superintendent and on motion of Dr. Cronin seconded by Mr. Goldensohn, the following resolution was adopted with Dr. Cronin, Mr. Ewing, Mr. Goldensohn, Mrs. Hobbs, (Ms. Serino), and Dr. Shoenberg voting in the affirmative; Mrs. DiFonzo and Mrs. Praisner voting in the negative#:

WHEREAS, Section 6-408 of THE PUBLIC SCHOOL LAWS OF MARYLAND permits the Board of Education to enter into negotiations with the designated employee organization concerning "salaries, wages, hours, and other working conditions;" and

WHEREAS, The Montgomery County Education Associate was properly designated as the employee organization to be the exclusive representative for these negotiations; and

WHEREAS, On February 28, 1990, the Board of Education approved the agreement for the period of July 1, 1990, through June 30, 1993, if the County Council funded said agreement; and

WHEREAS, The County Council did not fund the agreement; and

WHEREAS, The Board of Education voted on May 21, 1990, to enter into renegotiations; and

WHEREAS, Such renegotiations occurred, agreement was reached, and the agreement has been ratified by the association membership; and

WHEREAS, The new agreement is for the period July 1, 1990, through June 30, 1992; now therefore be it

RESOLVED, That the president of the Board of Education be authorized to sign the amended agreement, all according to said amended agreement and law.

Re: FISCAL 1991 OPERATING BUDGET
FOLLOWING COUNTY COUNCIL ACTION

Mr. Goldensohn moved and Ms. Serino seconded the following:

WHEREAS, The Board of Education adopted a Fiscal 1991 Operating Budget of $720,039,651 on February 28, 1990; and

WHEREAS, The County Council made reductions of $17,079,440 from the various State budget categories, as shown in the following schedule in appropriating $702,960,211 for the Board of Education's Fiscal 1991 Operating Budget:

| | BOE Approved As of 2/28/90 | Council Reductions | Council Approved On 5/15/90 |
|---|---|---|---|
| 01 Systemwide Sup. | $ 33,064,913 | $ 912,934 | $ 32,151,979 |
| 02 Instruc. Salar. | 381,502,936 | 10,292,454 | 371,210,482 |
| 03 Instruc. Other | 22,267,139 | 362,747 | 21,904,392 |
| 04 Special Ed. | 75,964,179 | 1,412,705 | 74,551,474 |
| 05 Std. Per. Svs. | 2,314,057 | 70,329 | 2,243,728 |
| 06 Health Svs. | 44,517 | 508 | 44,009 |
| 07 Std. Transport. | 34,421,377 | 564,956 | 33,856,421 |
| 08 Op. of Plant | 47,362,152 | 359,329 | 47,002,823 |
| 09 Maint. of Plant | 17,568,433 | 175,031 | 17,393,402 |
| 10 Fixed Charges | 85,093,918 | 2,834,227 | 82,259,691 |
| 11 Food Svs. | 661,728 | 997 | 660,731 |
| 14 Comm. Svs. | 743,411 | 9,540 | 733,871 |
| 61 Food Svs. Fund | 19,030,891 | 83,683 | 18,947,208 |
| TOTAL | $720,039,651 | $17,079,440 | $702,960,211 |

now therefore be it

RESOLVED, That, based on an appropriation of $702,960,211 approved by the County Council on May 15, 1990, the Board of Education adopts its Fiscal 1991 Operating Budget reflecting the changes shown in Schedule A; and be it further

RESOLVED, That the county executive and County Council be informed of this action.

Re: A MOTION BY MR. EWING TO AMEND THE FY 1991 OPERATING BUDGET (FAILED)

The following motion by Mr. Ewing to amend the FY 1991 Operating Budget failed of adoption with Mr. Ewing voting in the affirmative; Dr. Cronin, Mrs. DiFonzo, Mr. Goldensohn, Mrs. Hobbs, Mrs. Praisner, (Ms. Serino), and Dr. Shoenberg voting in the negative:

RESOLVED, That the FY 1991 Operating Budget be amended by deleting $750,000 in minigrants, $200,000 in legal fees, $25,000 from the Board of Education, and $75,000 in contract painting; and be it further

RESOLVED, That the following restorations be made to the FY 1991 Operating Budget:

2 Chapter 1 Teacher Specialists - $120,704
Supervisor of Teacher Training - $76,721
Long-range Planning Supervisor - $84,090
Mid-level Lunch Hour Aides - $23,028
Hiring Psychologists at Beginning of Year - $88,525
Hiring Behavioral Assts. at Beginning of Year - $132,025
Support for Early Childhood Ed. - $54,350
Parent Information Training - $31,830
Employee Assistance - $28,213
New Teacher Hiring Rate - $159,731
Kindergarten Aides - $115,815
Equipment for Eastern IS - $10,000
EYE Days - $113,600
Cross-cultural Education - $37,000

Re: A MOTION BY MR. EWING TO AMEND THE FY 1991 OPERATING BUDGET

Mr. Ewing moved and Dr. Shoenberg seconded the following:

RESOLVED, That the FY 1991 Operating Budget be amended by deleting $750,000 in minigrants, $200,000 in legal fees, $25,000 from the Board of Education, and $75,000 in contract painting.

Dr. Shoenberg suggested that the Board vote on the cuts one at a time.

Re: A SUBSTITUTE MOTION BY MS. SERINO TO AMEND THE FY 1991 OPERATING BUDGET (FAILED)

A substitute motion by Ms. Serino to amend the FY 1991 Operating Budget by deleting $250,000 in minigrants failed with (Ms. Serino) and Dr. Shoenberg voting in the affirmative; Dr. Cronin, Mrs. DiFonzo, Mr. Ewing, Mr. Goldensohn, Mrs. Hobbs, and Mrs. Praisner voting in the negative.

Re: A SUBSTITUTE MOTION BY MR. EWING TO AMEND THE FY 1991 OPERATING BUDGET (FAILED)

A substitute motion by Mr. Ewing to amend the FY 1991 Operating Budget by deleting $100,000 in minigrants failed with Mr. Ewing, Mr. Goldensohn, (Ms. Serino), and Dr. Shoenberg voting in the affirmative; Dr. Cronin, Mrs. DiFonzo, Mrs. Hobbs, and Mrs. Praisner voting in the negative.

Re: A MOTION BY MR. EWING TO AMEND THE FY 1991 OPERATING BUDGET (FAILED)

A motion by Mr. Ewing to amend the FY 1991 Operating Budget by deleting $200,000 in legal fees failed with Mr. Ewing and Mrs. Hobbs voting in the affirmative; Dr. Cronin, Mrs. DiFonzo, Mr. Goldensohn, Mrs. Praisner, (Ms. Serino), and Dr. Shoenberg voting in the negative.

Mr. Goldensohn assumed the chair.

RESOLUTION NO. 392-90 Re: AN AMENDMENT TO THE FY 1991 OPERATING BUDGET

On motion of Dr. Shoenberg seconded by Mr. Goldensohn, the following resolution was adopted with Mr. Ewing, Mr. Goldensohn, Mrs. Hobbs, (Ms. Serino), and Dr. Shoenberg voting in the affirmative; Dr. Cronin, Mrs. DiFonzo, and Mrs. Praisner voting in the negative#:

RESOLVED, That the FY 1991 Operating Budget be amended by deleting $50,000 in legal fees.

Dr. Shoenberg assumed the chair.

Re: A MOTION BY MR. EWING TO AMEND THE FY 1991 OPERATING BUDGET (FAILED)

A motion by Mr. Ewing to amend the FY 1991 Operating Budget by deleting $25,000 from the Board of Education budget failed with Mr. Ewing and Mrs. Hobbs voting in the affirmative; Dr. Cronin,

Mrs. DiFonzo, Mr. Goldensohn, Mrs. Praisner, (Ms. Serino), and Dr. Shoenberg voting in the negative.

Mr. Goldensohn assumed the chair.

RESOLUTION NO. 393-90 Re: AN AMENDMENT TO THE FY 1991 OPERATING BUDGET

On motion of Dr. Shoenberg seconded by Ms. Serino, the following resolution was adopted with Mr. Ewing, Mr. Goldensohn, Mrs. Hobbs, (Ms. Serino), and Dr. Shoenberg voting in the affirmative; Dr. Cronin and Mrs. DiFonzo voting in the negative; Mrs. Praisner abstaining#:

RESOLVED, That the FY 1991 Operating Budget be amended by deleting $10,000 from the Board of Education budget.

Dr. Shoenberg assumed the chair.

RESOLUTION NO. 394-90 Re: AN AMENDMENT TO THE FY 1991 OPERATING BUDGET

On motion of Mr. Ewing seconded by Dr. Shoenberg, the following resolution was adopted with Dr. Cronin, Mr. Ewing, Mr. Goldensohn, Mrs. Hobbs, Mrs. Praisner, (Ms. Serino), and Dr. Shoenberg voting in the affirmative; Mrs. DiFonzo voting in the negative#:

RESOLVED, That the FY 1991 Operating Budget be amended by deleting $75,000 in contract painting.

Re: ADDITIONS TO THE RESTORATION LIST

Dr. Shoenberg asked for a motion and a second to add items to the list for restoration.

1. Dr. Shoenberg moved and Mr. Goldensohn seconded that the Board restore 200 EYE days for a total of $56,800.

2. Mr. Ewing moved and Mr. Goldensohn seconded that the Board restore one Chapter I teacher specialist at a cost of $63,000.

3. Mr. Goldensohn moved and Mrs. Praisner seconded that the Board restore the telephone operator position at a cost of $35,408.

4. Mr. Ewing moved and Dr. Shoenberg seconded that the Board restore $50,000 for long-range planning.

5. A motion by Mr. Ewing to restore $8,000 for cross-cultural education failed for lack of a second.

6. Mrs. Praisner moved and Dr. Cronin seconded that the Board restore $75,000 in lapse funds.

7. Ms. Serino moved and Mrs. DiFonzo seconded that the Board restore $98,561 for the mid-level alternative program.

8. Mr. Ewing moved and Mr. Goldensohn seconded that the Board restore $23,028 for lunch hour aides.

9. Mr. Ewing moved and Mrs. Hobbs seconded that the Board fund the SED program at the beginning of the year for $62,836.

For the record, Mrs. Praisner said that some of the reductions that were made by the County Council and county executive were unspecified, and then the Board had to select them. She stated that the County Council might have thought it was following its requirements, but she did not believe they were as they were not specific as to where the cuts needed to come from.

10. Mrs. Praisner moved and Mr. Ewing seconded that the Board restore four safety and security assistants at the beginning of the year for $41,874.

11. A motion by Dr. Cronin to restore four positions to reduce oversized mid-level classes failed for lack of a second.

12. Dr. Cronin moved and Mrs. Praisner seconded that the Board restore two positions to reduce oversized mid-level classes at a cost of $66,331.

13. A motion by Mr. Ewing to hire three psychologists at the start of the school year for $88,525 failed for lack of a second.

14. Mrs. Praisner moved and Mrs. DiFonzo seconded that the Board restore two behavioral assistant positions at the senior high level at a cost of $38,605.

Dr. Shoenberg asked for expressions of support on the part of Board members for the items listed above. Any item receiving support from Board members would be considered to be added with the Board members not supporting to be listed as abstaining. The mid-level alternative program received three votes, Chapter I received two votes, the telephone operator received two votes, long-range planning received one vote, lapse funds received three votes, lunch hour aides received two votes, SED received two votes, and behavioral assistants received three votes.

Mr. Goldensohn assumed the chair.

RESOLUTION NO. 395-90 Re: AN AMENDMENT TO THE FY 1991 OPERATING BUDGET

On motion of Dr. Shoenberg seconded by Mr. Goldensohn, the following resolution was adopted with Mr. Ewing, Mr. Goldensohn, Mrs. Hobbs and Dr. Shoenberg voting in the affirmative; Dr. Cronin, Mrs. DiFonzo, Mrs. Praisner, and (Ms. Serino) abstaining#:

RESOLVED, That the FY 1991 Operating Budget be amended by restoring $56,000 for 200 EYE days.

Dr. Shoenberg assumed the chair.

Re: A MOTION BY MRS. DiFONZO TO AMEND THE FY 1991 OPERATING BUDGET (FAILED)

A motion by Mrs. DiFonzo to amend the FY 1991 Operating Budget by restoring the mid-level alternative program and an amount of EYE days to total $135,000 failed with Dr. Cronin, Mrs. DiFonzo, Mrs. Hobbs, and (Ms. Serino) voting in the affirmative; Mr. Ewing, Mr. Goldensohn, Mrs. Praisner, and Dr. Shoenberg abstaining.

Mr. Goldensohn assumed the chair.

RESOLUTION NO. 396-90 Re: AN AMENDMENT TO THE FY 1991 OPERATING BUDGET

On motion of Dr. Shoenberg seconded by Mr. Goldensohn, the following resolution was adopted with Dr. Cronin, Mrs. DiFonzo, Mr. Goldensohn, Mrs. Praisner, (Ms. Serino), and Dr. Shoenberg voting in the affirmative; Mr. Ewing voting in the negative; Mrs. Hobbs abstaining#:

RESOLVED, That the FY 1991 Operating Budget be amended by restoring EYE days (see Res. No. 395-90), two high school behavioral assistants, and lapse funds for a total of $135,000.

Dr. Shoenberg assumed the chair.

RESOLUTION NO. 397-90 Re: FISCAL 1991 OPERATING BUDGET FOLLOWING COUNTY COUNCIL ACTION

On recommendation of the superintendent and on motion of Mr. Goldensohn seconded by Ms. Serino, the following resolution was adopted with Dr. Cronin, Mr. Goldensohn, Mrs. Hobbs, (Ms. Serino), and Dr. Shoenberg voting in the affirmative; Mrs. DiFonzo, Mr. Ewing and Mrs. Praisner voting in the negative#:

WHEREAS, The Board of Education adopted a Fiscal 1991 Operating Budget of $720,039,651 on February 28, 1990; and

WHEREAS, The County Council made reductions of $17,079,440 from the various State budget categories, as shown in the following schedule in appropriating $702,960,211 for the Board of Education's Fiscal 1991 Operating Budget:

| | BOE Approved As of 2/28/90 | Council Reductions | Council Approved On 5/15/90 |
|---|---|---|---|
| 01 Systemwide Sup. | $ 33,064,913 | $ 912,934 | $ 32,151,979 |
| 02 Instruc. Salar. | 381,502,936 | 10,292,454 | 371,210,482 |
| 03 Instruc. Other | 22,267,139 | 362,747 | 21,904,392 |
| 04 Special Ed. | 75,964,179 | 1,412,705 | 74,551,474 |
| 05 Std. Per. Svs. | 2,314,057 | 70,329 | 2,243,728 |
| 06 Health Svs. | 44,517 | 508 | 44,009 |
| 07 Std. Transport. | 34,421,377 | 564,956 | 33,856,421 |
| 08 Op. of Plant | 47,362,152 | 359,329 | 47,002,823 |
| 09 Maint. of Plant | 17,568,433 | 175,031 | 17,393,402 |
| 10 Fixed Charges | 85,093,918 | 2,834,227 | 82,259,691 |
| 11 Food Svs. | 661,728 | 997 | 660,731 |
| 14 Comm. Svs. | 743,411 | 9,540 | 733,871 |
| 61 Food Svs. Fund | 19,030,891 | 83,683 | 18,947,208 |
| TOTAL | $720,039,651 | $17,079,440 | $702,960,211 |

now therefore be it

RESOLVED, That, based on an appropriation of $702,960,211 approved by the County Council on May 15, 1990, the Board of Education adopts its Fiscal 1991 Operating Budget reflecting the changes shown in Schedule A; and be it further

RESOLVED, That the county executive and County Council be informed of this action.

For the record, Mr. Ewing made the following statement:

"I voted against it because I think it represents a kind of self-fulfilling prophesy in an ironic kind of way. The Board said it did not want to fund the salaries once the Council had made budget cuts because it did not want to cut program improvements, and now it had cut a substantial number of program improvements while also not funding the salaries. I think that is the worst of all possible outcomes, and I can't support it.

Re: ADJOURNMENT

The president adjourned the meeting at 10:55 p.m.

---

PRESIDENT

---

SECRETARY

HP:mlw