

# University Faculty Council Minutes

---

*December 7<sup>th</sup>, 2020 1:30 – 4:30 pm | Zoom*

## Attendees

Co-Chairs: John Walbridge, John Watson, Joe Wert

Officers: Yu Kay Law (secretary) Rachael Cohen (parliamentarian)

Ex Officio: Michael McRobbie, John Applegate, Nassar Paydar

UFC Office: Elizabeth Pear

Members: Keith Anliker, Mark Baer, Rebecca Carlton, Paul Coats, Paul Cook, Ange Cooksey, Emily Davis, J Duncan, Charlie Feldhaus, Pnina Fichman, Philip Goff, Lucia Guerra-Reyes, Diane Henshel, Debora Herold, Israel Herrera, Bernie Jessie, Sara Johnson, Jiliang Li, James Marrs, Shawn Nichols-Boyle, Yusuf Ahmed Nur-Baadi, Harold Olivery, Scott Opasik, Megan Palmer, Sameer Patil, Angie Raymond, Cate Reck, Kristoffer Rees, Elaine Roth, Steve Sanders, Angad Sidhu, Marietta Simpson, Monica Solinas-Saunders, Jennifer Springer, Melida Stanely, Crystal Walcott

Guests: Kip Drew, Trevor Foughty, Bill Stephan, Alex Tanford, Doug Wasitis,

## 0. Call to Order

The meeting was called to order at 1:32 pm

## 1. Approval of Minutes of April 28<sup>th</sup>, 2020

John Walbridge moved to approve the minutes as presented. Rachael Cohen seconded the motion. The minutes were approved by voice vote.

## 2. Executive Committee Business (Walbridge, Wert, Watson, UFC Co-Chairs)

**John Walbridge:** There was no earth-shattering business that occurred in the executive committee. In Bloomington, the in-person part of the semester went through remarkably well thanks to hard work from faculty and very good behavior by students.

**Joe Wert:** Expressed appreciation by all – faculty, students, staff, and administration – for facilitating what has been a pretty successful semester.

**John Watson:** Agrees with Joe Wert, and thanked Elizabeth Pear for assisting and facilitating the business of the Council.

*General agreement was expressed by all.*

### 3. Presiding Officer's Report (President Michael McRobbie)

**President Michael McRobbie:** President McRobbie reported that he finished his monthly update to the university community and expected that it would be distributed soon. In the update, he echoed the sentiments expressed by the Co-Chairs.

He reported that the university made it extremely successfully through the Fall 2020 semester without having to reverse course. It was not quite how either we or the students wanted teaching to occur, however there was really no other choice. Against the face of skepticism by everyone – faculty, students, and staff across all campuses – we defied the expectations that campuses would end up being plague houses with everyone getting infected. Instead, we demonstrated through our rigorous testing protocol that it was safer within the IU community than outside. This is thanks to our public health protocols with everyone working together to keep things safe. He is optimistic that we will be able to make it through Spring semester similarly.

The testing labs at Bloomington and Indianapolis are now open and will be able to process 50000 tests each week. This means that weekly testing would be expected in the Spring. The intrusiveness of this protocol is recognized but the small inconvenience is worth it for everyone's safety. He thanked those responsible for making this work.

There is light at the end of the tunnel. The FDA will be meeting on Wednesday to decide on emergency use authorization for the Pfizer vaccine, with Moderna being reviewed the following Wednesday. AstraZeneca's vaccine, which the IU School of Medicine has been involved in trialing, probably will be reviewed by the FDA in mid-January. More vaccine candidates are in the pipeline as well. Jay Hess, Dean of the IU School of Medicine, remarked that the efficacy for these candidates are almost unprecedented.

The state is finalizing plans for vaccine deployment and it was clear that health-care workers would be prioritized first, with particular priority for those on the front-line against COVID. This will mean that everyone at the university who serves in healthcare, public health, and social work with interactions with patients would be among the first in line to be vaccinated. Nursing homes and those 65 and older will then be next in line. Indiana will get approximately 400000 doses (covering 200000 people) in December, which approximates the number of health care workers in the state. More doses will be coming after that, so the impact of this campaign will be seen rapidly.

There is hope on the horizon, but the numbers are bad right now. We expect the new White House administration to be more forward and aggressive in acting on pandemic issues.

At the university level, a fourth member of the medical response team has been appointed. This is Dr. Lana Dbeibo, who is serving as Director of Vaccine Initiatives. As state policy becomes clearer, this will be communicated and we will seek to see more interplay between IU Health and IU as a whole, particularly given that IU Health is one of the first five hospitals for vaccine deployment.

**EVP John Applegate:** The first phase for health care workers will focus on hospitals as distribution points. As the vaccine distribution progresses, IU may be asked to further assist counties with distributions and will learn more about what we will do ourselves – in a sense, this has been something that we’ve started planning since March/April. We are currently reviving and revising points of distribution agreements with the State and counties, so we are in good shape if IU ends up to be a distribution point.

*Questions:*

- **Yu Kay Law:** *Will clinical students be part of the rollout?* **Response:** Yes, this will be part of it; some students have volunteered for trial deployment. Dean Hess has been getting his vaccination qualifications updated so he can deliver the COVID vaccination himself.
- **John Walbridge:** *What will happen to the COVID testing labs post-COVID?* **Response:** It is expected that we will need to test at scale until summer; we are currently optimistic that the fall semester will be more “normal” and expect the problem to decline. We also consider the fact that there might be more pandemics like this in the future. There are 500000 types of viruses in constant mutation, and many of these are currently in animals only which can jump to humans at any time. The animal-human jump for viruses is more and more likely as the whole world becomes denser and more congregate in nature. Furthermore, the COVID pandemic has proven IU’s need to be ready to look after itself. While we hope that future federal responses could be more effective, the state has clearly been struggling to handle this pandemic and the facilities are reasonably cheap to have. Furthermore, the instrumentation purchased is dual use –this is basic PCR technology – and therefore can be easily redeployed for other purposes across the IU School of Medicine. We will be prudent going forward with other, similar purchases.

#### 4. Question/Comment Period

**Israel Herrera:** Highlighted that this is the first time different groups of faculty at different campuses have met at UFC.

#### 5. Legislative Update

**Bill Stephan (Vice President for Government Relations and Economic Engagement):** In the recent election, Biden won the presidential race; Senate control hinges on the runoffs in Georgia; and the House of Representatives shifted towards the GOP (in a surprise development compared to conventional wisdom), although the Democrats will still be in control.

One thing to note is that Biden’s coattails are not really strong; they are the second worst in history (almost a 5% decline down ballot overall). On a positive note, voter turnout has been the highest since 1900 (66.4%), with similar results in Indiana. Noted that most counties in Indiana have at least 50% turnout, and thanked IU initiatives for encouraging turnout.

In terms of money, this has been the most expensive election cycle, with more than double the amount of money spent than ever in history. The other feature that is of note is the widening electoral gap between voters with college degrees and those without, particularly during the Trump years.

**Doug Wasitis (Assistant Vice President for Federal Relations):** One factor to consider is that the Biden margin implies that there would be no Democratic control of the US Senate for the first time for an incoming president. No transformative legislation is therefore expected; continued dominance of executive action is expected in terms of policy, with any legislation requiring the support of moderates. Continued issues associated with the debt ceiling are expected.

Issues that are expected to dominate the federal agenda include COVID, economic recovery, racial equality, climate change. Immigration is expected to be one of importance. In terms of higher education:

- The approach to COVID is expected to be science driven with reliance on research. There is expected to be funding for COVID-19 research. Less political interference and other improvements are expected for the federal science workforce.
- As far as economic recovery is concerned, particular aspects of the agenda include student loan forgiveness (some form will be expected to be part of the overall economic recovery package) and free college tuition as a driver for recovery, in addition to brick and mortar investments. The challenge with this, of course, are the razor-thin margins on Capitol Hill.
- Racial equality initiatives are expected to include research partnerships and investments with minority serving institutions (MSIs) and historically black colleges and universities (HBCUs) to enable them to compete with large universities for federal funding, as well as requirements for 10% of grants to large universities to be subcontracted to HBCUs and MSIs.
- In terms of climate change, it is expected that initiatives will include rescissions of Trump's executive actions as well as spending increases in associated research and operations. The appointment of John Kerry as climate envoy makes a statement on how the issue will be treated.

Transition priorities that the Association of American Universities (AAU) and others have proposed include:

- Tripling the maximum Pell grant award.
- Protecting DACA recipients.
- Revisions to the Title IX regulations.
- Enabling the retention and enrollment of international students.
- Commitment to yearly increases in associated funding.

One factor to consider at IU is that there will be no Hoosier legislator in the appropriations committee. The greatest hit on this front will likely be defense-associated spending.

Challenges in terms of the federal agenda for the university includes runaway federal spending, with the COVID response leading to record federal deficits. Sequestration and budget caps are therefore

expected after the COVID crisis. The imposed budget cap in 2011 expired recently, and the AAU is pushing to not renew this; there is a strong possibility that this will come to pass. It is noted that with COVID, amidst divided congress, intensifying inequality, and disinvestment in higher education at the state level that federal funding will become more important.

**Michael McRobbie** *asked about the Endless Frontier Act.* Response: As a recap, this was a bipartisan bill jointly proposed by Sens. Todd Young (R-IN) and Charles Schumer (D-NY) to invest \$100b on a new directorate in the NSF to fund research in new key technologies such as artificial intelligence and quantum science. With bipartisan and bicameral support, it is believed that this has momentum. The IU Government Relations office considers this key and has been working to support this.

**Trevor Foughty (Associate Vice President, State Relations):** The election brought very little change or turnover to the state government; the GOP maintained its supermajority, with greater urban/rural divides being found. From a practical standpoint, COVID has made it more challenging to meet with legislators due to changes in session logistics, particularly since guests to the legislature will be sequestered in a separate room and there is less opportunity for one-on-one interaction with legislators.

The biggest concern is the revenue forecast and the budget cycle. There was a significant shift in the revenue cycle due to the delayed income tax collection at the start of the pandemic. The state did not hit its revenue target through July; it has been all over the place since then. There is significant uncertainty, and there had been no updated revenue forecast since last Spring. The update next Wednesday is expected to determine how tight this has to be.

It is expected that each committee will focus on COVID to some degree. Another priority likely will include public safety/police reform issues. In this, due to our training and reform efforts, IU is a leader in best practices and we are looking for ways that we can support the work of our faculty and the state on this.

In terms of redistricting, the delay in census results means that we're still in a "wait and see" mode on this.

IU's state budget request began with a review of the budget process in February. Components of the budget request was reviewed and approved by the Board of Trustees in August. There are three components to this:

- The operating budget is driven by increases in performance funding; three of the highest performance funding increases were attained by IU campuses.
- Line items (projects operated by IU that support the state)
- Capital projects. It was debated whether these should be requested; however, this is considered important so the state knows our priorities. We generally submit five requests and expect only one to be funded. This year's top priority will be the co-location of the IU School of Medicine at the Methodist Hospital, which highlights the importance of IU's expertise during a pandemic.

The biggest question for this budget session, of course, is the level of support possible. 7% of state funding was withheld earlier, and there are some leaders in the state who wish to avoid further cuts.

It will be important for the university to make the broader case for investing in IU and higher education in general. This is summarized in McRobbie's recent op-ed in the *Indianapolis Business Journal*, where it was explained how COVID impacted minorities and those with lower socio-economic status disproportionately in both economics and public health, as these people are likely to have to balance their jobs (which often cannot be done remotely) versus their own health risk. It is magnified by the fact that these same groups attain college degrees at lower rates than their wealthier/whiter peers. It should be noted that at the peak of unemployment the unemployment rate was much lower for college graduates compared to those with high school education only.

This is not just hindsight; there will be continued economic shock and the importance of higher education is increasing with the change in nature of work. More companies are building remote work into policies, with the largest job losses being in areas like retail and wholesale (where workers with no college degrees are concentrated), where apart from general reduction in workforce there would be greater emphases on the use of artificial intelligence and automation in future – both of which would require college degrees in order for workers to be competitive. It is further expected that the next big competition between different states will be for college-educated workforces that may be able to work remotely. As a result, states that prioritize higher education investments now will win; others will have to play catch-up in the future.

In this respect, IU is poised to propel Hoosiers forward. In terms of degree production, almost half of all bachelors' degrees and almost all graduate/professional degrees in Indiana were awarded by Indiana University. In terms of public health, IU is playing a critical role in the fight against COVID:

- IU Health is a Phase III trial site for the AstraZeneca vaccine; IU also has other medical research projects in progress associated with COVID.
- The Fairbanks School of Public Health has been working with the Indiana State Department of Health on the background infection study for COVID. The results of the 3<sup>rd</sup> round of the study has just been released to the Governor, which reveals how the virus has spread and the percentage of Hoosiers with antibodies against COVID-19.
- The Center for Rural Engagement has been helping develop rural health networks across the state, including both telehealth networks and new, in-person networks.
- The Monon Collaborative has been working to translate medical research into the field more quickly.
- More locally, the University has been supporting the community through its Small Business Development Centers which support moving small business operations online, identifying hotspots of substance abuse disorders via the Grand Challenges initiatives, and with the IU High School and dual credit programs sharing online curricula with community schools pivoting to online instruction.

The key is that IU needs to focus on its value proposition to the State, and we expect to be able to continue demonstrating this.

*The Council adjourned for a break at 2:32 pm and reconvened at 2:40 pm*

## 6. Policy Review Committee

**Alex Tanford:** The Policy Review Committee has no staff assigned to it, and has been working with Kip Drew (Chief Policy Officer) to review all university-wide policies for which the University Faculty Council is either primarily or jointly responsible (all policies that are designated ACA-XX). Many of these have not been reviewed for a long time prior to this; the oldest existing policy dates from December 1942 (ACA-49, regarding leave for jury duty).

At this point, 35 policies have been reviewed/updated; 8 policies are before the UFC today; 10 policies are being reviewed (mostly grading-related policies that are in discussion with e.g. registrars); and 25 policies that are pending review/revision.

### Policies Approved by the UFC Executive Committee Under Bylaw 11C

**Alex Tanford:** These policies have been approved over the summer by the UFC Executive Committee (May 14/August 10). This serves as formal notification for these policies and can be objected to within 7 days).

ACA-08: Faculty Members Holding Administrative Positions: This policy addresses what happens to administrators' positions when they return to the faculty (leaving administration). This was a routine update with no substantive change.

ACA-41: Faculty Role Regarding University Financial Exigency: This policy was drafted rather hurriedly at the beginning of the summer. While Trustees have policies that address closing programs and dismissing faculty in the event of financial exigency, financial exigency has not been defined, and neither have procedures to be followed in the event of financial exigency. ACA-41 seeks to incorporate both, given the risk of the university closing down campuses/programs or dismissing faculty in the wake of budget cuts associated with COVID-19.

The policy and the underlying trustee policy are based on AAUP definitions, and emphasizes that financial exigency is when the entire university system faces the risk of closure. The goal of this process is to make sure that there is a "seat at the table" for faculty in this contingency. The process involves the President consulting with the UFC Executive Committee and providing the financial/budgetary picture facing the university. The UFC Executive Committee would then form a financial exigency committee that provides an analysis of academic contribution of likely affected programs/units to the President and the Board of Trustees.

*Questions:*

**Steve Sanders:** *When tenured faculty are mentioned, does that also include faculty with long-term contracts?* Response: Yes, it includes non-tenure track faculty on long term contracts who face dismissal prior to the end of their appointment terms.

Interim UA-03: Discrimination, Harassment, and Sexual Misconduct: These urgent amendments were made due to federal regulations associated with Title IX (Sexual Misconduct) that required universities have conforming policies in place by August 15<sup>th</sup>. This was prepared by the same *ad hoc* committee as in 2013 headed by Emily Springsteen (University Director of Institutional Equity and Title IX Coordinator), with input from students, faculty, and administrators. Due to the law being in flux with court challenges, this was written as an interim (one-year) policy with a lot of short-term work. Therefore, this will likely be amended again particularly given the fact that it is a priority of the Biden administration to reverse the changes made in these federal regulations to the Title IX regulations. When these changes were made, it was also recognized that victims of discrimination and harassment are not limited to those who are subject to sexual misconduct, and hence all of this was unified into one policy. It is expected that discrimination and harassment will continue to be part of the revised UA-03 when proposed this academic year.

ACA-17: Faculty Boards of Review: Minimum Standards for Uniform Hearing Procedures: The policy in question was woefully out of date, and recent federal policies as well as best practices require claims of sexual misconduct to be investigated specifically in a way by trained investigators, unlike most other faculty grievances. The policy was therefore changed to distinguish between traditional hearings and appeals of sanctions/decisions associated with violations of misconduct policies. The latter (appeals) are the subject of Section D, which provides for time limits, closed hearings, and the fact that the Faculty Board of Review may not conduct new fact-finding. In addition, there will be a right for everyone to be heard by the Faculty Board of Review. It is noted that the Faculty Board of Review may, in these cases, affirm, recommend alternative findings/sanctions, or (particularly in cases where new fact-finding is needed) to recommend new investigations.

### New Motions of the Policy Review Committee

These motions pertain to updates of current academic policies. As these policies are not solely policies of the UFC but rather are joint responsibilities with other units within the university, a preference was stated for policies to be remanded back to the policy review committee if there were significant concerns rather than revising them on the floor.

**UA-17: Conflicts of Interest and Commitment:** This is brought to us from the Office of Research Compliance to bring us in line with federal guidelines. The actual policy has the spelling error for “principle” corrected to “principal”.

The big idea is that family members of the principal investigator can only be paid from a grant if either the other family member is a Co-PI listed on the grant proposal or the associated arrangement and compensation has been approved by the Chair, with a management plan that is approved by the Office of Research Compliance.

*Questions:*

**Diane Henschel:** *How is “family member” defined?* Response: “Individual with a familial and personal relationship.” It was wondered if this would cause conflicts elsewhere, particularly with the upcoming policy on consensual policy.

It was further noted that the definitions section of a policy provides a definition for “familial relationship”.

*Does this affect reciprocal hirings between (say) two different lab groups?* Response: This is not addressed; the changes are solely intended to address federal regulation requirements and do not prohibit reciprocal relationships. Furthermore, the policy does not forbid hiring family members from grants, merely that they are disclosed.

*This comes back to the consensual relationship policy that is at work. One of the ways that it was said to have been going is that it may prevent any power relationship.* Responses:

Elizabeth Pear: Plan is to present this at the meeting in March.

*Suggested contacting Celine Carter and Kip Drew to make sure there is agreement on what is in this.*

Response: It is expected that these policies will not interact except for definition. This policy is on Kip’s desk in any event since this is not solely a faculty policy. We also don’t want to hold up peoples’ federal grants due to the lack of these policy provisions.

**Yu Kay Law:** *What if there is no department chair?* Response: There are lots of different departmental structures; it should be assumed that the Dean will review this if there is no chair. This will be raised with the compliance officer.

**Diane Henschel:** *Suggested a friendly amendment to add “and other” between “personal” and “relationship”.* Response: No. Technical changes can be made by the UFC Executive Committee anyway, and this vehicle can be used to address minor clarifications. We also don’t want to hold up grants. It was suggested that where there may be issues clarification from Fred Cate (VP of Research) be sought as needed.

This motion was carried unanimously by voice vote.

**ACA-52: Permanent Separations for Academic Appointees:** The changes here focus on addressing cases of involuntary dismissals. The goal here is to clarify the former distinction of “personal misconduct” and “serious personal misconduct” (which justify dismissal without the one-year notice period). In the policy here, personal misconduct justifying immediate dismissal include ongoing or repeating threats or actions that lead to felony charges; this matches the standard currently used by campus academic affairs officers. It was also proposed that inconsistent definitions from different policies addressing the distinction between personal misconduct and serious personal misconduct be removed and replaced with cross-references to ACA-52.

*Questions/Comments*

**Israel Herrera:** *For non-tenure track faculty, personal incompetence is a separate category for dismissal. How would this interface with personal misconduct?* Response: ACA-18 section 5 provides for the same, separate grounds for dismissal of non-tenure track faculty as tenured faculty (as found in ACA-52). Several years ago, there was an attempt to define “incompetence” on the Bloomington campus, which went nowhere. This policy change is focused on misconduct, and it is a fallout associated both with the COVID policy and changes to the sexual misconduct policy.

**Diane Henschel:** *There is no copy of a revised/red-lined policy making it hard to vote for this.*

**Steve Sanders:** *Who defines “ongoing threat”? What are the standards and what causes it to kick in?* Response: Alex Tanford doesn’t know how to define it more specifically. This is not arbitrary and similar language is used in the Indiana Criminal Code. In terms of procedure, there are at least three appellate steps prescribed by policy (decision by Vice-Chancellor/Vice-Provost for Academic Affairs; review by Provost/Chancellor; review by Faculty Board of Review; Executive Vice President for University Academic Affairs (John Applegate)). This is similar to common law in that there is a lot of gray area and one cannot predict situations that would become an ongoing threat. For example, for COVID precautions, does refusal to wear a mask and comply with COVID precautions constitute an ongoing threat to security? There is no way to define this, and the entire process assumes the presence of experience administrators and a Faculty Board of Review that would not allow ridiculous/capricious cases be deemed as serious personal misconduct.

John Applegate underscored the process and the language by pointing out that there are situations where an individual’s behavior is a threat to security and safety to the extent that the university cannot just stand by and allow that individual to remain on campus. It should be a rare application of the policy.

**Angie Raymond:** *What is the definition of community? Asked for a five minute break to see the language in the policy.* It was noted that the redlined policy within the context of the policy wasn’t in this document. Response: Such a redlined document was never requested and that’s why it was not supplied.

**Israel Herrera:** *What’s the proposal now?*

**Angie Raymond:** *The redlined version is the complete version?* Response: ACA-52 is the master policy, and there are no other changes to the current policy other than Section D on involuntary dismissal, involving two small changes. There are no changes to Section E, and Section F is completely new.

The proposal was carried by a majority.

**ACA-47: Leaves for Academic Appointees:** Currently policies regarding leaves for faculty are scattered in several different policies. Since ACA-47 involves Trustee decisions and therefore there is least flexibility in changing, it was decided to merge all of these policies into this number. These policies have not been reviewed recently; the oldest dates from 1942 and most of the others date from the 1960s and are inconsistent with current practice. There is, however, not a lot of room for making changes since a lot of this is governed by federal law. The current revisions were developed by a working group of

administrators in consultation with HR, Policy Office, and the Academic Vice-Chancellor for IUPUI (Rachel Applegate) who, as former UFC Co-Chair, saw both administrator and faculty perspectives on this.

Most of the changes were made to require consistency with federal law. The only substantive addition is to address current concerns by some faculty that some chairs/deans were holding up sabbaticals for unit staffing reasons, affecting faculty access to research sites in certain cases. It therefore required that campuses develop policies for reviewing denials of sabbatical leave.

There was an erroneous statement in the draft in Section A on medical leave for IU School of Medicine that references ACA-51 (which addresses family leaves for IU School of Medicine faculty). This sentence was struck from the policy.

It was emphasized that the other policies (ACA-46, ACA-48, ACA-49, ACA-50) are not being rescinded, but rather transferred to ACA-47. It is believed that Board of Trustees policy cannot be rescinded; however, they can be transferred to other numbers.

*Questions/Comments:*

**Diane Henschel:** *1) non-tenure track faculty had concerns that they wanted sabbatical-like leaves; the second is a question about why sabbaticals are only for research – that these may be used for teaching.*

Response: both of these issues came up in the review. The fundamental issue here is that sabbatical policy is entirely the responsibility of the Board of Trustees (and the current policy on sabbaticals was established by them in 1949). It was felt by the Policy Review Committee that it is not their job to recommend any changes at this point, and so that part of the policy was not changed. Any such changes should be referred to the UFC's new Faculty Affairs Committee, which is still working out its agenda; this committee can then make recommendations to the Board of Trustees.

**Michael McRobbie:** *Putting a policy in ACA-47 doesn't make it a policy of the Board of Trustees!*

**Israel Herrera:** *ACA-18, ACA-19, and ACA-20 for clinical and lecturer track faculty contains language recommending sabbatical-like leaves for non-tenure track faculty as departments see fit. Could this be transferred to ACA-47?* Response: The language in those policies is not mandatory language, and ACA-18, ACA-19, and ACA-20 are currently being reviewed by the Faculty Affairs Committee and belongs there. The current proposal is just consolidation of existing policies.

This motion was approved unanimously by voice vote.

**ACA-78: Transfer Credit Related to Military Service and ACA-56: Transfer Credit from an Associate's College:** This is driven by the University Transfer Office, and is driven both by state law mandates as well as 2016 revisions of this body regarding how credits from community colleges can transfer at the 300+ level. There were no substantive changes beyond language and what was requested by the University Transfer Office.

*Questions/Comments:* None

This motion was unanimously approved by voice vote.

The Council thanked Alex Tanford for doing this for the past 3-4 years. Alex Tanford asked the Council to request documents a couple of days ahead of the meeting, and do ask for things if you need more.

The meeting was adjourned at 4:02 pm.