

Minutes
Southern Sociological Society
Mid-year Meeting of the Executive Committee
Saturday, October 25, 2014
Charlotte, NC
President, David Maume presiding

Present: David Maume, John Reynolds, David Brunsma, Stephanie Bohon, Barbara Risman, Beth Rubin, Dawn Robinson, Lisa Slattery Walker, Elizabeth Stearns, Shannon Davis, Steve McDonald, Toni Calasanti (via Skype).

Not present: Leslie Hossfeld, Donald Tomaskovic-Devey, James Maples

Add Committee on Sociological Practice Report

The meeting was called to order at 7:59 am.

Approval of minutes

Moved by Rubin and seconded (by Walker) that we approve the minutes. The EC discussed that we need to change the Constitution regarding the Publications Committee in order to make the math work regarding when people roll off this committee. We will discuss during new business. Some typos were fixed and some points clarified. The EC questioned the statement in the minutes reading, "New Committee". It was moved by Calasanti and seconded (by Moller) to create the Committee on Sociological Research in the South, and between now and midyear, appoint an initial group that will give a structure and mission proposal to Executive Committee. The motion was approved unanimously." EC recalls that there was a lot of resistance to and discussion about this. They believed that the motion was actually for the Committee on Sociological Practice to think about the need for a committee and propose such a structure to EC. Brunsma noted that the Committee on Sociological Practice appears to be already pursuing this kind of work according to their midyear report to EC. Minutes were changed to reflect that the motion was simply to plan and consider, not create a committee.

Minutes were approved unanimously.

Diversity: Elections

Maume asked Reynolds to report on diversity in elections. Reynolds reported that the Nominations Committee met twice by teleconference/web. There were many nominees who were qualified, experienced in organizational leadership, diverse, and active in SSS. The Committee hoped that there would be a slate of candidates for next year, as well, which partially worked. Thanks to everyone for all the nominations. People were also very willing to run for office. As a whole, the slate of candidates is diverse and brings a lot to the Southern. In every race in these upcoming elections, if only white candidates won, about half of the leadership will be white, which will improve diversity somewhat. It was hardest to get people to run for President. There is a gap between nominations and elections, and it's difficult to get great turnout for the elections, and no one is really in charge of the election (except the Executive Office). Reynolds argued there needs to

be more structure about when the elections are held, advertising it, and so forth. A lot of the work falls on the Assistant Executive Officer/Webmaster. Rubin noted that we no longer need thirty days to vote, since there isn't the need to hand-verify membership status. Brunsmas noted that people are often confused about their membership status, so two weeks may not be enough time for everyone to get their membership paid in order to vote. Risman argued that what we need is some kind of cheerleading. Brunsmas noted that last year they sent email reminders every week about elections during the elections cycle. Also, Nominations has done their job once the ballots are finished. It's not a big deal to automate a system where email reminders about the election are sent every week. Davis reported that we should be sure to have a document (*Handbook*) to institutionalize how the election process occurs. Stearns asked if the ballot could be organized by office rather than alphabetically. Reynolds reported that online presence is different from the document shared with the EC; Brunsmas stated that when the ballot is presented to the membership, the candidates will be presented by office and each candidate will have a link to further information about the candidate. EC revisited an on-going discussion about having elections earlier next year (right after the annual meetings). Davis noted that it would be a good idea to have some time in the meeting for a meet and greet with the candidates. Reynolds noted that it would be useful for the Vice President-elect to be included in the discussion of the Nominating Committee to be up to speed. Finally, Reynolds noted that it was hard (and expensive) to coordinate a web conference. They will try freeconferencecall.com next time. Brunsmas expressed his excitement about having an early election, but he was concerned about the impact on dues. *Social Currents* has helped to spur people about paying dues, but voting helps, too. Having two elections in one dues cycle will make it harder to get people to pay dues early. McDonald asked about using the manuscript submission process to make people pay dues. Our big problem is that we don't have integrated systems (database for manuscript submissions is different from database for membership is different from the database for *Social Currents* subscription). Brunsmas asked for a directive from the EC about the timing of elections. Davis noted that there is a sense from reading the website that paying dues and registration when submitting their abstracts prompts people to do that. Robinson asked what would happen if we moved the timing of dues to May 1 and held the election by June 1, would that be a problem? It might be for smaller colleges that pay dues.

Maume summarized that we would try having an earlier election this year and see how it impacts behavior. Will voting participation go up?

It was moved by Risman that we move the next election to May 1, one year provisional. Rubin seconded. Motion carried unanimously.

Maume thanked Reynolds for putting together two slates of candidates.

Diversity: Proposal from the Committee on Sociology in Community and Small Colleges
This was a discussion regarding this email to the Executive Committee on October 6:

Good evening esteemed members of the SSS Executive Committee,

We (the Committee on Sociology in Community and Small Colleges) are very excited about the '15 meetings in NOLA. We've been working hard organizing a series of sessions and panels that we believe will benefit the membership as a whole. The details of those sessions will appear in our mid-year report, but there is one particular session that we want to run by you now—ahead of the submission deadline (and hopefully solicit your endorsement and/or involvement). What do you think of the following idea for a session?

"Making SSS a More Diverse and Inclusive Organization: A Brainstorm Session"

This is an idea that I have been pondering since our final committee meeting of last year. I know I had a number of discussions with members last year about diversity and inclusion at SSS. It even seemed that this was a prominent topic in Exec Meetings (I presented my committee report after the Committee on Race & Ethnicity, and this topic was central to that conversation). Diversity and inclusion are robust concepts that could relate to matters of gender, race, sexuality, or even sociologists who are not at RI schools (since we're often not seen as the center of the canon, so-to-speak). I also thought it'd be a great opportunity to engage our membership and give everyone a voice. Organizational buy-in is maximized when members see that their input is valued, and this session can serve as the vehicle for such an interaction. Plus, CSCSC wants to make a difference. Although CSCSC largely represents members from teaching-centered schools, we like to think of our committee as being fully vested in the overall health of the organization. Instead of making diversity and inclusion a "committee agenda item" this session could bring together SSS leadership and all interested members of SSS to engage in an open, constructive discussion about increasing the health of the organization via diversity and inclusion.

If the Executive Committee is interested in this session, perhaps co-sponsorship could be an option? We haven't gotten into the details of how this session would be formatted—we wanted to wait until we solicited your input. One route might be to have the panel collect comments from members and attendees and give that to the EC. It could also be useful to include EC members in the audience (the session could be scheduled as an afternoon session). Or, if EC members were interested in being active members in the session, we could design it around them. There are plenty of options. But, for now, my principal concern is whether you see value in this session and whether you support my organization of this session.

Thank you for reading my long-winded description, and have a wonderful evening

*Best,
Nick*

*Nicholas A. Guittar, Ph.D.
Assistant Professor of Sociology
Department of Sociology, Anthropology, and Criminal Justice
Valdosta State University*

Davis reported that the CSCSC wanted to have a panel at the New Orleans meeting to increase diversity at the meetings. Davis noted that there was some disconnect between how the conversations between Program and CSCSC have occurred and how Guittar is putting the session together. There is a slot for this session on the program, but Program Committee wants permission to give greater guidance to CSCSC on how this session should look and to give the panelists some guidance about the topic so that this is a session that helps rather than hurts.

Rubin stated that we don't want this to be a panel of experts presenting research findings on gender, race, etc. We want people to talk about SSS specifically so that we have input and voice from membership. Davis wants to convey to Guittar that this session should facilitate the conversation rather than having people talking at members. Brunsma wants the session to mostly involve SSS members talking. Risman suggested an active learning session where people at the session are charged with coming up with ideas and tasks for the EC after invited panelists say just a few words. Davis agreed to have another conversation with Guittar to ensure that the session will look more like a grassroots productive session. Rubin wants to make sure we convey that the session has a goal, and that goal is to create a series of action items. Brunsma suggested that David Embrick would be a good person to facilitate the session. Bohon asked if we could move Sandy Darity (President, Association of Black Sociologists), who had been asked to be on the panel, to a session highlighting his own work, since he's not really in a situation to talk about the Southernns.

Association for Black Sociologists

The SSS mid-year meetings have corresponded with the ABS meetings this year. Bohon and Robinson attended the ABS dance party the previous night at their invitation. They reported that ABS leadership is very much looking forward to some of our members (Risman, Brunsma, McDonald) showing up to their Executive Board meeting today to have an open conversation about ways we can collaborate. They reported that there was a lot of conversation at the dance party about how the ABS meetings are arranged (in concurrence with ASA versus not, some years). Robinson suggested that it might be interesting to get them to occasionally link their meeting to ours, since they try to occasionally meet in the South in order to allow sociologists at HBCUs who have small travel budgets to attend. Bohon suggested that Risman and others attending today's meeting would offer a joint meeting, perhaps Atlanta.

Diversity: Charles U. Smith award for community research

Bohon reminded the EC that they had agreed to create this award at the urging of CU Smith during our meetings in Jacksonville, perhaps in conjunction with the Gomillion fund. Brunsma reported that he's not been able to contact CU Smith after two years of attempts. **We need to give a description to the Committee on Honors of the Moland-Killian-Gomillion Award.** Risman suggested creating subcommittees within the Committee on Honors to deal with the growing number of awards. Because the Bylaws constrain the membership of the Committee on Honors to six, we considered having each member of the Committee chair a subcommittee.

Diversity: Changing CREM scholarships

Bohon asked the EC to consider changing the way that CREM scholarships are allocated. Currently they are given to minority undergraduates, but Sociology is very good at attracting minority majors. It seems better to allocate the scholarships to Assistant Professors at HBCUs, Hispanic-serving institutions, and primarily undergraduate institutions who have papers accepted at our annual meetings. The committee agreed on five awards of \$500. Brunnsma suggested that we also waive the registration fees for undergraduate students that attend meetings with scholarship recipients. Risman and Rubin strongly urged that this be posed as an award, and not a hand out.

Bohon moved that we shift the CREM scholarships to five awards of \$500 each to Assistant Professors from underrepresented groups working in HBCUs, Hispanic-serving institutions, tribal colleges, Native American serving, non-tribal institutions, that are primarily undergraduate institutions who have papers accepted at our annual meetings. Rubin seconded. Brunnsma underscored that communication on the award should come from the CREM chair. We would like outreach to schools that don't have a presence at the Southern. Stearns noted that when she was Program Chair there was a list generated of all institutions in the South, we could also link this to the call for papers going forward. Motion passed unanimously.

Web link to SWS

Davis reported that SWS-S just wants a presence on the SSS website that provides a link between our meeting page and their website. This would simply be an imbedded link with no content that the SSS webmaster would have to manage. Risman noted with could also do that for ABS or AKD or even organizations that table/exhibit at SSS annual meetings. EC members confirmed that other regionals do this. Brunnsma noted some concerns he discussed with the webmaster, some of which had already been addressed. Would this be a link to the SWS-S page? Would this entail any maintenance by the SSS webmaster? What if other organizations ask for this? Would we allow this? How? How do we monetize this, if we want to? Can we link this to having a (paid) table at the annual meeting? McDonald noted that the Program Chair should add information about communicating the possibilities for organizations to link to our website to the *Handbook*. **Brunnsma will communicate to SWS-S that we will allow this.**

Member satisfaction survey

Risman noted that we had very positive response to the satisfaction survey. Members appeared to be happy. Walker revisited the idea of having a separate hotel for graduate students. Brunnsma noted that we're doing a better job this year of advertising triple and quad room prices. Astor Crowne is \$195 plus \$20 extra per person. McDonald wondered if there were ways for graduate students to connect in order to share rooms. Brunnsma also will check with the contact at the Astor Crowne about a block of rooms that might be reserved for multiple student use.

Maume asked if we should do a member satisfaction survey every year. Brunnsma noted that it would be good to have longitudinal data. Walker asked if there was a good way to share the data collected. **Brunnsma agreed to write a TSS article.**

Proposal from the Committee on Gender and Sexuality: Child Care

Walker reported that, in Charlotte, there are drop-in day care centers, and this information was made available to members who asked the Program Chairs. Risman stated that it was surprising that SSS has made no provisions for child care at our meetings. This shouldn't be an "if," it should be a "how." The "how" can differ from place to place.

The EC discussed which committee should be charged with handling child care. We need a vendor that handles child care in the hotel and has their own insurance. Members who make use of the service would pay for it. Maume suggested that we use an off-site drop-off center, if possible. He asked what SWS does. Davis reported that, for SWS, there are drop-off centers and they also provide a list of people who would be willing to come to your room. There was a general sense that Local Arrangements be tasked with coming up with child care arrangements for members, being careful not to shift liability to SSS.

Brunisma agreed to work with Jaita Talukdar (Local Arrangements Chair) and Lynn Stetzer (at Astor Crowne) in order to find a bonded, insured person to arrange childcare. He would look at options.

Proposal from the Committee on Gender and Sexuality: All-Gender Restrooms

Davis noted that there are very few restrooms (and elevators) at the Astor Crowne. There are very few options in this hotel to make an all-gender restroom. The only possibility for an all-gender restroom is on the fourth floor, which seems more marginalizing than doing nothing. The Program Committee is concerned about restrooms, in general. We cannot designate the ballroom floor, because other organizations are using the restrooms the same time we are.

The proposal from CGS is to make family restrooms in hotels all-gender restrooms. This is easily implemented, but what to do about New Orleans? Brunisma noted that the fitness center is the only solution for us. Maume noted that you must have a hotel key card to use that bathroom. Risman suggested that we use the two (small) restrooms on second floor mezzanine of the Astor Crowne as all-gender restrooms.

The Executive Officer will purchase all-gender restroom signs for this and future meetings, following the mock-up provided by CGS. He will also contact the hotel and make sure it's allowed.

Maume reminded the EC that the CGS wants us to require the provision of an all-gender restroom in hotel contract.

Risman moved (and Rubin seconded) that we include language requiring the provision of an all-gender restroom be included in our hotel contract going forward. Motion carried unanimously.

Risman moved that we spend money to buy all-gender restroom signs, if necessary. (Stearns seconded.) Motion carried unanimously.

Program Committee Report on Paper Submissions

The Program Committee had to extend the submission period for a few hours because of a server overload and a server crash. As of last night, there are now 137 submitted sessions. Presentations within those sessions total 299. Papers submitted that are not yet attached to sessions total 772. Total number of people attached to papers/sessions is 1,628. Total number of people who say they'll attend meetings is 1,330. All numbers are tentative, since the submission portal closed at midnight last night.

Underemployed Sociologists' Dues and Registration

Kamala Platt sent an email to Brunisma asking for a membership waiver for those working as adjuncts. Brunisma suggested that there might be more to be gained than lost by providing a reduced cost of dues and registration for adjuncts. We considered \$30 for membership and \$35 for registration. Brunisma requested we only do this for a couple of years to see how it works. Walker suggested that the Membership Committee make adjuncts aware of the new category. EC discussed various ways of rolling this out.

It was moved by Rubin that we create a non-tenure track, contingent, and unemployed category of membership charging \$30 for membership and \$35 for meeting registration. McDonald seconded. Motion carried unanimously.

Charges for Departments to have Posters

Davis reported that there would be a place for departments to advertise their graduate programs by putting up posters. Brunisma said we could allow departments who are departmental members to put up posters. Alternatively, we would charge every department an arbitrary amount (\$20). Several EC members pointed out how difficult it is for departments to pay small amounts. The EC ultimately decided they didn't want to charge departments.

Photographer

Tracy Ore (University of Minnesota) has volunteered to be the photographer for the New Orleans meeting. Brunisma asked if we could comp a room night for her or waive registration. Reynolds asked if photos would be directly linked to our social media presence.

Archivist Issue

Jim Houghland has been our archivist for some time. Our archives are at the University of Kentucky. Houghland asked the EC (through Brunisma) to consider how our archives are used. They are currently on deposit with the University of Kentucky. If we gift them to UK, then they begin to become curated. Another question is if the archives are valuable. Would SSS consider funding a graduate student at UK to organize the material? How do we go forward in the electronic era? The EC discussed whether or not there was a downside to gifting the materials to UK. Brunisma also contacted the

archivist at Virginia Tech as the request of Maume. VT's archivist was not thrilled about receiving the SSS collection. His gist was that SSS should gift the collection to the University of Kentucky, and UK libraries would become the archivist. **Brunisma needs to ask the UK libraries if they will receive future documents electronically when he negotiates the contract.**

Risman moved to gift our archives to the University of Kentucky with a provision in the gift that if they choose to destroy any of the archives, we are provided the option of repossessing the material. Robinson seconded. Motion was carried unanimously.

Accountant Issue

Brunisma was not happy with the availability of the accountant; they didn't have a good working relationship. He set up a meeting with the accountant and shared his feelings about their relationship; he indicated that he needed to meet and communicate more regularly, that he wanted to walk through the data. Brunisma felt he actually hadn't asked for what he needed so rather than pull the plug, now that he has better articulated his needs from the relationship, wants to give it a try. She is not an expert at non-profit work and that was a concern but if the EC is fine with his decision, then he'd like to give it another chance. Wants to know if EC is okay. Rubin said that if he was comfortable so were we.

Presidential Task Force on Committees

Maume summarized Bissler's report. On page 13 of their report summarizes actions recommended on each committee and the EC's actions. The task force recommended doing away with the Committee on the Professions, but the EC declined. Moller recommended dissolving the Development Committee, and Brunisma recommended dissolving the Disasters Committee. Bohon noted that we still have Katrina/Rita money that has not been spent and was collected for the purpose of helping researchers recoup lost research or to research Katina/Rita. Risman suggested a call for short (no more than five year) proposals to look at the long-term impacts of Katrina and then revisit each time the fund reaches the \$5,000 mark. **Brunisma will contact Steve Picou to see if he might replace himself (Brunisma) on the committee and be willing to send a call for proposals.** It was suggested by Davis that the Disaster Relief Committee would be dissolved but its functions would be succumbed by the Finance Committee. Calasanti (via skype) recommends that the grant be supervised by the EC and not the Finance Committee. Ultimately, it was decided that Picou would be charged with taking over the Disaster Relief Committee for this year only, for the purpose of distributing the current funds (about \$5,000). The Committee will be reconstituted as funds accrue, but it will be otherwise dissolved after this year.

Bissler recommends having the Vice President act as a liaison between EC and Committee Chairs. EC agreed that this should happen. Brunisma pointed out that most Presidents give charges to the committee and request reports from the committee. VP would also encourage chairs to get their *Handbook* revisions in.

Davis reported putting a place in the program for a chairs luncheon meeting. Brunσμα asked Davis to remind him when and where the luncheons and breakfasts for the various events are, so that he can plan catering.

Formation of an Odum Committee

The Executive Committee was in agreement that Odum should remain under the auspices of Honors, but that they form a subcommittee for the purpose of evaluating Odum. Calasanti (via skype) asked if the chair appointment was being done incorrectly in the past. Walker noted that the bylaws say that the chair can only serve one year and a chair-elect is appointed each year by the President-elect.

Technology Committee and Technology

The Presidential Task Force on Committees recommended we create a Technology Committee. Brunσμα was not in favor of this idea, since it is better to allow the webmaster to handle most technology problems. However, it would be good to have someone to Tweet the meetings and post to Facebook. Robinson suggested a team of people to do this. Walker thought that those working on registration (getting free registration) should Tweet the highlights of the meeting. Our hashtag is #sss2015; volunteers should be charged to Tweet positive comments.

Our audiovisual equipment is under the auspices of an AV coordinator, who is usually a graduate student at the Executive Officer's institution. Depreciation on our equipment is almost zero. We are starting to have trouble with the fact that not every laptop communicates with the projectors. We might need to buy a few adaptors. Walker suggested we call for people to donate VGA converters.

Blog on Graduate Student Professionalization

Renzulli has suggested a blog or Q&A column that would allow students to post questions about professional development. The question is posed whether or not this would have longevity and whether we want to link to a single-person organized blog. Rubin suggested that it would be easy to say "yes" to this, given who is suggesting it, but what if other people wanted to link blogs to SSS? What then? EC talked about the SWS and Sociology Education models where responses from various people are compiled and printed in a newsletter. Risman expressed concern, in a general form, about allowing any one person to maintain a blog that is supposed to represent our society. Robinson asked about the creation of a blog space for graduate students, more generally. Rubin noted that *The Chronicle* has an advice blog. Could we do something like that? Walker suggested that the Committee on the Status of Students (that Renzulli chairs) could collectively moderate something, but we need a more developed vision of what is being proposed before we can make any decisions.

Mentoring Program

The EC discussed the mentoring program that the Committee on the Status of Students proposed to begin with the next meeting. It was the general consensus of the EC that the CSS be allowed to try this. Sociology of Education does this at ASA, and it works well. Davis asked if this meant there needed to be space on the program, and it was the EC's opinion that Program Chairs didn't need to find space, but it might be okay to put

up an easel. Calasanti (via skype) suggested that the mentoring program be better defined by the CSS. Risman suggested that each mentor-mentee pair would work out what was needed. Brunσμα worried about the “mentoring” label which is different from faculty members just providing advice to graduate students.

Incentive Program

Calasanti and Davis mentioned an Incentive Program that was recommended by the Presidential Task Force. Many members of the EC opposed that, since we already give a service award. This is professional service, but there are also networking and other rewards.

Chair’s Handbook

The Presidential Task Force asked for a Chair’s Handbook. However, the *Handbook* is intended to be the chair’s handbook. Robinson suggested that people be urged to check the handbook and make changes at the same time as submitting reports.

COSSA Liaison

Our new COSSA liaison is Roberta Spalter-Roth. She is asking for some direction of what she should do in this role. Brunσμα suggested she do a small report for *TSS*. She might also create digests that can be distributed to members via Mail Chimp.

Bohon moved (Davis seconded) that the Executive Committee endorse a change of the Constitution as follows:

Old Version:

The Publications Committee shall consist of six members elected by the voting membership of the Society for a term of three years with one member's term expiring each year. The terms of the initial members shall be staggered from one to five years. The Executive Officer of the Society, the Editor(s) of the official journal of the Southern Sociological Society, and the Editor(s) of *The Southern Sociologist* shall be ex-officio members of the Publications Committee. The Past-Past President shall be a voting member of the Committee. A Chair and a Chair-Elect of the Publications Committee shall be selected by voting members of the Committee and shall each serve a one-year term.

New Version:

The Publications Committee shall consist of six members elected by the voting membership of the Society for a term of three years with ~~one member's term~~ **two members’ terms** expiring each year. ~~The terms of the initial members shall be staggered from one to five years.~~ The Executive Officer of the Society, the Editor(s) of ***Social Currents***, the official journal of the Southern Sociological Society, and the Editor(s) of *The Southern Sociologist* shall be ex-officio members of the Publications Committee. The Past-Past President shall be a voting member of the Committee. A Chair and a Chair-Elect of the Publications Committee shall be selected by voting members of the Committee and shall each serve a one-year term.

The motion carried unanimously. **Brunisma will include the voting item in the upcoming ballot.**

CREM requests

CREM's report states, "We also discussed requesting that a representative from REM committee be on the a) executive committee board (with an allotted time of 5 minutes on agenda) and b) nominations committee (or at least a guarantee that one of our recommendations will be nominated)." The Executive Committee wasn't exactly clear what was being asked, but it seemed that CREM was unaware that they are always invited to report at the EC meetings during the Annual Meetings and that Nominations Committee welcomes nominations from CREM.

Sociological Practice Requests

CSP wants their practice briefs put on the website. EC will check with the webmaster to see if this is feasible.

They requested a Margaret Jarman Hagood award that largely mirrors the Moland-Killian-Gomillion award. EC generally was of the opinion that there was little value in making awards proliferate. We'll pursue the award that we've already approved but have not yet enacted.

They requested two consecutive sessions at the Annual Meeting. The Program Committee chair (Davis) reported that this request came too late to be honored, and there are far too many papers submitted to this years' meeting to make this possible.

Program Chair's Presence at the Mid-Year Meetings

It was moved by Davis that the Program Chairs be invited to attend the mid-year meetings. If they cannot attend the meeting, they should be on call for consultation. Hotel rooms will be provided for the Chair(s). (Rubin seconded.) The motion carried unanimously.

Social Currents report

Calasanti gave a report from October 2013 to mid-September 2014. So far, 165 original manuscripts have been received and they have 40 revised manuscripts. Receipt of manuscripts is far beyond expectations. Sage will publish four issues next year which is sooner than anticipated. The editors have rejected 59% so far and accepted 8% outright. Sage did a comparison of the journal's performance relative to other new(ish) Sage journals shows; we're ahead of other journals in terms of downloads. There are nearly 11,000 downloads to date. Total access to top three downloads is better than ASR's top ten.

Annual Meeting

The question was whether the EC meeting time during the annual meeting could be shortened. The point was raised that the Thursday meeting could be eliminated if all of the Committee Chairs show up on Wednesday to give their reports. **Maume should remind Committee Chairs now that they are required to show up for Wednesday.** The

EC committed to relinquishing the Thursday meeting time so that the Program Chairs can have that room.

Meeting was adjourned at 3:44 pm.