1) Jim L. and Marge have done their job of identifying some places for Judy to research. She will have information about their programs and their operations for us to look at and discuss. This background will help frame our work and may generate some good ideas.

2) Meanwhile some progress has been made by Hank and John about what alternative facilitators we should consider, if any. We can get an update, but I hope in the meantime to be able to get back to Sarno with some kind of information. If by the April 6 meeting we can agree to go with Sarno, then the next question is how we direct him in terms of the scope of his work.

3) Bill will have found the earlier income stream documents from the Adler study and we will look at that.

4) Even though Ted will not be there, if we can meaningfully do so, I think it is important that we review Ted's notes about the landscape for funds coming into educational initiatives. Maybe Marge could help in this part of the discussion?

5) Marge and Vivian have been planning a meeting with teachers and others, and we can get an update.

Separately from the agenda, please respond to the following. At our last meeting, it was deemed worthwhile to write down a set of things we'd like the facilitator to accomplish. We also said it would be helpful to write down a "premise" statement. Here is my attempt to do these things, open for comments.

Premise: excite and engage students and the public in science, technology, engineering, and mathematics by taking advantage of the resources of Yerkes Observatory and its unique history.

What we want as a result of the facilitator's work:

* identify the major stakeholders in the future of Yerkes Observatory

* identify their commonly held values and interests

* identify issues, concerns, and range of perspectives
* identify ideas for the nature of the best use of the facilities

We agreed that before this was sent to a prospective facilitator, we would add a preface that gives the context.