

University Senate
April 13, 2015

The University Senate met in regular session at 3 pm in the Auditorium of W. T. Young Library on Monday, April 13, 2015. Below is a record of what transpired. All votes were taken via electronic voting devices unless indicated otherwise; specific voting information can be requested from the Office of the Senate Council.

Senate Council Chair Andrew Hippisley called the University Senate (Senate) meeting to order at 3:02 pm. He reminded senators to pick up their clickers.

The Chair called for an attendance vote and 60 senators registered their presence.

1. Minutes from March 9, 2015 and Announcements

The Chair reported that no corrections were received by 9 am Friday. There being **no objections**, the minutes from March 9, 2015 were approved as distributed by **unanimous consent**.

There were a couple announcements.

- eCats, UK's curricular proposal system, will see either a rewrite or new system implemented over the summer.
- Apportionment information for Senate college elections has been sent to colleges. The deadline for colleges to send names of elected senators is May 1.
- UK Appreciation Day will be Thursday, May 21, Pieratt Field/Boone Tennis Center from 11 am – 2 pm. The purpose of the event is to express appreciation for employees' work and dedication to the UK community.

2. Officer and Other Reports

a. Chair

The Chair said that the SC took some actions on behalf of the Senate: it waived *Senate Rules 6.1.3.A* on submission of midterm grades; approved a change to the 2015-16 Dentistry calendar, and added a student to the December 2014 due to administrative error on the part of the Graduate School. The SC also approved nominations for area and advisory committees.

The Office of Faculty Advancement asked for SC input into a faculty exit survey, which the SC provided during one of its regular meetings. Finally, the SC approved questions for faculty's survey evaluation of the President's performance. Faculty have until Monday, April 27 to submit their response to the survey.

b. Vice Chair

Vice Chair Christ explained she was soliciting nominations for the annual Outstanding Senator Award. The award is for a faculty member or senator who:

- Has contributed to the Senate by showing active & exemplary service on one or more Senate cmtes during his or her tenure.
- Has made notable substantive contributions in communicating with the Senate and while working with the faculty at large on important issues that impact the faculty as a whole.

- Has given strong voice to faculty issues in Senate meetings, public events, and/or local/regional news media and actively defended the principle of shared governance in University forums.
- Is effective in generating and effecting the Senate's larger agenda and goals.

Christ further explained that current members of SC are not eligible and that nominees need not be currently serving a term in the Senate. The Vice Chair asked that nominations be sent to her by April 21.

c. Parliamentarian

Parliamentarian Seago recalled that there were questions and a little confusion at the last meeting about rescinding or amending something previously adopted, specifically in regards to the report of the ad hoc committee on teacher-course evaluations. Below are the highlights from her presentation.

- There are some motions that cannot be rescinded/amended
 - Motions that have already been carried out and that cannot be undone.
 - Motions to accept resignations or actions electing or expelling a person from membership or office
 - Motions subject to being called up for reconsideration (occurs within the same meeting)
- The motion to rescind:
 - The motion to rescind is used to cancel the motion altogether
 - Can't interrupt a speaker who has the floor
 - Must be seconded
 - Is debatable and can be amended
 - Vote is 2/3 without previous notice, but majority with previous notice
- The motion to amend something previously adopted
 - The motion to amend something previously adopted is used to make a change to a motion by making a simple change or substitution.
 - Can't interrupt a speaker who has the floor
 - Must be seconded
 - Is debatable and can be amended
 - Vote is 2/3 without previous notice, but majority with previous notice
- A two-thirds majority is required if the motion is brought without notice. Notice should be given in the previous meeting.
- If notice is given, then the motion requires a simple majority of the group.

d. Trustee

Trustee Grossman reiterated the Chair's suggestion that senators encourage their constituents to fill out the SC's evaluation of President Eli Capilouto's performance.

3. Update on Strategic Planning Process - Provost Tim Tracy

Provost Tim Tracy gave senators an oral update on the strategic planning process. There was one question from a senator about Senate participation and Provost Tracy said that the draft plan will be available to senators in advance of the campuswide town hall meetings.

4. Committee Reports

a. Senate's Academic Programs Committee (SAPC) - Margaret Schroeder, Chair

i. Proposed Suspension of MA in Theatre

Schroeder, chair of the SAPC, said that the **motion** from the SAPC was that the Senate approve the suspension of the Master of Arts: Theatre, in the Department of Theatre within the College of Fine Arts. Because the motion came from committee, no **second** was necessary.

Schroeder explained the proposal to suspend the MA Theatre. There were no questions from senators.

A **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with 69 in favor and two opposed.

ii. Proposed New Graduate Certificate in Latin American, Caribbean, and Latino Studies

Schroeder said that the **motion** from the SAPC was that the Senate approve the establishment of a new Graduate Certificate in Latin American, Caribbean, and Latino Studies, in the College of Arts and Sciences. Because the motion came from committee, no **second** was necessary.

Schroeder explained the proposal. There were no questions from senators.

A **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with 69 in favor and one opposed.

iii. New University Scholars Program: BA Art History and MA Art History and Visual Studies

Schroeder said that the **motion** from the SAPC was that the Senate approve the establishment of a new University Scholars Program of a BA Art History and MA Art History and Visual Studies within the School of Art and Visual Studies in the College of Fine Arts. Because the motion came from committee, no **second** was necessary.

Schroeder explained the proposal. There were no questions from senators.

A **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with 74 in favor.

iv. Proposed New MS in Finance

Schroeder said that the **motion** from the SAPC was that the Senate approve, for submission to the Board of Trustees, the establishment of a new MS in Finance, in the Department of Finance and Quantitative Methods within the Gatton College of Business and Economics. Because the motion came from committee, no **second** was necessary.

Schroeder explained the proposal. She noted that the effective date (of fall 2016) was incorrect in the proposal – the program will begin in spring 2016. There were no questions from senators.

A **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with 69 in favor, one opposed and two abstaining.

b. Senate's Admissions and Academic Standards Committee (SAASC) - Greg Graf, Chair

i. Doctoral Committee Composition Change

Graf, chair of the Senate's Admissions and Academic Standards Committee (SAASC), explained the proposal. Greg said that the current policy for doctoral committee compositions was a requirement of four members – three from the home department and one from outside the department. The original proposal also reduced the required number of faculty from within the home department, but SC removed that from the proposal due to concerns about committee size. The Chair noted that because the **motion** to approve the proposed change to doctoral committee compositions came from

committee, no **second** was required. There were a lot of questions from senators – many were unclear about the total number of committee members required, if the change would be imposed upon programs if they did not wish to see such a change, and whether the terms “academic program” and “department” were indeed interchangeable because some departments offer multiple academic degree programs.

Wood **moved** to amend the language of the proposal as follows¹:

This core must include a minimum of two faculty members from the ~~academic~~ graduate program (with one major professor as chair or co-chair), and one representative from outside the ~~academic~~ graduate program ~~(department)~~.

Porter **seconded**. There was additional discussion and then a **vote** was taken on the amendment. The motion **passed** with 66 in favor, six opposed, and one abstaining.

There were additional questions from senators; many were concerned that the proposed change could negatively affect students. A **vote** was taken on the amended proposal and the motion **passed** with 50 in favor and 22 opposed.

The Chair urged senators to get the word out to colleagues about this big policy change at the graduate level. In response to Grossman, the Chair opined that the change was effective immediately.

ii. Doctoral Time Extension Policy

Graf explained the proposal to change the doctoral time extension policy. There were some concerns expressed about the change, particularly for students in field-based disciplines and that it might lead to students taking even longer to complete their program of study. Graf noted that the proposal for the time extension policy merely gave directors of graduate studies the ability to request that a student not have to retake their qualifying exams, but it did not strictly remove that requirement.

The Chair noted that the **motion** on the floor was that the Senate approve the proposed change to the doctoral time extension policy. Because the motion came from committee, no **second** was needed. A **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with 62 in favor and eight opposed. The Chair again asked senators to share this change with their colleagues.

5. Annual "State of the Libraries" Report - Dean of Libraries Terry Birdwhistell

Libraries Dean Terry Birdwhistell thanked senators for the opportunity to present to the Senate. He said that as his presentation, he had asked Associate Dean for Academic Affairs and Research Stacey Greenwell to offer senators a presentation on the role of Libraries in student instruction. Guest Greenwell talked about initiatives in services provided by Libraries, including Libraries’ instruction program on information literacy, strategies around the same topic, and how to assess effectiveness.

There were no questions from senators and the Chair thanked Dean Birdwhistell and Greenwell for attending.

6. Proposed Changes to *Governing Regulations II* ("Governance of the University of Kentucky")

¹ Strikethrough indicates deleted text and underlines indicate added text.

The Chair invited Marcy Deaton, associate legal counsel, to explain the proposed changes. Guest Dean said that the changes were intended to elevate the Audit and Compliance Subcommittee of the Board of Trustees (Board) to become a committee in its own right, not a subcommittee. Practically, it would make the committee's proceedings more transparent and after the proposed change, the committee's reports would be given to the full Board rather than to its parent committee, the Finance Committee.

The Chair said that the **motion** from the SC was that the SC endorse the proposed changes to *Governing Regulations II*. Because the motion came from committee, no **second** was required. There were no questions from senators.

A **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with 67 in favor, one opposed and one abstaining.

On a somewhat related matter, Tagavi commented that the language already in *Governing Regulations II* states that the Board chair and vice chair are automatic members of the Executive Committee, but that Kentucky Revised Statutes (KRS) require all Executive Committee members to be elected. Deaton thanked Tagavi for his comment. She said she would take Tagavi's comments under advisement and discuss them with General Counsel.

7. Proposed New Governing Regulation on Faculty Disciplinary Action (first reading - discussion only)

The Chair explained that Dave Watt (ME/Molecular and Cellular Biochemistry), who also is a member of the Senate Council (SC), chaired the SC's ad hoc Committee on Faculty Disciplinary Action. The Chair asked Watt to explain the proposed new *GR*.

Watt offered some background information. President Eli Capilouto wrote to the SC in September to ask for consideration of a faculty disciplinary policy. That memo triggered the creation of the ad hoc Committee on Faculty Disciplinary Action (Committee). Watt thanked the members of his Committee and asked that they stand and be recognized: Marcy Deaton (associate legal counsel); Connie Wood (AS/Statistics, chair of Senate's Rules and Elections Committee); Liz Debski (AS/Biology); David Pienkowski (EN/Biomedical Engineering); and John Wilson (ME/Behavioral Science, faculty trustee). Watt said that he wanted to identify Committee members so that they would be recognizable to senators. As senators review the proposed new *GR* over the next month, Watt suggested senators contact Committee members, including him, to discuss concerns. Watt thanked General Counsel Bill Thro for the many hours Thro spent discussing the proposed *GR* with Watt. Watt also thanked President Eli Capilouto, who met with Watt and the Chair on several occasions. Watt reminded senators that the President has the authority to issue *Administrative Regulations (AR)*; President Capilouto could have merely issued an AR on faculty disciplinary action, but instead chose to come to the Senate to request the Senate's input into the regulation and Watt expressed appreciation for that. Watt said he would pose five questions, which he would immediately answer; the intent was to help broadly frame the proposed new *GR*.

Question #1: Do other universities have similar policies?

Answer: Yes. These types of policies exist, perhaps not in this exact format, at virtually all the universities reviewed by the Committee. The Committee reviewed many, many other universities.

Question #2: Why do we need this policy? We already have a Code of Faculty Responsibilities in *Senate Rules Section 7*.

Answer: As the Committee delved deeper into discussions, it learned that the Board of Trustees has not delegated to the Senate the authority to develop the Code that is in *Senate Rules (SR)*. As a corollary to the proposed new *GR*, the Senate will need to revise that *SR*. Watt said the strongest argument in favor of having a *GR* like this was that faculty are a group of professionals who are best suited to write a code of faculty conduct. Watt said he believed that the Committee members did the absolutely best job they could do to meet the requirements laid out by the President in his September memo to SC as well as balance the need for faculty protections.

Question #3: What doesn't this policy do?

Answer: The proposed *GR* does not mention or address the issue of post-tenure reviews. Watt said he had been concerned for years about the lack of good mechanisms to deal with faculty who have behavioral or mental health issues. The proposed *GR*, however, does not address behavioral or mental health issues.

Question #4: What does this policy do?

Answer: Watt noted that there was a great deal of information on the Senate's website about the proposed *GR* and he encouraged senators to review it.

- The proposed *GR* will apply to everyone, from instructor to president; anyone who holds a faculty rank will be subject to the policy.
- Allegations of misconduct can come from virtually any source – local law enforcement could notify UK Police about a faculty member, or a report could come from a faculty colleague or a parent calling from overseas to complain about a faculty member's treatment of a student. Watt explained that allegations will come from a variety of sources and people. Deans, in consultation with General Counsel, will evaluate any allegation. If a decision is made to conduct an investigation, it will be done by UK's internal professionals, such as Internal Audit or Equal Opportunity Office, which will issue a written report that will be provided to the accused faculty member and that person's dean.
- The Committee hoped that the predominant action taken after an allegation will be mediation, in which the accused faculty member and the dean will meet and attempt to come to a decision about what transpired and what sanctions the faculty member may face if found guilty. Based on his length of service to UK and experience from the administrative roles in which he served, Watt said that he did not expect many situations that would even proceed to mediation, let alone progress to the next step.
- If mediation does not work, the next step is to send the issue to a panel of faculty. There will be a faculty disciplinary pool, comprised of 25 faculty chosen by the President from a list of 36 nominees submitted by the SC, which will be representative of title series and colleges. If mediation does not work, an inquiry panel will be named, which will be similar in function to a grand jury.
- The inquiry panel will review the professional investigative report. The inquiry panel will be comprised of three members: one faculty member chosen from the disciplinary pool, a representative from Human Resources (HR) and a representative from the Provost's office. The

President and General Counsel desired assurance in the form of the HR representative that the sanctions imposed on a faculty member found guilty will match what would happen to a staff member in a similar situation. The Provost's representative will be present to ensure treatment of faculty members do not differ dramatically across colleges. The inquiry panel will not determine innocence or guilt, but rather will review the evidence and determine if there are grounds for probable cause. If so, the case will proceed to the next step.

- If the inquiry panel believes there is sufficient evidence to continue the disciplinary process, the next step is to the faculty hearing panel. The faculty hearing panel will be comprised of five faculty, also chosen from the faculty disciplinary pool. The burden of proof will be "clear and convincing evidence," which legalistically falls between the one extreme of "preponderance of evidence" (over 50%) and the other extreme of "beyond a reasonable doubt." The faculty hearing panel will determine if there is sufficient evidence for the accused faculty member to be charged as guilty, or if the faculty member should be declared innocent. If the hearing panel deems the faculty member to be guilty, the hearing panel will also make a recommendation for sanctions, which are listed in the proposed *GR*.
- The recommendation of the hearing panel will go to the Provost, who will determine the sanctions to be imposed.
- If a dean is unhappy with the hearing panel's recommendation, either for guilt or for innocence, the dean can appeal the decision of the hearing panel to the faculty appeals panel. The inclusion of a mechanism for a dean to appeal innocence was intended to offer parallel construction with respect to a faculty member's ability to appeal, too. Within seven days of the hearing panel's decision, either the faculty member or the dean can appeal the decision to the appeals panel. The appeals panel will be comprised of three individuals: the Provost, the chair of the Senate Council, and the Academic Ombud. These three will review the briefs that were filed in the case. Watt thought the dean's appeal could most likely occur if the hearing panel acts improperly, such as flipping a coin to determine the outcome of a case, or collusion among the faculty on the hearing panel. Watt opined that UK tended to write regulations around sometimes unrealistic "what if" scenarios and said he was not as concerned as some of his colleagues with the prospect of a dean appealing a faculty member's innocence. Watt suggested that the harshest critics of a faculty member going through the disciplinary action process would be the faculty on the hearing panel.
- After the appeals panel renders a recommendation, the Provost will determine the sanction(s) should be. If the accused faculty member is found guilty by the hearing panel and does not appeal to the appeals panel, the next step after the hearing panel is also for the Provost to determine the sanction(s). A faculty member can appeal sanctions to the President. Watt said it was virtually impossible to write down every possible misbehavior and a corollary punishment, so a sentence was included that requires a sanction to be commensurate with the misconduct. While it does require a certain level of trust, Watt said he was comfortable with it.
- The proposed *GR* makes it clear that retaliation of any kind is not allowed. Further, if there are instances in which it is best for the faculty member to not be on campus while the investigation is ongoing, there is a clause that allows for involuntary leave with pay. According to the language of the proposed *GR*, only the Provost can place a faculty member on involuntary leave with pay, although there are qualifications for such an action.

Question #5: What does Dave Watt recommend?

Answer: Watt noted that there would be no vote during the day's meeting, but rather was an opportunity for free and open discussion. Watt said he would do his best to answer questions and invited Committee members and SC members, who played a real role in getting the proposed *GR* to its current state, to do the same. Watt said he and others had spent many hours on words and phrases in the proposed *GR*. It includes compromise language and some sections were the subject of arguments back and forth. Watt asked that senators talk to Committee members and SC members and circulate the proposed *GR* widely among colleagues. He asked that senators confine their comments to the major issues – necessary clerical edits will be dealt with, but he hoped senators would spend more time productively discussing the substantive issues of the proposed *GR*.

In response to a question from Prats about when something will be handled internally and when something will be handled by local law enforcement, Watt said that allegations could come from a variety of directions. The dean is the ultimate recipient of allegations, not a department chair. The dean will consult with General Counsel, which will help the dean determine if the situation warrants immediately informing the police. A secondary consideration will be whether or not the faculty member can remain on campus during the investigation.

Grossman commented about the kinds of behavior covered by the policy and the rules faculty must adhere to. Watt read from the paragraph that addressed that (second paragraph under "Introduction," lines 16-20. Watt noted that it would be helpful if UK developed a policy office that could better coordinate UK's *GRs*, *ARs*, Human Resources Policies and Procedures, the Business Procedures Manual, and the *Senate Rules*. Because there is no consistent definition of faculty in UK's regulations and policies, there is a specific definition in the proposed *GR*.

Firey expressed concern with the principal behind a dean's ability to appeal innocence. While she appreciated the symmetry in appealing, a dean's ability to appeal an innocent decision seemed to fly in the face of protection against double jeopardy. Watt replied that the issue Firey raised was the most hotly contested part of the proposed *GR*. A dean will be able to appeal innocence, but only based on substantive errors in the process or errors of fact or law and such a claim must be substantive and in writing for the appeal of innocence to go forward. Watt noted that the President and General Counsel were insistent that the ability of a dean to appeal innocence be included. Wood said the Committee's final report did not include a dean's appeal and she expressed empathy with Firey's concern. She noted Watt's comments and referred Firey to the language in part F [in Section IV.F.9, lines 292-29] which strictly limited the grounds on which a dean can appeal a faculty member's innocence. She added that there was no mechanism to introduce new evidence against the faculty member in the appeals stage.

Brion supported the idea of having the inquiry panel composed of an equal balance of administrators and faculty, as opposed to having one faculty member and two administrators. Watt noted that if a dean is accused, there will be three faculty and the two administrators. He said that because the group was merely deciding if the case should go forward, it was okay to have a simpler composition.

Tagavi said he preferred that the inquiry panel composition for a dean (three faculty and an HR representative and Provost's representative) was fairer for all faculty, as opposed to the three-member inquiry panel for rank-and-file faculty. Tagavi also spoke against the investigative bodies offering an opinion of guilt or innocence – he said the role of the investigative bodies should be factual, not

opinionated. Watt thanked Tagavi for his comment and noted that that language [lines 102-104] was from an older version and should be changed so that the investigative body does not render an opinion of guilt or innocence nor does it suggest possible sanctions.

The Chair noted that if senators had changes they would like to suggest, they should send such edits to the Chair in writing; the Chair will ensure the proposed amendments are distributed to senators in advance of the meeting. In response to a query from Tagavi, Parliamentarian Catherine Seago explained that the *SR* do speak to having amendments submitted in writing, which trumps the lack of that requirement in Robert's Rules of Order (Newly Revised).

Ferrier asked about the division between misconduct in a faculty member's personal life and in their professional life. Watt opined that if a faculty member was alleged to have robbed a fast food restaurant, that situation would likely be handled by the local police, not the proposed *GR*.

Truszczynski expressed concern about the vague standards of behavior that faculty must adhere to, saying that the policy was essentially an answer to a vaguely defined problem. While faculty are not governed by different ethical standards from others on campus, so Mirek said he would prefer to see a policy that addressed the University community as a whole, not just faculty. The proposed *GR* makes it appear that faculty need the policy. In addition, due to Watt's comments about mediation happening in the majority of cases, Mirek did not see how the proposed *GR* would solve a problem that the current regulations do not already take into consideration. Watt explained that the Code of Faculty Conduct section in the *SR* was invalid, so that policy was not in effect. Human Resources (HR) does have policies on conduct and some do expressly mention faculty. For example, the alcohol policy refers only to "staff employees" and "students," while the drug abuse policy refers to "employees," which presumably includes faculty. Watt said that staff employees are subject to HR disciplinary policies and he opined that the faculty needed a disciplinary policy, too.

Brion expressed concern that the proposed *GR* could be used to prevent a faculty member from doing their job – a faculty member could be locked out of their lab or office and barred from student contact, based on an unproven allegation. Brion said that would violate the assumption of being innocent until proven guilty. Watt replied that if a member of a lab alleges that a faculty member has committed scientific misconduct, someone from Legal Counsel and the dean's office will seize related notebooks, files, hard drives, etc. as a part of the investigation. That type of situation, however, is not addressed in the proposed *GR* – scientific misconduct has its own regulation that guides actions surrounding scientific misconduct. Wood commented that an aspect to protect faculty was inserted into the section on involuntary leave with pay – the language now parallels the language that of leaves with pay in another *GR*. Voluntary leaves with pay must go to the Board for approval, so the proposed *GR* was changed to require involuntary leaves with pay to also go to the Board. Wood reminded Brion that any instance of impinging upon a faculty member's academic rights is appealable to the Senate's Advisory Committee on Privilege and Tenure (SACPT).

Tagavi said he liked the language that required a sanction to be commensurate with the act, but said there should be another overarching principle that the sanctions cannot prevent a faculty member from doing their job. If an associate professor is sanctioned with loss of their laboratory and removal of a stipend, when the faculty member receives their next performance review or post-tenure review, they will receive a low score that is not their fault. If a sanction restricts a faculty member from adequately performing their job duties, the faculty member should not be expected to carry out their duties. Watt commented that years ago he was told not to do anything that he would be uncomfortable reading

about in the paper. If a faculty member does something questionable, Watt said he did not see how or why the University would have an obligation to protect that faculty member's teaching space or laboratory. Tagavi said that what he meant was that the University could not say that a faculty member did not perform as expected if the University prevented the faculty member from performing. He said another point of concern for him pertained to a sanction being enacted in such a way as to equate to a revocation of tenure. Reprimanding a faculty member is more easily done than a revocation of tenure. If a faculty member received a 99% reduction in their salary for the time-delimited period of 99 years, it would be equivalent of revocation of tenure without going through the hoops. Watt said that if one can believe that sanctions will be commensurate with the action, then it would be unlikely to find the Provost imposing a 99% salary reduction for 99 years. If such a punishment were imposed, it would be for a grossly serious situation of misconduct. Watt pointed out that the Engineering professor who was recently found to be pilfering University funds did not have his tenure revoked, but rather he resigned when confronted with the evidence. Watt said that a faculty member who has behaved that badly will typically choose to resign. There is no record of any faculty member at UK having their tenure revoked – all those who have behaved very badly in the past chose to resign.

The Chair noted that it was getting late and that many members had since left the room. He suggested senators read the proposed *GR* if they had not already done so. He said that amendments should be submitted to him in writing. Steiner said that the issue of the proposed *GR* was very important and the discussion should have started earlier in the meeting. He said the agenda had too many pro forma items on it prior to the proposed new *GR* discussion. The Chair explained that the extended discussion on one of the agenda items had not been anticipated by the SC.

Grossman asked if non-senators could submit amendments. The Chair said that non-senators could contact a senator to submit an amendment if there was a desire to do so. Debski asked if the SC would vote on which amendments to send forward to the Senate. The Chair replied that all amendments submitted in advance, in writing, will be discussed by the Senate.

The meeting was adjourned at 5:15 pm.

Respectfully submitted by Alice Christ,
University Senate Secretary

Invited guests present: Marcy Deaton and Stacey Greenwell.

Absences: Adams, I., Adams, M., Allday, Anderson, Bailey, P., Bird-Pollan*, Birdwhistell, M., Blackwell, Bondada*, Brennen, Browning, Campbell, Cassis, Clark, Cox, Crampton, de Beer, Dunn, Folmar, Fox, Grace, Hallam, Healy, Ingram, Jackson, J., Jackson,, N.*, Jong*, Kellum*, Lacki*, Lewis, Martin, McCulley*, McManus, Mock*, Murthy, Oberst, O'Hair, D.*, O'Hair, MJ, Osorio, Peffer*, Pienkowski, Prather, Profitt, Rabel, Real, Rey-Barreau, Richey, Royse, Sanderson, Sekulic*, Shen, Smyth, Stratton*, Turner, Vasconez*, Vosevich, Walz, Wilhelm, Witt, Wolken, Xenos*.

Prepared by Sheila Brothers on Tuesday, April 28, 2015.

* Denotes an absence explained prior to the meeting.