

University Senate
November 12, 2007

The University Senate met at 3 pm on Monday, November 12, 2007 in the Auditorium of the W. T. Young Library. Below is a record of what transpired. All votes were taken via a show of hands unless indicated otherwise.

Senate Council Chair Kaveh A. Tagavi called the University Senate (Senate) meeting to order at 3:04 pm.

1. Minutes from October 8 and Announcements

The Chair said that no changes to the minutes had been suggested and asked if there were any comments from those present. There being no objection, the minutes from October 8 were approved as distributed.

The Chair noted that he had a variety of announcements to share with senators. The first pertained to a comment the Chair made during the October Senate meeting. He had stated that the Senate would not approve another suspension of the oral communications requirement unless a report on the matter was submitted to the Senate Council (SC) and Senate. College of Communications and Information Studies Dean David Johnson then spoke up and stated he thought the Chair's comment was in error, but the Chair reiterated his statement. The Chair explained to senators that he had indeed been in error regarding his comments on the oral communications suspension – he said that he had mistakenly been thinking of the SC's statement that another winter intersession would not be approved without a formal report. He apologized to Dean Johnson.

Although Professor Brad Canon had agreed to serve the Senate as parliamentarian for the fall 2007 semester, the Chair noted that the Senate would need to identify a different parliamentarian for spring 2008. He asked senators to submit suggestions to him via email.

Due to a change in the meeting time of the Board of Trustees (BoT) for their December meeting, the annual Board and Senates' Holiday Reception was cancelled for 2007.

The Office of the Senate Council received a request from a student who was deployed overseas in the military and was unaware of the prohibition on including Bluegrass Community and Technical College (BCTC) grades in the UK GPA. The student requested a waiver to allow the BCTC grades to factor into the UK GPA. The SC voted to waive the deadline for such request and to refer the matter to the Reinstatement Committee for a thorough review and to authorize that committee to make the final decision to grant or deny the request.

The process of electing senators to the SC will take place in late November and early December; the nomination period will run from November 19 – 30 and voting will take place during the week of December 10 – 14.

2. USP Reform Update – Provost Kumble Subbaswamy

The Chair invited senator and Provost Kumble Subbaswamy to share his thoughts on how the USP reform initiative would proceed. The Provost thanked the Chair and proceeded to offer a brief presentation.

The Chair asked for questions and comments from senators. Yanarella noted that during the tenure of the General Education Reform and Assessment Committee (GERA), a student forum was held to solicit student input, but there was very little interest on the part of students to offer comments, perhaps because there were few specific details to discuss. In terms of incorporating campus feedback, Yanarella asked if students would have an opportunity to look at various iterations of the USP reform principles and an actual revised curriculum. The Provost replied that there would certainly be opportunities for student input and that there had already been one recent forum along with the recent faculty forums. Because that one forum may not have been enough, the Provost said that he was open to advice on how to get student input.

Grossman asked when the Senate would be able to hold a discussion on the guiding principles and adoption of the reformed USP. Provost Subbaswamy replied that the timeline was solely within the purview of the SC, which was responsible for setting Senate agendas. He said the principles would be submitted very soon to the SC, after which the SC would need to decide the appropriate time for a Senate discussion. The Chair added that a broadcast email would go out to faculty members and that the SC would discuss how to proceed at its next meeting. He said that the timing of events was within the purview of the Senate and would go either as fast or as slow as the Senate determined.

Grossman asked that if after the Senate approved principles, if a problem arose with the curriculum as a result of the principles, could the principles be revisited? Provost Subbaswamy replied that the next phase it would be most important to ensure that a new curriculum reflected the principles that were approved. If the principles and curriculum were divergent, it would be very difficult to continue moving forward. He said he was very much open to suggestions on how to proceed. The Chair agreed that whatever principles the Senate approved should guide subsequent actions.

Steiner asked about the rationale behind the current University Studies Program (USP) and if it was related in any way to what was being proposed. The Provost replied that there was a fundamental difference, a shift from an emphasis on the course content to critical thinking. He said the revised USP would not include survey and pre-major courses, nor would “double-dipping” be allowed, but the

revised USP would have fewer required hours. The intent would be to include courses that strictly satisfied general education requirements.

Lesnaw asked if benchmarks' general education programs were reviewed. The Provost said that within the past decade or so, there were many institutions going through similar activities. He said he could provide Lesnaw with a list of recent changes on the national level. The Provost noted that there were differences among institutions' core assumptions, however, such as assuming that a student already knew how to write, or not assuming a student could write well, upon beginning college. He said an effort had been made to distill the national conversation into something relevant to UK. There were a variety of links at <http://www.uky.edu/GenEd> on information about the national discussions.

Cibull said that one criticism had been a perceived lack of openness on discussing the USP Reform Steering Committee's (USPRSC) proposal. He suggested that there be open, publicized meetings and minutes. If the process was open from the beginning, there would be an opportunity to identify problems as they arose.

Janacek expressed uncertainty as to where he should direct his comments. The Provost referred him to the GenEd website where there was a mechanism by which faculty could make comments and, if so desired, post them for anyone to see. He added that comments could also be sent to him or Chair Tagavi. The Chair further explained that whenever he received any type of communication, he automatically de-identified the communication unless specifically asked not to.

Hallman asked if the hiring of more faculty members was foreseen to allow more faculty to be in freshmen courses. Provost Subbaswamy replied that logistical considerations necessarily had to be part of the implementation. He said he was unable to answer in the abstract but affirmed that faculty would be added, although it would not be feasible to teach all courses in small class sizes. He said that looking at pedagogy and the use of teaching assistants would be part of future conversations.

Yanarella said that "resources" was more than merely faculty members and included faculty development. He asked that if faculty supported such a program, would the Provost agree to fund it? Provost Subbaswamy replied affirmatively.

Eldred said that the current USP was the victim of numerous amendments on the Senate floor at the time of its approval, which created the impossibility of a coherent program. The Provost agreed with that and said that if something similar happened again when it was time to approve a reformed USP, the coherence would be destroyed. It would be better to have a simple, small set of outcomes that were clearly articulated, in part because outcomes assessments were more and more how universities evaluated themselves and how other

evaluated the same universities. Assessment will be an important part of UK's reformed USP.

There being no further comments or questions, the Chair thanked Provost Subbaswamy and moved to the next agenda item.

3. UK December 2007 Degree List

The Chair said that the SC recommended that the elected faculty senators approve UK's December 2007 degree list as distributed for submission through the President to the Board of Trustees as the recommended degrees to be conferred by the Board pending further certification by the colleges. He added that the last bit of the sentence was added to signify that, although included in the list, if a student did not complete required coursework, the student would not receive the degree. He said that the list came to the Senate from the SC with no recommendation but did not need a motion or second.

A couple of senators noted that there were names missing from the list. The Chair reiterated that the appropriate time to add names to UK's degree list was not during the Senate meeting, and rather in the six days after the list was distributed to Senate members but prior to the Senate meeting. He asked the senators to communicate the information to him after the meeting was adjourned.

There being no further comments, a **vote** was taken on the **motion** to approve UK's December 2007 list of degrees. The motion **passed** with a clear majority in favor, none opposed and one abstaining.

4. New Track: Masters of Public Policy

The Chair explained that the proposal would essentially allow a student without a master's degree (MS) to earn one during the process of successfully fulfilling the requirements to earn a PhD. He noted that there is a rule in the Graduate School that automatically allows for a student to receive an MS en passant to a PhD if programs so chose, so long as the two degrees are in the same program. For the current agenda item, however, the degrees were indeed similar but not in the same program. He invited the director of graduate studies in the Martin School of Public Policy & Administration, Dwight Denison, to offer any additional comments.

Guest Denison noted that the degree would be a master's degree in public policy, but did not have additional comments. The Chair said that the SC approved the new track with a positive recommendation and an effective date of fall 2007 – there were students already in the program that could benefit from the change.

There being no questions, a **vote** was taken on the **motion** to approve the proposal to allow a student to receive a master's degree after fulfilling all other requirements for the master's degree in public policy (MPP) to substitute their

doctoral Qualifying Exam for the final master's exam and thereby receive an MPP. The motion **passed** with a clear majority in favor, none opposed, and one abstaining.

5. [Kentucky Blood Center Presentation](#)

The Chair invited Jack Hillard, Kentucky Blood Center's Director of Development to offer some thoughts on the Big Blue Crush. Afterwards, the Chair urged senators to donate blood.

The Chair noted that there was one additional curricular item on the agenda – he said he would be willing to entertain a motion to reorder the agenda so that the changes to *Senate Rules 5.3.1.1* (“Repeat Option”) could be addressed prior to the Robinson Forest motion. Cibull **moved** thusly. Grossman **seconded**. The motion **passed** unanimously.

7. [Proposed Change to Senate Rules 5.3.1.1 \(“Repeat Option”\)](#)

The Chair stated that the item was one of three campuswide proposals from the College of Arts and Sciences. All three had been approved, but the other two had a few modifications which required that they be reviewed by the Senate's Rules and Elections Committee prior to Senate review.

The Chair said that the proposal would change the method by which a student requested to use the repeat option. He added that Adrienne McMahan, Assistant Dean of Undergraduate Affairs, was present to answer questions.

In response to a question from Hulse about the rationale for requiring approval by the student's advisor, Guest McMahan explained that it was to ensure that the student made the best possible decision and not waste the repeat option. She said the original proposal did not include any involvement with an advisor prior to requesting the repeat option from the Office of the Registrar. Sottile added that he was aware of a recent situation in which a student used a repeat option for a remedial course – he spoke in favor of requiring some type of formal advice to the student.

Hulse noted that as currently written an advisor could deny a student their right to a repeat option. He suggested that the language be revised to reflect a consultation with an advisor, not approval by the advisor. He offered an **amendment** that the language be changed to “shall consult with” instead of “have the approval of.” Arnold **seconded**.

In response to Yates, Associate Registrar Jacquie Hager (Guest) said that until SAP was to the point that a repeat option could be done electronically, the Office of the Registrar would require some type of documentation from the advisor stating that the student consulted with the advisor. In response to Banks, she added that it would have to be in writing. The Chair opined that once SAP could

accept such requests, the need for a written note would cease and electronic functionality would be used.

Grossman **offered a friendly amendment** to change¹ the already modified [by the SC] language from “A student exercising the repeat option ~~must have the approval of~~ shall consult with the student’s advisor....” to “A student exercising the repeat option ~~must have the approval of~~ shall consult with consult the student’s advisor....” Hulse and Arnold **accepted**.

Deem asked a procedural question about how to notify the Office of the Registrar that a student had consulted with her. Hager replied that a form would be developed.

Cibull asked for clarification, primarily because his college [Medicine] did not do undergraduate advising. He wondered if students needed a level of guidance that required approval by the advisor or if it should be the student’s decision alone, based on advisor guidance. Chappell opined that students should have the discretion to exercise their right for a repeat option and that inserting advisor’s approval would be micro-managing. Hertog said that a number of premajor students in his college [Communications and Information Studies] would not know who their advisor was, since an advisor was not assigned until entry into the program. Grossman stated that if a student did not know who their advisor was, it would be opportunity to find that out, since every student should know their advisor.

There being no further discussion on the amended amendment, a **vote** was taken on the motion to change the language of the proposal to “A student exercising the repeat option ~~must have the approval of~~ shall consult with consult the student’s advisor....” The motion **passed** with 54 in favor, seven opposed and four abstaining.

There being no further discussion on the main motion, a **vote** was taken to change the language in *Senate Rules 5.3.1.1* to no longer require the dean’s approval and to require consultation with the advisor: “~~A student exercising the repeat option must notify in writing the dean of the college in which the student is enrolled. A student exercising the repeat option must have the approval of~~ shall consult with consult the student’s advisor and must notify the Office of the Registrar.” The motion **passed** with a clear majority in favor and five opposed.

6. [Proposed Robinson Forest Motion](#)

The Chair gave an overview of the October Senate discussion on Robinson Forest (RF). He said that a misunderstanding occurred when Arnold said she would be willing to make a particular motion. The Chair understood that to mean that she was not yet ready to do so, therefore he recognized the next senator wishing to speak. As a result of Arnold not making a motion as she had intended,

¹ Strikethrough indicates deleted text and underlining denotes added text.

the SC decided it would be reasonable to allow some time during the November Senate meeting during which senators could discuss motions that were submitted in advance, in writing.

The Chair stated that in the future, it would be best to use specific, direct language and avoid using “would” when making a motion. He added that just because a motion was moved and seconded, it was not officially in front of the body until the Chair recognizes it. He said that at any time during any meeting, it would be acceptable to query the Chair as to whether or not a motion was currently before the assembly.

Moving on to the SC’s deliberative process, the Chair explained that the SC solicited motions from senators and received two. Although Arnold submitted the motion, it would still need to be moved during the meeting. The Chair mentioned that he characterized the motion as a sense of the Senate so that the Senate would not overstep its bounds of responsibility, since *SR 1.2.1* explicitly defined the functions of the Senate, which did not include any administrative or managerial input.

Discussion would only be allowed on the two motions received in advance, and any amendments that drastically change the intent of the motion would not be allowed. The Chair said that he would allow discussion strictly on the motion at hand only and that any statements regarding logging itself would not be appropriate or allowed.

Senator Smith (also dean, College of Agriculture) submitted a response to the motion in writing because he could not attend the Senate meeting. The response from Dean Smith was included in the handout and the Chair said it was his understanding that it would also be read into the minutes by Senator Barnes, a member of the Department of Forestry.

Cibull made a parliamentary inquiry. He asked if the two-part motion was separable. After a brief discussion involving the Parliamentarian, it was determined that one part of the motion could be dropped via an amendment. In response to Hayes, the Chair said that the matter would be concluded by the end of the day’s meeting. Robert’s Rules of Order stated that a motion voted on could not be brought back to the body unless there was an intervening matter to change the issue. The Chair said he would first recognize Arnold if she was willing to move the motion.

Arnold **moved** the following:

The University Senate recommends that the University of Kentucky Board of Trustees: 1. Develop a set of guidelines regarding undeveloped lands owned or obtained by the university that include oversight and decision-making policies for the use of these lands. These policies should evaluate the conservation value of the land,

specific legal requirements of each property and the research initiatives proposed, with ultimate acknowledgement of the educational, conservation and ecological resources of each property, as it relates to the long-term mission of the University of Kentucky; and 2. Place a moratorium on the logging of Robinson Forest until the guidelines for use of undeveloped lands owned by the University are established, and applied to Robinson Forest.

Lesnaw **seconded**. Arnold said that her motion was more about undeveloped lands as a whole that were owned by UK, not necessarily about RF. She opined that a lack of clear guidelines for oversight was a weakness of many universities. Additionally, she believed that the logging in RF had previously been approved by the Board of Trustees (BoT), so additional discussion on that issue was not necessary.

Barnes said that the statement from Dean Smith had been given to him just that morning, which was also when he first learned about it. He said that his comments were his own and unrelated to Dean Smith's statement. Barnes said that he concurred with Arnold's statement that the logging in RF was a separate issue from the motion on land conservation guidelines. He said that the Department of Forestry (Forestry) had already debated the issue of logging in RF at length. While Forestry overall did not object to the first part of the motion, the second part of the motion was very problematic and would involve millions of dollars and large amounts of time.

Cibull **moved** to amend the motion by deleting the second part of the motion. McNeill **seconded**. Lesnaw spoke against the amendment, saying that in her opinion, Dean Smith's comments fully supported the need for land-care guidelines and that it would be very appropriate to re-review the logging in RF once such guidelines were in place.

Grossman made a parliamentary inquiry. He wondered if the second portion of the amendment were deleted, could it be raised separately? The Chair stated it could not be and the Parliamentarian added that dropping the second portion was equivalent to defeating it.

After a question by Yates, who wished to separate the two sections but not drop the second portion, the Parliamentarian ruled that there could be an amendment to the amendment. Cibull noted that was what he had intended and **withdrew his amendment**. Yanarella noted that during SC deliberations, the SC misunderstood Arnold's intent – the SC believed the plan for land-care guidelines was intended to be applicable to logging in RF. In light of Arnold's explicit statement earlier in that she did not intend it to apply to RF, it would be best to separate the two. Arnold concurred with Yanarella's statement and that it was intended to be applied to future events, not the current issue of logging in RF.

Yates **moved** that the Senate vote separately on the motion's first and second parts. Cibull **seconded**. The Chair asked if any SC members wished to comment. Yanarella said that his previous comments sufficed for his input. Finkel opined that it was a reasonable motion – the intent of the SC was not to suppress discussion on either portion.

There being no further discussion on the **motion** to separate the motion into two parts, a **vote** was taken. The motion **passed** with a clear majority in favor, one opposed and one abstaining. The Chair then said he needed a senator to move the first part of the motion.

Arnold **moved** the following:

The University Senate recommends that the University of Kentucky Board of Trustees develop a set of guidelines regarding undeveloped lands owned or obtained by the university that include oversight and decision-making policies for the use of these lands. These policies should evaluate the conservation value of the land, specific legal requirements of each property and the research initiatives proposed, with ultimate acknowledgement of the educational, conservation and ecological resources of each property, as it relates to the long-term mission of the University of Kentucky.

Cibull **seconded**. Barnes said that he understood Dean Smith's concern that the language about undeveloped lands was prejudicial. The College of Agriculture typically held and managed far more land than other colleges. Barnes opined that UK had done a poor job of managing all its lands, not just those that were undeveloped; he pointed to the planting of invasive, exotic species on the main campus.

Barnes **amended** the motion to remove "undeveloped." Newman **seconded**. There being no discussion on the amendment, a **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with a clear majority in favor, five opposed and four abstaining.

Grossman expressed his support for the motion, but added that sometimes people in positions of decision-making authority did not include a substantially wide group of people in the decision-making activities.

Grossman **moved** to add the following sentence to the motion between the first and second existing sentences:

The people who decide the policies and are responsible for implementing the policies should include as wide a group of stakeholders as is reasonably possible.

Yates **seconded**.

Chappell expressed a desire to comment on the language suggesting that the BoT was the appropriate body to create such guidelines. The Chair noted that it was a valid comment, but that discussion at the present time had to deal with Grossman's amendment.

Thelin opined that the proposed amendment was gratuitous, since there were a number of guidelines at UK that governed how the BoT acted. He said that the more people added to such a group, the better the chance of derailing the project before it began. Lesnaw supported Thelin's statement. Eldred spoke against Thelin's statement, saying that Grossman's amendment would help prevent assuming or under-defining the stakeholders. She thought, however, that the term "stakeholders" was too vague.

The Chair reminded senators of the time and noted that once the meeting was adjourned, the matter would be closed for the foreseeable future.

Hallman said that her primary concern was that the guidelines and those who determine them be sensitive to the environment. She said that would allay many fears on campus. Calvert said that the BoT ultimately made all decisions regarding lands owned by UK and would continue to make such decisions regardless of "stakeholders."

D. Williams said that with respect to Grossman's amendment, it was arrogant to assume that faculty members in Forestry were not environmentally sensitive. He found it insulting to those faculty, though he was not a member of that department. If such a motion were passed, it should also require that all activities in all colleges should be micromanaged.

Atwood wondered if the Senate could have more involvement as a guardian of stakeholders. Wood asked if Grossman would consider a friendly amendment to include language that referred to "members of the university community." Grossman thought that language similar to "concerned members of the university community" could be acceptable, although he expressed a desire to keep "stakeholders."

The Chair asked senators to remain so that a quorum could be kept. There being no further discussion on the amendment, a **vote** was taken on the **motion** to add the following sentence to the motion, between the first and second existing sentences:

The people who decide the policies and are responsible for implementing the policies should include as wide a group of stakeholders as is reasonably possible.

The motion **failed** with 28 opposed, 20 senators in favor and four abstaining.

Anderson **called the question**. The Chair noted that a two-thirds majority of those present was required. A **vote** was taken and the motion to call the question passed with a clear majority in favor, three against and two abstaining.

A **vote** was then taken on the motion (with “undeveloped” removed):

The University Senate recommends that the University of Kentucky Board of Trustees develop a set of guidelines regarding lands owned or obtained by the university that include oversight and decision-making policies for the use of these lands. These policies should evaluate the conservation value of the land, specific legal requirements of each property and the research initiatives proposed, with ultimate acknowledgement of the educational, conservation and ecological resources of each property, as it relates to the long-term mission of the University of Kentucky.

The motion **passed** with 39 in favor, eight opposed and four abstaining.

Arnold reiterated that the motion was in no way intended to be offensive to Forestry personnel. The Chair asked Lesnaw if she wished to move the other portion of the original motion.

Lesnaw **moved** that the University Senate recommend that the University of Kentucky Board of Trustees place a moratorium on the logging of Robinson Forest until the guidelines for use of undeveloped lands owned by the University are established, and applied to Robinson Forest. Steiner **seconded**.

Cibull stated that the October Senate discussion on RF and the issue of experimental logging in RF illustrated to him that the proposal had been vetted through appropriate channels, had been peer-reviewed and was approved by the BoT using existing guidelines. He said it was dangerous for the Senate to second-guess research on the floor of the Senate; it could lead to similar debates regarding controversial studies in the College of Medicine or in any other college. He spoke against the motion.

Williams stated that the passing of the first motion would likely cause problems and that if the second motion passed, the Senate should draw up guidelines for every laboratory, since RF was a laboratory as well. Remer opined that the motion was not so much about laboratory management or about attacking Forestry, but rather about calling attention to the BoT and their processes. He said he did not know if the BoT had a process by which to approve such activities, nor if such a process was followed.

Hayes agreed with Cibull. She said that stopping the proposed experimentation already in place in RF was not appropriate. Houtz also supported Cibull’s comments. He said that the motion that just passed opened up the possibility that someone could argue that the research farm on south Nicholasville Road was

not being developed in a horticultural and sustainable way. He supported Dean Smith's comment that the motion's language was ambiguous as to how it would apply to research areas in various colleges that were located across the state.

Yanarella stated that as faculty trustee, he had requested that the BoT chair have the opportunity to make a site visit to RF and that there be a moratorium on logging until after the site visit. He said that to the best of his knowledge, the moratorium was still in place. He added that as a faculty trustee, he was looking to the Senate for advice and guidance regarding how the BoT should proceed. The Chair noted that the time was nearing 5 pm.

Garrity said that he had read the "green paper" and found that there were aspects to the proposed logging that were highlighted and problematic for him. He said that while the experiment was probably well-designed, the end result would still be a very large portion of the pristine RF being torn up. He said he supported the motion to place a moratorium on logging in RF.

Provost Subbaswamy said he was taking the extraordinary step of urging senators to vote against the motion. He said assumptions were being made regarding the integrity and intent of Forestry. He wondered if comments about pristine forests were well informed, and if those using such terms actually knew what a pristine forest was. He wondered if those with questions had actually spoken with Forestry senators. The Provost said that assumptions were being made without needed knowledge. He ended by stating that it would be pernicious and dangerous to place a moratorium on a peer-reviewed experiment that had been planned for years. He urged fellow senators to vote against the motion.

Calvert **called the question**. Finkel **seconded**. A **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with more than two-thirds in favor. Anderson requested that the hands raised for the vote be recounted; she questioned if two-thirds actually were in favor of calling the question.

The Chair asked senators to vote again. The motion to stop debate **passed** with 38 in favor, 11 opposed and three abstaining.

A **vote** was then taken on the **motion** that the University Senate recommend that the University of Kentucky Board of Trustees place a moratorium on the logging of Robinson Forest until the guidelines for use of undeveloped lands owned by the University are established, and applied to Robinson Forest. The motion **failed** with eight in favor, 38 against and four abstaining.

The meeting was adjourned at 5:02 pm.

Respectfully submitted by² Kaveh A. Tagavi,

² Senate Secretary Randall was unable to attend the Senate meeting. Therefore, Senate Council Chair Tagavi submitted the minutes from the meeting.

Senate Council Chair

Absences: Adams, Anderson*, Anyaegbunam, Barbee, Bartilow, Bernard, Bhatt, Bhavsar, Biagi*, Blackwell*, Blades, Bollinger*, Brown, Bush*, Butler, Cammers, Cantagallo*, Cheng, Cibulka, Crofford, DeSimone, Diedrichs*, El-Ghannam, English*, Evans, Fox, Frost, Gonzalez, Gottlob*, Hardesty*, Hazard*, Heller, Hoffman, Hopenhayn, Jackson, Karpf, S. Kim*, Y. Kim, Kirschling*, Kovash*, Lee*, Lester, Lillich, Lorch*, Luhan, Martin, Mattingly*, McCormick, Mehra*, Michael*, Mobley, Moliterno*, Nardolillo*, Nieman*, Parrish, Parrot, Patwardhan, Pauly, Perman, Phelps, Randall, Ray*, Roberts*, Santhanam*, Shay, Smart, Smith*, Storm, Sudharshan, Telling, Terrell*, Todd, Tracy*, Turner, Vasconez, Vestal, G. Williams, Wiseman, Witt, Woodruff*, Wyatt.

Prepared by Sheila Brothers on December 5, 2007.

* Denotes an absence explained prior to the meeting.