

University Senate  
October 10, 2016

The University Senate met in regular session at 3 pm on Monday, October 10, 2016 in the Athletics Association Auditorium of W. T. Young Library. 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 Katherine McCormick (ED) called the University Senate (Senate) meeting to order at 3:06.

The Chair explained that the Senate follows Robert's Rules of Order and reminded senators to be civil to one another and to guests. She said that *Senate Rules 1.2.3* ("Meetings") requires that minutes, agenda, and supporting documentation be sent to senators six days in advance, but not all items were available on Tuesday. Therefore, Senate needed to waive *Senate Rules (SR) 1.2.3* to allow the Senate to consider the agenda, etc. because the entire agenda was not sent out six days in advance.

Wood **moved** to waive *SR 1.2.3* to allow consideration of the agenda, etc. for October 10, 2016 and Blonder **seconded**. The motion **passed** in a show of hands with a vast majority in favor and two opposed.

#### 1. Minutes from September 12, 2016 and Announcements

The Chair said that a few changes to the minutes were received. There being **no objections**, the minutes from September 12, 2016 were **approved** as amended **by unanimous consent**.

The Chair had one announcement. The Senate Council (SC) received a request to add Title IX-related language to syllabi. The information has already been uploaded to the Senate's syllabus page and is available as an optional component for faculty to cut and paste into course syllabi.

#### 2. Officer and Other Reports

##### a. Chair

The Chair reported on a variety of SC-related activities.

- The SC sent forward nominees for the external review committee for Libraries and Health Sciences.
- The SC identified a small group of faculty to serve on an ad hoc committee to review *Administrative Regulations 6:2* ("Policy and Procedures for Addressing and Resolving Allegations of Sexual Assault, Stalking, Dating Violence, and Domestic Violence"). That regulation was promulgated without soliciting faculty (or staff or student) input. The intent is for the ad hoc Committee to review and report back by end of semester to SC and also perhaps to Senate.

##### b. Vice Chair

There was no report from Vice Chair Bailey (AG).

##### c. Parliamentarian

There was no report from Parliamentarian Seago (LI). The Chair offered a few comments about Robert's Rules of Order (Newly Revised) and expressed her gratitude to Seago for Seago's continued help and support.

##### d. Trustee

Faculty trustees Grossman (AS) and Blonder (ME) gave a brief report, noting that there had not been a Board of Trustees meeting since the Senate last met in September.

The Chair acknowledged the chair of the Staff Senate, Troy Martin (administrative staff officer, Libraries), who was present for the day's meeting.

### 3. Old Business

#### a. Committee Reports

Yost began by saying that he was challenged after the last Senate meeting as perhaps being cantankerous and confrontational with a faculty colleague. He apologized for any perceptions of that nature and noted that the Senate was the place for open dialogue. Tagavi (EN) commented that Yost was very much a gentleman and that it was important for committee chairs to simply present proposals, not advocate for them.

#### i. Senate's Admissions and Academic Standards Committee (SAASC) – Scott Yost, Chair

##### 1. Proposed Changes to Senate Rules 4.2.2.1 ("Admission to College of Nursing")

Yost explained the proposal. The **motion** from the SAASC was a recommendation that the Senate approve the revision to *Senate Rules (SR) 4.2.2.1* ("Admission to College of Nursing"). 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 84 in favor and one abstaining.

##### 2. Proposed Changes to Senate Rules 4.2.3.3 ("College of Medicine")

Yost explained the proposal. The **motion** from the SAASC was a recommendation that the Senate approve the revisions to *SR 4.2.3.3* ("College of Medicine"). Because the motion came from committee, no **second** was required. Tagavi (EN) wondered aloud if the proposed changes to Medicine's admissions policies meant that subsequent revisions could be done by a department chair, or if all future changes would need to come to the Senate. Guest Chris Feddock (ME/Internal Medicine, assistant dean for medical education) explained that requirements will be listed in the University Bulletin and would be changed only upon the approval of the College of Medicine faculty. On behalf of the SAASC, Yost accepted as a friendly amendment the addition of "as approved by the College of Medicine faculty" to the proposal to clearly indicate that admissions changes were approved by Medicine's faculty.

There being no further discussion, a **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with 76 in favor and five abstained.

#### b. Proposed Changes to Administrative Regulations 2:10 ("Voluntary Series Faculty")

Guests Kevin Pearce (ME/Family and Community Medicine) explained the proposed revisions to *Administrative Regulations 2:10* and was assisted by Guests Carlos Marin (Medicine, assistant dean of community and cultural engagement) and Marcy Deaton (associate legal counsel). There were a couple questions from senators. The Chair reported that the motion came from the SC and was a recommendation that the Senate endorse the revisions to *AR 2:10* ("Voluntary Series Faculty"). Because the motion came from committee, no **second** was required. A **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with 79 in favor, two opposed, and four abstained.

#### c. Candidates for Degrees

##### i. Honorary Degree Nominee for December 2016 - Interim Graduate School Dean Brian Jackson

The Chair invited Graduate School Dean Brian Jackson to offer an informational report on the two proposed honorary degrees.

The Chair did not call for a vote because the SC approved the honorary degrees on behalf of Senate at the SC meeting on August 29. There was some confusion among senators about the SC's approval on behalf of Senate. The Chair reiterated during the discussion that the SC had already approved the honorary degree nominees.

Cross (CI) **moved** that the Senate return to the issue and vote on the honorary degrees. Kennedy **seconded**. Grossman (AS) commented that it was appropriate for SC to act on behalf of Senate in cases where time is pressing, particularly when the issue has to be addressed prior to the next Senate meeting. The SC's actions have to be reported to Senate, but the SC's actions regarding the honorary degree nominees was proper. Wood (AS) agreed with Grossman. Ms. Brothers explained that the Chair announced in September that the SC had approved the honorary degree nominees on behalf of the Senate. There was an informational presentation scheduled for senators at the September meeting so senators would be aware of the nominees, but Senate ran out of time so the informational presentation was necessarily postponed until October. A **vote** was taken and the motion to hold a vote on the honorary degree candidates **passed** with 96 in favor, 36 opposed, and seven abstained.

Cross (CI) **moved** to approve the honorary degree nomination for Don Ball and Tagavi (EN) **seconded**. A **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** in a show of hands with a vast majority in favor and two opposed.

Cross (CI) **moved** to approve the honorary degree nomination for Mira Ball and Kennedy (emeritus faculty representative) **seconded**. A **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** in a show of hands with a vast majority in favor, one opposed, and one abstained.

#### 4. Committee Reports

##### a. Senate's Academic Organization and Structure Committee (SAOSC) – Ernie Bailey, Chair

##### i. Proposed New John. H. Schnatter Institute for the Study of Free Enterprise

Bailey (AG), chair of the Senate's Academic Organization and Structure Committee (SAOSC), explained the proposal for the new John. H. Schnatter Institute for the Study of Free Enterprise (Schnatter Institute). He described the SAOSC's deliberations, their interactions with Gatton College of Business and Economics Dean David Blackwell and Ernie Yanarella (AS/Political Science, department chair) who offered comments for and against the proposal, respectively, at an SAOSC meeting and at the Senate Council (SC) meeting when the SC discussed it. Bailey asked if there were any questions about the SAOSC's processes. Grossman (AS) commented that the motion on the slide had an erroneous, unnecessary period; Bailey accepted that change as a friendly amendment.

The Chair invited Guest Ernie Yanarella (AS/Political Science, department chair) to offer some comments. Yanarella spoke for about 10 minutes and he encouraged senators to review the hard copy of his presentation for additional details and information. Yanarella's major concerns were as follows:

- There is an overall increasing corporatization of universities and the mission of the Koch Foundation's support of universities was not entirely an academic enterprise.
- Funding by the Schnatter and Koch Foundation would put pressure on the university to make hiring and programmatic decisions that were inconsistent with institutional autonomy.

- The connection to the Koch brothers apparatus and their legislative and lobbying activities is deleterious to American democracy and could have a similar effect on the individual academic freedoms of faculty members in the Gatton College of Business and Economics (Gatton College).
- The Koch brothers' integrated network is connected to the Schnatter Institute and linkages between Koch and Schnatter's national- and state-level strategies are now being forged at other levels. Faculty must be hired based on their academic qualifications, not on their willingness to be affiliated with the Schnatter Institute.
- The real threat to academic freedom is encapsulated in the mission statement that restricts research to the positive aspects of capitalism and does not allow for a critical focus on capitalism and its alternatives. The narrow framing and normative model will effectively preclude a broader research view unless the Schnatter Institute wishes to risk its funding being pulled by the donor.

Yanarella (AS) said that the bottom line for him is that the infusion of the donor's money into the University with an intent to remold the campus structure cannot be separated from the darker national campaign by Schnatter and Koch to use dark money to heavily impact the United States' elections and administrative policies. The design, control, and agenda of the Schnatter Institute is unworthy of the University's highest academic ideals and should be voted down.

Bailey (AG) commented that it was the responsibility of the SAOSC to investigate the integrity of the program so he thought it would be useful to comment on a couple of Yanarella's points. In reference to contracts at other universities that gave foundations a voice in the hiring of faculty, Bailey said the SAOSC looked very carefully at the UK contract and the donors have no authority over the hiring of faculty. After a normal recruitment, faculty will be hired into an existing department in the Gatton College, although the Schnatter Institute director will be included as a member of the search committee. Bailey said that the biggest issue the SAOSC had was the potential for undue influence into academic freedom due to the donated funds and how insecure UK might be if the funds were pulled by the donor or if the University felt the need to return the money. Regarding the types of work that the Schnatter Institute will engage in, after discussions with faculty and Dean Blackwell, the SAOSC was satisfied that it will not be a new type of faculty-related activity.

The Chair then invited Dean David Blackwell (BE) to offer some comments. Blackwell also spoke for about 10 minute; his major points were as follows.

- The Schnatter Institute will not create, house, or deliver any degree programs; it will not create new courses; and it will not hire or house any faculty. The Schnatter Institute will exist to promote the teaching and research of faculty on the effect of capitalism on society and branding of activities; it will not resemble an academic department or a degree program.
- The study of free enterprise is not narrow, rather it applies to virtually every field of economics, where researchers put a strong emphasis on understanding how markets work and how well models characterize them. Economic research often considers how government interacts with markets and its effect on income; research output that utilizes this approach is reviewed by the standard peer review process in the economics profession. Faculty will be rewarded for publishing in elite and excellent journals that have significant impact on the field; faculty in the

Gatton College have been conducting research on free enterprise in various ways for well over 30 years.

- The proposal for the Schnatter Institute was carefully vetted and endorsed by Gatton faculty, departmental faculty, the faculty council, and Gatton's advisory council. Dean Blackwell endorsed the proposal and Provost Tim Tracy did, too; both the Dean and Provost will provide funds to offset shortages if the charitable donation is not continuous. The donor agreement and other such documents have been available for everyone to review and there are significant and sufficient protections of academic freedom and integrity.

Dean Blackwell (BE) said that, in conclusion, the charitable grant donation was similar to other such donations – documentation to execute grant activities is required, as well as reporting to the grant's donors. The source of funds for the charitable grant should not be treated differently from other charitable agreements; other types of donations can disappear for any number of reasons. The Dean said that the University will be on a slippery slope if it begins to evaluate the Schnatter Institute differently than other centers and institutes only because of the donor's political viewpoints.

Visona (FA) said that she was involved with UK's Confucius Institute (UKCI) and said that the funding and governance model of that unit could be a good model for the Schnatter Institute; UKCI offers events and other academic opportunities supported by funding received by the government of China. The director of UKCI has subjected the UKCI to stronger University oversight than other, comparable institutes across the country have at their institutions. She noted that the name of the unit ("John. H. Schnatter Institute for the Study of Free Enterprise") framed debate narrowly through the viewpoint of free enterprise without considering other types of enterprises.

Bailey (AG) commented that the Confucius Institute was different as it was an administrative unit; the Schnatter Institute would be a multidisciplinary research center with faculty oversight. Yanarella (AS) commented that he was also involved with the Confucius Institute. The University set up a separate administrative body to supplement the work and direction of the Confucius Institute to ensure a well-rounded viewpoint. In addition to the many good offerings, such as culture and art and language, it was clearly an instrument of Chinese foreign policy. He noted the Schnatter Institute's emphasis on positive features of capitalism and said the proliferation of university institutes that are guided by ideological code words will preclude the type of research into the negative effects of free enterprise that should also be conducted.

Dean Blackwell (BE) responded that the name of the institute intentionally includes the phrase "study of" so as not to convey advocacy on one side or another. The researchers affiliated with the Schnatter Institute will ask questions about the impact of free enterprise on society; those answers are not predetermined. As long as faculty are asking good questions and doing rigorous work that is published in respected journals, that is fine. Grossman (AS) commented that research in his department [Chemistry] and in pharmacy focuses on developing new drugs to treat human ailments; it does not necessarily mean that research will always have a positive view on whatever drug it is evaluating. Grossman referred to recent news articles about controversy over a Koch-funded institute at Western Carolina University (WCU) – that institution initially signed an agreement but then after faculty objected, leadership went back to the foundation and negotiated the contract, which a majority of faculty approved. That university ended up where UK already is, although UK's administration already consulted with faculty. He noted that even the activist group "UnKoch Our Campuses" did not fault the final WCU agreement, except for the clause that allows withdrawal of funds with 30 days' notice.

Fiedler (AS) opined that there was a fundamental contradiction between the language of the mission statement in the charitable grant agreement and the language of the academic proposal for the Schnatter Institute. Fiedler stated that his concern was previously touched on by Yanarella – that the mission embedded in the charitable grant agreement pertained to the discovery and understanding of aspects of free enterprise that promote the well-being of society. There was no mention of aspects that undermine the well-being of society. He said he was categorically opposed to the agreement, although it was interesting that the language of the proposal was more in keeping with an open and objective approach to all aspects of the impact of free enterprise on society. Fiedler asserted there was plenty of evidence that free enterprise has both positive and negative impacts on society. He said that the agreements with the Koch brothers and with Schnatter do not include the latter possibility and until it did, he would not support the proposed new Schnatter Institute. Bailey (AG) commented that the contract was not part of the day's discussion – the proposal itself was up for review. Fiedler replied that it was not possible to discuss the proposal for the Schnatter Institute without also discussing the language in the charitable grant agreement.

Kearney (ME) said that he had a basic question to pose, not an opinion. What gift of similar magnitude [\$10 million] does not come with strings of any kind? If academic freedom can be assured, then donors are free to direct donation-supported activities in some way; donors give to their area of interest.

Butler (GS) explained the type of work that he engages in (econometrics) and said he is happy to participate in all types of research regardless of a political perspective. He said Dean Blackwell was convincing in his comments about preserving academic freedom. Nevertheless, he did not trust the Schnatter Institute and intended to vote against it. Wood (AS) said that her concerns about the Schnatter Institute did not pertain to the political leanings of the Koch brothers but rather were related to the charitable donation agreement that UK already signed. Wood addressed two particular issues of concern about that agreement, which was signed in December 2015. The first was that any change in the director has to be reported to the donors and the second issue was that funding could be terminated on just 30 days' notice. Wood stated that even though there have been assurances that UK can come up with the money necessary to fill the hole left if monies were withdrawn, it would have to come from someplace and \$10 million is a lot of money; she expressed concern about the possibility that replacing funds withdrawn by the donor under the 30-day clause could be in jeopardy if that was not the highest academic priority at the time – the Provost determines academic priorities. She said she was very concerned about the charitable grant agreement – it says that the Schnatter Institute will be for the benefit of UK and for the Koch foundation. Bailey (AG) noted that the SAOSC was very concerned about undue influence and asked Dean Blackwell what he would consider to be “undue influence.” Bailey said that Blackwell responded that any influence would be considered undue influence. Bailey also noted that the SAOSC was impressed that Dean Blackwell intended to support the Schnatter Institute even if funding was pulled by the donor.

Dean Blackwell offered a few explanations. Regarding informing the donor if the director of the Schnatter Institute changed, he said he had an example in another center in BE, the Von Allmen Center for Entrepreneurship. When the director of that center recently changed, before the formal appointment Dean Blackwell called both agencies that support that center to inform them of the change, which he characterized as a standard procedure. He added that he adjusted the Schnatter Institute proposal slightly based on request from a senator to clarify the process through which the center director is named, specifically that the director has to be approved by UK's Board of Trustees. Dean Blackwell went on to explain that the \$10 million grant is for the life of the entire grant and a lot of

that money will go to support external research grants, enrichment activities, and a speaker series; a relatively small portion will support faculty, approximately \$1 million. He said the Gatton College could absorb \$1 million in faculty costs if for some reason funds were pulled. Regarding the 30-day notice to pull funding, Dean Blackwell said he did a little research and found that the Koch brothers have never pulled funding from one of these types of institutes. Secondly, he said that he asked for an explanation of the possible rationales for the funding being pulled and was told that the funding would be pulled if UK loses its tax exempt status or if the donations were used for non-Schnatter Institute related matters. Removal of funding is not tied in any way to answers to questions that researchers find who are affiliated with the institute. Researchers associated with the Schnatter Institute who accept funding need to agree to attempt to answer some sort of question that is reflected in the Schnatter Institute's mission.

Blonder (ME) said that she echoed the concerns of Fiedler and Wood. She said there were several things in the grant agreement that concerned her. She pointed out that 22% of the faculty in the Gatton College voted against the proposed new Schnatter Institute, as did almost half of the Department of Economics. Because faculty in opposition to the new Schnatter Institute did not submit letters indicating why they voted against the proposal, there was no way to know why they were against it. Blonder noted that at a past discussion, the department chair in Economics asserted that some faculty were concerned about reputation. As Fiedler pointed out, Blonder reiterated that the charitable donation agreement was of critical importance. The mission of the proposed new Schnatter Institute ("aspects of free enterprise that promote the well-being of society") already showed the slant of the Schnatter Institute. The donor agreement states that the funds donated to the University will be used towards advancing the mission of the Schnatter Institute, which is "the well-being of society." Next, the charitable grant agreement includes a requirement that UK submit an annual written grant to receive grant funds. Finally, there is a 30-day pull-out clause through which the Schnatter Institute can pull all funds with just 30 days' notice. Blonder acknowledged that the donor's agreement with UK was better than other agreements between the donor and other universities, but that did not change the fact that the Schnatter Institute's mission is restricted to well-being and there remains a 30-day pull out clause. Blonder added that while her concerns could describe a worst-case scenario, it was still a possible scenario. She said she planned to again vote in favor of the academic content but vote against endorsement based on non-academic matters.

Dean Blackwell said that he concurred with Grossman's analogy about the mission statement – the attempt is to try to advance society through a better understanding of free enterprise, both good and bad aspects. As long as researchers ask questions with high academic integrity, he thinks the mission will be fulfilled in the eyes of the donors. He added that it was routine to give donors a list of activities supported by donations.

Noting the lateness of the hour, the Chair asked senators if anyone had a new comment to offer. Brown (AG) said he was in favor of the Schnatter Institute regarding its academic merit. The second vote, on non-academic merit was an interesting question but Brown noted that the first motion included a review half-way through the grant to address concerns about academic freedom. Therefore, he intended to vote in favor of the endorsement motion, too. Childs (BE) said Dean Blackwell asked to meet with faculty this past fall to let them know the donation was in the works. It was clear to Childs that Dean Blackwell wanted input from faculty on various points of consideration; if the agreement had been one that warranted concerns about academic freedom, it would have been shot down quickly. As a member of the Department of Finance, Childs said that there is a long history of promoting academic freedom in the department and the college – the matter is one of science, not politics. He said the

donors would not have any input on who gets hired and the hiring process would remain the same as it always was, as would the evaluation process. Childs added that he doubted the Koch brothers were able to influence how top journals would evaluate research.

Kennedy (emeritus faculty senator, AS) asked Dean Blackwell to explain how an ad for a faculty member with an appointment in the Schnatter Institute would be crafted. Dean Blackwell (BE) replied that a faculty member would be hired into academic departments using normal channels, along with an indication that the position would be affiliated with the Schnatter Institute. Ederington (BE) said by way of background that mainstream economics research was not ideologically based. He offered an anecdote – the day's Nobel Prize winner in economics did research in the area of chief executive officer (CEO) theory and contract theory, but the Nobel Prize winner was unwilling to answer a question about whether or not a certain level of pay for a particular CEO was appropriate or not – advocacy is different from academics. Ederington said that the primary concerns in the Department of Economics were first reputational [if the gift was accepted], and then pertained to how narrowly the vision will be interpreted. He said the Department of Economics hires faculty who are currently active in research and as long as research-active faculty members are hired who fit the needs of the Department, many concerns will be allayed. Ederington added that Dean Blackwell has been consistent in stating that he wants the Department to do just that with the faculty hires.'

The Chair said she would allow discussion to continue for another five minutes. Cheng (EN) asked for some clarification – if a faculty member publishes and has their affiliation with the Koch brothers included in the publication, would that help publish the paper or would it make publication harder? Would a graduate student affiliated with the Schnatter Institute find it easier or harder to find a job? Dean Blackwell (BE) said that in business schools and economics departments it was common to hire faculty who were former graduate students who received institute-based funding. He said it was expected that in working papers and publications, donor monies would be acknowledged. Given that the Gatton College expects its faculty and graduate students to follow the usual standards for excellence in research, at worst an affiliation with the Schnatter Institute would be neutral or it could be positive, presuming the faculty and graduate students achieve what they are supposed to achieve as faculty and as graduate students. College of Arts and Sciences Dean Mark Kornbluh (AS) noted that the College of Arts and Sciences would be bringing to Senate in the near future a proposal for a center for equality and social justice – he acknowledged that that sort of center could be described as having an ideological base but that faculty understand how to work in those types of diverse centers.

Peffer (BE) said he was not interested in watching the college be brought down because that would of course hurt him, too. He said he had been inclined to vote against the Schnatter Institute if there were any issues. What convinced him to vote for it when the proposal was in the Gatton College was the answer to a question about influence – he was told that the donors will have no influence on research or on hiring, although they have made monies available. Peffer said he trusted the administration within his college to do what they have said they will do. He said that if the donors start to try to have influence, he had full faith that the monies would be rejected – that is what caused him to vote for the Schnatter Institute. He said he did not see the influence from Koch as changing what research would be done. The faculty are evaluated by their research and their publications in premier journals.

The Chair explained that the first **motion** from the SAOSC was a recommendation that the Senate approve the proposed new John. H. Schnatter Institute for the Study of Free Enterprise on the basis of its academic status and require at the halfway point of Foundation support (September 2019) a review by the University Senate in collaboration with the Provost of the program's progress in scholarship and



University Senate  
October 10, 2016

its mandate to safeguard academic freedom. Because the motion came from committee, no **second** was required. A **vote** was taken but while voting was ongoing, Wood (AS) suggested that the word “status” needed to be changed to “content” because Senate was voting on the academic content of the Schnatter Institute, not its academic status. Because voting was underway, Parliamentarian Seago ruled that the change was out of order. The motion **passed** with 44 in favor, 24 opposed, and three abstaining.

The Chair then moved to the second **motion** from the SAOSC, a recommendation that Senate endorse the academic organization, reporting, infrastructure and funding for the John H. Schnatter Institute for the Study of Free Enterprise. Because the motion came from committee, no **second** was required. A **vote** was taken and the motion **failed** with 37 in favor, 40 opposed, and four abstaining. The Chair thanked Bailey for all his work and for the SAOSC’s work reviewing the proposal.

Given the time, the Chair solicited a motion to adjourn. Wood (AS) **moved** to adjourn and Mazur (ED) **seconded**. Senators expressed approval of the motion by leaving. The meeting was adjourned at 5:04 pm.

Respectfully submitted by Ernie Bailey,  
University Secretary

Invited guests present: Marcy Deaton, Carlos Marin, Kevin Pearce, Darlene Welsh, and Ernie Yanarella.

Absences: Allen; Atwood; Bailey, A.\*; Beaulieu\*; Bird-Pollan; Birdwhistell, M.; Birdwhistell, T.; Brennen; Brown; Browning; Capilouto; Cassis; Clark; Cofield; Cox ;Cross; Danner; de Beer; Debski; DiPaola; D’Orazio; Farrell; Flaherty; Folmar; Ford; Giancarlo; Guy; Harris; Hazard; Heath; Hippisley; Holloway; Jackson; Kilgore; Knott; Koch;; Kurczaba; Kyrkanides; Lee, B.\*; Martin, A.; McGillis\*; Mills; Nichols; O’Hair, D.; Reid; Rice; Richey; Smith; Sogin; Sokan; Stevens; Summey; Tagavi; Thamann; Tracy; Truszczynski; Vernon; Vosevich; Wilson, K.; Witt; Xenos; and Yeager.

Prepared by Sheila Brothers on Thursday, November 3, 2016.

---

\* Denotes an absence explained prior to the meeting.