

Minutes of the Meeting of the Board of Trustees
University of Kentucky
Friday, September 9, 2016

The Board of Trustees of the University of Kentucky met on Friday, September 9, 2016, in the Robertson and Feix Ballrooms in the Augenstein Alumni Center on the campus of Western Kentucky University in Bowling Green, Kentucky.

A. Meeting Opened

Dr. E. Britt Brockman, chair of the Board of Trustees, called the meeting to order at 8:00 a.m. (CDT). Chair Brockman asked Trustee Kelly Holland, secretary of the Board, to call the roll.

B. Roll Call

The following members of the Board of Trustees answered the call of the roll: C.B. Akins, Sr., Jennifer Y. Barber, Claude A. “Skip” Berry, III, Lee X. Blonder, James H. Booth, William C. Britton, E. Britt Brockman, Mark P. Bryant, Michael A. Christian, Kelly Knight Craft, Angela L. Edwards, Carol Martin “Bill” Gatton, Cammie D. Grant, Robert Grossman, David V. Hawpe, Kelly Sullivan Holland, David Melanson, Rowan Reid, C. Frank Shoop, Robert Vance, and Barbara Young. Secretary Holland announced that a quorum was present.

The University administration was represented by President Eli Capilouto, Executive Vice President for Finance and Administration Eric Monday, and General Counsel William Thro.

Guests and members of the news media were also in attendance.

C. Approval of Minutes

Chair Brockman called attention to the minutes from June 24, 2016. Trustee Shoop moved approval of the minutes as written. Trustee Bryant seconded the motion and it passed without dissent (See the June 24, 2016, minutes on the Board of Trustees website, www.uky.edu/Trustees, under agenda.)

D. Presidential Evaluation Discussion

Chair Brockman began by reviewing the process of the 2015-16 Presidential Evaluation from the February 2016 Executive Committee meeting through the present. The timeline/process included:

February 19, 2016	Executive Committee approved proposed list of questions and reviewed timeline; then questions sent to the Senate Council Chair, Staff Senate Chair, and SGA President for distribution, review, and feedback
-------------------	--

May 3, 2016	Executive Committee finalized questions and authorized the Chair to approach representatives of the constituent groups
June	Questionnaire/Survey circulated to constituency representatives President submitted self-evaluation to Board Chair for distribution to the Board of Trustees
June/July	Collection and analysis of constituent surveys
June 24, 2016	Board of Trustees passed CR-1, extending the President's contract and increasing the President's compensation
July 21, 2016	Executive Committee met to review constituent surveys and President's self-evaluation and sent report of meeting to the Board of Trustees
	A qualitative evaluation form was sent to the Board of Trustees
August	Return of the Board of Trustees' second qualitative evaluations
September 9, 2016	Board of Trustees reviews evaluations

Chair Brockman continued that the major accomplishments noted in the Trustee questionnaires included:

- Building productive relationships with lawmakers, private partners, and key stakeholders to advance university priorities.
- Investing in residential, student life, academic, research, athletic, and health care facilities.
- Growing the University's philanthropic activity.
- Taking a proactive, thoughtful, and empathetic approach to fostering a diverse and inclusive UK community with an enduring sense of belonging.
- Recruiting a larger, better prepared, and more diverse student body, and ensuring their success as UK students.
- Facilitating the development and adoption of the Strategic Plan.

Major strengths mentioned by Trustees included:

- Strong interpersonal skills that aid in building relationships with faculty, staff, students, other campus stakeholders, community members, and donors.
- Acts with a high level of integrity, compassion, humanity, and thoughtfulness.
- Well-organized, data-driven, and willing to make difficult choices in pursuit of aspirational goals.
- Passionate about the University, its mission, and its people.

- A visible and effective communicator.

The Board offered opportunities for improvement in the following areas:

- Improve and enhance communication with the Board of Trustees.
- Increase diversity among the University's senior leadership and within positions of responsibility across campus.
- Improve faculty morale, rewards, and engagement in strategic decision-making.
- Articulate implementation efforts and metrics for operationalizing the Strategic Plan.
- Ensure the University is compliant with Kentucky open records/open meetings statutes.
- Increase the profile of graduate education and non-health-related research.

Chair Brockman continued that in regards to the Strategic Plan, the Board recognizes progress on enrollment, diversity, retention and graduation, and federal research grants and contracts. There are still aspects of the Strategic Plan that need to filter down to the campus units and the Board would like to have annual reporting on the progress toward the objectives in the Plan.

Chair Brockman reported that the Board believes the President effectively engages the Board and has unified the Board around the Strategic Plan and University priorities. At the same time, communications with the Board of Trustees can be strengthened and more frequent and Trustees would like to have more frequent and informal interactions with one another to build relationships.

E. Closed Session

Chair Brockman announced that the Board of Trustees needed to go into closed session in order to discuss President Capilouto's appointment pursuant to his contract and also to discuss proposed or pending litigation. Secretary Holland moved that per KRS 61.810, the closed session shall be in accordance with subsection (1) (f) and shall be for discussion on the appointment of President Capilouto, specifically for discussion on whether his appointment remains the same per his existing contract or whether his appointment should be changed per an amendment to his contract. Secondly, per KRS 61.810 (1) (c), the closed session shall be for discussion of proposed or pending litigation against or on behalf of the University. Trustee Bryant seconded the motion and the motion passed without dissent.

Chair Brockman stated that only members of the Board would be permitted to attend and participate in the closed session. If the Board feels that there are other persons who have valuable input to the topic, such persons may be invited to participate, one at a time. Chair Brockman asked President Capilouto and General Counsel William Thro to join the Board in closed session.

The Board went into closed session at 8:11 a.m.

F. Open Session

At 10:07 a.m. Chair Brockman stated that the closed session of the Board had concluded. No action was taken in closed session and the Board was back in open session.

G. Presidential Evaluation (CR 1)

Vice Chair Akins moved for the consideration of CR 1 Presidential Evaluation which recommends:

“that the Board of Trustees accept the Chair’s report on the evaluation of President Eli Capilouto’s performance in 2015-16; commend the President for his continuing transformative leadership of the University of Kentucky toward achievement of the goals of the 2015-2020 Strategic Plan; and urge that the President continue to build on his accomplishments and work on areas identified for performance improvement.

Background: Pursuant to Section E. (Evaluation), of President Eli Capilouto's Employment Agreement with the University of Kentucky Board of Trustees, an annual performance evaluation shall be performed in accordance with Governing Regulation II.E.2(a).

The Executive Committee shall serve as the performance review committee for the President. The Executive Committee shall involve the entire Board of Trustees in this evaluation and shall also solicit input from the executive committees or executive councils of the University Senate, Staff Senate and Student Government Association.

At its February 19, 2016, meeting, the Board established a process for reviewing the President's performance in 2015-16. As in the past, the evaluation included input from various constituencies; and each member of the Board was asked to provide an evaluation of the President. The evaluation, through questions reviewed and approved by the Executive Committee, assessed the President’s performance across the range of responsibilities of the Office and missions of the University, including objectives of the 2015-2020 Strategic Plan adopted by the Board of Trustees at its October 2015 Retreat. The performance assessment document contained both qualitative and quantitative components. In addition, the President prepared and submitted an annual self-evaluation to the Board; and the Executive Committee received the results of the annual survey of faculty conducted by the University Senate.

As the Board voted unanimously at its June 24, 2016, meeting to extend the President's Employment Agreement and increase his compensation, there is no further action on his Employment Agreement.”

Trustee Bryant seconded CR 1 and it passed without dissent. (See CR 1 on the Board of Trustees website, www.uky.edu/Trustees, under agenda.)

H. Adjournment

Hearing no suggestions for additional business or motions, the meeting was adjourned at 10:10 a.m.

I. Meeting Reconvened

Chair Brockman called the meeting to order at 1:00 p.m. (CDT). Chair Brockman asked Trustee Kelly Holland, secretary of the Board, to call the roll.

J. Roll Call

The following members of the Board of Trustees answered the call of the roll: C.B. Akins, Sr., Jennifer Y. Barber, Claude A. “Skip” Berry, III, Lee X. Blonder, James H. Booth, William C. Britton, E. Britt Brockman, Mark P. Bryant, Michael A. Christian, Kelly Knight Craft, Angela L. Edwards, Carol Martin “Bill” Gatton, Cammie D. Grant, Robert Grossman, David V. Hawpe, Kelly Sullivan Holland, David Melanson, Rowan Reid, C. Frank Shoop, Robert Vance, and Barbara Young. Secretary Holland announced that a quorum was present.

The University administration was represented by President Eli Capilouto, Provost Tim Tracy, Executive Vice President for Health Affairs Michael Karpf, Executive Vice President for Finance and Administration Eric Monday, and General Counsel William Thro.

The University faculty was represented by Chair of the University Senate Council, Katherine McCormick, and the University staff was represented by Chair of the Staff Senate, Troy Martin.

Guests and members of the news media were also in attendance.

K. Petition to Address the Board and Consent Items

Chair Brockman reported that there had been no petitions to address the Board since the last Board of Trustees meeting and called attention to the consent items on the agenda. The items were as follows:

- | | |
|---------|---|
| ASACR 1 | Candidates for Degrees: August 2016 |
| ASACR 2 | Candidates for Degrees: May 2016 |
| ASACR 3 | Deletion of Degrees: College of Arts and Sciences |
| FCR 1 | Charitable Grant Commitment from Don Jacobs, Sr. Charitable Foundation and Naming of a Building |
| FCR 2 | Gift in Kind from Operation Technology, Inc. |
| FCR 3 | Pledge from Marguerite Pelissier |
| FCR 4 | Establishment of the David Pettus Scholarship Quasi-Endowment Fund |
| FCR 5 | Charitable Grant Commitment from Vanguard Charitable Endowment Fund |
| FCR 6 | Authorization of Negotiated Disposition of Personal Property |

FCR 7	Repair/Upgrade/Improve Building Mechanical Systems Capital Project (Dickey Hall)
FCR 8	Renovate/Upgrade/Improve Eagle Building Capital Project
FCR 9	Upgrade/Renovate/Expand Grain Center of Excellence Capital Project
FCR 10	Renovate/Improve UK Good Samaritan Hospital Facilities Capital Project (Replace Air Handling Units)
FCR 11	Improve Clinical/Ambulatory Services Capital Project (Radiation Medicine Linear Accelerator/Brachytherapy)
FCR 12	Proposed Revision to Governing Regulation: Capital Project and Gift Approval
FCR 13	Proposed Revision to Administrative Regulation: Approval of University Capital Projects
FCR 14	Capital Construction Report
FCR 15	Patent Assignment Report

Hearing no requests to remove items from the Consent Agenda, Chair Brockman asked for a motion for approval. Trustee Bryant moved approval of the Consent Agenda. It was seconded by Trustee Britton and passed without dissent. (See consent items on the Board of Trustees website, www.uky.edu/Trustees, under agenda.)

L. Chair's Report

Chair Brockman felt that all would agree that the Board's time in Bowling Green and the region had been informative and deeply rewarding. UK's commitment and work have many partners and collaborators who push new boundaries in the fields of education, health, and economic development to make real and meaningful change.

Chair Brockman thanked President Gary Ransdell and the staff of Western Kentucky University for being a wonderful host for the meetings and for being one of UK's partners in the region. Chair Brockman invited Dr. Ransdell to come forward and share his thoughts.

Dr. Ransdell stated it had been an honor to host the University of Kentucky Board of Trustees and further strengthen the partnerships between UK and Western Kentucky University. Appointed the ninth president in 1997, Dr. Ransdell will retire in 2017. He shared the history of the institution and what he thought were his "Top Ten" proudest achievements for WKU over the last twenty years. They were:

- Student Life Foundation – a rebuilding and recapitalization of campus residence halls
- Two successful capital campaigns (1998-2003 - \$101M, 2007-2012 - \$202M)
- Three new baccalaureate degrees in electrical, mechanical, and civil engineering
- Four new doctoral degrees: education, nursing practice, physical therapy, and psychology (practice based)
- Creation of an independent Honors College
- Gatton Academy of Math and Science to help the gifted and talented students achieve their full potential
- Broadened national and international prestigious scholarships

- Internationalization of the campus including increased international student enrollment, study abroad programs, and the Confucius Institute
- Move from Division I AA to Division I A athletics programs including the FBS Series in football

Dr. Ransdell concluded that all eight Kentucky universities have their own niche, personality, and distinctions. All have slightly different missions, but have important roles in Kentucky's higher education landscape.

Chair Brockman stated that the Board met in closed session this morning to discuss the President's Evaluation. CR 1 was passed which continued President Capilouto's existing contract and applauded him for his performance.

M. Nominating Committee Report

Trustee Frank Shoop, chair of the Nominating Committee, reported that the Nominating Committee met on August 29, 2016. The slate of officers and members elected to the Executive Committee were discussed and approved.

N. Election of Officers

Trustee Shoop submitted the following nominations for the following offices:

- For Chair - Dr. E. Britt Brockman
- For Vice Chair - Dr. C.B. Akins, Sr.
- For Secretary - Ms. Kelly Sullivan Holland
- For Assistant Secretary - William Thro, General Counsel

Chair Brockman stated that the Board would proceed with the election of the officers. He continued that he was honored to be the nominee for chair, but felt it would be a conflict of interest to preside over that election. He asked Nominating Committee Chair Frank Shoop to come forward to accept the gavel and conduct the election of chair.

Chair Pro Tem Shoop stated that the Nominating Committee had nominated Dr. E. Britt Brockman for chair. He asked for any nominations from the floor. Trustee Vance moved the nominations cease. It was seconded by Trustee Bryant. Hearing no nomination, Chair Shoop asked for the vote and it passed with 20 affirmative votes and one abstention from Trustee Brockman.

Trustee Shoop congratulated Chair Brockman and the gavel was passed. Chair Brockman continued with the election.

Chair Brockman stated that the Nominating Committee had nominated Dr. C.B. Akins, Sr. for vice chair. Chair Brockman asked for nominations from the floor. Trustee Shoop moved the nominations cease. It was seconded by Trustee Bryant and hearing no discussion, the nominations were closed.

Chair Brockman called for the vote for Trustee C.B. Akins, Sr. as vice chair and it passed without dissent. Chair Brockman congratulated Vice Chair Akins.

For secretary, Trustee Kelly Holland was nominated by the Nominating Committee. Chair Brockman asked for nominations from the floor. Hearing no nominations, Chair Brockman declared the nominations closed. Chair Brockman called for the vote for Trustee Kelly Holland as secretary and it passed without dissent. Chair Brockman congratulated Secretary Holland.

The Nominating Committee nominated William Thro, General Counsel for the office of Assistant Secretary. Chair Brockman asked for nominations from the floor. Hearing no nominations, Chair Brockman declared the nominations closed. Chair Brockman called for the vote for General Counsel William Thro as assistant secretary and it passed without dissent. Chair Brockman congratulated Mr. Thro.

O. Election of Executive Committee

Trustee Shoop explained that per Governing Regulation II.E.2(a), the chair and vice chair of the Board are two (2) of the five (5) members of the Executive Committee. The Chair of the Board of Trustees shall also serve as chair of the Executive Committee. By virtue of their newly elected offices, Chair Britt Brockman and Vice Chair C.B. Akins, Sr. were members of the Executive Committee. As Secretary of the Board, Trustee Holland is the ex officio Secretary of the Executive Committee. Therefore, the Nominating Committee submitted the following three nominations for the at-large members:

Mr. Mark Bryant
Mr. Robert Vance
Ms. Barbara Young

Chair Brockman explained that the election of the members of the Executive Committee would proceed in like fashion to the election of the officers of the Board. He stated that the Nominating Committee nominated Mark Bryant, Robert Vance, and Barbara Young as the at-large members of the Executive Committee. He asked for nominations from the floor. There were no nominations from the floor.

Chair Brockman moved approval of the slate as presented by the Nominating Committee and it passed without dissent.

P. Appointment of Trustee to the University of Kentucky Gluck Equine Research Foundation Inc. Board of Directors (NCR 1)

Trustee Shoop stated that NCR 1 concerned the appointment of a trustee to the Board of Directors of the University of Kentucky Gluck Equine Research Foundation, Inc., for a four-year period ending September 30, 2020. Trustee Shoop stated that since NCR 1 concerned his appointment, he did not participate in its adoption and he will abstain from the vote. He noted for the record that the majority of the committee had endorsed the recommendation and, therefore, he believed it was appropriately presented before the Board for a vote.

Chair Brockman noted the Nominating Committee's approval of NCR 1 and called for the vote. NCR 1 passed with 19 affirmative votes and one abstention by Trustee Shoop. (See NCR 1 on the Board of Trustees website, www.uky.edu/Trustees, under agenda.)

Q. Appointment/Reappointment of Trustees to the Board of Directors of the University of Kentucky Mining Engineering Foundation, Inc. (NCR 2)

Trustee Shoop stated that NCR 2 was the recommendation that the Board approve the appointment of Trustee Robert Grossman and the reappointment of Trustee Jim Booth as trustee members to the University of Kentucky Mining Engineering Foundation, Inc. Board of Directors for two-year terms ending September 30, 2018. The bylaws of the Foundation require that the Board of Trustees approve appointments to the Board of Directors.

On behalf of the Nominating Committee, Trustee Shoop moved approval of NCR 2 and it passed without dissent. (See NCR 2 on the Board of Trustees website, www.uky.edu/Trustees, under agenda.)

R. President's Report

President Capilouto stated:

"Mr. Chairman, members of the Board of Trustees, I have not spoken publicly about the matter of privacy in the case of sexual assault. That's because I wanted to speak to you collectively first. I come to you today in a spirit of respect and trust.

Stories about sexual assault or misconduct really seem simple from afar, but as someone who has had more than 25 years of experience as an administrator in dealing with these cases closely, I assure you that they are always complex and the tension between privacy and transparency is real.

You know, every fall, every year since I've been here, at the beginning of the school year I attend the enrollment preview night for Lexington. Thousands of potential students and their parents and loved ones come to learn about the University of Kentucky, and I share our hopes for their time with us in hopes that they'll join our family. And it's the idea that we are to be a community that is welcoming, safe, and protective of everyone's well-being.

During the same time at the beginning of the year, I have the honor of joining dozens and dozens of volunteers from across our campus to welcome parents and students on move-in day.

And I see parents, and I've been one of these, that sometimes with a tear in their eye as they move their son and daughter away from home to a new home for the first time and, I watch them when they turn and drive away. And I am left knowing it's a heavy burden that they're entrusting their child to us, to this University, their child, what is most precious to them.

What else do I know about this time? I know from both data that we collected in our survey of the entire student population -- I think we're the only ones that do this -- as well as firsthand

experience that the first six weeks of college are a particularly vulnerable time for a young student. We know that seven out of every 100 females that we welcome onto our campus will experience sexual assault in this year, and only one out of five victims is able to bring themselves to report an incident of sexual assault.

So why don't the other 80 percent report? What do our surveys show? It's the desire for privacy, the overwhelming feeling of shame, fear of retribution, or the understandable desire to simply forget. But they never forget, and that is why they need our counseling centers and why we're adding more counselors to help these victims deal with this trauma. Sure enough, recently I was awakened at six in the morning to learn that our many offices and dedicated staff involved in such cases had been up all night dealing with an incident.

I feel deeply that our students involved in this incident and their families deserve privacy. They should be the only ones who decide whether to tell the details of their story. And I know other victims, those who have told us their stories, and when they muster the unbelievable courage to come forward and seek help from our police, their health care providers, counselors, victim advocates, investigators, or my office, they must be able to do so with full assurance that it will remain confidential and that they -- they retain the full authority on whether, when, or how their story is publicly told.

And I also know the stories of students, faculty, and staff who have been wrongly charged with an incident of impropriety and what this can mean for them and their families, and these individuals deserve privacy as well. This is the backdrop and the context we carry with us when considering these very real complex issues. It's what I bring to the table when I confront and consider these issues.

So I'm not sure how many of you read the August 22nd front page story in the Kernel about this issue. The Kernel states astonishingly that it does not name victim/survivors in sexual assault cases. And other media cite those accounts without investigation and perpetuate a canard. While the Kernel says it does not identify the victims, make no mistake, that's exactly what it did. In printing salacious details to attract readers, they have effectively identified the victim/survivors. You can easily find them. In this story you see a, quote, anonymous spokesperson purporting to represent victims being quoted, yet you do not see the victims who filed the sexual assault complaint quoted here or anywhere. You don't see that they said they wanted these facts of their stories to be made public... until today.

But what does the law say, federal laws? Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act, just from the act you know what it's about. And the Violence Against Women Act, they offer protections for the privacy of victims because of the high potential for retribution, online harassment, and the chilling effect that such brazen disregard for privacy will have. And if you want to see this taken to an extreme, take an hour and a half of your time, download it from Netflix, and watch the documentary Hunting Ground and see what happens to the individual sexually assaulted by someone prominent.”

President Capilouto continued:

So you've now seen the front-page headlines and stories with details about sexual assault. What I've bet you've missed because nobody's given them any ink or sentences or press conferences is the letter from the victim/survivors community voicing their concerns about these stories. It was back on page 11, and it deserves -- it's a story that deserves to be told.

And as they said, while we all have the right to know about assaults that occur on campus, no person other than the survivor and the people that disclose the information have the right to know any specific details about the assault.

You are entitled to privacy and the space to guide your healing. You deserve to have confidence that the University values your privacy and won't release specific details about your case to the public. We depend on the law to protect these victims and their stories, and the federal government depends on us. It requires us to abide by the law and to protect them in their stories; and if we don't, there are penalties, and there should be.

When we assure victim/survivors they can come forward and we will protect their confidentiality and privacy, it also means we do not ship their personal information off to a bunch of lawyers in Frankfort that they have never met. Indeed, the Office of Attorney General in this state has long recognized the stakes involved and their obligation to protect this information.

Before I arrived here in 2008, with the benefit of outside expert counsel, the University was successful in declining to let the Attorney General review, even in private, student records. The Office of Attorney General in an opinion acknowledged that an in-camera review was not appropriate for FERPA-protected materials, and they did so again in 2012 in another case before the office. And that's why I am so surprised of a reversal of a long-standing position in cases involving this University and our desire to protect confidential student information as required by federal law.

So based on principle, policy and the law, I gave my word to the campus that I would not give up the names of victims or the names, in other cases, of those who have been falsely accused, and I will not.

The law may be unclear to some, and they are, to be sure, complex issues and reasonable people I expect can disagree. But let us be crystal clear about the stakes of this disagreement. If it is determined that the current and other media outlets have ready access to private protected information, it means that everyone has access to private protected information, and we've [lived through] these on our campus. Everyone, a survivor's classmates and current and future employers as well as strangers, stalkers, and anyone else with the time to file an open record request.

We will be saying that a survivor's story is not theirs to tell, but it is everyone's to share across every platform. In the United States, such matters are settled civilly in a court of law. That's the process, and we respect that, and that's how it's supposed to work. Demonizing those who avail themselves of the process afforded to everyone mystifies me.”

President Capilouto concluded:

“But bottom line for me is this: Losing a case in court, along with the attendant headlines, worries me much less than not doing everything I can to fight for the privacy and confidentiality of those victim/survivors. It is essential, essential, that the victims of brutal assault know that their University and their president stands with them, embracing them when they come forward in the courageous effort at justice and at healing and that we will do everything in our power to protect their privacy, even in the face of unfair and uninformed publicity.

I will be happy to continue this discussion in a moment, but, Mr. Chairman, I believe you have some information to share.”

Chair Brockman stated:

“Three letters have been delivered to me. Two are from the victim/survivors whose names I will not mention at their request, although the letters will be available to the public after I read them.

The first letter:

‘Dear Board of Trustees,

We are SPARC, - a student activist organization here at the University of Kentucky. Our mission is to work alongside other students, administration and survivors in order to end sexual violence on our campus.

As you move through these decisions, we want you to know that you have been told an incomplete story, a story that does not recognize the feelings of survivors or the greater campus community. We as students are concerned about the dangerous precedence for how the university will handle sexual assault cases if such cases are made public.

Survivors come forward with the understanding that their identity and the details of their assault will remain private. If such records are put up for public consumption, survivors will no longer report or seek services at the university. There are already many barriers to reporting, with fear of retaliation or judgment being the most common. We fear for our brothers and sisters who have experienced sexual assault should they no longer be able to receive confidential help from the resources on campus.

We believe survivors. We expect you to listen to their voices and take this opportunity to make the University of Kentucky an example of what an institution with survivor-focused policies looks like. We, as students at UK, are in solidarity with President Capilouto on his stance to stand with survivors.

Given this information, as you move into a dialogue about the efficacy of open records, we urge you to consider the voices of survivors at UK. Our campus has the right to know about sexual assaults that happen in our community but not at the expense of the privacy and dignity of our friends and colleagues who have experienced sexual assault. There is no justice in depriving survivors of their right to decide if, when, and how to share their stories.”

Chair Brockman continued:

"The next letter from a victim:

‘To Whom It May Concern,

My name is (sic). I am a Ph.D. candidate in the Department of Entomology at the University of Kentucky. Last year a fellow graduate student and I presented allegations of sexual harassment and sexual assault against Dr. James Harwood, a faculty member in our department. The resolution of this case was that ultimately there was enough evidence for a reasonable person to find Dr. Harwood guilty for two counts of sexual harassment and two counts of sexual assault.

Unfortunately, these types of incidents are far too common in academia against men and women alike. Extrapolating upon the suggestions as to why would take more time and more space than I have available in this short letter. Unfortunately, the refusal of an open records request of our case has eclipsed the bigger issue of misconduct in the sciences (*and academia*) as well as what we can do to prevent it from happening from in the future. I am disappointed that a case that was handled so thoughtfully by Martha Alexander at the University of Kentucky is now being presented so negatively.

Blank (sic) and I recently had a meeting with Dr. Capilouto where it became clear that he had student interests at heart as well as the safety of our campus. That being said, this case is very unique and much bigger than one open records request. We absolutely should be focused on transparency in these incidents in the sense that those convicted of or those with enough reasonable evidence to be convicted of sexual harassment or assault should no longer be professors. Other universities should have access to this information in order to prevent those convicted of wrongdoing from repeating their behavior elsewhere. I applaud the Kernel for drawing attention to that fact. However, I support Dr. Capilouto's stance regarding open records requests. The **sensitive** details of individual sexual harassment assault cases should be private to protect those that have come forward with a difficult story. There's a fine line between transparency and an invasion of privacy, and I think it is important that we walk on the correct side of that line. For budding graduate students, these details could impact their entire career.

There are ways to be transparent about the procedural side of these cases that do not risk the safety of those that have come forward when it was difficult.

We should be working on a way to develop and improve that system rather than being blinded by the dramatics of only one case of many across the United States. For that to work, media and university administration should be on the same side of the aisle. I hope that we can find a swift resolution here that prompts positive change and movement forward, maybe even with the development of novel, more relevant laws regarding transparency. Regardless, what's occurring now has shifted the conversation from what blank (sic) and I intended, and I hope we can right the ship."

Respectfully, unnamed (sic).

Chair Brockman concluded:

“Last letter, from a victim:

‘To Whom It May Concern,

I am writing this letter to offer my support of President Capilouto and the University of Kentucky, specifically the Office of Institutional Equity and Equal Opportunity, (IEEO), and the Violence Intervention and Prevention, (VIP) Center.

As a victim of sexual harassment and assault at the hands of my Ph.D. advisor, I was faced with the difficult decision of coming forward, mainly due to the potential impact it could have on my future career. When I ultimately decided to tell my story in July 2015, I was met with compassion and kindness from UK's Counseling Center, the VIP Center, and IEEO office. Throughout the entirety of a month's long investigation, I always felt safe and believed Martha Alexander, the Deputy Title IX Coordinator, conducted an extensive investigation, of which I was routinely kept informed. I always felt that the University and the IEE Office took my complaint seriously and that they had my best interest at heart.

I was in a very unique position. I had just defended my dissertation but was not allowed any contact with my major advisor to finish edits and complete my degree. The policies UK had in place ensured that I was able to get the help I needed to graduate on time while still having a safe place to work. The university took swift actions that prioritized my safety, education, and the safety of others in my laboratory. While this was a difficult and arduous process, I never once questioned my decision to come forward thanks to the university's response.

I have found the recent reports in the media troubling because they have not accurately depicted the University of Kentucky that I grew to know over the course of two degrees. There are other issues at play here regarding university professors who are allowed to resign without future employers finding out about sexual misconduct or tenure revocation taking the better part of two years, in addition to the time it takes for the multiple appeals.

President Capilouto was generous enough to have a lengthy meeting with me regarding my concerns over this investigation and these larger issues. What I took from that meeting was that first and foremost he was genuinely concerned about my well-being. He was willing to listen to my ideas on how we can make UK's campus safer for students, specifically those affected by sexual harassment or assault. These are complex problems that will not be solved overnight, but having a university president who will fight for students, including those that may not be able to fight for themselves, is a step in the right direction.

Respectfully, unnamed (sic).”

Chair Brockman stated that the floor was open for discussion and recognized Trustee David Hawpe.

Trustee Hawpe began:

“Mr. Chairman, I can't avoid my sordid past as a journalist, nor can I deny that more than a half-century ago I spent four years as a staff member of the Kentucky Kernel and was its executive editor. But I hope that what I say today can be interpreted as the opinion of someone who is primarily speaking here as fiduciary for the people of Kentucky because that's what we were appointed to do. I leave it to others to judge the merits of media coverage that has been published so far. That's not my mission today. I've been told by other trustees in leadership that if I prompted a vote on this today that the President would resign and I would plunge the University into chaos, so I'm simply going to express my own view today and not call for a vote.

I think the University's position is unwise and unfair, and I think it's the wrong balancing of interests, which I freely admit exists on both sides of this controversy. Our position as a University purports to protect victims of sexual assault and harassment from unwanted publicity, but I think we have other obligations to consider as well.

One is to protect individuals wherever a person guilty of such behavior decides to relocate. Our version of protecting people leaves those individuals in the dark, much as parishioners were left in the dark when offending priests were moved to new locations and their past was not revealed to congregations. And I might add that it was only media coverage which finally prompted reform of that vast scandal.

The administration insists that the case at hand must be handled in secret lest it set a precedent for release of materials that could identify victims, but in my view that is not the case. It's not the case legally in my view and in the view of experts whose view of the legal issues involved is different and decisively so than the legal views on which we're operating here. It's not a precedent, in my view and in the view of other legal experts, unless we treat it as such. This case is singular in part because the identifying information has already been publicized. I also believe that there is -- a part of the way in which we encourage victims comes in -- in future from our ability to demonstrate, by openly sharing information, that the university deals responsibly and fairly and aggressively with such cases, that the system works.

Secrecy leaves people in doubt about how the University is operating, in doubt about the what and the why and the how of the University's actions. My conviction, in talking over the years to many victims of rape because I was involved deeply in national conversations in the media about the identification of rape victims, my conviction is that there's a large body of people who feel differently than the victims who have been cited today, who feel that the shame and embarrassment involved in these cases is perpetuated and deepened by the publicity -- by the failure of media to vent these cases, to make them visible.

There are rape victims, Mr. Chairman, who want these cases and their names published, and there always have been, and they've raised a great public hoorah about it, and I was involved in those conversations, because they said perpetrating the secrecy of those cases and their experiences perpetuated the shame and embarrassment.

I am not a lawyer, but I have more than 40 years of experience directly in open meetings and open records disputes, and I was schooled and guided throughout those decades by lawyers whose practice defined the Kentucky Open Meetings and Open Records Law.

So I don't come to this as a stranger, and my belief is that our decision to refuse even to let the Attorney General review materials in this case in camera is wrong. And I think the federal protections that are cited as a reason to take that position are wrong and will be found so eventually.

And even if eventually we were to lose that case in a legal point of view -- from a legal point of view, it seems to me that we have a responsibility both philosophically and morally to present that, whether we are prevented from or discouraged from by the federal government or not, to offer up the materials in question to the Attorney General. And you say that we shouldn't want to submit those materials to a bunch of elected politicians in Frankfort. I think that's demeaning and unfortunate. I think that's a demeaning and unfortunate way to describe people who have served as Attorney General.

And by the way, judges are elected. Are we going to take the position that we can't and shouldn't present these materials to judges because they're a bunch of elected politicians? I don't think so. From a public perception point of view, there is no question that we have been showered with criticism from one end of the state to the other, and that includes criticism from the most conservative newspaper in the state in the far western reach of the state. And I think the criticism in my view has been valid. We obviously also have received national and international condemnation for this.

I think, finally, I am distressed by a whole succession of legal problems that we've encountered at the University, not just this one but others, and I think throughout that we've exhibited a blinkered view of our responsibility to protect people.

We did that first when we yielded to the public pressure to adopt a campus approach to dealing with sexually related charges that is fundamentally unfair. That case has been made by law groups at law colleges across the country, including at Harvard and at Penn and elsewhere. It's a fundamentally unfair system. It doesn't provide adequate protections to the accused. And I think it was unfortunate that we -- that we adopted that system. The consequence of being blinkered with

respect to both the victims and the accusers is obvious to me in the case which was mentioned in which there was an order, a memorandum opinion and order issued on August 31st of this year by Judge Hood, a federal judge.

The case is Jane Doe versus the University of Kentucky. And I'm not going to read the many pages of the decision, but I am going to read part of it and just a couple of paragraphs. This is what a federal judge says about the way in which we handle these kinds of cases. 'It was at this point,' says the judge, 'however, that the University's handling of this matter took a dramatic downhill turn. It is undisputed the University bungled the disciplinary hearing so badly, so inexcusably, that it necessitated three appeals and reversals in the on-campus process in an attempt to remedy the due process deficiencies. The disciplinary hearings were plagued with clear errors, such as conducting a hearing without Student B's presence' -- that's the accused -- 'and refusing to allow Student B, the accused, to whisper to an advisor during the proceeding, and those are only two examples of several obvious errors that resulted in multiple appeals, spanning months, profoundly affecting the plaintiff's' -- that's the accuser, the alleged victim -- 'affecting her ability to obtain an education at the University of Kentucky.'

And I'm going to offer one more paragraph. The judge says, 'This is not the first time that the Court has been made aware of constitutional deprivations in the Universities' student disciplinary proceedings. While those deprivations have been corrected by the University's internal appellate process, the Court suggests it is time for the University to get its act together. The Court hopes the University's general counsel, his staff, and the many lawyers at the College of Law can somehow come up with a proceeding that does not result in multiple appeals on blatant constitutional deprivations and disciplinary hearings in the future, which work to the disadvantage of both the accuser, the alleged victim, and the alleged perpetrator.'

This is a case that's gone on for a couple of years and still has. So I'm concerned about our legal positions. I'm concerned about a succession of failures on our part. I'm concerned about the blinkered approach that we take to these issues which, as I demonstrated here, works to the advantage in this instance, in my view -- to the disadvantage of the accused, and the judge seems to believe that's true.

So I respect the views of the President; I truly do. And I have praised this President relentlessly for the humane approach he takes to operating this University, and I think it's his greatest virtue, and I've said that openly many times. And I think his position in this set of controversies reflects that humane concern that drives him, and that's something I'm proud of and that I respect greatly on his part. I simply think that in this instance we have -- we have got the competing interests out of balance.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman."

Chair Brockman recognized Trustee Lee Blonder.

Faculty Trustee Dr. Blonder stated:

“I would like to echo some of the comments that my colleague, Trustee Hawpe, has made and add my own additional opinions. First of all, as we all know, we're in this situation now. There's no turning back. The situation has gone national. Every outlet, every media outlet from the New York Times to CNN to regional newspapers have had commentary on this case. They have remarkably almost exclusively supported the Kentucky Kernel in this case. Frank LoMonte, who is the Executive Director of the Student Press Law Center, has weighed in on the case.

He has also discussed the opinion that the President discussed, which was Jack Conway's determination not to require the University to come up with the actual records for an in-camera review. Later on, that same Attorney General did take National College to court to get records.

So there have been -- there's a history here, and now there are people weighing in nationally about this case. I understand, and the stories that you've read are heart wrenching and there's complex issues involved here. I think that the case has not been handled properly.

I believe that, rather than characterize the Attorney General and his associates as a bunch of lawyers in Frankfort, that we should respect the office of Attorney General which is an elected office. The Attorney General requested these records from the administration with the names redacted so that they could do a meaningful review and decide whether they agreed that these records are protected or not.

Had the University submitted those records when requested, it's very possible that the Attorney General's office would have agreed that these records should remain confidential. Had that happened, we might not be in this position. Had they rendered a different opinion, then we would have been in a position to fight this case, but at least we would have had the respect, the authority, and we would have given the records to the Attorney General's office.

One of the things the Attorney General has stated in joining the lawsuit now, attempting to join the lawsuit, is that the University is saying ‘trust me’ and that this sets a precedent for other public institutions in this state to ‘trust me’ without review. This was the issue with National College when they claimed that FERPA protected the records that they didn't want to release. So I think that's a dangerous precedent, and I think we need to be setting an example. And the other thing that I would like to make a statement about is that we have a very prominent school of journalism here. These faculty are teaching these student journalists who are writing the Kernel article. Those faculty, some of them have contributed to the GoFundMe page. This is putting the faculty in a very difficult position. This is putting many of us in a very difficult position. The student paper has raised over \$11,000 to help with their legal case. I think that this has to become at some point, after it plays out, a teaching moment for all of us. This has been handled -- mishandled, and I agree also that we have multiple open records and open meetings violations cases pending, so this is part of a larger picture that we need to examine. Those are my comments.”

Chair Brockman recognized Trustee Mark Bryant.

Trustee Bryant stated:

“Mr. Chairman, it is difficult to support being in court using our resources against our student newspaper, especially in a futile effort to shield documents that are already public. In my four years on this board, the only time I have ever seen such vehement criticism of our University, its leadership, and its board is for refusing to comply with open records requests.

This board is comprised of decent and honorable men and women, many of whom are leaders of commerce and public policy in this Commonwealth. We are guided by wise and highly respected administrators at the University of Kentucky, but our actions in this controversy give the impression we have something to hide. The more we withhold documents, the more criticism and scrutiny we attract.

What do we have to hide? Secrecy breeds suspicion. We can just redact what we believe should be exempt to protect the victims. We aren't ashamed of anything we do, so we can redact. Redact the names and give them the information. And the professor who was sexually abusing his students, he has the right to privacy. Our actions so far seem emblematic of secrecy, and secrecy breeds suspicion.

In the space of one week, critical in-depth stories have appeared in several widely-read forums: USA Today, The New York Post, the Courier Journal, The Lexington Herald-Leader, BuzzFeed, the newspaper in Bowling Green, the newspaper in Morehead. The national media has made us look like a backwater place, not a great research institution with a beautiful campus, new dormitories, and great leadership.

It is our job on this board to establish University policy, and so I vote for transparency. We must do the right thing. “

Chair Brockman recognized President Capilouto.

“Mr. Chairman, I want to at this time try to address every issue raised by the Trustees, who I respect. I do want to make clear that, as Trustee Hawpe eloquently stated, that many victims do want to share their experience. And, again, I hope we agree that that is their choice, not anybody else's choice.

I would also like to point out to you we follow federal regulations. We received a ‘dear colleague’ letter in 2014 and 2015, and in a short amount of time had put together a process to handle these cases. And we recognized from the beginning that we had difficulties, but throughout our difficulties, keep this in mind. There was an appellate process, independent in each stage here that protected the accused. The criticisms you cite at Harvard and all did not have that. Also, I directed the General Counsel to revamp the way we did this and the people who are involved in doing it. We have trained professionals, and this case, as the victims have indicated, was handled quite well.

So I don't want to characterize, again, as the victims say, mischaracterizing their University is something I don't want to lose sight of.”

President Capilouto shared that Sanders-Brown Center on Aging received a \$10 million gift, the continuation of the National Institutes of Health funding for Alzheimer's Disease research.

The University also welcomed another outstanding freshman class that is well-prepared, very diverse, and comes from all parts of Kentucky and across the country.

President Capilouto introduced Dr. Marcus Randall, president of the Kentucky Medical Services Foundation (KMSF) to present information to the Board of Trustees about how KMSF is governed and how it conducts its business.

Dr. Mark Randall began by explaining that KMSF was founded in 1978 with two primary missions: 1) to bolster efforts to recruit and retain the best clinicians to ensure the provision of high-quality health care for the region and the Commonwealth; and 2) to serve as a charitable organization to support the education, research, service, and patient care missions of the University of Kentucky and its health system.

KMSF was organized and established as a physician-led, non-stock, non-profit 501(c)(3) corporation under the Internal Revenue Code and is a non-affiliated corporation of UK. Organized in this manner, it provides greater flexibility with respect to physician compensation and other benefits.

KMSF is governed by a Board of Directors composed of: clinical department chairs (or their designee); elected faculty directors in the practice areas of Medical specialties, surgical specialties, primary care, and hospital-based specialties; and two at-large elected faculty directors. Ex-officio (non-voting) members include the Chief Medical Officer, Chief Financial Officer (UK HealthCare), and an Executive Director. There is also a community advisory member.

Committees of KMSF include the Executive Committee, Finance Committee, Audit/Compliance Committee (advised by tax professionals from auditing firm Dean, Dorton, Allen, and Ford), Compliance Committee, Nominating and Governance Committee, and the Information Technology (IT) Governance Committee. All committees with the exception of the Executive Committee are comprised of board members and general faculty and/or practicing physicians within UK HealthCare.

Dr. Randall continued that the core operating functions of KMSF are to bill and collect revenues for the UK College of Medicine physicians and then administer and distribute those revenues. KMSF provides for the allocation of departmental plan income to a number of functions that enable the academic and clinical functions of the department to take place. These include:

- KMSF overhead
- Departmental operating expenses
- Incidental business expenses under IRS rules
- Pay the Plan portion of faculty remuneration
- Fund incentive compensation of faculty physicians

- Supplement faculty fringe benefits (disability, life insurance, dependent tuition reduction, dental insurance and accounted for via UK payroll)
- Collect and administer a malpractice fund
- Set aside a portion of clinical revenue collected for the UK College of Medicine's Dean's Academic Enrichment fund

KMSF also procures, executes, and manages leases for certain facility spaces for the use and benefit of UK as defined in the annual contract; and supports the efforts of UK in the formation of new delivery systems and other business activities designed to support the management and advancement of UK's health system.

Dr. Randall provided a funds flow process and how the revenue is collected and redistributed to UK. Financial statements are reported as part of the consolidated financial statements of UK and are independently audited by a third-party auditor, available to the general public. He reiterated that monies provided by the state of Kentucky are only for the educational piece of a faculty position.

From the physician's perspective, Dr. Randall shared that KMSF is valuable and indispensable for the following reasons:

- Keeps benefits packages competitive with private and other academic practices
- Assists the departments and chairs with critical functions to facilitate clinical operations (leases for clinical space, billing/compliance services, revenue management consultation and reporting)
- Gives the physicians a voice that is important for physician engagement and partnership
- Can partner with UK's health system to strengthen both the enterprise and physicians in selected situations (e.g. leases or purchases that support both organizations)
- Provides a mechanism for physicians and departments to provide philanthropic support for related entities (e.g. Kentucky Children's Hospital)
- Manages the documentation and reimbursement process for professional development activities for physicians
- Chairs and Departments utilize their funds within KMSF for recruiting expenses, professional development activities, educational activities (e.g. visiting professors, etc., critical to maintaining the academic nature of the departments and programs)

Dr. Randall concluded that KMSF's continued value is in physician recruitment and retention, audited and streamlined business procedures, and the ability to respond swiftly to the external environmental forces.

Trustee Grossman asked why the University of Kentucky is unable to offer competitive salaries on its own. Dr. Randall explained that at the time KMSF was formed (1978), a professor of surgery would have the same benefits package as an English professor. The reality was that without tuition support programs, specific disability support programs, and similar programs, the University was having a great deal of trouble recruiting and retaining physicians.

Trustee Britton verified with Dr. Randall that although the word “Foundation” is used in its title, KMSF is not a private foundation. Dr. Randall agreed and reiterated that KMSF is a charitable 501 (c) (3) organization.

Trustee Blonder asked Dr. Randall to explain the status of the separate entity lawsuit currently being reviewed. Dr. Randall explained that the term is “affiliated”. In 1982, the Attorney General ruled that KMSF is not affiliated with UK from a legal point of view. KMSF is affiliated with UK in the sense that the founding documents, IRS filings, clearly point out that its charitable purpose is to support the University of Kentucky.

Vice Chair Akins thanked Dr. Randall for his presentation and expressed that in his five years on the Board, this was the most “in-depth explanation of KMSF” he had heard that explained the function and funds flow. Chair Brockman added that the Board will start receiving briefings through the University Health Care Committee on a biannual basis.

Trustee Hawpe asked if the current Attorney General agrees with the original Attorney General’s opinion. Dr. Randall replied that “apparently he does not.”

Chair Brockman noted and asked for a clarification on PR 2. Provost Tracy replied it concerned the Department or Center for Gerontology and once clarification is obtained, it will be brought before the Board for approval.

S. Proposed Elimination of Governing Regulation: University of Kentucky Development Council (PR3)

President Capilouto stated that PR 3 was the recommendation that the Board of Trustees approve the elimination of Governing Regulation XII, which was received for preliminary consideration as PR 4 on June 24, 2016, relating to the University of Kentucky Development Council.

Trustee Britton moved approval of PR 3. It was seconded by Trustee Grant and the motion passed without dissent. (See PR 3 on the Board of Trustees website, www.uky.edu/Trustees, under agenda.)

T. Academic and Student Affairs Committee Report

Trustee Angela Edwards, chair of the Academic and Student Affairs Committee, thanked Dean Nancy Cox of the College of Agriculture, Food and Environment, agricultural extension agent Joanna Coles and her team, and Elizabeth Chaney Lunsford, who provided a presentation on UK and their work with the Warren County extension program.

U. Finance Committee

Trustee Bill Britton, chair of the Finance Committee, stated that the Committee approved 15 FCRs. Brian Nichols, the new Chief Information Officer was introduced to the Committee. Mary Vosevich, Vice President for Facilities Management provided an update on the new facilities

opening in fall 2016 and Dr. Monday submitted a list of active letters of credit per UK's policy.

V. Audit and Compliance Committee

Trustee Mark Bryant, chair of the Audit and Compliance Committee, stated that the Committee had met that morning. Three action items were presented and approved.

ACC 1, was the UK Quarterly Work Plan for the second quarter, with updates of the unplanned activities and first quarter audits. The plan approved three new audit activities and it was noted that less hours were available during this quarter due to the holiday schedule and planned training.

ACC 2 and ACC 3 approved updated language to the Audit and Compliance Committee Charter and the Internal Audit Charter respectively, to reflect the current organizational naming and structure.

W. Investment Committee

Trustee Bill Britton, interim chair of the Investment Committee, stated that the Investment Committee met yesterday to review performance results and conduct other business. The Endowment pool had a market value of \$1.2 billion as of June 30, 2016. For the fiscal year ending June 30, the Endowment pool returned an estimated -1.8%, compared to a return of -0.1% for the market-based policy benchmark. Non-U.S. Equity and Diversified Inflation Strategies were key detractors from Endowment pool performance in the period. The Endowment pool regained an estimated 1.8% in the month ending July 31, 2016. Gains were driven by strong performance in domestic and international stock markets.

X. University Health Care Committee

Trustee Bob Vance, chair of the University Health Care Committee, stated that one of the reasons for our meeting in Bowling Green was to celebrate the partnership between the University of Kentucky College of Medicine, the Medical Center of Bowling Green, and Western Kentucky University to increase the number of physicians in Kentucky.

The Committee received a welcome from President Ransdell from WKU and an overview from Connie Smith, Chief Executive Officer of the Medical Center.

Other presenters included Dr. Darren Johnson, Chairman of the UK Department of Orthopaedic Surgery & Sports Medicine, who provided the committee an update on the department and the affiliation between UK HealthCare and the Medical Center at Bowling Green.

Dr. Rob Edwards, UK HealthCare's Chief External Affairs Officer, provided the committee an overview of the brand strategy and communication efforts around the UK/Bowling Green partnership.

Dr. Robert DiPaola, Dean of the UK College of Medicine, provided the committee an

update on the college's recent activities and their teaching opportunities. He along with Dr. Griffith, Vice Dean of Education of the College of Medicine, provided updates on the college's regional campus expansion plans. This expansion makes strategic sense for several reasons: The physician shortage in Kentucky, the college's deep applicant pool and having reached enrollment capacity on the Lexington campus, and the university's partnerships will provide additional faculty to assist in teaching and educational space.

Dr. Linda Van Eldik, Director of UK's Sanders-Brown Center on Aging, provided the committee an overview and update of the center's mission and activities.

Mr. Craig Collins, Vice President/Chief Financial Officer gave an update on the finances of the hospital and UK HealthCare and the committee approved two actions items for capital project facility improvements. The Committee also approved the permissions and credentials for Chandler and Good Samaritan Hospitals.

Y. Other Business

Chair Brockman reviewed the 2017 proposed meeting dates of the Board of Trustees. They are:

Thursday/Friday - February 16 & 17, 2017
Monday/Tuesday - May 1 & 2, 2017
Thursday/Friday - June 15 & 16, 2017
Thursday/Friday - September 14 & 15, 2017
Thursday/Friday - October 19 & 20, 2017 (Retreat)
Monday/Tuesday - December 11 & 12, 2017

Trustee Britton moved approval of the 2016-17 Board meeting dates. It was seconded by Trustee Young and it passed without dissent. (See Proposed Meeting Dates on the Board of Trustees website, www.uky.edu/Trustees, under agenda.)

Hearing no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 2:35 (CDT) p.m.

Sincerely,



Kelly Sullivan Holland
Secretary, Board of Trustees

(CR 1, NCR 1 and 2, PR 1, 2, and 3, ASACR 1, 2, and 3, FCR 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, and 15, Proposed 2017 Meeting Dates are official parts of the Minutes of the meeting)