

Senate Council
April 28, 2014

The Senate Council met in regular session at 3 pm on Monday, April 28, 2014 in 103 Main Building. Below is a record of what transpired. All votes were taken via a show of hands unless indicated otherwise.

Senate Council Chair Lee X. Blonder called the Senate Council (SC) meeting to order at 3:01 pm.

1. Minutes and Announcements

There were no minutes ready for approval. The Chair reminded SC members that she would host an end-of-the-year celebration for SC members at Pazzo's after the last SC meeting on May 12. She said that the SC members who left in December were also welcome. The Senate Council office will pay for drinks and pizza.

2. Old Business

a. Proposed Change to 2014-15 and Tentative 2016-17 Calendar - Dates When Students Cannot Change Majors

The Chair said that she learned earlier in the day that neither of the two individuals from the Registrar's office who could answer questions about the proposed change could attend. She suggested that the agenda item be postponed until May 12, when both could attend. There were no objections from SC members.

All those present introduced themselves.

b. Proposed New Bachelor of Public Health

The Chair reminded SC members that the SC asked that the proposal for a new Bachelor of Public Health return to the SC after being revised to remove references to a proposed new minor and certificate, as well as to include science and math prerequisite tracks. Guest James Holsinger (PbH, associate dean for academic affairs) explained the revisions to SC members. The proposal was revised to remove language about a minor and certificate. He added that the proposal now included prerequisites for courses in math and science and also included information about how curriculums for pre-medicine and pre-dental may fit into the proposed new Bachelor of Public Health degree.

Debski asked Hoppisley, chair of the Senate's Academic Programs Committee (SAPC), to explain the SAPC's apparent waiver of the requirement (on the new program form) for departmental consultation when using courses outside the home academic unit. Hoppisley acknowledged that the SAPC discussed documentation of such consultation, but approved the proposal without it. Holsinger commented that the College of Arts and Sciences (AS) and the College of Public Health (PbH) worked hand in glove on both the proposed new Bachelor of Public Health and the proposed new BA in Health, Society and Populations, in AS. He said each of the two deans provided a letter of support for the other degree. Hoppisley affirmed that collaboration, noting that the Undergraduate Council's review of the proposal included an understanding of the two colleges working together. There was additional discussion about the need for departmental letters of support, in addition to letters of support from college deans.

The Chair reminded SC members that the original motion from SAPC was to approve the proposal and send it to the University Senate (Senate) with a positive recommendation – she asked SC how they wished to proceed. Anderson suggested proceeding through the SC with the stipulation that Guests

Holsinger and Michelle Lineberry (PbH, assistant dean for academic affairs) require letters of support from department chairs whose courses are part of the proposed BPH curriculum. After brief discussion, SC members determined that letters of support from department chairs should be requested from the following departments: Anatomy, Anthropology, Biology, Geography, Physiology, and Sociology. Day said that students were interested in the proposed new Bachelor in Public Health so delaying Senate review until fall 2014 would not be in the best interest of students. Day **moved** that the SC send the proposed new Bachelor of Public Health to the Senate with a positive recommendation, with the stipulation that letters of support be requested (from Anatomy, Anthropology, Biology, Geography, Physiology, and Sociology) prior to the Senate meeting. Brown **seconded**.

Harling spoke in favor of the motion, saying it would be an important degree program and that the proposers did due diligence in putting together the proposal. He objected to torturous reviews during SC meetings. Debski said that the requirement for departmental letters of support was clearly documented in the form, so requesting such letters was appropriate. The Chair and Hippiisley agreed that the revised new undergraduate program form that was being developed would solve the problem of letters of support. College of Arts and Sciences Dean Mark Kornbluh said he would be happy to get letters of support put together quickly. After additional discussion, Anderson **called the question**. The Chair called for objections, but there were none. A **vote** was taken on the motion that that the SC send the proposed new Bachelor of Public Health to the Senate with a positive recommendation, with the stipulation that letters of support be requested (from Anatomy, Anthropology, Biology, Geography, Physiology, and Sociology) prior to the Senate meeting and the motion **passed** with two opposed.

c. Faculty Evaluation of President Capilouto

The Chair asked Wood for an update. Wood replied that over the weekend she checked and there were over 610 respondents. She said she would send out a third email on Tuesday morning, this one being a reminder about the poll closing Tuesday at 5 pm. Wood said she would close the pool shortly after 5 pm; she did not think there would be the 800 respondents that the SC desired.

3. Committee Reports

a. Senate's Academic Programs Committee (SAPC) - Andrew Hippiisley, Chair

i. Proposed New Undergraduate Certificate in Leadership Studies

Hippiisley explained the proposed new Undergraduate Certificate in Leadership Studies. He said the **motion** from SAPC was that the University Senate approve the establishment of a new Undergraduate Certificate in Leadership Studies, within the Division of Undergraduate Education. Wood said there was a real problem with housing the proposed new certificate in Undergraduate Education (UE) because UE was not an academic unit. Guest Jayson Richardson (ED/Educational Leadership Studies, interim chair) said he became aware of that problem at noon. He said that he spoke with both colleges and ED has agreed to host the proposed new certificate. Guest Gary Hansen (AG/Community and Leadership Development, chair) said that he also found out about the problem at noon. Wood acknowledged that educationally housing the proposed new certificate in UE was not a problem a year ago, when the proposal was initiated. Hansen said he had not gotten AG input on the proposed homing in ED. There was additional discussion.

Wood **moved** to amend the motion from the SAPC so the proposed new Undergraduate Certificate in Leadership Studies would be housed within the College of Education. Harling **seconded**. After brief discussion, a **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with none opposed. The Chair said that discussion could proceed on the motion as amended.

Wood **moved** to send the proposed new Undergraduate Certificate in Leadership Studies to the Senate with a positive recommendation conditional upon receipt of letters verifying that ED will host the degree, as well as that AG and the chair of Community and Leadership Development also concur. Harling **seconded**. There being no further discussion, a **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with none opposed and one abstaining.

ii. Proposed New BA in Health, Society and Populations

Hippisley explained the proposal for a new BA in Health, Society and Populations. Wood asked for clarification about the faculty of record. Guest Deborah Crooks (AS/Anthropology) explained that the affiliated faculty were those who taught or advised in the program, but the faculty of record had voting rights regarding the program. Debski asked for confirmation that a pre-medicine or pre-dental could not satisfy the proposed new program's requirements. Crooks clarified that the undergraduate biology advisor was a member of the new program's faculty and will work with students who may want to double major. Debski opined that that would likely decline the number of majors in biology. College of Arts and Sciences Dean Mark Kornbluh explained that the curriculum was also developed with an eye towards students who cannot succeed in a biology degree. Biology is the largest undergraduate degree on campus, so Guest Kornbluh said the proposed new BA would give students an opportunity for a liberal arts degree and that an interest in science can lead to a degree in the social sciences. Debski suggested that it would leave Biology without the best students and leave Biology to be a service department. Dean Kornbluh clarified that about 95% of medical students are biology majors, so those students will not be leaving the biology program in droves. If a student is interested in science but does not excel, a student could still pursue their interest in science through the proposed new program. It is not a professional, pre-medicine degree. Debski offered additional concerns about the proposed new degree program.

Harling said he supported the proposed new program and would vote in favor of it. Anderson **moved** to send the proposed new BA in Health, Society and Populations to the Senate with a positive recommendation. Day **seconded**. A **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with none opposed.

b. Senate's Academic Organization and Structure Committee (SAOSC) - Greg Wasilkowski, Chair

i. Proposed Name Change from Department of Theatre to Department of Theatre and Dance

Guest Greg Wasilkowski, chair of the Senate's Academic Organization and Structure Committee (SAOSC), explained the proposed name change of the Department of Theatre to the Department of Theatre and Dance. Wood asked Guest Nancy Jones (FA/Theatre, chair) for more information on the proportion of faculty specializing in dance, as opposed to faculty in theatre, in the Department of Theatre. Jones explained that the department had two full-time faculty, as well as quite a few adjunct faculty. She said the department had great success with adjunct faculty, many of whom are specialize in a wide range of dance techniques. Jones added that the variety and flexibility that came with adjunct faculty was in some ways very beneficial to students. Wood suggested that dance should be a significant and sustainable component of the department before the name is changed. Harling said he would vote in favor of the proposal.

Harling **moved** that the Senate endorse the change of the name of the Department of Theatre to the Department of Theatre and Dance, in the College of Fine Arts. Christ **seconded**. There being no further discussion, a **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with none opposed.

c. Senate's Admissions and Academic Standards Committee - Greg Graf, Chair

i. Proposed College of Health Sciences Probation and Suspension Policy

The Chair explained that the chair of the Senate's Admissions and Academic Standards Committee (SAASC), Greg Graf, was unable to attend. She asked Guest Corrie Scott, student affairs officer in the College of Health Sciences, to explain the proposed College of Health Sciences' Probation and Suspension Policy; Scott did so. There was some discussion about whether or not the language was confusing and if it could be made clearer. McCormick **moved** to approve the proposed College of Health Sciences Probation and Suspension Policy and send it to the Senate with a positive recommendation. Guest Davy Jones, chair of the Senate's Rules and Elections Committee (SREC), affirmed for the Chair that the changes to the policy would be incorporated into the *Senate Rules* after the Senate approved the policy change itself. Harling **seconded**. There being no further discussion, a **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with none opposed.

d. Senate's Rules and Elections Committee - Davy Jones, Chair

The Chair invited Jones to give an update on the faculty trustee election. Jones said that the College of Nursing again had the highest percentage of participation in the election. None of the candidates received a majority of the votes, so the top three vote-getters were contacted to advise them of their progress to the final round of voting – Robert Grossman, Paul Kearney, and Sidney Whiteheart. He said that assuming the election software worked properly, the final round of voting would begin on Friday and remain open until the following Friday at noon.

i. Office of Dean of Undergraduate Studies

Jones offered SC members a brief history of the Undergraduate Education unit and how it has developed over the years. He reminded SC members that academic courses and programs must be housed in an academic unit; the Senate and administration compromised and identified Undergraduate Studies as a pseudo-college, which could house academic programs (such as the Honors Program) and a variety of courses. As such, the associate provost for undergraduate education also had the title “Dean of Undergraduate Studies” for symmetry with other large academic units (“colleges”) that were allowed to house academic courses and programs. Until very recently, thousands of students, some of which have no declared major, are under the auspices of the Dean of Undergraduate Studies, who decides on withdrawals and other such academic matters. Unfortunately, Provost Christine Riordan removed the dean title from the organizational structure of the Provost’s office. Although the Provost can rearrange the Provost’s office without Senate input, the Senate is always consulted when there is a change in a college’s organizational structure that affects its educational activities. Due to the administrative nature of the Provost’s office, however, the Senate was not consulted regarding the deletion of the title “dean of undergraduate studies.” Jones suggested that the appropriate course of action was for the Chair to discuss the matter privately with the Provost.

SC members discussed the issue and offered a few suggestions. The Chair said she would bring Jones along. SC members supported the idea of the Chair inviting the Provost to a future SC meeting to discuss the issue if she did not support reversing the removal of the title “dean of undergraduate studies.”

ii. Foreign Language Requirement

Jones offered SC members some background information on how the foreign language requirement had been affected by the switch from UK’s prior general education component, University Studies Program, to the current UK Core. Jones added that a fix for the foreign language requirement had not transpired in the anticipated time frame; the SC extended the prior foreign language requirement for only one year. Associate Provost for Undergraduate Education Ben Withers warned that students in fall 2014 would matriculate without the foreign language requirement. Jones suggested the SC provisionally

extend the foreign language requirement for another year until the Senate adopts a formal policy; this would prevent any students from not being subject to the requirement.

Jones stated that the **motion** from the SREC was that the SC act for the Senate to continue in effect the previous University Studies Program foreign language policy until such time as the Senate determines its final policy, and that the Bulletin language be amended as described below¹.

Any first-time freshman or transfer student must either, (1) demonstrate that they have ~~completed~~ passed two high school credits in a single foreign language, or two semesters at the postsecondary level. ~~A student who has not completed the high school foreign language requirement will be required to~~ or (2) take pass a two-semester sequence in one foreign language at the University of Kentucky prior to graduation.

Because the motion came from committee, no **second** was required. SC members discussed the proposed stop-gap measure, what requirement would be appropriate for UK students, and the road blocks that may prevent successful implementation of any such requirement. Guests Susan Carvalho (associate provost for internationalization) and Randolph Hollingsworth (assistant provost for integrated academic services) answered questions from SC members. When discussion was finished, Wood **moved** that the SC act for the Senate to continue in effect the previous University Studies Program foreign language policy for 2013-14, 2014-15, and 2015-16, and that the Bulletin language be amended as described below.

Any first-time freshman or transfer student must either, (1) demonstrate that they have ~~completed~~ passed two high school credits in a single foreign language, or two semesters at the postsecondary level. ~~A student who has not completed the high school foreign language requirement will be required to~~ or (2) take pass a two-semester sequence in one foreign language at the University of Kentucky prior to graduation.

A **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with none opposed. SC members discussed the possibility of an update from the ad hoc committee charged with recommending a new foreign language requirement. The Chair said she would invite the ad hoc committee's chair to the May 12 SC meeting.

iii. In Memoriam Posthumous Degree Diploma Language

Jones explained that the Senate already approved the parameters for an In Memoriam posthumous degree, so the only aspect left was to determine the diploma's wording. Jones said the **motion** from SREC was that the SC consider and approve an appropriate content for the In Memoriam Honorary Degree. Because the motion came from committee, no **second** was required. SC members discussed whether or not "of college" was required to modify "dean." Jones said he could remove "of college" and no one spoke against that change. When there was no further discussion, a **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with none opposed.

iv. Proposed Revision to Governing Regulations XI ("University Appeals Board")

The Chair introduced Guest Robert Grossman, member of the Senate's Rules and Elections Committee (SREC), who offered background information on the agenda item. Grossman said that SREC proposed that the SC recommend that the University Senate (Senate) ask the Board of Trustees to modify *Governing Regulations XI* to restore the authority of the Senate to establish rules by which the

¹ Underline formatting denotes added text; strikethrough denotes deleted text.

University Appeals Board (UAB) decides academic cases, including violations of academic rights and academic offenses. Prior to 2005, there was no question that the *University Senate Rules (SR)* governed how the UAB made decisions. The *Governing Regulations (GR)* delegated authority to the SR; there was also an *Administrative Regulation (AR)* that said the UAB followed what is in the SR. In 2005, the Student Government Association (SGA) was involved in a significant election dispute, which was ultimately resolved in the local court system. The court ruled that the UAB's authority to make decisions on SGA elections was not clear in the SR; *GR XI* was changed to be clear that the UAB had the authority to oversee and determine if SGA elections were legitimate. When the revisions to *GR XI* were developed, new language was added, "original jurisdiction," so that when a student appealed a finding of an academic offense, the UAB had original jurisdiction. If a student appealed an alleged violation of their academic rights, the UAB also had original jurisdiction. If a student appealed the severity of a penalty for an academic offense, the UAB had appellate jurisdiction only.

When the changes to *GR XI* were vetted with the SC in 2005, SC members asked if the revised language would change the relationship of the Senate and the UAB, i.e. did the UAB still have to follow the SR? SC members were told by representatives of Legal Counsel and the Provost's office that, in the representatives' opinion, the language revision did not change that relationship and that the use of "original jurisdiction" only meant that the UAB could engage in new fact finding. In fall 2014, however, UK's Legal Counsel, Bill Thro, issued an opinion that directly contradicted that opinion, saying that "original jurisdiction" meant that the UAB did not have to follow the SR. According to Thro's opinion, the UAB does not have to work within the confines of the SR and the UAB could, in contrast to the SR, could: rule that record of a student's guilt of an academic offense be destroyed instead of maintained permanently; and change a student's grade for any reason, instead of changing the grade only if the instructor acted in anything other than good faith in issuing the grade. The SREC is very concerned and has been advised that changing the language "original jurisdiction" back to "appellate jurisdiction" will restore the SR's authority over the UAB. Therefore, the SREC proposes that the Senate recommend that change to *GR XI*, as well as addition of explicit language that says the SR defines the UAB's procedures and scope of actions. Guests Marcy Deaton (associate legal counsel) and Richard Greissman (assistant provost for program support) assisted in the discussion.

Day asked if the explicit language in *GR XI* negated the need for changing the language from "original jurisdiction" back to "appellate jurisdiction." She expressed concern about possible confusion among students if the language reverted back to the way it once was. Grossman said that SREC was advised that "original jurisdiction" removes the ability of the Senate to regulate any aspect of the UAB. "Appellate" is much more restrictive, but the Senate can expand the particular definition of "appellate" in the SR, even things that are not normally something entailed in "appellate." In response to a request from the Chair, Deaton explained that "appellate jurisdiction" is the power of a court to review and revise a lower court's decision. The appellate review is done prior to a final decision to ensure a decision was consistent with procedures, but the appellate review does not involve a new hearing of the case. With "original jurisdiction," it is almost as if there was never a decision before and the court hears the case all over again. Day asked about decision-making responsibilities in the process; Grossman replied that the original jurisdiction in an a case of an academic offense lay with the instructor, who decides if a student committed an academic offense, as well as the associated penalty if the student committed the offense. Grossman and Day briefly discussed the process whereby a student brings a complaint about a finding of an academic offense or an associated penalty to the Academic Ombud, who will determine if a case exists and then presents a summary of the situation to the UAB; a student is able to present information and people can ask questions. Wood said that there was no intent in the wording change to prevent a student from presenting any evidence to the UAB. She said the difference between "appellate

jurisdiction” and “original jurisdiction” in this situation took time for the SREC to understand. Wood explained that in cases of “original jurisdiction” no rules apply and the UAB cannot be forced to follow any portion of the *Senate Rules*, like minimum penalties. She added that the *SR* could give the UAB fact-finding jurisdiction under within its appellate abilities. There was additional brief discussion.

Harling **moved** that the SC recommend the Senate ask the Board of Trustees to modify *Governing Regulations XI* to restore the authority of the Senate to establish rules by which the University Appeals Board (UAB) decides academic cases, including violations of academic rights and academic offenses. The specific revisions to *Governing Regulations XI*, Sections C.2. and C.4, are below².

C. The University Appeals Board - Jurisdiction

There shall be a University Appeals Board (hereinafter UAB) with specific jurisdiction over student matters. The UAB shall be assigned either original or appellate jurisdiction over various students, as established by this *Governing Regulation*, as follows:

1. Disciplinary Offenses

In cases of disciplinary offenses (outlined in the *Code of Student Conduct*, Article II) where the student is sanctioned with social suspension, disciplinary suspension, or expulsion, the UAB shall have appellate jurisdiction.

2. Academic Offenses

~~(a) In cases of academic offenses (outlined in the *University Senate Rules*, Section 6.3) where the student contests guilt, the UAB shall have original jurisdiction.~~

(b) In cases of academic offenses (outlined in the *University Senate Rules*), Section 6.3) where the only issue is the severity of the sanction, the UAB shall have appellate jurisdiction. The *University Senate Rules* define the procedures that the UAB shall use in these cases and the scope of the actions that the UAB may take.

3. Violation of Student Rights

(a) In cases where a student claims a violation of student rights (outlined in the *Code of Student Conduct*, Article I), the UAB shall hear any case referred to it by the Dean of Students and may grant the written appeal of any student to hear a case not referred to it by the Dean of Students.

(b) Registered student organizations that receive the majority of their regular operating budgets from allocations of student fee monies and/or University allocation shall have a hearing process which shall include final appeal to the UAB.

(c) The UAB shall have jurisdiction over final decisions of University hearing agencies in which a student alleges a violation of student rights. In a case involving a student election in which a candidate alleges that his or her student rights were violated, the UAB may affirm the decision of the Student Government Association appellate body, refer the matter back to the Student Government appellate body to correct the error identified by the UAB, or affirm or void the election. The jurisdiction of the UAB does not extend to the selection of the President of the Student Government Association.

² Underline formatting denotes added text and strikethrough formatting denotes added text.

4. Violation of Academic Rights

In cases where a student claims a violation of academic rights (outlined in the *University Senate Rules, Section 6.1*), the UAB shall have ~~original~~ appellate jurisdiction. The *University Senate Rules* define the procedures that the UAB shall use in these cases and the scope of the actions that the UAB may take.

5. College Honor Code Offenses

The UAB shall hold appellate jurisdiction over the decisions of college honor councils or committees, except that if the hearing panel, by majority of those present, decides the student's rights have been substantially violated, the hearing panel has original jurisdiction on the issue of guilt.

6. Cases of Temporary Sanctions

When the Vice President for Student Affairs imposes temporary sanctions on a student, the UAB shall have appellate jurisdiction

Watt **seconded**. There being no further discussion, a **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with none opposed. Grossman added that if the UAB so desired, it could submit a proposal to the Senate for a change to the *Senate Rules*.

5. UK's May 2014 Degree List

Wood **moved** that the elected faculty senators of the SC approve UK's May 2014 list of candidates for credentials, for submission to the Senate and then through the President to the Board of Trustees, as the recommended degrees to be conferred by the Board. Harling **seconded**. A **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with none opposed.

6. UK's Early August 2014 Degree List

Wood **moved** that the elected faculty senators of the SC approve UK's August 2014 list of candidates for credentials, for submission to the Senate and then through the President to the Board of Trustees, as the recommended degrees to be conferred by the Board. Harling **seconded**. A **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with none opposed.

7. Proposed Non-Standard Calendar for MA 109, MA 111, WRD 110, and UK 090 (one-time request)

The Chair invited Guest Stephanie Mayberry (assistant director, Center for Academic Resources and Enrichment Services, CARES) to explain the rationale for the one-time proposed non-standard calendar for MA 109, MA 111, WRD 110 and UK 090. SC granted a permanent non-standard calendar for these courses in spring 2013, with a start date of the Monday after the second Sunday in June. Due to the past winter's inclement weather, however, many high school seniors will not be out of school yet by that date. Mayberry requested a one-time non-standard calendar for MA 109, MA 111, WRD 110, and UK 090, from Tuesday, June 17 – Friday, July 25, 2014. Debski **moved** to approve the proposed non-standard calendar for MA 109, MA 111, WRD 110, and UK 090 and Harling **seconded**. There being no discussion, a **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with none opposed.

8. Proposed Non-Standard Calendar for Education Abroad Courses

Guests Susan Carvalho () and Abby Hollander () explained that the relatively recent Senate effort to ensure proper approval of non-standard calendars caught many of the Education Abroad (EA) staff and academic departments by surprise. Most of the courses that will be taught in summer EA programs were

allowed to use a non-standard calendar without specific Senate approval, but some courses were held up. Carvalho added that to be on the safe side she was asking for Senate approval for non-standard calendars for all the courses. Brown asked about the start and end dates for academic activities. Carvalho responded that the courses were approved at the departmental and college level, while EA signed off on the travel dates for each EA program associated with the course. Wood asked about a permanent solution to the need to request non-standard meeting patterns. Carvalho replied that they planned to prepare a formal proposal for special consideration of EA courses, in the fall.

The Chair clarified that the request was for one year only. Harling **moved** to approve non-standard calendars for courses used in EA programs for one year, through 2015. Watt **seconded**. There being no further discussion, a **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with none opposed.

9. Update on Graduation Composition and Communication Requirement

Guest Matthew Giancarlo (AS/English, co-chair Graduation Composition and Communication Requirement Advisory Committee) offered SC members an update on the implementation process of the new Graduation Composition and Communication Requirement (GCCR). After his presentation, he answered a few questions from SC members.

10. Tentative Senate Agenda for May 5, 2014

SC members and Guest J. S. Butler (Senate parliamentarian) discussed the tentative Senate agenda. Pienkowski **moved** that the SC approve the revised tentative Senate agenda for May 5, 2014 as an ordered list, with the understanding that items may be rearranged to accommodate guests' schedules. Harling **seconded**. There being no further discussion, a **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with none opposed.

11. Other Business

The Chair reminded SC members about the end-of-the-semester celebration for SC members at Pazzo's on May 12.

There being no further business to attend to, the meeting was adjourned at 5:17 pm.

Respectfully submitted by Lee X. Blonder,
Senate Council Chair

SC members present: Anderson, Blonder, Brown, Christ, Day, Debski, Harling, Hippisley, McCormick, Pienkowski, Watt, Wilson, and Wood.

Invited guests present: J. S. Butler, Deborah Crooks, Marcy Deaton, Matthew Giancarlo, Richard Greissman, Robert Grossman, Gary Hansen, Abby Hollander, Randolph Hollingsworth, James Holsinger, Davy Jones, Nancy Jones, Mark Kornbluh, Michelle Lineberry, Stephanie Mayberry, Brea Perry, Jayson Richardson, Corrie, Scott Deanna Sellnow, Toni Thomas, and Greg Wasilkowski.

Prepared by Sheila Brothers on Friday, May 23, 2014.