BRADLEY University

Fourth Regular Meeting
2024-2025 Bradley University Senate
3:10 p.m., Wednesday December 4, 2024
Michel Student Center – Marty Theater

MISSION:

Bradley University empowers students for immediate and sustained success in their personal and professional endeavors by combining professional preparation, liberal arts and sciences and co-curricular experiences. Alongside our dedication to students, we embrace the generation, application and interpretation of knowledge.

I. Call to Order

II. Announcements
1. The meeting is being recorded and livestreamed. Thank you, IT!
2. Please use the microphones and identify yourself the first time you speak. This is for the benefit of those watching online or watching the recording as well as for accessibility here in the room.

III. Approval of Minutes – Please see attached minutes
Approval of the Minutes of the Third Regular Meeting of the 2024-2025 University Senate, November 21, 2024.

President Stern called for a motion to approve the minutes.
Karl Jung motioned.
Teresa Drake seconded the motion.
The motion was unanimously approved by voice vote.

IV. Report from Student Body President Adalia Yeung

Hi everybody. I do not have much to report as we just met three weeks ago. Senate wrapped up their Semester on Monday. Projects are still the same and we will be working actively over winter break. The Greek ad-hoc committee met with Tom Coy, all the new executives coming into Greek Life, and they are working on that committee right now. On behalf of the student body, thank you for the work you've done, faculty, staff, and senior administration alike. We completely appreciate it and love what you are doing. Also, thank you to the faculty and staff who have reached out to be this semester, please keep using me as a resource. I am available all of winter break so please keep reaching out. Happy Holidays, everybody!

V. Reports from Committees

A. Admissions and Retention – Chair James Courtad

President Stern: Dr. Courtad provided a written report for me to read:

The committee has met 4 times this semester. We are comprised of representatives from all Colleges except for Foster College of Business. The committee also consists of representatives from Enrollment Management (Admissions and Student Financial Services), Student Affairs (Smith Career Center, Academic Success Center, and Orientation and Advisement), and Student Senate.

Our main focus this semester has been on retention and those students who have been admitted to the Colleges as UNV students who have not been directly admitted to the majors they have applied to, as well as AEP students. Also, we have focused on communication and collaboration, as that has been communicated to us as a key component to increasing our student population and retaining students once they begin their academic careers.

We have invited to our meetings Sarah Glover, Special Assistant for Retention and Graduation, to discuss information found on the Data Dashboard, and we've also had a visit from Emily Huschen, Director for Digital Innovation, to fill us in on Be Connected. Sarah Glover indicated that the Chair of this committee would be granted access to the Data Dashboard to then bring some of the information to the Committee for discussion and to come up with suggestions. The Chair also met with Provost Moon and Sarah Glover separately, and it was in this meeting that the need to focus on AEP / UNV students and communication was stressed. The Chair still has not been given access to nor an orientation session on the Data Dashboard. Emily Huschen gave us an overview of Be Connected and all of the ways that the tool will help with communication among the different units on campus.

The Committee also was given samples of the admittance letters that go out to students who have applied and been accepted to Bradley. In particular, we looked at the College UNV letters and expressed concern with some of the wording in the letters and the lack

of uniformity and consistency among letters. We relayed these comments and concerns to Admissions.

Submitted,
James Courtad, Chair

B. University Resources – Chair Candace Esken

Good afternoon, everybody. Thank you for having me here today to provide a brief report and an update for what we are working on for the University Resources Committee. First, I want to let you know who is also serving on the committee alongside me. We have Ryan Schmidgall from financial services. Stephanie Toland is our staff representative. Our faculty representatives include Michelle Fry, Iqbal Shareef, and Amit Sinha. We do also have a student representative, Landon Williams, on the committee. We are really pleased to have a diverse, well-rounded group involved. I believe we have been having a productive and positive semester so far. On November 11th we met with Vice President for Finance, Betsy Hull. You may remember she gave an update on this at our last Senate meeting, and I just want to echo the sentiment she shared which is I do believe, and I believe the committee agrees, it was a really positive and productive meeting. We tasked her with answering eleven extensive and difficult questions and on a relatively short timeframe. She came through. She delivered and was excited to be there and collaborate with us and engage in a very productive and open discussion. I want to thank her sincerely for that. On November 25th, Interim President Jon Michael came to join us as well. Again, we had given him a list of questions prior, and he came well prepared and very excited to engage with all of us. I also want to point out because I think it's noteworthy, he was already familiar with everyone in that room. He knew us by name and I thought that was a positive sign from a President of a University. A couple things we've been working on, first, early in the semester Vice President Hull tasked us with reviewing the Barnes and Noble First Day Complete Program. She asked us for our opinions on that program and to review it, which we spent a lot of time doing. We worked with a couple representatives from Barnes and Noble to gather more information. We then worked with our student representative, Landon Williams, to take this to the Student Senate because ultimately the program impacts the students most. The Student Senate recommended that we do not adopt that program as a University, which we agreed with on the URC. We gave that recommendation to VP Betsy Hull and she accepted our recommendation. That was a great outcome from that task. Moving forward to next semester we plan to review the faculty and staff travel budget to see if there is a more productive way that we can allocate those resources among out faculty and staff to support the travel needs of the University. Thank you for your time and if anybody has anything they would like to discuss with me or anyone else on the committee moving forward, I invite you to reach out and do so. Thank you.

VI. Reports from Administrators A. Interim President Jonathan Michael

We don't have an update on the Presidential Search. The committee meets again next week so we may have an update after that. I'm sure we have many more applications than we had the last time. We've talked about enrollment as a top priority of mine, and of the University. Enrollment Management and Marketing are developing some tools to help us to recruit. There will be a new portal rolled out in the spring semester. They are beta testing that next week. The Deans and department heads are working with Dr. Angie Cooksy to review tools available through that portal. Look for that. That's about all I have but I am glad to take questions.

Ruston Gates: I was beginning my mandatory training portals, which are rapidly coming due. I noticed a new one I hadn't seen before, and I've never seen since I've been here. It was a confidentiality agreement. I would appreciate some information on the agreement itself, the reasoning for it, for example, why now? And the scope and breadth of that agreement?

Daniel Moon: This has been a recent topic of conversation and outside of my purview. First, the institution, about two or so years ago, implemented the confidentiality agreement for new hires. More and more institutions are incorporating this, particularly at onboarding. To get a confidentiality agreement out to everyone, we decided to implement it with the mandatory training rather than onboarding. It's appearing in a different place now. The Senate Executive Committee and Deans have raised concerns about the scope of the agreement and that it is open ended. That is a conversation I've been having with Crystal Elliott and Erin Kastberg. We are going to take the agreement back to review so faculty and staff have a better understanding of what we'd like to disclose or not disclose publicly. More on this to come. The current agreement doesn't convey the true intent.

Interim President Michael: So, should they sign it?

Interim Provost Moon: So, for those of you who already have, thank you. For those of you who are comfortable doing so, thank you. For those of you who want to wait for the changed and revised version, you are welcome to do that. No pressure to sign the version that currently exists knowing we are going to change it.

Valerie San Juan: You are saying that we don't need to sign it in order to complete the required courses in Canvas? Also, is it possible to rescind an agreement that's already signed?

Interim Provost Moon: Answer to your first question, yes. Answer to your second question, I don't know. Let me get back to you.

Karl Jung: It has an option to say no. What happens if you say no?

Interim Provost Moon: Another great question. I don't know. I'll connect with others and get back to you.

Danielle Glassmeyer: The faculty handbook already holds us accountable. The faculty handbook is commonly understood as an extension of our contract. You certainly will use that against us if we violate the faculty handbook and call it a contract agreement. So, the faculty handbook already holds us accountable for confidentiality in terms of conflict of interest, due process, research misconduct, final grades, and student data, as well as computing services. It's hard to figure out what we haven't got covered.

Interim Provost Moon: Thank you, Danielle, that's certainly something we need to take back and consider in the revision of that document.

Teresa Drake: Can Contractual Arrangements also review it?

Interim Provost Moon: Great question. Not in my purview to say yes or no, but I will take that back as well.

Crystal Elliott: If you would like to change your answer, you can email Crystal Elliott and I will go back and delete your response.

Interim President Jon Michael: Thank you all. Happy Holidays! Have a great break!

B. Interim Provost and Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs Daniel Moon

Thanks everyone, I will be brief as we just recently met. I want to thank you all for the incredible hard work you've already put in under the challenging circumstances. I want to thank you for the continuing commitment you show to this University, to our students, and to each other day in and day out. I wanted to talk about our fall to spring persistence. I reported that we were a bit behind compared where we were last year and versus our three-year averages. In terms of total student population, were about 3-3.5% behind this year compared to where we were last year and compared to our three-year average. I asked you to do everything you can to encourage students to register and sign up. I am happy to tell you that we did catch up. We are within 0.5% of where we were last time. I have personally learned of so many efforts from faculty and staff members who worked to retain students. We also gained ground with our first-year students. I reported that we were 6-7% behind where we typically are. Now, we are only about 3% behind. Thank you for your efforts, please keep them up. This is a great thing to hear because it signifies to me, whatever the challenges are, if we work together, we can make progress and we can achieve them. It's not the only challenge we are facing as a university community. We pulled together to resolve it. But this is how we do it. One by one, step by step, together. Teddy Roosevelt said, "do what you can with what you have from where you are" and that's exactly what we will do. Every one of us has a role to play. It might not be the same role. What one person excels at might not be a strength for someone else. But that person in turn will have their own skills, knowledge, expertise that they bring to the table. President Michael talked about enrollment as one of our priorities and you know

that's true. When we talk about enrollment we also talk about retention. When we work together, we just showed that we can move the needle. Thank you for the ideas you are bringing to me and to colleagues across campus. That's how we get stronger.

On the subject of getting stronger, there's one more thing I want to talk about. A few of my colleagues have asked about efforts going on to develop a process to evaluate new programs. My strategy is three-fold: 1. To develop a process by which new academic programs are appropriately vetted, so we have the greatest confidence possible that we are making wise investments. This is not talking about changing the C&R or Senate approval process, I want to be clear on that. The new academic programs that the University have developed and launched have gone through very different processes in terms on the information provided, research done, and financial proformas. Even the degree to which there was a well-articulated concept statement with a target student audience has been variable. These are things we need to be consistent on. I've been working very closely with Betsy Hull and Angie Cooksy to identify the pieces of information that we need to give us the greatest confidence when conceptualizing new programs. I've talked to Senate President Stern to see at what point does that process integrate with C&R, Senate, Senate leadership to make sure we are on the same page. I want to avoid being in a situation where an academic unit does a lot of work, potentially signs a contract with a third-party, before there is a conversation with the campus community and Senate.

There are two other things we will be working on. Another is, we will formalize a sunset clause for every new program we put forth including the ones that have recently been developed. We want to be sure we are making the wisest use of our resources, time, effort, etc. As we embark on our new academic adventures, we need clear criteria to determine if we are making the best investment. In the situation where we need to redeploy resources, we need a well thought out plan for what the phase out of that program looks like. This is still conceptual and not well formulated; we are working on it. An additional step that we need to work on together that has not started, we need a regular and periodic (annual) process by which we can access the needs and strengths of all our academic programs, not just the new ones, all of them. This needs to be frequent because if there is an opportunity for us to strengthen or modify an academic program to better position the program and University, we need to do that more often than every seven years. I don't want to be in a situation where evaluations of programs are done quickly, without a collective and collaborative process, and done in a reactive way with the goal of deciding which programs we are forced to cut. Program evaluation should be about identifying opportunities to strengthen and giving our faculty members the opportunity to see areas in which there is opportunity to strengthen, and then to work collectively and collaboratively to make that happen.

I want to make sure we aren't in a situation where we are forced to make challenging decisions without having mechanisms in place to guide us to making the wisest decisions possible. Thank you for all the work you've been putting in. Thank you for the support

and grace you've shown me. Happy Holidays! Hope you have some opportunities to rest, relax, connect with family, friends, loved ones, and enjoy the peace of the holiday season. I'll take any questions.

Teresa Drake: You talked about a process to assess all programs, that it would be frequent. Faculty should be involved in this, particularly with discontinuing programs, and sooner than later would be good.

Interim Provost Moon: I agree. By no means is this process complete. We are thinking about the new programs that have been launched and are being launched, we want to know what information we've been missing. I've started having conversations with Senate President Stern about that. I want to keep him in the loop with our progress. Even with new program data, this is still early on, it's not finished.

Colin Corbett: The program evaluation sounds like a good idea and concept. Back in 2019 we had a big program evaluation push. It ended up being a ton of work for departments. It involved subjective and unclear evaluation criteria. We also didn't do anything with this work. So, when we are designing a better process, we need to be mindful of minimizing workload for existing departments. Also, we need clarity with how things will be evaluated and knowing what will be done with this information before we submit it.

Interim Provost Moon: Thank you so much, Colin. Yes, to everything you said. Part of our objective is to have clear criteria that everyone understands, not necessarily agrees with. The criteria used will be from a collaborative conversation with faculty, staff, and students. I've heard we haven't done anything with the periodic program review information. So, one thing I can bring is helping the campus community figure out what happens after we do these evaluations. What is the follow through with the information we collect? After we do these evaluations, what happens next? This will be part of our thinking going forward.

Ahmad Fakheri: What constitutes a new academic program? Our previous provost had a novel interpretation of that. How does the mission of the university fit into the new programs being proposed? For many years, we have been chasing after money and we have forgotten about the fundamental mission of this institution.

Interim Provost Moon: Such great questions. With regard to your first question, we do not have clarity on what constitutes a new program. We have not come to a consensus defining what we consider an academic program to be new versus a modification of something existing. In terms of fit and mission, that absolutely needs to be at the forefront of our conversations. I anticipate the new President will be having a lot of conversations about what are the mission, vision, and goals of the institution. We will be able to get much greater clarity soon. We are not there yet.

Teresa Drake: We are advertising online engineering programs. Those have not come through Senate. At the very least, it's a program modification. It may be argued it's a new program. Can you address that?

Interim Provost Moon: The decision to launch that program was made by previous administration. We are well down the road with it, like you said, we are advertising it already. We will learn a lot from this. A lot of programs in the past two years have not gone through he steps in the process they needed to.

Teresa Drake: I question, why do we keep moving forward? I'm pretty sure those programs require courses from other departments. I don't know that those other departments have weighed in on whether they are willing to or able to offer courses that are online. That's why this needs to go through Senate. This impacts departments and the campus as a whole.

Interim Provost Moon: We are very far down the road. We have colleagues who have put a ton of effort into that program. The focus is on, going forward, we have the conversations and processes in place to give us more confidence. It would be a disservice to our colleagues to pull the rug out from under them after all the work they've put in. This is a program that has been worked on by faculty in Engineering. I know not everyone sees the value in this program, but a number of our faculty do. These decisions were made by prior administration.

Ahmad Fakheri: This goes back to the question I asked earlier. How do these things fit? I appreciate my colleagues have put a lot of work into these programs forward. I am sorry about that. What is going to be the impact of these programs on the entire University? How many other universities are offering undergraduate online engineering degrees? How will this impact our reputation? We must consider these questions. This did not go through the Senate process.

Interim Provost Moon: I appreciate that. Previous decisions were made with the view that the program did fit with the mission of the institution. That is a question that we as a campus community do need to address. A more significant move into online education was in line with the vision of what leadership had for the institution. With a change in leadership, it opens that question and is something we need to think about as we develop additional new programs. Thank you everybody.

VII. Unfinished Business

A. Proposed changes to Section D Internal Operations

President Stern: Any discussion of the proposed changes? This is unfinished business, so it does not need a motion. Any discussion?

Interim President Michael: I request that the Senate postpone approval of this until the next meeting.

President Stern: There is a provision in the handbook, "The final vote on any question shall be postponed until the next meeting if two members so request unless the Senate by a 2/3 vote of

those present at the meeting indicate that it considers the question too urgent to permit such postponement." Do we have a second?

Interim Provost Moon: Second.

President Stern: We have a second.

Teresa Drake: Can we discuss why?

President Stern: You can, yes.

Interim President Michael: I think the changes that are proposed have gone too far. The changes are telling the Board of Trustees how to act. I don't think it's this body's purview. I just want to postpone, that's all.

[Allowing non-senator Mat Timm to speak (no objection)]

Mat Timm: I will remind the president, you are a Senator, you can propose an amendment to the language. So please, Deans, Provost, our Ex Officio members of the Senate are full, voting members of the Senate. You can address issues and propose amendments to anything a Senator puts in front of this body. I think it would be good if our administrators acted as full members of this body. I would like to see that.

President Stern: Is there any pushback to postponing the final vote of this to the next meeting? The February 20th, 2025 meeting. It does not mean that we cannot discuss it today, we will not have the final vote today.

Teresa Drake: If we are postponing until the February meeting, will the President be in attendance?

President Stern: The February meeting of Senate is February 20th and the February meeting of the Board of Trustees is February 21st so I don't know who is going to be in attendance.

Teresa Drake: I think if there are things to discuss we should do them today so we are prepared in February.

President Stern: Any further discussion? Seeing none, we will vote at the next meeting in February. I will open back up to discussion.

Interim President Michael: I appreciate the redline. I will provide my comments in writing back to you.

President Stern: We will send this back to Handbook Rewrite Committee. Any other commentary? Questions? Discussion? Mat, anything you want to add to it, as Chair of the Handbook Rewrite Committee?

Mat Timm: There are several guiding principles we've been trying to use as we've been doing this. There are reasons why it would be good to shorten the Handbook. That seems to be in conflict with clarifying things. We are attempting to shorten but also provide greater clarity. We have two documents we take as our starting point. Our Handbook is one and then documentation from AAUP. On my laptop is a third column with a bunch of our rationale for suggesting these changes and where they are coming from. If you would like to come talk to me about this in more detail, please come by.

Colin Corbett: This document is trying to define the role of the Board of Trustees. Thinking about who has power over what, is it within the purview of the Senate to define the power of the Board of Trustees? Who has the power to define the power of the Board of Trustees?

Mat Timm: The Board has final say about things approved by Senate. So, there is already a mechanism for the Board to express their approval or disapproval of anything we suggest. What this is, is a negotiation. Here are some things we are proposing to the community. It goes through Senate. If Senate approves it, it goes to the Board and they can weigh in if they accept those changes or not. If they don't like something, it would come back to the President of the University then to the Senate President and then ultimately back to us. It's to the faculty's benefit to understand the role of the Board.

Interim President Michael: I'd really like to get the third column from you, that would be helpful for me.

Libby Trones: When you look at these proposed changes as a whole, look at section D as a whole, which is rights and responsibilities of administrators, faculty, and students. This section is about shared governance. How do these entities work together? Look at these sections as a whole. Give this a careful read.

Kristi McQuade: I'll echo what Libby said. The group of faculty on this committee have been extremely careful and deliberate about every single recommendation we make. None of us have decided, let's tell the Board of Trustees how to function. That's not it at all. This serves the purpose of the faculty understanding what the Board's responsibilities are. We have no mechanism by which faculty can interact with board members. We can make a proposal, they will either approve or ask us to come back and make edits.

President Stern: As a point of clarification, any Handbook change approved by the Senate cannot go into effect until after 60 days or a week after the conclusion of the next Board of Trustees meeting whichever is later. If we pass changes today on December 4th, they cannot go into effect until March 1, 2025. Any further discussion on the proposed changes to Section D Internal

Operations. Seeing none, as we are planning to vote on this at the February meeting, we will move on to the next item.

B. Proposed changes to Annual Executive Committee Evaluation of the Dean Questionnaire

Mat Timm: Is there an inconsistency here? If you check "1", then should you go on to answer the next, does that make sense? Shouldn't there be a sixth circle that says "unable to evaluate"? I'm not a Senator so I can't propose that as an amendment.

President Stern: This is coming out of the Provost office so would you like to propose a response or provide an amendment?

Interim Provost Moon: I'll provide a response. That's a valid suggestion, if that's the desire, then I would be okay if a fellow Senator wanted to propose an amendment.

Jim Muncy: I propose that all three questions have an alternative for those who don't want to respond. Another issue is whether these will be forced choice responses or if you can choose not to respond. That would be another way to deal with those. Does anyone know if these will be forced choice or can you skip? You can set it up either way in Qualtrics. Mat, what do you want me to say.

President Stern: I think we can make one motion to add a sixth option, "unable to evaluate".

Karl Jung: I motion that for any item that asks the evaluator how familiar they are, if they select "1" then there needs to be an option that says "unable to evaluate for the effectiveness".

Teresa Drake: Second.

President Stern: Discussion of this proposed amendment.

Colin Corbett: I think this is great. I also think it's important that when we are evaluating these results, it isn't entered as 6 nor 0, we don't want it to impact the average.

President Stern: Further discussion of the amendment? Seeing none, for this amendment to add "unable to evaluate" to each of the assessment evaluative questions, not the questions about familiarity, throughout the evaluation, all those in favor of this amendment, signify by saying aye. The ayes have it, the amendment to add "unable to evaluate" to each of the assessment questions has been approved. Now we are back to the original motion, the acceptance of the new evaluation document. Any discussion of the larger issue? All those in favor of accepting the proposed changes to the Annual Executive Committee Evaluation of the Dean Questionnaire, signify by saying aye. All

those opposed, signify by saying no. The ayes have it. The proposed changes to the Annual Executive Committee Evaluation of the Dean Questionnaire format changes have been approved.

C. Proposed changes to Annual Faculty Assessment of the Dean Questionnaire

Karl Jung: I'd like to motion for the assessment performance questions, for all items on this evaluation assessment, we add a sixth option of "unable to assess".

Jim Muncy: Second

President Stern: Discussion? Seeing none, all those in favor of the amendment to add "unable to assess" to the evaluative questions, not the familiarity questions, all those in favor of that amendment signify by saying aye. All those opposed, signify by saying no. The ayes have it. Back to the original motion, any discussion? Seeing none, all those in favor of the proposed changes to the Annual Faculty Assessment of the Dean Questionnaire, signify by saying aye. All those opposed, signify by saying no. The ayes have it. The Annual Faculty Assessment of the Dean Questionnaire changes have been made. That is the end of our unfinished business. Any new business for the group?

VIII. New Business

Teresa Drake: I have just a comment. I would like to point out we just went through the process of fixing something the administration had done outside of the shared governance process, and yet we could do that with other things like the online engineering programs. They could still go through the regular Senate processes.

President Stern: Any additional new business? Seeing none, I will entertain a motion to adjourn. Thank you all for your work, dedication, and service this past semester. I hope you enjoy your break!

IX. Adjournment

Karl Jung motioned to adjourn.
Adjourned at 4:31pm

Next meeting: Fifth Regular Meeting on Thursday February 20, 2025. 3:10pm. Ballroom, Student Center

Name	Unit	Initials	Name	Unit	I
Bill Bailey	FCB		Kristi McQuade	LAS	
Rachel Borton	EHS		Kris Maillacheruvu	Int.Dean CCET&FCB	
Heather Brammeier	CFA		Cyle Metzger	CFA	
Adam Byerly	Handbook Ed.		Suruz Miah	CCET	
Colin Corbett	FCB		Jonathan Michael	Int. Pres	
David Daye	CFA		Dan Moon	Int. Provost	
Sarrah Denton	Student Rep		Sherri Morris	Int. Dean LAS	
Teresa Drake	Im. Past Sen. Pres.		Libin Mou	LAS	
Candace Esken	FCB		Jim Muncy	FCB	
Ahmad Fakheri	CCET		Lee Newton	LAS	
Heather Ford	CFA		Jessica Nigg	EHS	
Rustin Gates	LAS		Melvy Portocarrero	LAS	
Danielle Glassmeyer	LAS		Malik Raheem	EHS	
Daniel Getz	LAS		Megan Remmel	LAS	
Amy Grugan	EHS		Val San Juan	LAS	
Ethan Ham	Int. Dean CFA		Amanda Scott	EHS	
Samuel Hawkins	LAS		Udo Schnupf	LAS	
Ray Hazlip	CFA		Kathy Shapley	Int. Dean EHS	
Jacqueline Henderson	CCET		Prasad Shastry	CCET	
Lauren Henson	Student Rep		Karin Smith	EHS	
Alex Hertich	LAS		Todd Spires	Exec. Dir. Library	
Jackie Hogan	LAS		Travis Stern	CFA	
Karl Jung	EHS		Naomi Stover	LAS	
Joseph Kelly	EHS		Jennifer Stubbs	Library	
Todd Kelly	CFA		Nathan Thomas	VP Student Aff	
Barb Kerns	CIO		Shannon Timpe	CCET	
Kevin Kimberlin	LAS		Libby Tronnes	Parliamentarian	
Andy Kindler	Registrar		Chris Williams	LAS	
Twila Lukowiak	EHS		Adalia Yeung	Student Pres.	

Name	College/Unit		Name	Colleg
Kristwin	BCM			
Michelle Fry	CHM			
Elena Gebor	CFA			
Jana Hunzicker	EHS			
Bethany Meeker	ODE			
Andy Kelley	LAS			
Lavin Williams	Student			
Holly Bland	EMHC			
Robert Hull	VP			
Lori Reynolds	Athletics			
BRAD CHANDLER	" "			
Charlie Roy	Alumn			
Mat Timm	LAS/MTH			
Tom Richmond	Advancement/Alumni			
Brian Joschko	BUPD			
Christina Norton	Library			
Sarah Glover	CFA			
Chris Jochum	EFN			
Rui Li	OODE			
M. Kras	PTHS			