A meeting of the Committee of the Whole of the University of Vermont and State Agricultural College Board of Trustees was held on Friday, October 26, 2018, at 8:00 a.m. and 4:00 p.m. in the Silver Maple Ballroom, Room 401 at the Dudley H. Davis Center.

MEMBERS PRESENT: Chair David Daigle, Vice Chair Ron Lumbra, Secretary Donna Sweaney, Briar Alpert, David Aronoff, Cynthia Barnhart1, John Bartholomew, Otto Berkes, Robert Brennan, Frank Cioffi2, Carolyn Dwyer, Jodi Goldstein, Robert Hilker3, Bernard Juskiewicz, Curt McCormack, Donald McCree, Caitlin McHugh, Ed Pagano, Shap Smith, Thomas Sullivan, Tristan Toleno, and Jeff Wilson4

MEMBERS ABSENT: Johannah Donovan, Anne O’Brien, and Governor Phil Scott

ALSO PARTICIPATING: Provost and Senior Vice President David Rosowsky, Staff Council President Stephen Lunna, Graduate Student Senate President Joseph Campbell, Faculty Senate President Cathy Paris, Alumni Association President Penrose Jackson, Student Government Association President Ethan Foley, Vice Provost for Student Affairs Annie Stevens, UVM Foundation President & CEO Shane Jacobson5, UVM Foundation Vice President for Development Clarence Davis, Director of Capital Planning & Management Robert Vaughan, Director of Facilities Design & Construction Paula Carlaccini, Dean of the Larner College of Medicine Rick Page, Dean of the College of Arts & Sciences William Falls, Chief Information Officer Simeon Ananou, Vice President for University Relations and Administration Thomas Gustafson, Director of Athletics Jeff Schulman, Cannon Design Principal Colleen McKenna, Associate Director of Athletics Cathy Rahill, UVM Junior Hanna Crymbale, UVM Junior Arnar Steinn Hansson, UVM Junior Paula Moltzan, Vice President for Finance and University Treasurer Richard Cate, and Capital Renewal Engineer David Blatchly

1Participated via phone from 8:30-11:00 a.m.
2Participated in person, arriving at 11:00 a.m.
3Participated in person until 9:35 a.m. Returned for the afternoon session.
4Participated in person, arriving at 10:30 a.m.
5Joined via phone until 10:10 a.m.

Chair David Daigle called the meeting to order at 8:10 a.m.

Approval of Minutes

Chair Daigle presented the May 18, 2018 meeting minutes for approval. A motion was made, seconded and voted to approve the minutes as presented.

Chair’s Report (see full report appended to minutes, beginning on page 14)
President’s Report

President Sullivan reported that Alumni Weekend & Reunion events took place October 4-6, 2018, and went very well. He noted that during the weekend, there were dedication ceremonies for the Michele and Martin Cohen Hall for the Integrative Creative Arts and Ifshin Hall, as well as a rededication ceremony for Billings Library.

President Sullivan provided an update on Fall enrollment. This year’s class is comprised of 2,531 students, with 22% from Vermont. For the fourth year in a row, the incoming class has set records for academic preparedness, with the highest SAT score (1265) in University history. Total enrollment is approximately 13,000 students, of which President Sullivan noted the following: women comprise of 62%; student of color enrollment is up 1%; there are 452 transfer students; and the retention rate increased by 1%.

Next, President Sullivan reported on the Move Mountains campaign, which has raised over $515 million. He detailed that out of the total committed funds, $79 million is for new scholarships, $62 million for new endowed chairs and professorships, over $69 million for facilities, and $305 million for academic programs.

President Sullivan noted that the annual Inquiry report regarding research at UVM and the Fall Issue of Vermont Quarterly have been published and encouraged the UVM community to read them.

President Sullivan introduced and welcomed the following new UVM leaders: Chief Information Officer Simeon Ananou, Dean of Engineering & Mathematical Sciences Linda Schadler, and Dean of the Larner College of Medicine Rick Page. He noted that national searches have commenced for the Dean of the College of Agriculture & Life Sciences and the Dean of University Libraries & Learning Resources.

President Sullivan concluded his remarks by sharing a video clip of a Day in the Life of UVM.

Provost’s Report

Provost & Senior Vice President David Rosowsky offered an update on the status of UVM’s self-study report for the New England Commission on Higher Education (NECHE) reaccreditation (formerly the New England Association of Schools and Colleges - NEASC). The report, an external review process, is required every ten years. Accreditation constitutes the University’s authority to continue granting degrees and to receive federal funding.

Provost Rosowsky stated that after more than a year of work by eight subcommittees comprised of more than 100 faculty, staff and administrators, and with input from many different campus constituencies, the draft self-study report has been written. The report addresses nine standards, is based on data and evidence, and serves as a comprehensive, evidence-based self-assessment of UVM as an institution of higher education.
The report and accompanying documents and data forms will be distributed to the re-accreditation external team prior to their site visit on March 24-27, 2019. President Sullivan will subsequently receive a report on the site visit team’s findings along with notification of our re-accreditation status. Together, the self-study report and the site visit findings will help the University to understand our strengths, challenges and opportunities, all of which will guide future directions for UVM.

Provost Rosowsky previewed several highlights of projections that have emerged from the self-study. He encouraged all members of the UVM community to read the report once it is posted, to participate in the public comment period, and to attend an open forum with the external team during the March 2019 site visit.

In conclusion, Provost Rosowsky thanked the Self-Study Executive Committee, the standards committee co-chairs, the standards committee members, and those who have participated in the self-study process and planning for the site visit.

**Governance Leaders Reports**

Staff Council President Stephen Lunna provided his first report to the Board. He began by thanking President Sullivan, who will be stepping down in the summer of 2019, for his positive impact at UVM. President Lunna then stated that Staff Council looks forward to building a relationship with the next President. He moved on to report that Staff Council works hard to supplement staff wage increases with valuable benefits, however, he noted that the increased cost of benefits is causing financial strain for some staff. He concluded by stating that parking continues to be an issue.

Graduate Student Senate (GSS) President Joseph Campbell provided his first report to the Board. He stated that this year, GSS has grown by over 100% and is one of the largest senates in the organization’s history. He highlighted that GSS will focus on housing, fees and stipends; transportation; maternity and family leave; diversity; health and wellbeing; professional development; and UVM community outreach, engagement, and collaboration. He emphasized that engagement will be one of the GSS’s largest goals. President Campbell observed that the common theme among the initiatives is to focus on the student experience and UVM’s vibrant community. He concluded by urging the University to continue to hear and respond to the needs of all students as they arise.

Faculty Senate President Cathy Paris focused on UVM’s General Education (GE) program. Recently, she has noticed more acknowledgement of the program and indicated the time is right to raise its profile. However, she has observed widespread misconceptions, such as the belief that the program is a top-down initiative with lack of faculty support, and that it arose piecemeal. President Paris countered these misconceptions by explaining the development of the program, which resulted in four GE requirements: Foundational Writing and Information Literacy, Quantitative Reasoning, Diversity, and Sustainability. These four areas directly connect with UVM’s mission and vision, and resonate with the values in *Our Common Ground*. President Paris stated that the current task for the GE program is to make clear its value, for the UVM community to speak of the program proudly, and to showcase it as essential to every UVM
student’s education. President Paris recognized that on-going work is needed to improve the program. She then acknowledged Associate Provost Brian Reed and Faculty Fellow for Assessment J. Dickinson for their leadership and guidance around the GE program.

Trustee Robert Brennan stated that GE has an important role in preparing students for the future and encouraged faculty to continue to ensure that GE evolves.

Chair Daigle opined that the calibration and refinement process of the GE program has felt slow and echoed Trustee Brennan’s statement. President Paris acknowledged the pace is slow, but explained that it is due to the complexity and size of the University as well as the GE team also having their primary job duties to manage.

Alumni Association President Penrose Jackson reported that the Alumni Association Board of Directors had 100% donor participation last year and the leadership boards achieved an average 93% giving rate. She next highlighted that this past summer, the Diversity Committee interviewed and surveyed the alumni of color and students of color communities, with the goal of identifying programs and initiatives to build bridges between them. Nearly 400 individuals provided feedback, and an action plan is being created to hold a Mosaic Summit in Spring 2019. President Jackson next reported that affinity programs continue to grow, with 33 recognized groups, and the Board plans to evaluate regional engagement structures and alumni engagement metrics. President Jackson discussed UVMConnect, the Association’s new career engagement platform, which has 4098 members. She concluded with a video showcasing UVMConnect.

Chair Daigle asked about demographics of the membership of UVMConnect. President Jackson replied that membership comprises of approximately 81% alumni and 12% students.

Trustee Jodi Goldstein asked if connections made through UVMConnect are being tracked to which President Jackson affirmed they are.

Student Government Association (SGA) President Ethan Foley reported that as President, his focal point will be addressing food insecurity issues as well as healthier food choices for students. He next highlighted the general goals of the SGA’s eight committees. President Foley and SGA Vice President Gillian Natanagara are also working on a five-point plan focusing on the following: affordable housing, Student Health Services and Counseling and Psychiatry Services, mitigating UVM’s contributions to climate change, enhancing curricular opportunities, and expanding restorative practices. President Foley concluded by expressing support for the On-Campus Multipurpose Center Project, which he feels is desperately needed.

Trustee Donna Sweaney referenced Provost Rosowsky’s idea, included in his written report, of a “climate certificate” for every UVM graduate and asked how SGA feels about the proposal. Trustee Caitlin McHugh, a member of SGA’s Academic Affairs Committee, responded that the proposal has been discussed at the committee level and there is concern about balancing an additional requirement with the GE program and major requirements.

Trustee Shap Smith referenced food insecurity and asked if SGA has researched who the students are that face this issue and whether it coincides with mental health issues. Vice Provost for
Student Affairs Annie Stevens explained that there were two surveys launched in 2017 which resulted in the student data they reference. She explained that UVM is below the national average for food insecurity, but have 15-19% students facing it.

Chair Daigle invited President Foley to report on SGA’s stance regarding the proposal to rename the Bailey/Howe Library. President Foley stated that SGA unanimously passed a resolution to support the renaming of the library.

Chair Daigle commented that he was most impressed with the student feedback for the presidential search process.

**Move Mountains: The Campaign for the University of Vermont Update**

UVM Foundation Vice President for Development Clarence Davis provided an update on the Move Mountains campaign progress since the May meeting. He reported that as of October 24, 2018, total commitments are $515,802,01. This total is $15 million over the campaign goal of $500 million, which was met a year early. Vice President Davis indicated that over the next few months, the Foundation will focus on unfunded priorities of the campaign.

Vice President Davis acknowledged that as the campaign comes to a close, it is easy to assume that the work is done. However, he explained that planning will begin for bridging this campaign and the next. He also stated that the Foundation will need to reposition its case for support, reflect on the performance of the current campaign, and evaluate resource allocation.

Vice President Davis next discussed that in early October, dedication ceremonies were held for the Michele and Martin Cohen Hall for the Integrative Creative Arts and Ifshin Hall, as well as a rededication ceremony for Billings Library. Also in early October, Massachusetts Mutual Life Insurance Company (MassMutual) announced that it is providing $5 million in funding to expand its relationship with the University of Vermont’s Complex Systems Center. The funding, to be provided over five years beginning in 2019, will include the establishment of the MassMutual Center of Excellence for Complex Systems and Data Science, which will initiate research projects and programs aimed at better understanding human wellness through data analytics, as well as programming to cultivate a strong pipeline of data science talent. In addition to the establishment of the center, the expanded partnership includes the creation of a paid MassMutual fellowship for Ph.D. students, a visualization data artist-in-residence program for early career data scientists, and funding for research and mentorship programs for undergraduate, postgraduate and Ph.D. students.

Chair Daigle called to attention that the Move Mountains campaign has raised $68 million for facilities and highlighted the difficulty in raising funds for facilities as they are not as attractive to donors. He asked the Board to keep this in mind as they consider the On-Campus Multipurpose Center Project.

Chair Daigle next acknowledged former Trustee Harry Chen for his new role as UVM’s Executive Director of the Center for Health and Wellbeing and Public Health Officer.
Grants and Contracts Awards Report


Capital Projects Update

Director of Capital Planning & Management Robert Vaughan and Director of Facilities Design & Construction Paula Carlaccini offered an update on progress made on the construction of the Science, Technology, Engineering & Mathematics building project (STEM Complex - Innovation Hall), and the University of Vermont Medical Center’s new Patient Care Facility. Director Vaughan affirmed that the projects are still on time and on budget.

Director Vaughan and Director Carlaccini also offered brief updates on Ifshin Hall, Billings Library, and the Michele and Martin Cohen Hall for the Integrative Creative Arts.

Chair Daigle acknowledged the massive amount of work that has taken place with these projects. He thanked Directors Vaughan and Carlacinni, and their team, for their efforts in completing the work on time and on budget, and safely.

Larner College of Medicine and College of Arts & Sciences Psychological Science Medical Research Complex Project Update

Larner College of Medicine Dean Richard Page discussed his first month on campus and shared that his time has been spent learning about the organization of the College, mission areas and its relationship to the University of Vermont Medical Center. Director of Capital Planning & Management Robert Vaughan previewed that the Budget, Finance and Investment Committee will be presented with a resolution, later today, to approve $6 million to continue the project’s design and pre-construction process and cost estimate, which will cover renovation of existing buildings, deferred maintenance and a new structure.

Chair Daigle noted that parking spots will be lost as a result of this project, for which a solution will need to be created. Dean Page agreed that parking would need to be addressed and he stated that the College has a vision to develop a Green in the place of parking.

Trustee Curt McCormack stated that he sees the reduction of parking as a positive and encouraged a move to perimeter parking. Chair Daigle and Dean Page agreed that perimeter parking and campus green engagement would be positive.

Framing the 2020 Vision for the Use of Information Technology to Advance the Mission of UVM 2019-2022

Chief Information Officer (CIO) Simeon Ananou presented the draft of a multi-year vision for the use of Information Technology (IT) at the University. He explained that the purpose of this vision is to move IT from functioning as a utility to becoming a strategic partner helping to
advance UVM’s mission. He added that it is important that IT at UVM meet the expectation of its users and to acknowledge that IT should pivot into a strategic investment.

CIO Ananou next explained that upon arriving at UVM, he spent his first 100 days listening to the UVM community. As a result, six distinct strategic imperatives emerged as the pillars on which efforts must rest over the next three to five years. These imperatives are: Develop the Teaching & Learning Environment of the Future; Support Faculty Research, Scholarship and Creative Activities; Support and Improve Administrative Processes; Promote Information Security and Protection of Digital Assets; Improve Operational Efficiencies; and Enable the Oneness of IT at UVM.

CIO Ananou next stated that he envisions a technology infrastructure that will complement teaching and learning activities by enabling the distribution of instructional materials effectively and ultimately contributing to the success of all members of the UVM community. His vision also considers that UVM is the only public research university in Vermont. As such, his vision is to strengthen and improve our research computing capabilities by making sure our researchers have the necessary computational resources and the data repositories to support their explorations and their discoveries.

CIO Ananou moved on to acknowledge that UVM has implemented some of the most complex administrative computing systems for a campus of its size. He explained that steps need to be taken to understand how these systems and their related business practices have evolved and how they can be adapted to better co-exist. This will also help reduce manual processes that are often error prone.

CIO Ananou next discussed the potential for data breaches. The proposed vision calls for an improvement of security operations through awareness and education, and through efforts to strengthen data protection methods, business continuity, and disaster recovery plans.

CIO Ananou moved on to state that part of the IT vision concentrates on the implementation of intelligent systems that make it possible to take advantage of the University’s economies of scale. He sees IT as playing a major role in leading the effort of converting data into intelligence and wisdom.

CIO Ananou next explained that an IT vision may not deliver sustainable success unless attention is paid to the human element of UVM’s technology operation. If his vision receives appropriate endorsement, he will move swiftly to establish an IT governance structure to help implement a better cohesion between IT professionals and to create consistency with users’ access to services.

CIO Ananou concluded that the main goal of the IT vision is to place students and the faculty at the center of IT-related efforts to enhance the overall student experience by enabling innovation and engagement at all levels. In order to realize this vision, it will take commitment to remain highly competitive, continue to be willing to change, to adopt best practices, and to realign resources.
Trustee Caitlin McHugh asked what a digital environment will look like for future UVM students. CIO Ananou answered that one area for improvement is to aggregate the seven digital spaces of learning materials into one. He also explained that infrastructure is needed which would allow the University to take learning vitals. Lastly, he believes that in the future, lectures will need to be available in the on-line learning space.

Trustee Briar Alpert asked if there is compatibility between the IT vision and the current financial model. CIO Ananou replied that the vision would require significant funds, noting that the University may have to prioritize elements that would have the greatest impact.

Trustee Robert Brennan asked if the campus is aware that there is a more centralized point of contact for IT with the establishment of the recently created CIO position. President Sullivan stated that awareness continues to be worked on.

Trustee Curt McCormack asked regarding the impact that hackings can have on institutions. CIO Ananou replied that the impact varies, but can have a negative impact on universities.

At 10:40 a.m., Chair Daigle called for a brief break.

At 10:52 a.m., the meeting resumed.

**On-Campus Multipurpose Center Project**

Vice President for University Relations and Administration Thomas Gustafson provided a brief history of the fruition of the On-Campus Multipurpose Center Project, beginning with the Campus Life Task Force that was appointed in 2007 to evaluate the potential project. At the time, the Task Force estimated the project cost would be approximately $200 million. Vice President Gustafson explained that the current project proposal stays true to the 2007 principles, with a cost of $95 million.

Vice President Gustafson summarized the Board action to date for the current proposal, as follows: February 2017 - approval of the concept and $750,000 for schematic design; October 2017 - approval of $1,000,000 for initial phase of design development; February 2018 - approval of $1,500,000 for final phase of design development and permitting; and May 2018 - approval of $2,000,000 for final full construction drawings.

Director of Athletics Jeff Schulman stated that the project is transformative for the entire campus. Once it is complete, the project will positively impact enrollment efforts.

Director Schulman next highlighted the unique nature of the Athletic Department, which encompasses health, wellness, recreation and varsity sports programming. He explained that the project will dramatically enhance and consolidate health and wellness space for the entire campus and create a true multipurpose center to tie these, and other, elements together.
Director Schulman next discussed project highlights and noted that the project will address $30-35 million in deferred maintenance, improve internal circulation, and increase efficiency that includes re-use of existing space and limited new construction.

Cannon Design Principal Colleen McKenna presented the long-term master planning concept, which focused on maximizing the use of every square foot. The project components include health and wellness, events center and shared space, the Gutterson Arena, athlete support space, and the Gucciardi strength and conditioning space.

Ms. McKenna next highlighted the current status of the project. She explained that there is a large team completing the construction documents in preparation to go out to bid. They will soon be issuing the early site design, utility enabling, and early building foundations packages.

Ms. McKenna also discussed the planning and design concept. She displayed illustrations of existing conditions and compared them with imaging of what the spaces will look like once the project is complete. She also detailed the program components of each space.

Director of Capital Projects Robert Vaughan outlined that the next step is for the Board to authorize construction at a project cost of $95 million. He indicated that the Burlington zoning permit has been approved and that the Act 250 permit is pending. Pending project approval and permitting, site and utilities enabling construction should begin this winter. Subcontractor bid packages are scheduled for release in November 2018.

Director Vaughan stated the project is on a 2.5 year construction schedule. This schedule projects that the Events Center will be completed in August 2020 and the entire project will be compete in May 2021. The schedule has been designed to avoid interruptions of hockey and basketball seasons.

Chair Daigle explained that, later today, the Educational Policy and Institutional Resources Committee will consider the project program and the Budget, Finance and Investment Committee will consider the funding proposal. If both committees approve their respective pieces, then the full Board will consider final approval at its meeting tomorrow.

Trustee Don McCree asked whether the project will help admissions. Provost Rosowsky explained that project will help the University to attract and retain more students interested in health & wellness.

Trustee Ron Lumbra asked what the risk would be if the project did not stay on schedule. Director Vaughan explained that a contractor was hired to consider how to phase the construction with the least amount of disruption. If the initial phase is not completed this winter, then the schedule cannot be met. He also added that if the Events Center is not completed on time, then everything else is held up. The entire project is tied together and it will need to stay on schedule.
Trustee Shap Smith asked how the project will impact students during construction. Director Schulman explained that there will be a level of disruption that is unavoidable, but efforts are being made to minimize it as much as possible.

Trustee Caitlin McHugh asked if the Center for Health & Wellbeing had been consulted on how it might use the space. Ms. McKenna explained that the Center was a stakeholder that was consulted regarding the project. She stated that the Center has similar needs to Campus Recreation and that the two entities will take advantage of opportunistic overlap in their programs.

Academic Presentation – Teacher/Scholar Model Highlighting Creative Arts

Director of Athletics Jeff Schulman began the academic presentation with a video highlighting UVM Athletics. Next, he and Associate Director of Athletics Cathy Rahill shared a brief overview of athletics including academic and athletic accolades, standings and program highlights. They were joined by student-athlete leaders, Hanna Crymble (Women’s Basketball), Arnar Steinn Hansson (Men’s Soccer) and Paula Moltzan (Alpine Skiing), who shared their experiences balancing academics, athletics, social lives and community engagement.

Director Schulman also recognized Josh Speidel, who has been able to continue at UVM as a student athlete despite a life-altering vehicle accident. Mr. Speidel has a 3.6 GPA and is a remarkable representative of all that is good about the athletic program.

Chair Daigle acknowledged that student athletes are inspiring and are recognized broadly.

At 12:00 p.m., the meeting recessed.

At 4:12 p.m., the meeting resumed.

Renaming Advisory Committee Report and Recommendation

Chair of the Renaming Advisory Committee Ron Lumbra explained the process used in addressing a proposal to remove Guy W. Bailey’s name from the Bailey/Howe Library. The proposal, submitted by Associate Professor Jackie Weinstock and signed by more than 100 members of the UVM faculty, cites Bailey’s involvement with the Vermont eugenics movement of the 1920s and 30s as grounds for revoking the naming honor.

Chair Lumbra explained that to evaluate the proposal, the Committee applied principles and criteria developed at Yale University. He emphasized that the Committee was deliberate, took care in the process, and was provided an opportunity for community input. He noted that because the proposal was received at the end of April, close to the end of the academic year, the Committee decided to provide an additional opportunity, in late August, for the UVM community to offer feedback. Feedback received was strongly in support of the proposal.

Chair Lumbra moved on to explain that after review of the proposal and subsequent research, the committee concluded that Bailey was significantly involved as president of the University in
promoting eugenics. The Committee also learned through its research of fiscal mismanagement during the Bailey presidency. Because this legacy is at odds with the mission of the University and because the building in question plays a substantial role in forming community on campus, a recommendation was made to the Board to remove Bailey’s name.

Chair Lumbra added that the previous addition of David W. Howe to the name of the library was not related to Guy Bailey, so the Committee did not consider removing Howe’s name. The recommendation was unanimous.

The following resolution was presented, with an amendment shown in track-changes below:

Resolution Approving Removal of the Name of Guy W. Bailey from the Bailey/Howe Library

WHEREAS, on March 26, 2018, the Board of Trustees approved the creation and appointment of a new Board of Trustees Renaming Advisory Committee (“Committee”) for the purpose of considering proposals to remove a name from a building, academic unit, or academic program; and

WHEREAS, on April 9, 2018, a memo was issued to the UVM Community detailing the process for submitting a proposal to remove a name from a UVM building, academic unit, or academic program; and

WHEREAS, on April 29, 2018, the Committee received a proposal to remove the name of Guy W. Bailey from the Bailey/Howe Library; and

WHEREAS, the Committee met on May 11, 2018 to conduct a preliminary review and determined the proposal warranted further consideration; and

WHEREAS, the Committee conducted a thorough, careful and deliberative process and issued periodic communications to the UVM Community to invite input on the proposal; and

WHEREAS, the Committee evaluated all input it received and then deliberated and prepared a report recommending that the name of Guy W. Bailey be removed from the Bailey/Howe Library; and

WHEREAS, the Board is satisfied that is has received adequate information to make a decision regarding the proposal to remove Guy W. Bailey’s name from the Bailey/Howe Library;

THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, that the Board of Trustees approves the removal of the name of Guy W. Bailey from the Bailey/Howe Library as recommended by the Committee in the report included as Appendix A to this document; and
BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the Bailey/Howe Library be renamed the David W. Howe Memorial Library.

A motion was made, seconded and the amended resolution was unanimously approved.

**Annual Deferred Maintenance Report**

Vice President for University Relations & Administration Tom Gustafson introduced Dave Blatchly, newly appointed Capital Renewal Engineer (CRE). CRE Blatchly has been with the University since 2002 and will focus on monitoring deferred maintenance.

Director of Capital Planning & Management Robert Vaughan discussed updates on recent facility renewal projects along with the standard forecast of the next three years for the deferred maintenance backlog projection. He also provided an update on funding and expenditures on small capital projects.

CRE Blatchly provided a recent history of the Physical Plant Department. He explained that the last UVM facility assessment was conducted by an external firm in 2001. The assessment yielded 12,000 deferred maintenance deficiencies. Physical Plant has built upon the assessment for the last 17 years, during which project priorities have remained the same. CRE Blatchly noted that energy efficiency and sustainability are drivers for how deferred maintenance is addressed.

CRE Blatchly moved on to state that now is the time for a re-assessment of deferred maintenance at the University. After thorough review, it has been determined that this assessment would be better served by being completed in-house, a process that will be led by CRE Blatchly. The benefit of having the process in-house is that staff have institutional knowledge and are focused only on UVM, it is cost-effective, there is the ability for the continuous improvement of data, and there would be more insight to the master plans of the University.

CRE Blatchly indicated that the assessment will be a large undertaking as there are over 300 facilities, 5.8 million square feet, and a current replacement value of $1.38 billion. He then explained the Facility Condition Index, and methods to determine the figure. CRE Blatchly expanded on the condition-based approach, which will utilize a “30/30 examination” focusing on the top 30 most valuable and largest facilities.

Vice President for Finance and University Treasurer Richard Cate discussed capital projects data for fiscal years 2013 through 2020. The projects total $261 million. He also discussed deferred maintenance data for the same period, which totaled $49 million.

Trustee Shap Smith asked what the deferred maintenance backlog total will look like under the new assessment model. CRE Blatchly explained that he will be able to provide more accurate figures once the in-house assessment has been completed.

Trustee Robert Brennan asked for more details regarding Residential Life funds for deferred maintenance. Vice President Cate explained that, since 1992, the University has placed 1% of the
construction cost of new buildings into a facilities renewal fund. Unfortunately, buildings before 1992, do not have dedicated resources.

Trustee Briar Alpert referenced the 30/30 examination and asked if it will have an impact on the University’s balance sheet. Vice President Cate responded that rating agencies consider deferred maintenance figures when evaluating the University.

In response to a question from Chair Daigle, CRE Blatchly explained that in-house deferred maintenance evaluation is a direction a lot of universities are going. He added that the Facility Condition Index is a standard industry metric.

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 5:05 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

David A. Daigle, Chair
Good morning. I want to extend a warm welcome to everyone to our October Board meeting. Thank you all for attending, and a very special thank you, once again, to all of our faculty, staff, and students who strive to make UVM such a special place.

I was able to spend a few days in Stowe this week, and caught that magical sight of snow falling against the red and yellow leaves covering the mountain. The changing of seasons in Vermont always produces these spectacular moments, for which we should all be grateful.

It turns out that presidential terms also have seasons, and we are approaching a change. In August, President Sullivan announced his plan to step down from the presidency at the conclusion of this academic year. To some this may have been a sudden surprise, but rest assured that Tom provided our Board with ample notice, and his decision was largely consistent with expectations he set with our Board when he assumed the presidency nearly seven years ago. We want to thank Tom for his leadership and professionalism, and we look forward to working with him to ensure a smooth transition to new leadership.

We have assembled a Search Committee to conduct the search for a new president. With representation from all major University constituencies, we are confident that the Committee will provide a strong pool of candidates for consideration by our Board. We have every expectation that we will review a broad, diverse, and deep pool of candidates. I want to thank the members of the search committee for their service and counsel as we seek to identify UVM’s 27th president.

We have three new senior institutional leaders on campus that I would like to acknowledge. Tom will provide a more formal introduction in a few moments, but on behalf of our Board, let me extend a welcome and thank you to Linda Schadler, Rick Page, and Simeon Ananou as they join our UVM community.

We will hear from Simeon today, the first installment in what I hope will become an ongoing dialog between our Board and the administration regarding technology issues. Technology is no longer a utility used to carry out the strategic work of the University, it has itself become a strategic pillar in higher education. We see technology’s impact on the academic core, but its promise extends to enrollment, advising, student services, central administration, and beyond. It is no accident that two of our newest trustees, Jodi and Otto, both have technology expertise.

I recently asked Simeon to address our Board on the topic of information security. Instead, Simeon suggested that he first present his vision for how we might use technology to transform how we achieve our mission at UVM. That Simeon views the core purpose of technology as mission driven is inspiring, and this perspective needs to be woven into the strategic planning conversations we will have next year. The critical issue of information security will be addressed at our next Board meeting.
I recently met Ryan Craig, the author of a new book titled “A New U – Faster + Cheaper Alternatives to College.” Craig describes a fundamental erosion in the confidence that parents, students, and employers have in the value of higher education, and surveys the myriad alternatives sprouting up to capitalize on that dissatisfaction. Alternatives are most common in the domain of technology, but this is precisely where students find some of the best employment prospects.

One quote sums up the book’s thesis: “There’s no question that a college degree will remain the default choice for the foreseeable future. But it’s clear that the conditions under which the default should and will be rejected are multiplying.” Craig frames the rejection conditions on the twin axes of affordability and selectivity, which, fair or not, is a proxy for quality. For colleges with weaker selectivity and affordability metrics, the odds of students rejecting are increasing.

These themes - affordability, selectivity, quality, value – are essential elements of sustainability for UVM and every other higher education institution. They form the antidote to disruptive change that will only intensify. We have made progress at UVM, but meaningful advances will require collective, collaborative, and sustained engagement of the entire leadership of this institution. This is the lens through which we will evaluate candidates in our presidential search.

As we strive to improve our value proposition for students, incremental resources will be essential. I want to take a moment to recognize the entire team at the UVM Foundation for the historic milestone of achieving the $500 million capital campaign target. This is only the third capital campaign in UVM’s history, and we have surpassed the combined total of the two previous campaigns. The creation of the Foundation was not without controversy, but today there is no doubt that it has been a defining positive moment in the history of UVM.

I also want to notify our community that we have completed the annual presidential review process. I want to thank our Annual Review Subcommittee members for their work on this important objective. Findings from these reviews, as well those from our strategic planning discussions at our retreat, will inform the presidential search process.

Finally, I want to quickly preview perhaps our most important agenda item for this meeting. UVM has been evaluating concepts to expand and enhance our athletic, health and wellness facilities for literally decades. For various strategic reasons, this Board and prior Boards have considered this project a priority, but have been unable to find an appropriate path forward. Today, we will propose a path that is credible, affordable, and appropriate for the current student body. My message to our Board and to all of you is simple: it is time.

This concludes my chair’s report, and I would now like to ask President Sullivan to share his report.
REPORT OF THE TRUSTEE RENAMING ADVISORY COMMITTEE WITH RESPECT TO PRESIDENT GUY W. BAILEY AND THE BAILEY-HOWE LIBRARY

October 16, 2018

I. Background of the Committee

On March 26, 2018, University of Vermont Board of Trustees approved the creation and appointment of the Board of Trustees Renaming Advisory Committee. This Committee is charged with considering and making recommendations to the Board regarding proposals from the University community to remove names from University buildings, applying principles and criteria developed at Yale University in 2016. Input from the University community is to be sought with respect to any proposed name removal that is considered by the Committee.

II. Criteria and Process

Once the Committee receives a proposal, it conducts an initial review to determine whether the following requirements have been met:

- Rationale for name removal, including relevant Principles on Renaming that apply
- Any relevant documents including pertinent historical or other evidence, with appropriate documentation and citations

If the requirements have been met, the Committee evaluates the proposal using the following criteria, which were developed by Yale University:

There is a strong presumption against renaming a building on the basis of the values associated with its namesake. Such a renaming should be considered only in exceptional circumstances.

The presumption against renaming is at its strongest when a building has been named for someone who made major contributions to the University.
Principles to be considered:

- Is a principal legacy of the namesake fundamentally at odds with the mission of the University?
- Was the relevant principal legacy significantly contested in the time and place in which the namesake lived?
- Did the University, at the time of a naming, honor a namesake for reasons that are fundamentally at odds with the mission of the University?
- Does a building whose namesake has a principal legacy fundamentally at odds with the University’s mission, or which was named for reasons fundamentally at odds with the University’s mission, play a substantial role in forming community at the University?

The Yale report further states: “We expect that renaming will typically prove warranted only when more than one principle listed here points toward renaming; even when more than one principle supports renaming, renaming may not be required if other principles weigh heavily in the balance.” (Yale University, 2016)

Next steps in the process include:

1) Gaining a thorough understanding of the legacy of the individual whose name is proposed for removal.
2) Providing an opportunity for UVM Community members to contribute input and commentary with respect to the proposed name change.
3) Once the Committee is satisfied that it has received adequate information to consider a recommendation, final deliberations take place. The Committee then delivers a final recommendation to the Board of Trustees.

III. Guy W. Bailey Name Removal Proposal

The Committee received the attached proposal, dated April 29, 2018, to remove the name of Guy W. Bailey from the Bailey-Howe Library complex. The proposal (“Weinstock Proposal”) was submitted by Professor Jacqueline S. Weinstock, and included 108 faculty supporters.

The proposal also may be found here:
http://www.uvm.edu/trustees/?Page=other_com/renaming/content.html&SM=submenu1.html

The primary rationale for the proposed name removal was Bailey’s direct and active involvement, while UVM President, in supporting the Eugenics Survey of Vermont (“ESV”).
The proposal did not request removal of the Howe name on the Library Complex. Howe was unaffiliated with Bailey’s tenure and his name was added separately to an addition to the library constructed later. Consequently, the Committee did not consider the removal of the Howe name.

IV. Summary of Committee Review

The Committee reviewed multiple sources both to verify the information presented in the Weinstock proposal, and to gather historical perspectives to inform its own inquiry. The Committee also fully reviewed all comments from members of the University community.

Through its research, readings, and deliberations, the Committee draws the following conclusions with respect to President Guy W. Bailey’s legacy:

1) Guy W. Bailey (1876-1940) was the 13th President of UVM, appointed in 1920, serving until his death in 1940. (Bassett, 1991)

2) Bailey’s tenure saw enrollment grow rapidly, with many new buildings added to the campus, including Slade Hall, the Fleming Museum, Ira Allen Chapel, Southwick, and Waterman. (Gale, 1991) Bailey was respected by many who knew him and benefitted from his guidance when they were students. He offered moral and financial support, active mentorship, and concern for their academic success and personal welfare and was actively engaged across the University community. He also is credited with expanding educational access to students, including women, as well as keeping the University financially afloat during the difficult years of the Great Depression. These aspects of his legacy formed the basis for a proposal by a group of alumni to burnish his tarnished legacy with respect to financial issues, and name the new library for Bailey, approved by the Board of Trustees in 1959. (Beckley, 1976).

Supporters of Bailey described him as “…A king-sized individual in every way. He was the most respected man in the State of Vermont. He could have been elected Governor if he had had the slightest interest in the job. He preferred to be President of the University of Vermont.” (Beckley, 1976).

3) With respect to eugenics, the issue upon which the Weinstock proposal is based, Bailey was significantly involved. Specifically, he supported the Eugenics Survey of Vermont, and its principal leader, Henry Perkins, UVM Professor of Zoology, in multiple ways, including:
   - “Heartily endorsing” Henry Perkins’s work with respect to the Eugenics Survey of Vermont. (Gallagher, 1999)
   - Serving as the key University leader in raising substantial private funding for the Survey, which was the first privately-funded research project at UVM. (Bassett, 1991)
   - Serving on the Eugenics Survey Advisory Committee. (Gallagher, 1999)
4) Broader Impacts of the ESV:
   - Perkins and the ESV successfully lobbied for the passage of a voluntary sterilization law in Vermont in 1931. While there is no direct evidence that Bailey was actively involved in this lobbying effort, he remained a member of the ESV Advisory Committee during this period. In practice, many of the sterilizations subsequently carried out were involuntary. (Gallagher, 1999)
   - In Vermont, eugenics research was largely motivated by concerns about the supposed degeneration of native-born Yankee “stock.” Although sterilization records are not available, it appears likely that it was mostly poor women, along with darker-skinned French-Canadian and Native-American populations, who were targeted by the Vermont eugenic sterilization program. (Gallagher, 1999)
   - By 1935, eugenics was largely falling into disfavor, especially after the Nazis embraced the concept in their “race hygiene” programs. (Gallagher, 1999)

5) Eugenics is now widely recognized and condemned as misguided and racist. However, in Bailey’s time it was widely accepted as an intellectually progressive idea built on a foundation of science. “The eugenics movement, led in America by biologists who embraced Mendelian genetics, attracted a broad and powerful constituency and generated a vast literature that influenced public policy concerning immigration, mental health initiatives, and state intervention in family life.” (Gallagher, 1999).

   Another perspective is offered by Alison Bashford: “…Eugenics was often, but not necessarily driven by race questions. Reduction in birth defects, on the other hand, was one consistent and central objective of eugenics in almost all national contexts. Eugenics and race, then, are often used interchangeably, in a way that flattens out this complicated history and that stems, in large part, from a still-common conflation of eugenics with Nazi racial hygiene.” (Bashford and Levine, 2010).

6) Although not mentioned in the Weinstock Proposal, a significant controversy over inappropriate financial practices employed by Bailey is well documented as part of his legacy. After his death, Trustees found that Bailey had concealed the fact that the University was deeply in debt and nearly bankrupt. (Bassett, 1991) “He spent money that he had no legal right to spend,” including using restricted annuity and scholarship funds for current expenses, and making unsecured loans to friends. Bailey also inflated the value of University property in order to make the institution appear solvent. (Beckley, 1976) Despite these clear violations of fiduciary responsibility, Bailey’s supporters asserted that his intentions were good. Bailey’s bookkeeper, Edwin B. Abbott, believed that “If he had lived, there was a good chance he would have succeeded in making up the deficit.” (Bassett, 1991) Of course, the outcome of this speculation will never be known.

V. Application of Criteria

The Weinstock Proposal identified three relevant Yale Principles to be applied in considering removing the Bailey name from the library. Most relevant are Principles 1 and 4:
“Is a principal legacy of the namesake fundamentally at odds with the mission of the University?”

“Does a building whose namesake has a principal legacy fundamentally at odds with the University’s mission, or which was named for reasons fundamentally at odds with the University’s mission, play a substantial role in forming community at the University?”

The Committee agrees that these two principles are most appropriate to apply in considering the Weinstock Proposal, thus reaching the threshold of meeting more than one of the Yale principles. The Committee also carefully examined Principles 2 and 3, but did not find sufficient evidence regarding the extent of debate over Bailey’s legacy at the time of naming to further consider these Principles. Therefore Principles 2 and 3 did not “weigh heavily in the balance,” one way or the other, per the guidance provided in the Yale Report. (Yale University, 2016).

Guy W. Bailey had numerous positive accomplishments that are part of his extensive legacy as President of UVM. However, the Committee is in agreement that two principal legacies of Guy W. Bailey’s Presidency are fundamentally at odds with the mission of the University (Principle 1):

1) His active involvement as President of the University in supporting and promoting the Eugenics Survey of Vermont, and;
2) His misappropriation of University financial resources, leaving the University in a dire fiscal condition at the time of his death. Although this was not identified in the Weinstock Proposal, the Committee deemed it worthy of consideration.

Further, the Committee is in agreement that the building named for Guy W. Bailey --the Bailey-Howe Library-- is at the epicenter of forming and supporting both educational and social community at the University (Principle 4).

It should be noted that although there exists extensive written material on the broad subject of eugenics, Guy Bailey’s connection to it was limited to his support of the Eugenics Survey of Vermont, and of its primary champion, Henry Perkins. Written materials related to this specific issue are limited. As well, although extensively acknowledged and unrefuted by both supporters and detractors, written accounts regarding the questionable financial practices employed by Bailey are few in number.

VI. University Community Commentary

The Renaming Advisory Committee received 44 commentary submissions from a variety of sources: students (grad and undergrad), faculty, staff, alumni, Emeriti Trustees, a parent, and a member of the local community unaffiliated with UVM. A significant majority were in favor of removing the Bailey name from the Library.
VII. Committee Recommendation

It is the unanimous recommendation of the Trustee Renaming Advisory Committee that the name of Guy W. Bailey be removed from the University of Vermont Library complex, currently known as the Bailey-Howe Library.

VIII. Other Suggestions

Although not under the direct charge of the Renaming Advisory Committee, we further suggest, that the University work to establish a lasting educational effort with respect to the history of eugenics, UVM’s role in it, and its impacts on populations in Vermont and beyond. Such an effort might include classes, seminars, speakers, displays (such as currently exists in the library), or public works of art.

Resources:


Additional Related Readings:


**Attachments (2):**
- Weinstock Proposal
- Yale Principles
Proposal for Removing a Name from a UVM Building or Program
April 29, 2018

I. Name(s) and contact information of proposers:

Jacqueline (Jackie) S. Weinstock
Associate Professor, Department of Leadership & Developmental Sciences
Email: Jacqueline.weinstock@uvm.edu (preferred)
Office Phone: (802) 656-2058

II. Facility or program for name removal consideration: Bailey/Howe Library

III. Rationale for name removal, including relevant Principles on Renaming that apply:

Bailey/Howe Library currently honors former UVM President Guy W. Bailey. Yet we have found sufficient evidence that President Bailey played a significant role in supporting and promoting the Vermont Eugenics Survey, enough to warrant removing his name from the library’s name. We understand that there are other contributions that Bailey made to the university and that Bailey will still be recognized as one of UVM’s presidents. Yet we believe given the record of his direct eugenics support, and the prominence of the undergraduate library to UVM students, faculty and staff, as well as to the larger surrounding communities, the honor of having the library named after him should now be denied.

According to Nancy Gallagher—whose University of New England Press book Building Better Vermonters: The Eugenics Project in the Green Mountain State (published in 1999) originated in research for her UVM masters’ thesis—Henry Perkins “began teaching eugenics in his new Heredity course in 1921” (Gallagher, n.d., “Vermont Eugenics: A Documentary History”). The Eugenics Survey grew out of this undergraduate course (Dann, 1991), and as Kevin Dann argued, Guy Bailey played a major role in helping to obtain initial funding for this survey. Specifically, “Guy Bailey acted as intermediary in soliciting” initial funding for this survey that came from Emily Proctor Eggleston, whom he knew “from her support of the Vermont Children’s Aid Society (VCAS) of which Bailey was treasurer.” An initial $5,000 of funds from Mrs. Eggleston was presented to UVM “after which they were dispersed to Perkins” (Dann, 1991, p. 8). This was in 1925.

In 1927, Professor Perkins obtained more substantial funding to create a comprehensive rural survey, ultimately referred to as the Vermont Commission on Country Life (VCCL). Here too, Guy Bailey played an important role. Indeed, as Dann reported, Guy Bailey wrote the official grant application that supported the expanded survey, which when implemented after securing funding, was “christened the Vermont Commission on Country Life.” Furthermore, as Dann reported, “Bailey was Perkin’s continual supporter in his eugenic endeavors, granting a year’s sabbatical (1927-1928) to organize the survey” (1991, p. 18)

Nancy Gallagher (1999, n.d.) also revealed Guy W. Bailey to be one of the central supporters of Perkins’ survey. Although the Eugenics Survey was “privately funded and staffed by a succession of professional social workers who conducted investigations, compiled reports, and
promoted the findings among Vermont’s social service agencies,” it operated as an “official” adjunct to the University of Vermont’s Zoology department. From this department Professor Perkins enlisted “the cooperation and support of an impressive roster of civic leaders, private charities, government officials, and professors in relevant fields” who “endorsed the enterprise” by serving as “advisors to the survey.” Although Gallagher notes that “Perkins’ advisors frequently tempered his zeal for hereditary causes of social problems,” they also “supported state programs for identification, registration, and ‘social control’” of those families found to be “deficient.”

Among these advisors was Guy W. Bailey, listed by Gallagher (n.d.) as one of the Academic Members of the Advisory Committee for the survey (as evidenced on the subpage, http://www.uvm.edu/~eugenics/partnersf.html). Specifically, Gallagher notes Bailey’s role in “giving his support primarily through negotiation and administration of the sponsors’ funding of the Survey and granting Perkins sabbatical leave to expand the scope of his enterprise.” This evidence suggests that Guy Bailey was not simply involved in name only, as a result of his being President of the University, but rather was directly supportive of and involved in the Vermont Eugenics Survey.

IV. Relevant Principles on Renaming: Two of the four principles to be considered are relevant to the current renaming request.

- “Is a principal legacy of the namesake fundamentally at odds with the mission of the University?”
- “Does a building whose namesake has a principal legacy fundamentally at odds with the University’s mission, or which was named for reasons fundamentally at odds with the University’s mission, play a substantial role in forming community at the University?”

It was during Bailey’s 20-year tenure as UVM’s President (1920-1940) that we see evidence of his being a supporter of Henry F. Perkins who spearheaded the Eugenics Survey of Vermont. We also believe there is substantial evidence that Bailey’s support was more than in name and that through his support for the survey—both in terms of supporting fundraising efforts and supporting Perkins in his work on the survey—he shares responsibility for the consequences of that survey and its “results.” These consequences include the passage and enactment of Vermont’s 1931 sterilization law, the expansion of programs for segregation of the “feebleminded,” and other forms of discrimination against individuals and groups based upon racial and ethnic identity in the name of promoting “blood and breeding” among Vermonters.

It is clear that the Eugenics Survey of Vermont, and support for it evidenced by President Guy W. Bailey, runs counter to the stated vision and mission of this institution (Office of the President, 2018): “To be among the nation’s premier small research universities, preeminent in our comprehensive commitment to liberal education, environment, health, and public service” (vision) and “To create, evaluate, share, and apply knowledge and to prepare students to be accountable leaders who will bring to their work dedication to the global community, a grasp of complexity, effective problem-solving and communication skills, and an enduring commitment to learning and ethical conduct” (mission). The Vermont Eugenics Survey was embedded and
resulted in unethical conduct and oppressive policies that egregiously harmed the health and wellness of indigenous citizens of Vermont.

Even more clearly, Bailey’s support for the Eugenics Survey violates the Justice value of “Our Common Ground”:

    As a just community, we unite against all forms of injustice, including, but not limited to, racism. We reject bigotry, oppression, degradation, and harassment, and we challenge injustice toward any member of our community.

Similarly, the Responsibility value, stating that “We are personally and collectively responsible for our words and deeds” is relevant here.

In affirmation of these two common ground principles, we respectfully request that Guy W. Bailey’s name be removed from Bailey/Howe Library. Even if it could be argued that Bailey was not fully aware of the grave consequences that followed from the Vermont Eugenics Survey or that he acted from bigotry widespread in his time, there is no doubt today that this survey and the policies that followed from it reflect such a degree of prejudice and inflicted such injustice that those who gave their names and their time to support it—that is, whose beliefs and actions not only reflected the prejudice of their era but helped foster and reinforce it—should not be honored on our campus.
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We, the undersigned University of Vermont faculty, join with UVM students in calling for the name of Bailey/Howe Library to be changed so as to no longer honor Guy W. Bailey, whose promotion of the Vermont Eugenics Survey\textsuperscript{1} devastated indigenous and other communities across the state.

1. Jamie Abaied, Associate Professor, Psychological Science
2. Tatiana Abatemarco, Lecturer, Environmental Studies
3. Eve Alexandra, Lecturer, English and Gender, Sexuality, and Women's Studies
4. Sarah C. Alexander, Associate Professor, English
5. Kenneth Allen, Senior Lecturer, Medical Laboratory and Radiation Sciences
6. Ellen Ann Andersen, Associate Professor, Political Science and Gender, Sexuality, and Women’s Studies
7. Jacques Bailly, Associate Professor, Classics
8. JB Barna, Sr. Lecturer, Social Work
9. Annika Ljung-Baruth, Senior Lecturer, Gender, Sexuality and Women’s Studies
10. Emily Beam, Assistant Professor, Economics
11. Emily Bernard, Professor, English and Critical Race and Ethnic Studies
12. Jean Bessette, Assistant Professor, English
13. Deborah E. Blom, Associate Professor, Anthropology
14. Lynne Bond, Emeritus Professor, Psychological Science
15. Holly-Lynn Busier, Senior Lecturer, Leadership and Developmental Sciences
16. Vicki L. Brennan, Associate Professor, Department of Religion and Director, African Studies Program
17. Mary Burke, Senior Lecturer, Sociology and Gender, Sexuality, and Women’s Studies
18. Keith Burt, Associate Professor, Psychological Science
19. Nichole Caisse, Lecturer, Department of Mathematics and Statistics
20. Yolanda Chen, Associate Professor, Plant and Soil Science
21. Sheila Boland Chira, Senior Lecturer, English
22. Thomas I. Chittenden, Senior Lecturer, Grossman School of Business
23. Selene Colburn, Associate Professor, UVM Libraries
24. Nicole Conroy, Lecturer, Leadership and Developmental Sciences
25. Stephen Cramer, Senior Lecturer, English
26. Celia Cuddy, Lecturer III, Social Work
27. Daniel DeSanto, Assistant Professor, UVM Libraries

28. Jennifer Dickinson, Associate Professor, Anthropology; Director, Center for Teaching and Learning
29. Sue Dinitz, Senior Lecturer, English
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33. Tina Escaja, Professor, Department of Romance Languages and Linguistics; Director, Gender, Sexuality and Women's Studies
34. Elizabeth Fenton, Associate Professor, English
35. Yolanda Flores, Associate Professor, Romance Languages and Linguistics
36. Alice Fothergill, Professor, Sociology
37. Gillian Galford, Research Assistant Professor, Gund Institute for Environment and Rubenstein School of Environment and Natural Resources
38. Jason C. Garvey, Assistant Professor, Leadership and Developmental Sciences
39. John Gennari, Professor, English and Critical Race and Ethnic Studies
40. Kathleen Gough, Associate Professor, Theatre
41. Anthony E. Grudin, Associate Professor, Art & Art History
42. Sayamwong E. Hammack, Professor & Director, Undergraduate Neuroscience Program, Department of Psychological Science
43. Susanmarie Harrington, Professor, English
44. Paula Higa, Lecturer, Music & Dance Department
45. Maria Hummel, Assistant Professor, English
46. Deborah Hunter, Associate Professor, Leadership and Developmental Sciences
47. Jen Hurley, Associate Professor, Education
48. Major Jackson, Professor, English
49. Vijay Kanagala, Assistant Professor, Leadership and Developmental Sciences
50. Brian Kent, Senior Lecturer, English
51. Colby Kervick, Assistant Professor, Education
52. Nikki Khanna, Associate Professor, Sociology
53. Felicia Kornbluh, Professor, History and Gender, Sexuality, and Women's Studies
54. Eric Lindstrom, Associate Professor, English
55. O. Veronica Lopez, Lecturer, Rubenstein School
56. Teresa Mares, Associate Professor , Anthropology
57. Fred Magdoff, Emeritus Professor, Plant & Soil Science
58. Todd McGowan, Professor, English
59. Rebecca A. McLaughlin, Lecturer, English
60. Anis Memon, Lecturer, Romance Languages and Linguistics
61. Libby Miles, Associate Professor, English and Director of Foundational Writing & Information Literacy
62. Eleanor M. Miller, Professor, Sociology
63. Beth Mintz, Professor, Sociology
64. Rachael Montesano, Senior Lecturer, Romance Languages and Linguistics
65. Mindy Morales-Williams, Assistant Professor, Rubenstein School of the Environment and Natural Resources
66. Charles-Louis Morand-Metivier, Assistant Professor, Romance Languages and Linguistics
67. Helen Morgan-Parmett, Assistant Professor, Department of Theatre
68. Dianna Murray-Close, Associate Professor, Psychological Science
69. Sarah Osten, Assistant Professor, History
70. Ingrid Nelson, Assistant Professor, Geography and Environmental Program
71. Hilary Neroni, Professor, Film and Television Studies
72. Deborah Noel, Senior Lecturer in English
73. Jane E. Atieno Okech, Professor and Chair, Leadership and Developmental Sciences
74. Holly Painter, Lecturer, English
75. Bindu Panikkar, Assistant Professor, Rubenstein School of the Environment and Natural Resources
76. Janice Perry, Lecturer III Dept of English
77. Elizabeth Pinel, Associate Professor, Psychological Science
78. John Pirone, Lecturer, American Sign Language Program
79. Walter Poleman, Senior Lecturer, RSENR
80. Cynthia Reyes, Associate Professor, Education
81. Corey Richardson, Lecturer, Social Work
82. Julie Roberts, Professor, Romance Languages & Linguistics
83. Kelly J. Rohan, Professor and Director of Clinical Training, Psychological Science
84. Valerie Rohy, Professor, English
85. Kate Ross, Lecturer, Communication Sciences and Disorders
86. Lawrence Rudiger, Senior Lecturer, Psychological Science
87. Frederic Sansoz, Professor, Mechanical Engineering
88. James Lam Scheuren, Lecturer, Art and Art History
89. Helen Scott, Associate Professor, English
90. Jeanne Shea, Associate Professor, Anthropology
91. David A. Shiman, Professor Emeritus, Education
92. Jean Sienkewicz, Lecturer, Social Work
93. Brenda Solomon, Associate Professor, Social Work
94. Laura Solomon, Research Professor Emeritus, Psychological Science
95. Peter Spitzform, Associate Library Professor, UVM Libraries
96. Clyde Stats, Senior Lecturer, Music
97. Brian Tokar, Lecturer II, Environmental Studies
98. Regina Toolin, Associate Professor, Education
99. Sarah E. Turner, Senior Lecturer, English
100. John Waldron, Associate Professor, Romance Languages and Linguistics
101. Rasheda L. Weaver, Assistant Professor, Community Development and Applied Economics
102. Jacqueline S Weinstock, Associate Professor, Leadership and Developmental Sciences
103. Nancy Welch, Professor, English, and Coordinator, Graduate Writing Center
104. Dan Wells, Lecturer, Environmental Studies
105. Beverley Wemple, Associate Professor, Geography
106. Jamie Williamson, Senior Lecturer, English
107. Sean Witters, Lecturer, English
108. Hyon Joo Yoo, Associate Professor, Film and Television Studies
Procedure for Consideration of Renaming Requests

The Report of the Committee to Establish Principles on Renaming (http://president.yale.edu/sites/default/files/files/CEPR_FINAL_12-2-16.pdf), adopted by the Yale Corporation on November 28, 2016, sets forth the principles for consideration of requests to withdraw the name of a building or other campus structure or space ("renaming request"). The report provides:

- There is a strong presumption against renaming a building on the basis of the values associated with its namesake. Such a renaming should be considered only in exceptional circumstances.
  - The presumption against renaming is at its strongest when a building has been named for someone who made major contributions to the University.

- Principles to be considered:
  - Is a principal legacy of the namesake fundamentally at odds with the mission of the University?
  - Was the relevant principal legacy significantly contested in the time and place in which the namesake lived?
  - Did the University, at the time of a naming, honor a namesake for reasons that are fundamentally at odds with the mission of the University?
  - Does a building whose namesake has a principal legacy fundamentally at odds with the University's mission, or which was named for reasons fundamentally at odds with the University's mission, play a substantial role in forming community at the University?

- The report states: “We expect that renaming will typically prove warranted only when more than one principle listed here points toward renaming; even when more than one principle
supports renaming, renaming may not be required if other principles weigh heavily in the balance.”

A renaming request must be submitted in an application that meets the following administrative requirements:

☐ states the grounds on which the name should be changed;
☐ specifies how the Principles on Renaming (http://president.yale.edu/sites/default/files/files/CEPR_FINAL_12-2-16.pdf) require that the name be changed, presenting a thoroughly researched and well-documented case with supporting historical and other evidence; and
☐ meets other administrative requirements as the Office of the Secretary may from time to time establish.

Such applications shall be submitted in writing to the Office of the Secretary at 105 Wall Street, 2nd floor, or via email to secretary.office@yale.edu (mailto:secretary.office@yale.edu). The Secretary or designee(s) will review the application and determine whether it meets the administrative requirements. This review will not address the merits of the application. If the application does not meet the administrative requirements, the applicant will be so advised and the application will undergo no further review. If the application meets the administrative requirements, it will be forwarded to the President who will consult with members of the University Cabinet (i.e., the Provost, Vice Presidents, and Deans).

The President, following consultation with the Cabinet members, will decide whether the application warrants further review under this procedure. Further review may be warranted only if (1) the application clearly demonstrates that the request may overcome the presumption against renaming when the Principles on Renaming are applied to it and (2) the review is needed in order to address significant concerns of the University community. The President may also determine without an application having been submitted that the historical name of a building or other campus structure or space warrants review under this process.

If a renaming question warrants further review, the President will appoint an advisor or advisors who have relevant knowledge and expertise to advise the President and Corporation on the question. The advisor(s) will consider the name removal question by applying the Renaming Principles and may obtain expert advice and consultation, solicit appropriate input from the University community, require the applicant to present additional evidence (historical or otherwise), and conduct research and fact-finding. Upon completion of this review, the advisor or group of advisors will submit to the President a report and recommendation.

The President will transmit the report and recommendation to the Corporation, which will review the matter and make a final decision.
After a name has been considered under this process, it will not be considered again absent a material change in known facts and circumstances.
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