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MRS. BARGE-MILES: Trustee Carter.

TRUSTEE CARTER: Here.

MRS. BARGE-MILES: Trustee Cavazos.

TRUSTEE CAVAZOS: Here.

MRS. BARGE-MILES: Trustee Dortch.

TRUSTEE DORTCH: Here.

MRS. BARGE-MILES: Trustee Lawrence.

TRUSTEE LAWRENCE: Here.

MRS. BARGE-MILES: Trustee Lawson.

CHAIRMAN LAWSON: Here.

MRS. BARGE-MILES: Trustee Mills.

TRUSTEE MILLS: Here.

MRS. BARGE-MILES: Trustee Moore.

TRUSTEE MOORE: Here.

MRS. BARGE-MILES: Trustee Marciette.

TRUSTEE MARCIETTE: Here.

MRS. BARGE-MILES: Trustee Perry will not able to join us. Well, he may call in. His brother-in-law passed away, so he'll be calling in either today or tomorrow.

Trustee Reed would not able to join us today.

Trustee Washington.

TRUSTEE WASHINGTON: Here.
MRS. BARGE-MILES: And Trustee Woody.

TRUSTEE WOODY: Here.

MRS. BARGE-MILES: Chair Lawson, you have the floor.

CHAIRMAN LAWSON: Thank you.

The first thing I would like to do is welcome our two, one newer and one newest. Our student government president, welcome again. I think we welcomed you -- this may be the second time we've welcomed you. I want to make sure you feel at home.

And our newish trustee, Trustee Cavazos.

TRUSTEE CAVAZOS: Cavazos.

CHAIRMAN LAWSON: Cavazos. I got it. I think I'm going to listen to her enunciation.

Welcome. Cavazos. Good morning and welcome as our newest trustee representing the faculty.

And we're glad to have you and we look forward to having your input as we walk through all these processes over the next 12 months. So welcome. Welcome.

TRUSTEE CAVAZOS: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN LAWSON: At this point we really enter into a critical juncture for the board.

I'm going to do just a little bit of
highlighting. I'm going to editorialize this agenda a little bit. A little bit of highlight of some of the things we're going to do this week.

But first and foremost is, today's, the morning, will be consumed with evaluation of the president based on annual goals that were set by the person and approved by us. We will go through our own assessment, as well as the president's self-assessment of himself, ending with an overall view of the president's performance over the last academic year.

And this is a really important piece, for a number of reasons. It allows us, I think, to level-set as a board our expectations of the president and also the president I believe to level-set as far as specifically how the board views him.

It also allows us to effectively communicate with our governing body, the Board of Governors, around how we assess our president and our league collectively moving forward on the right objectives.

Issue number two for the day, which is
also really important, is a self-assessment of
ourselves, a self-assessment of the board. How
can we perform versus our objectives. How did
we perform in the areas of efficiency and
effectiveness. How are we in the areas of
governing the president and being stewards of
the enterprise and good fiduciaries of the
institution.

So this is our opportunity to self-assess
ourselves and this is also a requirement, if
I’m not mistaken. So this is a really
important piece of what we need to do as a
board, as an operational item.

After the self-assessment we’ll have a bit
of a working lunch. I put together a laundry
list of issues.

And the challenge in part with the issues
is that some of them become tough to talk about
in a round table forum like this because we’re
technically not supposed to converse openly
about an item that may come before the full
board for a vote.

So we can talk about some items from an
opportunistic standpoint, but not necessarily
draw firm in the conclusions.
So we're going to ask our attorney to sit in on that portion just to make sure that we're inside the white lines on what we say and how we operate moving forward.

From there a lot of you have expressed an interest in going out to see the Brooksville property. So hopefully, weather permitting, we will get out of here around 2:00.

The property calls it, with a bus route, probably an hour from here. We'll get a chance to see the farm, see the facility, which is obviously where the big solar farm is going to eventually be. So I think that will be great.

And then we'll collectively come back here for a casual dinner tonight at a restaurant called Jacksons, if I'm not mistaken.

And then tomorrow looks more like a traditional board meeting day, starting with the governor's committee. We'll run through budget and finance -- budget, finance and facilities.

There are a number of informational items in there that I think are really important, as well as a couple extra items that we need to address.
Counting your committee, the DSO has a couple extra items around some namings that we need to address.

And then my committee which, you know, fortunately, unfortunately, becomes a bit of a lightning rod as of recent.

As opposed to me giving you guys an update on the audit, I thought it would be imperative to have the audit firm come in and give the update.

You know, they're objective. They stand on their own reputation. They're not closed down for a week by the University, and I thought it would be really important for them to walk you through what they found when they did the audit of the athletic expenditures.

So they will come in -- I'll give you an update on ending year's budget, coming year's budget. But when it comes to the audit findings, I thought it was -- I thought it would just go over better and be more transparent if we let the audit firm speak for themselves and tell you what they found and answer any direct questions that you might have.
So that will happen tomorrow around 10:30ish. Then we'll go from there into a full board meeting.

As you all know, we handle most of the items via consent agenda, so that board meeting should move fairly swiftly. So I just wanted to give everybody the lay of the land.

Again, I'm really happy to be here. We tried to move this venue around. Last year I think we were at the law school. The year before that I think we were at the foundation building. So we try to move this around the State a little bit. And Jacksonville the year before that, right. And I guess four years ago we were in Crestview. So we try to move it around a little bit to give us a little diversity in location, as well as connect with the other remote locations around the State, as well.

So with that being said, I'm going to now pass the meeting to Trustee Mills to lead us into the discussion of the president's evaluation.

TRUSTEE MILLS: All right. Good morning, everyone. How are you guys doing. All good.
I’ll apologize up front that I won’t be able to make it to the Brooksville tour. I was telling the chairman that I have my oldest that I’m dropping off at college tomorrow. So we have a flight tonight. My first one.

TRUSTEE LAWRENCE: Where is she going to school?

TRUSTEE MILLS: She’s going to Carnegie Mellon in Pittsburg. So anyway, so obviously lots to cover within a couple days, as the chairman just outlined. And we’re getting started with the fun stuff, which is going through our esteemed president’s evaluation and goals.

And I think at some point we’re also going to talk about his proposed goals for next year in this dialogue, as well. We have -- we have, you know, a couple hours basically on the agenda here, and we only have a page and a couple lines.

So the point of that really is is that, you know, we have a lot of time for, you know, open, honest, candid discussion around both the goals and our achievements as we go through here.
1 And I do think it's imperative to -- that
2 we all kind of understand the goals and how
3 they're measured for sure.
4 Okay. The only other thing I would
5 mention in preamble here is we probably could
6 talk about our self-evaluation before the
7 president's evaluation. You know, and we'll
8 get to that later.
9 But just as a highlight, there are a
10 couple of things. If you look at the takeaways
11 from that, one of the big takeaways with
12 consistent themes was our ability to hold
13 management and staff accountable and follow
14 through.
15 And I think it's important for us to keep
16 that in context as we kind of go through this
17 evaluation, for sure.
18 But that says -- and by the way, as you
19 probably all read, you know, we do think very
20 highly of ourselves. But we do need to make
21 sure that, you know, our responsibility is to
22 ensure that sort of sustainability and concern
23 of the institution itself.
24 And so that's a big part of what we need
25 to make sure that we're deliberating at this
point. Okay?

TRUSTEE MOORE: Mr. Chair.

TRUSTEE MILLS: Yes.

TRUSTEE MOORE: We will have the compiled narrative for the review? You know, everybody's summary of this is what we said and, you know, prior reviews.

TRUSTEE MILLS: Oh, in terms of the comments and such --

TRUSTEE MOORE: Yeah, the comments, the backup. Is that available electronically?

MRS. BARGE-MILES: That was so large that we didn't print it out, but we can send it to you.

CHAIRMAN LAWSON: We can always add --

TRUSTEE MILLS: Mr. Chair, if I may?

CHAIRMAN LAWSON: Of course. It's a retreat.

TRUSTEE MOORE: Oh, yeah. Harold, we need that.

CHAIRMAN LAWSON: Did the team request they email the narrative?

MRS. BARGE-MILES: The thing with all of the --

MRS. WALLACE: Yeah, that was e-mailed to
TRUSTEE MILLS: Okay. So in the meantime, while she's pulling that together, I do think we can kind of go through the annual priorities and goals for sure, because those are the ones that we're, you know, fully aware of.

And if you do, do you happen to have at least the president's self-evaluation with you?

Okay. Because that one just has -- remember that page two that had the description of those priors and goals included on this document.

Okay. So let's just dive right in here. Oh, the other thing is, too, is they put the dashboard item in your packets. But I'm not sure if you spent much time actually online previous to this with it.

This is actually a really good tool. And I think, you know, this is like on demand, so you can go in at any given time and look at where we are, et cetera. And there's always like reconciliation items that come up later.

But I would recommend that you reference that dashboard, particularly as it relates to these annual priorities, et cetera.
So at any rate, so the first one is performance-based funding metrics, right? And I think, you know, we kind of went through all those in the last board meeting.

Last year we had lowered our goal to 70, based on some information and insight that we had received. And we actually reached a 70 for this year, right?

And just very quickly, any sort of rehash or questions about that, any of those performance-based funding goals?

TRUSTEE MOORE: Just a general comment. I think --

MRS. ZACHERY: Mrs. Wallace is going to get the flash drive that the full document is on. But I'm going to e-mail the president's self-eval to Theo.

CHAIRMAN LAWSON: Sorry to interrupt. Can she make copies for everybody? How long is the document?

TRUSTEE MILLS: We love the earth, man.

We love the earth.

CHAIRMAN LAWSON: I'm just saying, in case everyone didn't have their computer with them today. They'd be able to --
TRUSTEE MILLS: I think they're going to try to put it on the screen in a little bit.

TRUSTEE MOORE: I guess my general problem in looking at this particular one is the fact that we were at 70 and we have talked about and we have pushed forward with how do we move the needle.

There was lots of effort around the state in support of moving from the bottom three, and that happened.

We, in turn, have to make sure and be very diligent that we are not leaving ourselves in the bottom three just by effort.

I think that even greater pushes the need to be in place to make sure that we’re moving forward. I think the challenging thing for me, when we talk about performance-based funding is that even when we were pulling together the numbers ourselves and what was presented to us, was lowering our expectations.

And yet, I think that was with the Board of Governors that came back and said, hey, you all need to -- we, I believe, have to be that body that says, let's push forward.

I don't think that the Board of Governors
should have to be in that position of telling
us, hey, go back. You need to climb and reach
and strive.

CHAIRMAN LAWSON: That's a good point.

TRUSTEE WASHINGTON: I agree with that
wholeheartedly. And just from an actual optic
standpoint, the annual trend is an upward
marker and I would like to -- it's certainly
not. We actually went down. So like we have
to be cognizant and hold ourselves accountable
of how we are residue to ourselves. How we are
meeting our goals, right?

Like we went from 72 to 70, which wasn't
technically the goal; however, the trend is a
downward trend.

So optically, I just think for us we have
to be cognizant of, are we moving forward and
are we giving ourselves and our community a
sense that we are moving forward on things that
we may or may not be looking for. I just think
we can be uber-transparent to all of ourselves
about our trends.

TRUSTEE DORTCH: Chair, for the sake of
evaluation though, we have to -- our evaluation
is based on the goal we set. We have to hold
ourselves accountable. But the key is in this evaluation of the president, if we set a goal and we met it, then that's the basis for the evaluation. But in terms of raising the bar, that's on us because the president and his administration have to perform to the levels we set. So I hope we keep that in mind for the purpose of this session.

MR. ROBINSON: Yeah. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate your comments. If the game you're saying is also just sitting where you are, it won't be good enough for anyone to put either a 90 or a 95. We have to show improvement. If you don't, then you stay where you are if you don't come back with some type of plan. So, you know, it's not a concept. It's not something to show. It's a necessity that we get better in order to stay in the money realm, so to speak. And the threshold of being in that realm, and that's the threshold. But next year or years, so you get two years and then after that you have to come with this approval plan. And the reason they did that is because --
THE COURT REPORTER: Can you speak up, please? I'm having a hard time hearing you.

MR. ROBINSON: If you could move closer.

Yes. And so the motivation to change that once you've met the threshold and you are getting better. So that's why I included, you know, or the two years. Okay.

You can't just sit there at 70 or 75 or 78. At some point it has to get better.

TRUSTEE MILLS: You do have to speak up a little bit. Sorry. I'm having a hard time hearing you also.

TRUSTEE CAVAZOS: It went from 72 to 70 and you're saying that we're dropping in our metrics, so we have to accommodate. So I'm not sure.

MR. ROBINSON: We thought that the greatest that it was, it was an outline. We did really, really well. But we kind of knew going in and sustaining that that it was going to be difficult, and it always is.

So we also have improvement points and you're learning less isn't the best, so we decided to put it in a threshold. The thought was more realistic; however, I agree with
pushing forward on it because the game has changed. It's staying at 70 and it will not be sufficient.

TRUSTEE MILLS: Was there something specific? I thought there were a couple specific items that we knew why we needed to move from 72 to 70, as opposed to just kind of setting us up.

MR. ROBINSON: I can tell you the mindset. We obviously once where we saw some slippage and I think it was on the retention rating. And then the percentage of degrees, you know, if this is something that you want to talk about.

Often areas of strategic inferences with SPE and we saw that. And those are trending things, so they're not going to resolve in one year because that -- that cold water is already in. So that was part of the recommended.

TRUSTEE MILLS: So I sort of equate it to, if you have a product that's declining and you know the revenue is going to decline for that product, you might as well set it based on what you think the expectations are as opposed to something that's not going to happen.
So that's kind of, you know, why we lowered the bar. Having said that, you know, in the context of next year we're only giving ourselves -- we're only setting it up for a 71.

MR. ROBINSON: You know, you get to talk about what you want to go to. We had to show some improvement.

TRUSTEE MILLS: Right. And so we just need to make sure we think about -- when we go into next year's goals, we need to think about is 71 or something higher, you know, in terms of --

CHAIRMAN LAWSON: And I look at this, you know, as all of these are important. But I look at this one in particular as a really important one for the University and I'll talk about kind of where we landed and talk about where we think we want to go when we start setting the metrics.

So it is a meets, because what Trustee Washington said is correct. The trend line is sliding down. And I think when you look at the individual metrics versus the goal, you know, we know the ones where we fell short.
So me personally -- you know, because we did get into the money. We were, you know, above kind of a threshold and it was a meets and not an exceed. But this one is really critical for me because it is really the yardstick that I felt our governing body evaluates us on. And I think it's also embedded in there, there are things that are within our control, i.e., graduation rate, retention rate, degrees in programs with strategic emphasis, research dollars. So there are things that even though the system is set up for the rules, there are things in there that we can control. And what I want to make sure that we're doing, now that we're getting the incremental infusion and performance dollars, and this is kind of, you know, part of -- the next part of this is, are those dollars put behind the initiatives that will help us sprint in some of those areas where we know we can improve it in the short term. You know, I know we have a graduation rate in the work plan or -- yeah, work plan. But I
think, you know, I think it should be higher.

And I think that, you know, the expectation, at least that I have, is with the incremental 13 million, plus the ability to spend reserves, carry forward -- excuse me. Carry-forward dollars that, you know, we've talked about being resource constraint.

Well, some of those constraints are slowly, not quickly, but slowly moving away, as far as resources go. So I think that we want to make sure that we are dialing up our performance in those key areas where we can show both some short-term and some long-term gains.

So that was why, you know, I probably didn't rate this maybe as highly as I did last year just because in looking at the raw data we were trending down. Looking at the opportunity moving forward with the dollars, I wanted to make sure that we are pushing really hard on all those key areas to improve because, you know, these other things, you know, granted, they are really important to the University, but our standing in the state is really tied to how we perform in those performance metrics.
And I think they have eliminated the bottom three, which is great. But technically, we still don't want to be in the bottom three. You know, we want to, you know, rise out of that bottom three, because the president said that if we don't improve, we'll have the right, quite frankly, to a work plan, which is basically rewriting your original business plan or your work plan.

And, again, having a third set of objectives versus a second set that you already have, it gets a little confusing, to be honest with you.

TRUSTEE MILLS: When you're not doing so well, you get a lot of unsolicited help.

CHAIRMAN LAWSON: Right. I would rather have one plan that we agree to that we really put our shoulders and effort to. And I think that it would be a little naive of us to think that we're getting this incremental 13 million at the expense of the preeminence that the expectation is not going to be there that we perform with that incremental infusion of money.

TRUSTEE DORTCH: I think also the other
thing is, while we set those as the floor and not the ceiling -- you know, when you say in business, you under promise and over deliver. The issues that we're dealing with the politics of the system where it keeps changing. The targets keep changing. So yeah, we're playing the game. We can't complain about it because we still have to be in the game. But because we set a certain level of performance for the president and administration, what we look for is over delivering. And so that looks good for everybody and all of a sudden it's giving us time to do the bottom line for delivery. So I say with that, I hope -- and when I'm sure the president understands the expectations that the administration is under as what we set as the floor. And that's the thing that we have to keep working and we have to do our part. But that's the key thing because of the way that the targets keep changing in the system.

TRUSTEE MILLS: So just on this one, and I'm not sure if we're going to get a whole lot
more detail, and if we are, Dr. Robinson, let me know.

But, you know, when we think about the 71, if we can kind of go back and forth real quick. When we think about moving from 70 to 71, why -- I guess plainly, but why such a small increase?

MR. ROBINSON: Well, we've done some preliminary assessments and some of those metrics that, you know, are locked in now more or less, and some that we can move. There's some we've spent a lot of time on this summer hoping to move.

One, in particular is that, you know, retention rate metrics. We've spent a lot of time and money on that. We don't know the final outcome yet.

Retention grads. We had students who had the perfect GPA, but had financial issues and we had the money to help them. That's a fairly commonplace. Cost system, I don't know the results of that yet.

We had a number of students with a graduation rate where it might be changed by the outcome of the summer school. So there's
some that we are waiting to hear from, you
know, but we're really skeptical.

TRUSTEE MILLS: So this is why I'm asking
the question, actually, Dr. Robinson, because
we're sitting here kind of, you know, at the
beginning of the year and we're going to set a
metric that we think is already met.

And so the question is is that -- is there
not work we do during the year to improve that,
you know, at the end of the day.

MR. EDDINGTON: Yeah, I wanted to have an
opportunity to talk a little bit about that
conundrum, because it is.

You know, I think about it every year and
I say, man, when you all are setting that
target.

Like right now most of the data that is
going to impact the scores that are released in
June of 2020 are already in the books, right?

TRUSTEE MILLS: Well, then this is easy
then.

MR. EDDINGTON: Oh, yeah. So my thought
was just if I ever had the opportunity, I was
going to suggest as you all have been talking
about this goal, setting the goal for
performance outcomes.

You think in a two-year span --

TRUSTEE MOORE: I was going to say --

TRUSTEE WASHINGTON: -- two years.

MR. EDDINGTON: And specifically those dollars that we just got, they're not going to impact the outcomes until 2021, because all the numbers are in the books, see. So for the most part, right.

So I'm just -- you know, short and long-term, I think about what can you do with the resources that we're getting and allocating. You won't see the impact on the performance until 2021. You'll see it in other places.

TRUSTEE MILLS: Right.

MR. EDDINGTON: I just wanted to make sure we're all on the same page about that part of it.

MR. ROBINSON: What we pay very close attention to for 19/20 metrics are those that haven't been yet determined. And one of the big ones we saw an opportunity to invest some money in was that retention rate, then trying to get as many to finish up as possible.
So it's a delayed impact, right, and the fact that we've got zero dollars. But we reinvested some -- we did nothing in the previous years, through the first years. But we certainly didn't have $13.7 million dollars to invest like we do now. You know, we'll see those in a year or so.

But the reality of it is is that it will be before the Board of Governors in June of next year.

TRUSTEE MILLS: Right. So I mean, this is kind of a question and I think, you know, we should all understand, right?

And I'm not sure if this -- if that is a true statement for all -- you know, all of these items on here.

MR. ROBINSON: No.

TRUSTEE MILLS: But certainly as it relates to PBF, you know, we might want to put some stakes in the ground today about what this means because, otherwise, we are kind of going through this exercise.

CHAIRMAN LAWSON: But I think -- I think though we're sitting in a system where some institutions have had a short-term acceleration
in their metrics by doing some, you know,
pretty specific things that, you know, maybe
it's been a one-year, maybe it's been a
two-years.
But there have been a couple schools that
have kind of risen out of the ashes, so to
speak.
So I agree with the two-year horizon, but
I also have a bit of impatience around our
ability to lean -- willingness to lean forward,
and our ability to really take these dollars
and aggressively invest in.
Because we have an example of, I think
it's FAU, that went from the bottom to close to
the top. Example of West Florida went from the
bottom to at least middle.
TRUSTEE MILLS: Right.
CHAIRMAN LAWSON: So I think that even
though I do agree some of these have a longer
horizon, I think we want to challenge ourselves
to say, okay, we have this --
TRUSTEE MILLS: Well, I think what we
heard --
TRUSTEE WASHINGTON: We could say one and
two years.
CHAIRMAN LAWSON: Yeah. We have this infusion -- not only infusion. I think we have good talent around the institution. And now we have this infusion of cash.

So those two things, I want to make sure that we are aggressive enough to say, there's some short-term pushes in graduation rate. There's some short-term pushes in incoming research dollars. There's some -- there are some things that have more of a shorter term window.

TRUSTEE MILLS: Okay. So let's do this.

Let's do this, because I think it's worth investing the time here. We're only talking about 10 things, right? And so let's try to be specific, right?

Out of the ten, right, which ones can actually change between now and June of 2020?

So I got 10 metrics.

MR. EDDINGTON: Yeah. So not many. I'm going to pull it out so we can look at it.

TRUSTEE WASHINGTON: Graduation rate. So percentage of Bachelors employed or continuing education one year after graduation. That's already done. Median wages, already done.
Cost to student, net tuition. Is that --

MR. ROBINSON: I'm not so sure about that one.

TRUSTEE WASHINGTON: -- based on whatever the window of collection.

MR. EDDINGTON: Yeah, I think that's the 18/19.

TRUSTEE WASHINGTON: Okay. So 18/19.

TRUSTEE MILLS: I mean, you're going a little fast for me. I'm sorry. Because I know we don't have them up.

But just go down the list one through ten.

TRUSTEE WASHINGTON: So number one, percent of graduates employed and/or continuing their education one year after graduation.

MR. ROBINSON: Done.

TRUSTEE WASHINGTON: Done. That's because that's last year.

TRUSTEE MILLS: Right.

TRUSTEE WASHINGTON: Number two is median wages of Bachelors graduates employed full-time one year after graduation. That would also be done.

Number three is cost to students, net tuition and fees per 120 credit hours.
MR. EDDINGTON: Yes.

TRUSTEE MILLS: Is that already done?

MR. EDDINGTON: I think so.

TRUSTEE WASHINGTON: Because that's 18/19.

So the collection period was last year's students.

TRUSTEE MILLS: Okay.

TRUSTEE WASHINGTON: So number four is FTIC four-year graduation rate.

MR. EDDINGTON: That's done.

TRUSTEE WASHINGTON: Is that already done?

MR. EDDINGTON: It's from the summer.

CHAIRMAN LAWSON: So I'm sorry, the date of collection period would be --

MR. EDDINGTON: It ended this summer.

TRUSTEE WASHINGTON: So through the end of summer.

Number five is academic progress rate.

Second-year retention was at least a 2.0 GPA.

MR. ROBINSON: That's done now.

MR. EDDINGTON: So that's based on who comes back this fall. That's something that --

we can impact that even now with the dollars that we just got.

TRUSTEE CARTER: That impacts our
retention, too.

TRUSTEE WASHINGTON: That is -- that's the academic -- so academic progress rate is the retention because it's not just retention, it's retention with a 2.0 or above. So there's a nuance in there of retention metric. But that is the retention metric in the performance-based funding.

TRUSTEE MILLS: Okay. And then number six.

TRUSTEE WASHINGTON: Number six is percentage of Bachelor degrees awarded within programs of strategic emphasis.

MR. EDDINGTON: Done.

TRUSTEE WASHINGTON: Because it's 18/19.

MR. EDDINGTON: Yes.

TRUSTEE WASHINGTON: The university access rate is number seven, percent of undergraduates with a Pell Grant.

Percentage of graduates -- percentage of graduate degrees awarded within programs of strategic emphasis.

MR. EDDINGTON: That's done.

TRUSTEE WASHINGTON: Percentage of Bachelor degrees awarded without excess hours.
MR. EDDINGTON: Done.

TRUSTEE WASHINGTON: Percent already in the expenditures funded from external sources.

MR. EDDINGTON: That one's going away.

TRUSTEE WASHINGTON: Oh, yeah. That one's going away because now we're at number of Bachelor degrees awards to transfers with AAs from the FCS. So that's an award -- that's an outcome metric and not an enrollment metric. So we might want to think about that in the goals or proposed goals for next year because I think it's an enrollment metric that we have. But the metric here is degrees awarded.

TRUSTEE MILLS: Okay. So the only one that I thought I heard that we can actually impact was the percentage of Bachelor degrees in -- I'm sorry. I read that wrong. Academic progress rate retention --

TRUSTEE WASHINGTON: Academic progress rate, retention.

MR. EDDINGTON: That's partial.

TRUSTEE WASHINGTON: Partial.

TRUSTEE MILLS: Partial.

MR. EDDINGTON: I mean, the way we can impact it right now is we're going to take some
of the 13.7 performance funding and we're offering what we call retention in bonuses. So retention grants to get incentivized students to come back this fall.

So, you know, it's debatable about what impact it is. But that's what we can do right now.

TRUSTEE MILLS: Okay.

TRUSTEE WASHINGTON: And so based on your runs, we're at 71ish.

MR. EDDINGTON: It's -- well, for that one, they haven't come back.

TRUSTEE WASHINGTON: And the same for the preliminary work that you guys have done.

MR. EDDINGTON: Well, we look at who finished during the spring.

TRUSTEE WASHINGTON: No. This is across the board for all 10.

MR. EDDINGTON: Oh, okay. I'm sorry. Oh, yeah, somewhere in there.

TRUSTEE MILLS: Yeah, so basically you already have a 71.

MR. EDDINGTON: Yeah. It's loosey-goosey.

See, we don't have official data, but we kind of guesstimate where the figures might be and
it's in that range.

MR. ROBINSON: I don't want to state for the record an official number.

MR. EDDINGTON: No.

MR. ROBINSON: I would leave it at, we have every intention to get to that, but I don't want to put it on the record. Because it's unofficial data.

TRUSTEE MILLS: Which is, in and of itself, a question for me. But go ahead.

MR. EDDINGTON: Well, only because the BOG certify those numbers.

TRUSTEE MILLS: But they have -- certification only means we say the numbers we gave them are right.

MR. EDDINGTON: Well, not necessarily. It's a little more than that. Like we -- some of those they use other sources, like cost to the student they have conflict methodology.

But we can't calculate that number.

TRUSTEE MILLS: Well, I don't get why not.

TRUSTEE WASHINGTON: They don't give us the --

MR. EDDINGTON: Yeah, they don't --

TRUSTEE MILLS: The algorithms?
MR. EDDINGTON: Yeah, we've all tried.

TRUSTEE MILLS: That doesn't make any sense.

MR. EDDINGTON: It doesn't.

TRUSTEE MILLS: So can we raise that? I mean, because again, there's no use having a metric that we can't even calculate ourselves.

I mean, it's hard to believe for me that anybody would want that.

And who's our primary liaison?

TRUSTEE WASHINGTON: We don't have one.

TRUSTEE MILLS: We don't have one. But we should raise that.

TRUSTEE CARTER: So we don't have one.

I've been gone for a while now. I leave and everything falls apart.

TRUSTEE MILLS: But ideally, we know how many people we graduated last year.

MR. EDDINGTON: Yeah.

TRUSTEE MILLS: That kind of stuff.

TRUSTEE WASHINGTON: Yeah, we know those.

MR. EDDINGTON: Yeah, you can get a good estimation. It's a little of a fee, for the most part.

TRUSTEE MILLS: All right. So the point
being is that basically there's nothing on here. I mean, when we set the priority -- when we set the goal for, what is that, for 19/20, it's already done.

MR. ROBINSON: That's why the multiple year, that makes sense on that one.

TRUSTEE MILLS: Right.

MR. ROBINSON: Not that we're going to relax in our efforts, because we don't do things now where we can impact on those --

TRUSTEE MILLS: Well, this is my point though. If we look at this 13.7, the question is how do we change that 71 to 75 or whatever, right, in 20/21.

TRUSTEE MOORE: My question, and you all know that there was an institution that went from zero to hero. FAU, they were where we are. And so same system, you know. What are some of the system foundational things that happened. That's not to say steal a page from somebody's playbook, but by golly if it works.

If they have the same year, you know, the metrics and all of that, then how and what did they do?
TRUSTEE MILLS: Wouldn't you argue that --

I think they had a multi-year plan, right. So what we didn't -- what we only saw was the increase.

TRUSTEE MOORE: I don't know. I mean, they had that there was a change of leadership, I think, was that UWF?

TRUSTEE WASHINGTON: UWF.

TRUSTEE MOORE: And so both kind of picking up where someone else had left off and I'm just saying that --

TRUSTEE WASHINGTON: Looking at it differently.

TRUSTEE MOORE: Yeah.

TRUSTEE WASHINGTON: I'm looking at UWF, they got -- I mean, they have the maximum improvement points in four metrics this year.

Number one, which is employed.

TRUSTEE MILLS: Yeah. But I think what you have to do is, if you look at their score two years ago -- because we could have that, too, in 21/20 is my point -- or 20/21. We could be that same person, but we just have to decide that now.

TRUSTEE MOORE: I agree.
MR. EDDINGTON: I'll tell you what they did. We know what they have done.

TRUSTEE MILLS: Well, talk to us.

MR. EDDINGTON: We just didn't -- I mean, we've been studying really for two years. And I have a data guy on my team. And his initial charge was to get us to the top.

So he come back to me and said, here's what we can do. And most of it was really, what's the term, manipulating the system.

I said, no. We can't do that. That's what everybody else is doing. We start talking to everybody. Oh, like, oh, you know, creativity. UWF is doing a lot of creative things.

For example, the profile to admit students. If they admit them in the fall, they only let them enroll for 11 credit hours. They're not full-time students. So they don't count in the metric. But it's creative.

There's nothing wrong with it. But those outside-the-box types of things.

So that's -- I mean, those are the strategies, right. So as we look at ourselves and we say, what kind of innovative,
outside-the-box but, you know, appropriate
approaches can we take. And that's what we've
been trying to do.

But everyone has really looked at this and
says, let's look at what we have to do, and
then you'll see volatility go up and do -- you
know, and up and down.

And there are ways to get a better outcome
in a short amount of time. It's policy and
procedural changes, limiting the flexibility
that students have as they matriculate.

You come in and say, you can't change your
major after this time and you've got to
graduate in this major if you get this far.

You can't drop certain classes. Those types of
approaches.

TRUSTEE MILLS: Those are legit.

TRUSTEE WASHINGTON: It's called guided
pathways. It's a natural thing.

MR. EDDINGTON: It's a philosophy. That's
all I'm saying.

MR. ROBINSON: Okay.

MR. EDDINGTON: Yeah, they're doing a lot
of great things. Don't get me wrong, a lot of
great things.
TRUSTEE WOODY: If that's the case then why not increase from 71 to higher?

MR. EDDINGTON: Oh, I think you should.

I'm not against that at all. I think you all should set it higher.

TRUSTEE MILLS: For 20/21.

MR. EDDINGTON: Yeah. This year and -- yeah, you have to.

TRUSTEE MILLS: You can't do it for 19/20.

MR. EDDINGTON: Yeah, y'all have -- I mean, my humble suggestion is you have to do everything you all are talking about. I'm not disagreeing with that. You have to do that.

I'm really just saying, I've always wanted to talk to you all about the reality and what you really should be looking at as far as the impact.

Because if you're saying to this administration, hey, we gave you all 13.7 million and we get to June and you, we were expecting you to get to 80. And we'll say, well, do you know that dollars didn't impact this 80.

TRUSTEE MILLS: Right. That's fair.

MR. EDDINGTON: That's all. But I think
you all should set higher standards. You should. You have to do that.

TRUSTEE MARCIETTE: I was going to ask, if I could, what would be a reasonable increase, in your opinion, from Dr. Robinson's 71?

MR. ROBINSON: You mean for 20 --

TRUSTEE MARCIETTE: For the upcoming year.


TRUSTEE MARCIETTE: Yeah, that's what I mean.

TRUSTEE MILLS: No. The one coming, there's nothing we can do about.

TRUSTEE MARCIETTE: Yeah, it's the one two years from now.

MR. ROBINSON: The best we've ever done was 72. I think we can shoot for a higher number than that. But I don't think it would be realistic to say about 85 or 90 or anything like that. I think somewhere in the middle to the high 70s.

TRUSTEE MILLS: So if we said 75 today for 20/21, that doesn't give you heartburn?

MR. ROBINSON: No.

TRUSTEE MILLS: It does force you to get creative?
MR. ROBINSON: Yes.

TRUSTEE MILLS: Like stretch goals or manageable goals?

TRUSTEE MARCIETTE: Aggressive goals.

MR. ROBINSON: It's aggressive under the circumstances. Our highest score was a 72.

Our average score was 65, 68, 68, 72 and 70.

And so for us that's a five-point system. It's a significant increase. We've never been beyond 72.

TRUSTEE MILLS: Right. I think that's what we're saying. I think we need something to force us to get creative, right? Because we can cruise along at 70.

CHAIRMAN LAWSON: Because I feel like the -- I'm trying to come up with the best analogy. Like looking at just the examples of FAU in the last quarter, I don't know the years that it took them to go from worst to, you know, really meaningful outcomes. But those are two good examples.

And I think, you know, we've been asked in the past have you looked at that, have you looked at that. And I think the answer is probably hopefully, yes.
So I think as we move through this discussion, I think we need some quick view into like what they really do. Like I know West Florida got an infusion of cash from the BOG through a special LVR two years ago. So did FAU. So was that part of the magic? And then, what else did they do with that money? Because I think where we're going with this, Trustee Mills, is unfortunately 19/20 -- if I said that right -- 19/20 is almost a lock at 71.

TRUSTEE MILLS: Correct.

CHAIRMAN LAWSON: So then if we say, we want to go from 71 to 75, 76 in the next horizon, what level of investment and what tactics will we have to put in place to get there. Because I think for us, and I know for me, sitting in those BOG meetings and, you know, you see Florida, FSU, FAU, dada, FAMU, you know, like you don't want to that. You want to see us rise out of that bottom three.

TRUSTEE MILLS: Right.

CHAIRMAN LAWSON: But in a responsible way. We can't go to 80. I get that. But I
think where we are now is we want to see that aggressive plan or stretch plan, or whatever you want to put adjectives behind it, to get to a higher 70ish score with the investment attached to it.

What does that investment need to look like based on learnings from around the system, based on, you know, our own internal learnings. Because I think -- I feel like when -- and I wish the court reporter wasn't here to hear this. But in other schools --

TRUSTEE MILLS: Did you get that? He wished you weren't here.

CHAIRMAN LAWSON: -- without their minority graduation rate it's painful to me.

TRUSTEE WASHINGTON: Absolutely.

CHAIRMAN LAWSON: Why can't we, as a minority-serving institution, improve our minority graduation rates?

TRUSTEE MILLS: Right.

CHAIRMAN LAWSON: It just doesn't --

TRUSTEE MILLS: Well, there's some low hanging fruit.

CHAIRMAN LAWSON: There's valid reasons and some other things. But what can we do to
kind of minimize some of those external issues that our students have?

TRUSTEE MILLS: Let me just double-click on this one more time and then we can start to move on. But if we -- what happens if we got the most improvement points that we could get for 20/21?

MR. ROBINSON: The system is liable to change.

TRUSTEE WASHINGTON: So here's what I'm going to also -- like this continuous improvement model, I think we have to be conscious of in multiple ways. So one, I would say that the next school above us is a 78. And if they have to continuously improve, as well, the bar is moving --

TRUSTEE MILLS: As it should. That's what life is about.

TRUSTEE WASHINGTON: -- as a rule.

And second, in continuous improvement means, like while we want to get the most improvement points, they're also the hardest to maintain.

So like how do we build -- like set
ourselves up for success and not having, you
know, one huge bump year and then having --

TRUSTEE MILLS: That's fair.

TRUSTEE WASHINGTON: -- a fallen year
after that and then having to do the continuous
improvements.

MR. ROBINSON: And it gets into
excellence, right, because you've got to get to
that threshold and stay there. Because if you
get up the full 10 points, improvement points,
you don't get to get any more in the next year.

TRUSTEE MILLS: No. I'm with you.

MR. ROBINSON: So unless you get across
the excellence threshold, right. And those are
our goals for, you know, four-year graduation
rates.

MR. EDDINGTON: Yeah. We had a meeting
with the chancellor recently last month and the
provost and talking and he was asking us
questions. And he asked me questions about
A&M. And I said, I want to share the same
thing about what we can do.

And I said we, in my mind, what we're
trying to do, I said, all of us in SUS have
been structured to get students out in six
years. The expectations have changed.

We have to reengineer ourselves and transform from the six-year institution to a four-year institution. That means everything is on the table. Our, you know, policies, our procedures and all those types of things.

That's what we're in the midst of doing at FAMU. We're reengineering our whole approach from the top to the bottom.

And you heard me talking about this yesterday at the planning conference. That's what we're doing. I appreciate y'all having this conversation. I've been hoping and praying that you all would look at this in this perspective because you all tell us -- tell us what you want us to do and we'll come back and tell you how we're going to do it and we need to do that. But it's a reengineering. It's not a simple --

TRUSTEE MILLS: Yeah, that's fair.

TRUSTEE DORTCH: I think sitting around this table has got to be more than us asking, you know, and talking about what's not happening. We need to know directly from you,
I mean, I look at -- we can sit here and right off, money is one thing because if students -- and we all know from our days in college there are students who come and stay one semester, two semesters and then they go break for work to make enough money to pay for the education that extends the amount of time for graduation.

There are also students who are working to help their families. When they're in the summer, they come for a year, take a break, go make enough money and come back.

We need to understand the challenges we have. And then it also starts with recruiting. Getting -- you know, we don't want to ever move away from what our mission has been to make sure there are opportunities.

But we've got to recruit high-performance students. And so that's another piece because if we start that pipeline, then we should see an increase.

So it's not just what is done at the campus, it's what we do as trustees and through fund development and all.

So we understand it's got to be what is
the solution to this? How do we get to that point. Whether it's us coming in and saying, tell us where you were and what you did is what we all need to be doing to get that. We know it starts.

And all of us can do -- I have this mother whose student -- I didn't know you could have a 4.5. I grew up remembering it was a 4.0.

TRUSTEE MILLS: Stop telling your age.

TRUSTEE DORTCH: A student had a 4.5. All of these big universities were trying to get her. She wanted to come to FAMU, so I sat her down and that it was, she wanted to come to FAMU, even though she had these full rides, she told her mother she was going to FAMU.

I sat her down. And we can be doing a lot of that out in the community. I think our alumni have done a great job with the students.

So I think all of those things filter in to how we see the performance and improvement here. That's at least another area we can change.

We know money is one of the major problems, even in recruiting. And one of the major challenges in keeping our students in.
So we need to look at globally everything.

TRUSTEE MILLS: That's right.

TRUSTEE MOORE: I'll be really quick and
to your point.

I absolutely agree. I think that we --

and I don't know if we have done that over time

in the profile of who we're serving. To really

drill it down to say, hey, we know this and we

haven't looked at it. You know, because that's

going to be how we address the strategy for

supporting.

But my point, my original point, was tied
to what Nicole mentioned and that was with the

performance numbers.

I believe that even if we say a goal of

75, that is looking at only us. That is a

reflection of competing amongst ourselves.

It's not the system. But that really is where

the challenge is with the system. The lowest

one is 78.

So it's -- we can have this inside

conversation, but it really is an external

conversation of what's happening out there.

At 78, we may not like it, but what's the

issue with having a stretch goal and we see
more change? And maybe we don't get the 78, but that's what we strive for.

You know, I'd rather honor and say you exceed trying to get to the 78 versus saying let's stay at the cellar at 71.

TRUSTEE MILLS: Yeah, so even at 75 you're in the cellar.

TRUSTEE MOORE: Yeah, that's what I'm saying. So I mean like, what a way -- you know, we might feel good when we're out of the room. But then when we look at the report with everybody else whom we've joined, we're -- I mean, you're still in the same place.

TRUSTEE MILLS: The question for me is how do we sort of, you know, force the team to get creative, right, to stretch every innovative possibility. And what goal should we set out there?

And I don't know if that number is 78 or if that number is 75. The good thing, I think, we have the opportunity to say now, right. We have the opportunity to say now it's 78 and then we, you know, we look at it again this time next year and we're able to modify that and then modify and start looking at these in
two-year cycles, right?

So if you look at it in the two-year cycle, you can always modify that with one year.

TRUSTEE MOORE: What I'll say is that individuals, organizations, they rise to the occasion.

TRUSTEE MILLS: Yes.

TRUSTEE MOORE: When the bar raises, you know --

TRUSTEE MILLS: But we have to understand that the 78 -- when we sit down next year the 78 is going to be 82.

TRUSTEE MOORE: Yeah. But it's not 71 or 72.

TRUSTEE MILLS: Right.

TRUSTEE CAZAZOS: I just want to add that, you know, when I talk with my students and I tell them when bad is available, your good is not good enough. So it's always striving for more than, not doing what we can.

So I love what Nicole said about the guided path. And I love what you said about some schools are, you know, bringing in these students and not allowing them to take a full
credit. And I've known schools have done that when I counsel high school students in terms of going into college.

Let us work with this level, 11 credits, and keep it moving, and it may raise the bar. So that being creative, as well as, you know, have we thought about that and implemented that?

MR. ROBINSON: So we can't argue about any one of these goals, right? I mean, they all make a ton of sense and we all understand that. But the system, it's kind of hard to gain in the system. Because one thing is money and it might impact another -- for example, and I'm just saying this so you understand how comprehensive the model is.

So if you're talking one metric, then you might have problems in another metric. Let's say we allow students to come in at 11 hours. I'm suggesting that's not a good strategy because what that does is you know that those students are going to spend a little bit more time in the school overall. So the overall cost that they have to pay to be in school will be impacted, right?
Depending on their financial circumstances with that student who is at less than a 4.0, they won't be available for financial aid.

So if we have an institute where say 65 to 70 students, then where are they going to get the monies to pay that 11 credit hours? Now, that's where we might be able to use some valid resources and help them to get there.

But just remember, the system is very comprehensive. When we sit down and go through these and be conscious about it, we have to look at the whole model, because that's where it would increasing in my mind. The thing that I would like to do more than anything is to get the kids out of -- the young men and women, out into the world of work as quickly as possible.

But there are some very innovative things.

But just remember the system, you know, where you might be focusing on one over here, another over here might be affected.

One that has to change in a legitimate and obvious way is the graduation rate. We have to get that up.

TRUSTEE MILLS: Right. So if I were to try to land this plane a little bit, is there a
consensus on what we think that this number
should be for -- we would like for this number
to be for 20/21? I heard 78.
TRUSTEE MOORE: I offer 80 as a reasonable
reach.
TRUSTEE DORTCH: I would say realistic go
to the 75 and hit 81.
CHAIRMAN LAWSON: Well, I mean, I'm just
looking at what it was like to go from 68 to
71. I'm just trying to be realistic, right?
So, you know, I think in the world of
trying to be aggressive, which is where we want
to be, and this two-year horizon is a
conversation we hadn't truly had before.
So, you know, we should probably be in
that 75, 76 arena with the quest to get to 80.
Because, you know, my concern is, you know, the
next school above us is having the same
discussion we're having in the next couple
weeks. How do they go from wherever they are
--
TRUSTEE MILLS: 78.
TRUSTEE MOORE: To 85.
CHAIRMAN LAWSON: -- up. And Florida and
FSU are having the same discussion around how
do we maintain our preeminence and go from 100
to 98 in the national rankings.

So I think we have to -- so 71,

unfortunately, you know, based on the way this
has worked out, we're kind of stuck there.

So I'm leaning towards -- and this is a
one-person opinion -- I love to hear everybody
else's opinion. I'm leaning toward we call it
the 76, 77, which is probably a good stretch,
with moving toward into the next two years
arising into the 80s.

TRUSTEE MILLS: Okay. So I've got 80, 75,
77 --

TRUSTEE WOODY: 78.

TRUSTEE WASHINGTON: So I would like to
not have a conversation about how to stay in
the bottom three. I would like to have a
conversation about how we're going to get out
of the bottom three. So I'm going with at
least 78.

TRUSTEE MILLS: In the two-year system?

TRUSTEE WASHINGTON: Yes.

TRUSTEE MILLS: Okay. 78.

MR. ROBINSON: Trustee Washington, stop
talking about the bottom three. We don't want
to come back --

TRUSTEE WASHINGTON:  I'm already hearing that it's not really gone away.

MR. ROBINSON:  I know it's not gone away.

TRUSTEE WASHINGTON:  So that's why I don't want to --

TRUSTEE MILLS:  Trustee Cavazos?

MR. ROBINSON:  Remember now, you can't take any action because you're not in the --

TRUSTEE MILLS:  We're not at --

MR. ROBINSON:  What the process entails, however, is you and I coming to a consensus, you and me.

TRUSTEE MILLS:  Exactly.

TRUSTEE WASHINGTON:  So he's getting the temperature of the room.

TRUSTEE MILLS:  For my discussion with you.

CHAIRMAN LAWSON:  Let's get everyone's input.

TRUSTEE CAVAZOS:  You know, if we say that we are a great institution and that we are -- that we really need to raise up the bar. And that was the theme I was suggesting when I presented my speech yesterday --
TRUSTEE MILLS: Yes.

TRUSTEE CAVAZOS: -- is raising the bar.

And we have a great team of leadership and I believe when we put our heads together can really be good in terms of not being afraid to strive for higher.

And so I'm of the mindset that, and this is what we do even with our students pushing them to the highest that they can be because I live by this. When bad is available, that good is not good enough.

And so maybe I like 80, but practically, because maybe we are -- still have -- we're still struggling with how to get out of the bottom three -- between 78 or 79 may be more practical. But I love to strive for the high number. And I think we really could do that.

TRUSTEE MILLS: So what's your number, 78 or 79?

TRUSTEE CAVAZOS: 78.

TRUSTEE MILLS: Okay.

TRUSTEE MARCIETTE: I was going to say -- honestly, I take personal challenge in this because I feel like a goal going from a 22.5 to a 30 percent with the University's four-year
graduation rate, that's my class. So, yeah.

I'm getting there and we're trying to.

Really -- SJ, we're really trying to invest in,

you know, more academic-based initiatives. So

the Department of Academic Affairs are really

trying to push, hey, like let's get out and

more personally I'm going to a lot of classes

talking to them about the importance of like

getting out of here in four years and overall

helping the University.

That's really the best way that we as

students can help our University. And FAMU

taught me a lot. It's really just about

challenging yourself from the get-go.

You know, you go in and set your high

goals and then you achieve them. And if you

don't achieve them, you learn from them and you

set even higher goals and achieve those.

So I like to be aggressive and I say 79.

TRUSTEE CARTER: A personal challenge,

right?

TRUSTEE MARCIETTE: Yeah, literally.

TRUSTEE MILLS: Matt?

TRUSTEE CARTER: I'm thinking 78, 80, in

that range.
TRUSTEE MILLS: Say again.

TRUSTEE CARTER: Between 78 and 80.

TRUSTEE MILLS: You've got to give me a number bro.

TRUSTEE CARTER: 80.

TRUSTEE WOODY: Mr. Chairman, I think I'll raise mine to 80. Because I think we have a -- and y'all know this, in my opinion, since I've been on this board I've had an opportunity to make a personal assessment to some of the universities, not only in the State of Florida, but also around the Nation.

And in my saying that I've learned since I've been here about when my grandchildren get to the age of going to the University, my money is going to FAMU. Because I believe honestly we have a great institution. And I've been raised to believe that you set that bar high. And if you make any progress, that's good. But you set it as high as you possibly can.

And if we believe in the institution, we've got to put the effort in it.

TRUSTEE MILLS: Okay. So you have 80.

MR. ROBINSON: Mr. Dortch.
TRUSTEE MILLS: Yeah, he said 75.

TRUSTEE DORTCH: I said 75, because I just want to answer Mr. Chairman's -- if we say we're going to 80, I would be in favor of 85. But what does that do to us if we hit 75 and don't get to 80? And does it have any penalties for us?

CHAIRMAN LAWSON: No. I'll give you my perspective. So I think I was 77, I think was my number. But I think the expectation is that FAMU needs to rise to a higher level of performance. So I think whether we go from 75 to 80, as long as we are making strides for higher levels of performance, I think that's the ultimate key. So I don't think we'll get any backlash if we say we want to go from 71 to, call it average of what everybody's numbers, probably 79, right? So if we go from 71 to 79 is our stretch over a two-year window, we have a year to come back and amend that if we see something in the data.

But I think we'll probably get more accolades for saying, okay, we're going to take
the gloves off and go after this, then we will
saying, you know, 71 to 73 and make these
incremental strides.
I think we'll get more accolades for
taking a bigger leap, realizing, hey, to get to
79 is going to take some pushing and shoving
and investing, some restrain, et cetera.
But I think we'll get more accolades for
being more assertive. But accolades with a
realistic plan that says, here's where you're
going to invest. Here are the things you're
going to change or do differently. Here's the
type of students we're going after. Here's
what you're doing to truly drive those
measures.
So I think it's got to be 79 with the
believable plan underneath it.
TRUSTEE MILLS: So it's not sort of an
exercise we're going through, we really are
telling the team. And so I was just going to
qualify, the 79 is the quote, unquote, average,
unless Tommy changes his. And but the
consensus is 80.
TRUSTEE DORTCH: No. I'll change -- I
just wanted to make sure we publicly put one
TRUSTEE MILLS: So let's do this. Let's just say 80, because it's a nice round number --

TRUSTEE DORTCH: Yeah, I can go 80.

TRUSTEE MILLS: But the idea here is now we're asking you guys to go back and do a workshop among yourselves, how the hell do we go to 80.

TRUSTEE WASHINGTON: Well, and what are our current strategies, where are we spending money, where can we -- I mean, like because we've got a million activities going on right now. Where are we focusing our energy and how are really are going to do it.

TRUSTEE DORTCH: I'm fine with 80, but in that plan I still think that the provost and the president and their team needs to also include not only what they're going to do, but they need to put a section on what do we need from the Board of Trustees.

TRUSTEE MILLS: That's fine.

TRUSTEE DORTCH: And that should be a part of the whole piece in the end.
CHAIRMAN LAWSON: And this -- we have been -- you know, there have been some discussion that, you know, if FAMU put forward a spending plan that said it could go from X to Y, there would be some interest in that. So I think it's, here's the goal. Here's the plan and then here's the needed investment to get to that plan. And then we need to talk about, okay, where's that investment come from. How do we get that investment.

Because it's not all of -- I mean, yeah, fundraising is a piece of it, right? Like there are other sources of funding out there that we can -- within the state, right?

TRUSTEE MILLS: Right.

CHAIRMAN LAWSON: And as you look at -- you know, for those of you that sat in the Board of Governors meetings, you saw what I thought was a very strategic move by the Gulf Coast. They came in with this great plan and they got rousing support from the BOG for funding.

So ideas like that I think are going to be what propels us forward.

TRUSTEE MILLS: So that's the next step.
So let me -- thank you. Again, this is a good conversation because it level sets us from I think incrementalism to something different.

Okay. So let me just kind of go back through there. Real quick, the four-year graduation rate which, you know, we did not meet this year.

We had a goal of 25 percent and we're going to reach 22.5 percent. And then if we match that, we've set that at 30 percent for 2019, '20 -- for 19/20.

So is everybody cool with that?

MR. ROBINSON: Yeah. Those have to pretty much -- the 80 will go in the accountability plan.

TRUSTEE MILLS: The licensure rates, we did not meet those and as a result many of them we lowered the expectation for next year.

MR. ROBINSON: We have one, and I don't want to disclose it at this time are we going to get there. We just haven't gotten an official word.

TRUSTEE MILLS: Oh, you mean -- so for 18/19?

MR. ROBINSON: Yeah. I mean, finishing
out the data for that year for one of those areas.

TRUSTEE MILLS: So you had one of four that we met. Are you suggesting there's two of four now?

MR. ROBINSON: Which one are you referring to?

TRUSTEE MILLS: I don't even know. Actually, it says --

TRUSTEE WASHINGTON: It says the goal was one of four, but it says year to date --

MR. ROBINSON: There's one on there.

TRUSTEE MILLS: I'm sorry. You're right. I misread that.

MR. ROBINSON: Until I get that, I'm going to pass it along. But at this point we haven't met it.

TRUSTEE MILLS: Okay. So for next year, I mean, if we're going to set these graduation rates, shouldn't the goal be to meet all the graduation rates -- or the licensure rates, rather. The licensure rates.

Because my point being is we've got two factors here. One is what the goal is. So, for example, you know, I think nursing was
90 percent and now we're moving it down to
85 percent, as an example, right? So if we're
going to do that, shouldn't we -- if we're
going to set the goal for licensure rate,
shouldn't we have a goal of actually meeting
all four of them? Because right here it says
our goal was to meet one of four, which doesn't
make any sense.

TRUSTEE WASHINGTON: It's like, what's the
difference if you meet -- if your goal is four
of four and you get zero and your goal is one
of four and you get zero, which one is worse?

CHAIRMAN LAWSON: I'm sorry. So what's
the goal again?

TRUSTEE MILLS: It was like, we had these
goals for licensure rate, but then our goal was
to only meet one of four of them, which doesn't
make any sense.

CHAIRMAN LAWSON: So we had the individual
percentages, but the documents is one of the
four numbers.

TRUSTEE WASHINGTON: Yes.

TRUSTEE MILLS: We're going to only meet
one of them.

TRUSTEE WASHINGTON: We're not going to
meet any of them.

TRUSTEE MILLS: And now we might meet potentially one of them. So my point being is if we’re going to change those because if you look at the 19/20 goals we actually change all of the licensure goals.

So, I mean, your goals should be to meet all the goals, four of four.

TRUSTEE MOORE: Correct. That is the goal, one goal. Yeah. Uh-huh.

CHAIRMAN LAWSON: So I mean, the only question I would have is these percentages, what are they tied to? I mean, are they national averages for that program?

TRUSTEE WASHINGTON: Oh, yeah. The actual goal percentages?

CHAIRMAN LAWSON: What are they tied to?

MR. ROBINSON: Those are tied to national, state and national.

CHAIRMAN LAWSON: And then --

TRUSTEE MILLS: So they got lowered for next year?

TRUSTEE WASHINGTON: Well, only one went down.

MR. ROBINSON: In some areas they did go
TRUSTEE WASHINGTON: Oh, two went down.

MR. EDDINGTON: Benchmarks fluctuate every year.

MR. ROBINSON: We're not setting those. They're coming from --

TRUSTEE MILLS: So why don't we set our own percentages?

MR. ROBINSON: The BOG gave us those.

TRUSTEE MILLS: Oh, the BOG gave us these?

MR. ROBINSON: No. The BOG has them.

MR. EDDINGTON: Those are in the accountability.

TRUSTEE WASHINGTON: This is what --

MR. ROBINSON: No. Those are the nationals.

TRUSTEE MILLS: I'm sorry. We have multiple conversations going.

MR. ROBINSON: No. We get them directly from -- I think these are the national benchmarks. I don't think those are the BOG's.

MR. EDDINGTON: So what has happened is, in our accountability plan we map out for each of those programs what the goals are. And then the timeline getting to the benchmark.
Then when you take that and map it onto this, that's why you see the phase approach. Y'all can change it.

CHAIRMAN LAWSON: I think we should have a system --

MR. ROBINSON: The question though, are these national benchmarks?

MR. EDDINGTON: Well, those are benchmarks, right? It's either a state benchmark or a national in the discipline.

TRUSTEE MILLS: Right.

MR. EDDINGTON: The law is a state benchmark.

CHAIRMAN LAWSON: That's where it comes from. Yeah, these are the work plan goals.

MR. EDDINGTON: Yeah, they define what the benchmark should be. So they say for law, we're going to use the state benchmark.

CHAIRMAN LAWSON: I'm sorry, Maurice. So these match what we presented as the work plan or the accountability plan.

MR. EDDINGTON: The accountability plan.

CHAIRMAN LAWSON: So we have to stick with these because this is what we showed the BOG, right?
MR. ROBINSON: You can go higher.

MR. EDDINGTON: Right. Your goal can be whatever you want.

TRUSTEE WOODY: We said 78 percent for law, that's a national.

MR. ROBINSON: It could be national or it could be state. But they are set by BOG. Now, we can go higher but, you know, going lower.

But I think the real question is, why aren't we -- why don't we have a goal that says we're going to achieve all four things.

TRUSTEE WASHINGTON: Yeah, all four goals.

MR. ROBINSON: But the goal currently is one of these four.

TRUSTEE WASHINGTON: I agree it should be all of them.

MR. ROBINSON: That's the question.

TRUSTEE MILLS: Well, there's two questions to me. I'm struggling with how the accountability plan can have a goal of 92 percent in 18/19, and then a goal of 78 percent in 19/20. So I'm struggling with that.

MR. EDDINGTON: Yeah, I don't know.

That's what happens. But in the accountability
plan, the state says, here's the benchmark or
national benchmark. All right. Here's how you
measure it up. You have one, two, three or
four. We say how many of those four benchmarks
we're going to meet that year.

So FAMU says, okay, in these four years
we're going to meet two of four the next year.

Whatever we say there should map on here as the
same goal.

TRUSTEE MILLS: So that's not
unreasonable, I don't think, now that I
understand that, right?

However, I'm still stuck on why is the
goal for next year lower than the goal for this
year?

MR. EDDINGTON: Yeah. So I can't give you
an exact answer. But it could be that the
bench is fluctuating.

TRUSTEE MILLS: Is lower.

MR. EDDINGTON: Yeah.

TRUSTEE MILLS: Okay. So if I can just
reaffirm, have somebody reaffirm, that the
goals for 19/20 match the same criteria,
whether it be state or national goals or
whatever.
MR. ROBINSON: We can look that up.

TRUSTEE MILLS: And make sure they match.

And then if we go back to X of four, then we can sort of stick with that.

MR. EDDINGTON: Yeah. And as a suggestion, too, on your point, if you all as a board want the targets for us to achieve the benchmarks, then you don't have to worry about what the number says because the benchmark is the benchmark for that year.

You can see that we can exceed the benchmark, because it's going to fluctuate then we won't have that problem.

TRUSTEE MOORE: Okay.

CHAIRMAN LAWSON: We're good with that.

TRUSTEE MILLS: Okay. So then the question then just becomes, is our goal for this team to be four of four, and is that reasonable?

MR. EDDINGTON: And my only feedback to y'all is to think about the ultimate goal here, the same way you all did for the performance. Half of these scores are already in the books this year. So to do what you all want --

TRUSTEE MILLS: So the answer would be
yes, is what you're saying?

MR. EDDINGTON: Yes. I mean, I'm all for it. I'm just going to tell you.

CHAIRMAN LAWSON: But if the data is already in the books --

MR. EDDINGTON: Right. So I'm telling you again, that the next year is fine. Same thing.

You say next year when you have a chance to impact all four realistically, that's going to be the goal.

TRUSTEE MILLS: Okay. I've got it. That makes sense. All right. So what will we get next year for 19/20?

MR. ROBINSON: In terms of what?

MR. EDDINGTON: My suggestion is you go two for four.

TRUSTEE MILLS: I mean, you said the numbers -- half the numbers are already in the book.

MR. EDDINGTON: Yeah, I mean, because the students --

TRUSTEE MILLS: What are those numbers?

MR. EDDINGTON: The ones that I know of, law is not looking good so far. Nursing is not looking good so far. There's another one that
Dr. Robinson said.

MR. ROBINSON: We haven’t gotten the final numbers so I don’t want to say.

TRUSTEE MILLS: All right.

MR. ROBINSON: That's the only one it could be, obviously.

TRUSTEE MILLS: Let's move on to the annual giving. We had a 25 percent in implemented plan to launch a capital campaign.

And it says we met that one with 11.6 million as of June 28th, '19.

And you know, what I didn’t understand was how much -- how much were the pledges compared to actual contributions?

MR. ROBINSON: I don't have a detail of that.

TRUSTEE MILLS: What percentage of it.

MR. ROBINSON: We can get that.

TRUSTEE MILLS: If she could send us that maybe some time today. I'm sure that's an easy number to get.

But the question will be, what percentage of that is pledges. And then obviously what our historical conversion rate of pledges is to actual dollars.
TRUSTEE DORTCH: She's done a great job in cleaning up the mess in the system, too. And they have a system of collections so I'm sure when we get those back you'll see a significant change from the historical way things were reported.

And they have done verification. And once we get them, you'll see a significant difference in the last board meeting.

They were targeted pretty high in terms of collections. So we can get that from Dr. Robinson. The board would be pleased with the success.

TRUSTEE MOORE: Well, and five million of it, we have to remember, came by way of our arrangements at the Mets. Our food service come from the auxiliary, which the team reported on at our last board meeting.

TRUSTEE MILLS: All that goes into the cap.

TRUSTEE MOORE: That, as I understand it, it was a contribution.

MR. ROBINSON: We got out of that.

TRUSTEE MOORE: That was a one time. That was the agreement.
TRUSTEE DORTCH: Anyway, she can give us those numbers. Do we consider the prior meeting being part of --

TRUSTEE MOORE: That's here. It's in there.

TRUSTEE DORTCH: If we get it, you think back in the board meeting, I think they had already collected over 11 million and Dr. Robinson said we wanted more money.

MR. ROBINSON: We actually started somewhere around two-and-a-half, three million. And then we brought it back to five for the final early extension.

TRUSTEE MILLS: Right. So that wasn't in last year, right? And that won't be in next year.

CHAIRMAN LAWSON: No.

MR. ROBINSON: No. That's it. It's in the books now. It's cash. So now we have to make that back up.

TRUSTEE MILLS: Okay.

TRUSTEE WASHINGTON: So when you say increase annual giving by 5 percent next year, is that pledges or is that actual cash?

MR. ROBINSON: Well, the way they do it,
they do both and then it goes through Trustee
Mills for what the conversion rate is and all
that.

TRUSTEE DORTCH: And as far as regulations
they put it in writing and it goes on the books
once someone makes a commitment in writing. So
it goes on your books.

TRUSTEE WASHINGTON: Unless we don't get
there.

TRUSTEE MILLS: We just need to know what
our conversion rate is.

TRUSTEE DORTCH: There's a system of -- in
fine development though we get the commitments
and they put them in writing. And some you
determine whether they're collectible or not
upfront before you can legitimize them.

But once they're in writing, that's the
system. It goes on the book as far as
regulations say, I commit a million to you and
I'll put it in writing and it goes on the
books.

So we can't determine the collectability
of it until they have worked the plan. But in
the past we've had some universities where
students would make pledges and we accepted
them and put them on the books and they were never collected.

So she's cleaned all that out. Now with the new leadership of the foundation it's more efficient of what's going on.

TRUSTEE MILLS: So if we can just get those two numbers, that would be helpful. One is what our percentage of the 11 is pledges. And then what our conversion rate has been.

Okay. That takes us to the goal five. Yeah, customer service, right?

MRS. BARGE-MILES: You all should have this with your goals.

TRUSTEE MILLS: So now the -- yeah, so customer service in goal five it says we met all the deliverables. But the one thing that I wasn't clear on is that we did do a customer service survey this year.

MR. ROBINSON: Last year. And these are some of the --

TRUSTEE MILLS: Right. I saw that. That's the first time I saw that. Have we seen this before, like our customer service results?

MR. ROBINSON: We have some more extensive results now we can provide to you.
MR. EDDINGTON: So if I could recall the discussion last year and we were discussing this and you all were going to set the goals and focus on the plan. I think Trustee Washington said, I want to see some numbers.

TRUSTEE WASHINGTON: Benchmarking.

MR. EDDINGTON: Right. Right. And we said, well, we don't -- the plan, in terms of customer service initiative includes developing tools to collect data and all that as part of that plan. But we don't have that in place.

So we said, let's use the exit survey of graduates as some type of baseline information.

So that column 18 and 19, those were the data that was in the exit survey for that year. And we said, well, at least use that to give us frame of reference in terms of the impact.

So that's what that data is showing is the data we've always collected on students who have graduated each semesters who has some specific questions.

TRUSTEE MILLS: Okay.

MR. EDDINGTON: That's what that is right there.

TRUSTEE WASHINGTON: So have we
implemented a plan or a tool or have we not?

MR. EDDINGTON: So we -- so the customer service initiative, right, has a timeline.

We're on that timeline. The timeline for implemented tools, we haven't reached. That's this year. So that's why we said we weren't going to have that data for this evaluation.

So you wanted something.

TRUSTEE WASHINGTON: Yeah.

MR. EDDINGTON: We're not there yet.

TRUSTEE WASHINGTON: So how did we meet all of the deliverables if we have not yet, in fact, met --

MR. EDDINGTON: So, yeah, the goal was, look at the timeline and plan that you all approved. I forgot how many things that are in it, right. But it said, okay, this year we're going to do A, B, C, D, E.

The goal was the president is going to meet all of those things. That was the goal.

And then we put the data in there, just so you all would have a frame of reference. The goal is not to meet the quantifiable targets for the data itself.

TRUSTEE WASHINGTON: So what we've -- what
I've seen, and correct me if I'm wrong, is basically we had somebody come on campus and start to do trainings. We're supposed to have a more comprehensive survey. And have we developed that yet across the enterprise? Is that -- this is not what this is.

MR. EDDINGTON: That's not what that is.

TRUSTEE MILLS: So I'm hearing that we missed this as a board, I think. Because in a sense what should happen is you --

MR. ROBINSON: No. If you look at the bullets, which is what we agreed and we've done.

TRUSTEE MILLS: Yeah. Yeah. I'm saying -- I'm not disagreeing that we agreed to that. I'm just saying we missed it. Because what we should have -- we should be like evaluating our service first and then developing a plan to improve it from there.

So my only point is is that if we can -- and we don't have to do this today -- but if we can go back and look at that timeline about when the tool is supposed to be implemented.

So as an example, if you do the survey this fall and then do it again in the spring,
that would help us understand how to move
forward more effectively. Because usually when you're implementing
these kinds of programs, you kind of get your
baseline score and then you bring your
consultant in or whatever you do.

MR. EDDINGTON: I was going to say, if you
want some data to set goals, I think it is
realistic at this point to use an exit survey.

If you want something right now.

TRUSTEE MILLS: This isn't a real customer
service survey.

TRUSTEE WASHINGTON: Like this isn't --
this is one segment of our customers. So we
need to do the faculties.

TRUSTEE MOORE: So what I'd offer -- and
when I talked to Vice President Schweigert and
Provost Eddington, that part of -- and this
falls under the finance with ABP Ingram, that
we have got to tell the consistent story of
where we are because our memories fail.

When we hear customer service plan, I'm
like, okay, where's the baseline. When did it
get deployed. I mean, it's throughout the
entire enterprise. But we did adopt these
individual, I'll call it breadcrumbs.

Now we're asking where we are. So you can anticipate at our next committee meeting that you'll see where we are and report on those things where we are constantly.

CHAIRMAN LAWSON: So if I can -- just to paraphrase. So what we said we would do we've done.

TRUSTEE MILLS: Yes.

MR. EDDINGTON: Yes.

CHAIRMAN LAWSON: So if we want to take it to the next level then we need to start with a baseline and then the tool and then that's where we are.

TRUSTEE MILLS: That's right.

CHAIRMAN LAWSON: But for what we started with, we've achieved those desired outcomes.

TRUSTEE MILLS: That's correct.

MR. EDDINGTON: I do know there was a disconnect and I know and remember then at the time and we were trying to get in front of it --

TRUSTEE MILLS: Well, what were you thinking? Boy, these guys are fools.

MR. EDDINGTON: No. No.
TRUSTEE MOORE: That's going to come back a year from now and you'll say where's the plan.

MR. EDDINGTON: No. I said, they're going to forget this conversation and the conversation was, when we decided to hire a firm and all that.

TRUSTEE MILLS: Right.

MR. EDDINGTON: One of the things that the firm said to us, they said, look, you can do this one of two ways. You can go for the quick and easy, in which we've seen people do that and fail, or they said, you can have a multi-year plan and it requires patience and it requires all this.

And we said, okay, we want to do it the right way. But at the time we said, we have to make sure we keep the board updated because you may get antsy and start saying, where's the change in culture --

TRUSTEE MILLS: Right. Antsy.

TRUSTEE DORTCH: So one of the things we've done is you conducted a campus-wide training to the customer service mission standards and that was completed in June
Initially, with service assessment tools. That was completed in June. You've had the retreat on training for customer service. So there are a few things here.

MR. EDDINGTON: That's just from the faculty yesterday.

TRUSTEE MILLS: Yeah, I know. I've got all those. And that's fine. It's just that usually there's a baseline and then you have an actual plan. So I think what we just want to do is kind of get to the baseline.

MR. ROBINSON: We've had quite a few surveys.

TRUSTEE MILLS: You have done quite a few surveys and that's what you were saying we're going to see?

TRUSTEE MOORE: We're going to bring everybody current at this meeting because I had the same thing like, where is it.

CHAIRMAN LAWSON: So you guys are going to forward us and send us finances?

MR. ROBINSON: Mrs. Ingram owns that.

CHAIRMAN LAWSON: Okay. But again, everything we said we'd do, we've done.

TRUSTEE MILLS: Right. Right. Yeah.
That's fine. No argument there.

CHAIRMAN LAWSON: Yeah, so then maybe you could take it a step further.

TRUSTEE MILLS: Yeah, and maybe accelerate.

Okay. So goal number six. So we had a goal of enrollment head count, which we've met, right?

TRUSTEE WASHINGTON: No.

TRUSTEE MILLS: We didn't meet.

TRUSTEE WASHINGTON: That's okay.

TRUSTEE MILLS: But the one thing I loved about this -- the one thing I loved about this more so was in your comments you had included the SAT scores, the average ACT scores and the high school GPA, which I'm not sure if that's the weighted GPA or, you know, because universities do this by school, right?

A 4.0 at one school is not the equivalent of a 4.0 at another school. So I'm assuming that's the weighted version.

MR. ROBINSON: If it's above a four it's weighted.

TRUSTEE MILLS: No. I guess what I mean, as an institution we -- a 4.0 -- a weighted
average of using AP class and all that kind of stuff, that's one thing. But universities measure schools differently. So a 4.0 at school A is not equivalent to a 4.0 at school B, or in Florida terminology an A school GPA is not equivalent to a D school equivalent. So I don't know if we do those weigh-ins.

MR. ROBINSON: You really can't do that, technically. You know, I mean --

TRUSTEE MILLS: Every university does it.

MR. ROBINSON: Yeah. On a GPA, right, I mean, that's the GPA.

TRUSTEE MILLS: Okay.

MR. ROBINSON: And you can go down and start those types of things and know that.

TRUSTEE MILLS: Okay.

MR. ROBINSON: But when they report that GPA --

TRUSTEE MILLS: Okay. So we'll circle back around to that.

MR. ROBINSON: I know exactly what you're saying.

TRUSTEE MILLS: But the point here is to Tommy's earlier point, it's about quality as opposed to quantity.
MR. ROBINSON: Yes, it is.

TRUSTEE MILLS: And I think we also got some feedback from the BOG around that, as well.

And so as we think about goal number six for next year, we went back to quantity again. And I'm not sure your opinions about this. But I actually am not a huge fan of this, meaning that we should stick to quality.

And even if it is transfers from AA schools, what's the quality of that student versus the number of that student? Because we're going to fall right back into this numbers trap again.

MR. ROBINSON: So the quantities, and that's with our two-plus-two agreements with the 13. So it's out there.

What you also need to know that I was just as concerned about this is getting input versus an output. In looking at the four-year graduation rates, but we got some pushback on it and that's because there is an expectation that some institutions, including FAMU, could do more in bringing those kind of college students in. We were on the low end of that
spectrum, as well, the overall percentage of 
those students.

So we didn't start with this one, as you 
know. We discussed it with the board and we 
presented our preliminary options to the BOG 
and this is what was --

TRUSTEE WASHINGTON: So this is not our 
BOG metric. Our BOG metric is the 
graduation -- the number of students we 
graduate. It is not enrollment. So I would be 
okay with a number if it's based on our 
outcome --

TRUSTEE MILLS: Graduation rate.

TRUSTEE WASHINGTON: Not rate, number. 
The actual number. I would be okay with that 
because that is part of our -- that's one of 
our metrics. It's part of our strategic plan. 
But yeah, the enrollment is a tricky one. 

MR. ROBINSON: Yeah, because -- well, it 
is tricky, but it rolls into the plan, right. 

So it's not like this is an outline. In the 
enrollment plan we talk about retention, FTICs, 
and these young people coming in.

Now, we're going to, to a certain extent, 
control it through those very specialized two
TRUSTEE MILLS: Right. And again, I think there's an underlying assumption that there's some quality metrics that you described from those students that we're accepting. I think culturally the slides are backwards when we start talking about the number of people we enroll. It really does need to be a focus on quality. And I don't know if it's, you know, the number of students with X kind of criteria that we accept. Because we're not accepting all A transfers either, right. And I don't want us to fall in this trap of saying we've got to get to 975, even though they might be borderline criteria folks that we have established.

CHAIRMAN LAWSON: What's in the accountability plan?

TRUSTEE WASHINGTON: Our performance funding metric, 10.2 is the number of Bachelor degrees awarded to transfers with AAs from the Florida colleges.

CHAIRMAN LAWSON: Okay.

TRUSTEE WASHINGTON: That's our metric.
TRUSTEE DORTCH: I think we also need to be realistic and understand, too, that one -- the standards are set by the system. And we start denying students who meet the requirements for entry, but because we want to have only the same students at FSU and all those have, then we're no better -- we can't be -- we can't be judged by saying we don't give opportunities.

TRUSTEE MILLS: I think we set those standards, Tom. We set the standards.

TRUSTEE DORTCH: What I'm saying though is, if a student meets the standard for admission -- because for every 100 students that's how many millions of dollars in enrollment? It's a few million.

I know we've looked at -- I mean, I've looked at this throughout the system and throughout the country where for every one of the students there's X amount of funding that automatically comes to the institution.

We're not saying we want to discount students who don't meet the requirements. But I know a lot of my classmates who are medical doctors, who are lawyers and judges and all who
we didn't think they were going to do anything.

Andrew Young was a C student. And

Dr. Martin Luther King was a C-minus student.

So we can't say we can predict what a student
is going to do based on their GPA and all. If
they meet the standards for admission, we've

got to have at least some of those students.

Because those are the leaders of this nation
and this world, too.

So we don't want to just -- Harvard and
Yale can take all A students and that's fine,
but FAMU will still have a diverse student body
but not just simply say, we're not saying we
don't want students who are not going to
succeed. But I hope we never get so stringent
that we say, if you're not a 3.0 or a 3.5
student, we don't want you at FAMU.

TRUSTEE MILLS: My only feedback is that
right now our retention goal is at 2.0 or more.
So I don't think we're close to --

TRUSTEE DORTCH: We can recruit at a
higher rate.

CHAIRMAN LAWSON: Some additional.

TRUSTEE MILLS: But we set the standards
for it and I just want to make sure we
highlight. We just change it so we're focused on -- our mentality is still focused on quality.

CHAIRMAN LAWSON: And so the additional color on number six. And I know Nicole remembers this.

We were at the bottom of the barrel of bringing in transfers from the two-year institutions, and we put a concerted effort against growing the numbers.

So some of our earlier metrics were tied to growing the numbers because we were so far below the curve.

But I think -- you know, I hear your point. I think we can make sure that as we grow those numbers, we're not growing them just in numbers but we're also growing them in quality, as well.

Because we were so far behind in curve.

And the thought was, gosh, FAMU, you have a real opportunity, you know, working with Levine when he chaired that committee to say, you know, you need to go after some of these students. There are what, 100,000 kids in the system, most of which are minority students.
And the other schools, quite frankly, Central Florida and others, were really picking those kids off. So we decided to go heavy.

So I think a lot of our early mentions reflect building the muscle and now I think we can say, okay, we've increased our notoriety and popularity in that system, so now we can really focus on quality, as well as the numbers.

So I think it's a bit of an evolution that we have gone through with the two-plus-two system. And I think it served us well because their graduation rates are higher than our first-time in college student population, as well.

So I think as long as we -- you know, we look for quality. We look for the numbers so those two match together. And as long as their graduate rates continue to exceed the base population, I think we're okay.

TRUSTEE MILLS: Yes.

TRUSTEE DORTCH: And when you look at best practices, I mean, I know Dr. Robinson admitted folks. Look at Georgia State University now with 62,000 students and where they are, their
graduation rate. They have more African-American students than all Georgia combined. But then when Dr. Rivers was present he recruited over 400-plus students and the faculty said we don't want these students. So he said, you make the vote. Georgia Southern took over half of those students immediately and then Albany State and other schools took those same students and he recruited 50 percent male students each year in his classes. But the difference between Georgia Southern, they created a summer enrichment program and brought those students in in the summer. Because it wasn't just that they weren't prepared. Some were first time leaving home and small cities. So you've got to have support programs that help those students to prepare themselves because a lot of them leave home the first time and they're homesick. So there are all kinds of things we need to look at. How do we really prepare those students to succeed?
Georgia State has a mentoring program for students and upper classmen. So I think we have to be -- we have to look at how we really help those students to get in and matriculate and get them out.

So it's not just the GPA, because I know a lot of my star students when I mentored 100 who were top flight students, they didn't make it and go on to Syracuse. They had cases with some of our other major institutions because they have other factors they have to deal with, cultural factors also.

I think it's how do we really create an environmental support system. I think Georgia State has one of the most successful programs for taking in those students and moving them along.

So I think we have to do more than just recruit. We've got to look at how we really prep them once we've got them there.

TRUSTEE WASHINGTON: What Georgia State does is, they put them on a guided pathway. They don't let them change their major and they give them very strict contracts upon arrival about what their deliverables are.
TRUSTEE DORTCH: And they have an effective counseling department that works with those students and they use graduate students to help those students also in their programs.

TRUSTEE MILLS: All right. Let me see if I can move on here real quick.

Goal number seven was R and D expenditures and we're kind of keeping that for next year, as well.

Goal number eight, as far as reducing expenditures.

TRUSTEE WASHINGTON: No. It changed. That's what it was last year.

TRUSTEE MILLS: I'm sorry. I'm talking about the current year, yeah, before we flip over here.

But reducing expenditure by 5 percent so that we can continue investing in key initiatives and strategic priorities. This says we did meet and that generated $11 million.

TRUSTEE WASHINGTON: It was 7 point whatever.

TRUSTEE MILLS: Yeah, 7 million bucks and do we know where that 7 million bucks went?
MR. ROBINSON: Some of it went -- half of it went into the reserve and half of it we reinvested.

CHAIRMAN LAWSON: I remember the prior CFO going through a spreadsheet of where those dollars went. Joyce is not here, but we have to dig that out. But we did see a spreadsheet of where those reinvested dollars went.

TRUSTEE WASHINGTON: So goal eight for next year is a different goal.

TRUSTEE MILLS: Yeah, we switched it just to -- and is there a reason why -- is there a why --

MR. ROBINSON: It's a lot of pain and suffering at 5 percent.

TRUSTEE MILLS: That's an annual thing in everybody else's world.

MR. ROBINSON: So I mean, it can be back in there. But to me, I was looking at the urgency around, and the importance of getting these major construction projects done.

TRUSTEE MILLS: Yeah. Yeah. I'm not saying that needs to come off.

TRUSTEE WASHINGTON: But will it be done by June 30th?
MR. ROBINSON: No. It won't be.

TRUSTEE WASHINGTON: So how is that a goal?

MR. ROBINSON: I'm staying on time and within budget. So the all time --

TRUSTEE MILLS: It says completion.

MR. ROBINSON: Completion on time. On time.

TRUSTEE WASHINGTON: But the problem --

MR. ROBINSON: The on time is a year from now. But it's going to be.

TRUSTEE WASHINGTON: We have to evaluate you.

MR. ROBINSON: But as you can see it is on target for where it needs to be.

CHAIRMAN LAWSON: But just a little history on number eight. For those of you that were around when the Village was built. We saw multiple plans and multiple plans and we ended up with a pretty significant cost overrun.

And we ended up in a delayed situation and we had challenges with the contractor to deliver building it on time.

So I think that is -- if I recall, that's one of the reasons we opted to put that in the
presidential lap to manage for number eight.

TRUSTEE MILLS: Yeah, I don't mind -- you
know, and maybe we'll change the language to
it's on schedule and on budget at the time.

But I don't know mind it being in there.

I just don't think we should exclude a specific
financial goal from the goal for next year.

MR. ROBINSON: Isn't that what number nine
is? If we can ever figure out what it means
based on the conversation.

But isn't that what number nine is?

TRUSTEE MILLS: Well, there's two things,
right? Number nine, which is -- yeah, about
solvency and long-term health, financial health
of the institution.

But there's annual sort of operating
goals, which kind of goes to -- you know, we
had that conversation at the last board meeting
about, you know, the BOG has us put that
emergency plan together or whatever and then
it's kind of an exercise. But really it does
force us to prioritize things. And we should
be -- we should be trying every year to get rid
of inefficient stuff and reinvest it in more
important priorities. So I'm going to suggest
MR. ROBINSON: It's the -- okay. So this is what we agreed to because this is part of our strategy right now and we aren't going to take a bowl this year.

TRUSTEE MILLS: A what?

MR. ROBINSON: A bowl. Because you're saying without those things that we're going to do with the 13.7, there are some recurring costs in there. And we're going to get to that by finding those, you know, where we can be more efficient and reinvesting those funds into those goals to keep those nonrecurring -- or the ones that are recurring.

You know, and so we're hiring counselors, advisers and coaches and we're going to continue that through those reinvestments.

So we have to find them and we know where they are. And we're going to cut the fat to get to some things we need to do.

TRUSTEE MILLS: So I just -- I still think we should just continue to have that on there so we understand where, you know, that is.

It's also both. It's reinvestment and, you know, some plan where we should paying that
back.

MR. ROBINSON: I do have some concern.

You saw what's happening in the world. The Legislature has continued to hone in on that.

TRUSTEE MILLS: On reserves, yes. But I'm just saying we should also think about how we pay down debt when we can, as well, just like we do at our own house.

And I get the reserves scenarios that we have and with the structure and their focus on that. And, you know, but we still should focus on overall financial health, in addition to reinvestment.

TRUSTEE WASHINGTON: I agree.

MR. ROBINSON: Okay.

CHAIRMAN LAWSON: Okay. Just a recommendation. Can we just -- now that we've gone through, just summarize this just so we can kind of -- because we'll need to memorialize this in the committee tomorrow.

TRUSTEE MILLS: Yes. That's exactly where I was headed. So we'll go through the rest of it.

CHAIRMAN LAWSON: So if we're looking at -- if we're looking at the summary, if you
will, or the rest of the goals, there were --
for the most part there, I think there were
general consensus. But there are a couple of
things I think we should highlight, namely
organizational management and financial
management. And if there's other ones that
anyone wants to kind of review, we can do that,
as well.

MR. ROBINSON: So what I would like for
you to consider, Mr. Chairman, is that not only
the places where that discusses around
something that didn't necessarily happen the
way we would like, but the other part of this
back to where things were, you know, more
positive.

Because I don't want the takeaway to be
like it was a year ago where the headline was,
you know, because of what we emphasized people
walked away or wrote away stories that implied
that it was a total disaster.

TRUSTEE MILLS: Okay. Yeah.

MR. ROBINSON: The overall picture was
much brighter. So yeah, we get to focus on the
places where we can get better. I enjoy that.

But let's not leave it out there that, you
know, as a goal -- and these are your
assessments. You know, different kinds of
clues and based upon those clues, there's two
or three that we talked about those this
morning.

TRUSTEE MILLS: Yeah, actually I was going
to wrap up on all the exceeds ones.

MR. ROBINSON: I took away your time.

TRUSTEE MILLS: Yes, you did.

TRUSTEE WOODY: Mr. Chairman?

TRUSTEE MILLS: Yes, sir.

TRUSTEE WOODY: Do you think in working
with the president that it's beneficial to talk
about where we have some issues of weakness so
we can talk about it as a body collectively?

TRUSTEE MILLS: Certainly, yeah.

TRUSTEE WOODY: So that should be a part
of the discussion, I would think, to improve,
hopefully improve for next year.

TRUSTEE MILLS: Is there one in particular
you're thinking about, Woody?

TRUSTEE WOODY: One in particular but I'm
going to wait until -- let me hold on to
that -- and I'll hold on to that discussion and
talk to you a little bit later before I bring
it up.

TRUSTEE MILLS: All right. Is it an organization management or financial management, because that's where I am right.

TRUSTEE WOODY: Financial.

TRUSTEE MILLS: Okay. So let's just talk about it, because I'm on those two right now.

TRUSTEE WOODY: In reference to what just happened just recently in reference to the auxiliary funds, I think that's part of the discussion that we must have and talk about it in the area of accountability.

And then accountability, not only talk about accountability of the president, but also accountability of the board, because we're responsible to make sure that things are running efficiently, not only just the college community or the university community, but the reputation of the University. Those are things that I think we need to talk about.

And I understand that we have a plan in place to rectify the situation. But I think it's beneficial -- it's beneficial for us to talk about it.

TRUSTEE WASHINGTON: It's not just the
plan, for me. It's the -- what is the followup and enforcement. Because I think we do a fantastic job in responding to situations by creating plans.

I don't know that we are as strong with creating structures to ensure that those plans are being implemented with fidelity over time, because I feel like our attentions get directed to whatever triages at the moment and then, you know, we just sort of -- our attention spans where it swings to whatever the next thing is.

So I would agree with that and the fact that we've seen this situation happen year over year over year and we're about to move into another operational audit, which means we are potentially putting ourselves in a another cycle.

I think we have to be really, really like focused on how we're going to improve this area.

TRUSTEE MOORE: And I concur with that. I think there have been great strides that have been made and I think that we do a really good job of developmental plans.

Our challenge and I know, Trustee Mills,
that's one of the areas that he's heartfelt in
the past about what happens after the plan.
How do we hold ourselves accountable.
I think this is certainly an area that
this board has to see it for what it is. That
this is something that is not small.
And recognizably, we were on a high and
then this. It's a big this. And how we look
at handling that going forward, I think that we
definitely do have to put some level of
accountability that go beyond what we've done
in the past.
TRUSTEE MILLS: I think there's a -- in
this theme there's kind of a sense of -- we
probably have a lot more focus on not only just
on accountability, but also level of competence
in some of these roles that we have, because
that's what's leading us to places, to certain
places where we don't want to be.
And, you know, even the idea that -- for
example, we missed our athletic budget. My
response has always been, so what. You know,
we miss it. You miss it and you go back and
you fix it and you figure it out.
The idea that we would try to figure out
how to plug the hole and in essence goes to a bit of

a culture -- a little bit of a cover everybody's

back, make sure everybody's good, which isn't always

healthy.

And then that ties to people making

obviously mistakes. So we can't -- as a board we
can't brush this under the rug by any means. It
goes against our responsibilities fundamentally.

And that's where I think we need to see

both a level of competence increased, a level of

controls increased and an overall level of

accountability of not only you, but also the rest of

the staff.

Because this side -- again, the concept

that if I miss my objective, then I miss my

objective. You know, most people don't get shot the

first time they miss their objective, right, kind of

scenario.

It happens. It happens in business
everywhere. But the idea that somebody's going to
try to cover it up for me, that's the problem.

That's a fundamental problem.

And I'm not clear that that -- let's cover
each other's back is not a pervasive part of our
culture that we need to figure out how to weed out
in some respect.

And I think that is -- when we hear this word accountability, accountability, accountability,

I think that's some of the things we're trying to get to.

MR. ROBINSON: So Mr. Chairman, we have spent a lot of time in the last month or so on that issue. And we believe that new -- first of all, I want to give Mrs. Ingram a whole lot of credit for standing in during the time we worked to bring those in.

TRUSTEE MILLS: By the way, I don't think we did earlier in the introduction.

MR. ROBINSON: In the interim, you know, CFO Rich Schweigert whose record is stellar when it comes to managing the University with financing, assisting and serving as a CFO.

But part of us getting here is we had the benefit of Mrs. Joyce Ingram and others in her unit and Provost to manage this division through some very difficult times.

A lot of them worked during that period addressing, you know, the issues and gaps that led up to this type of thing occurring. And we knew that there were systemic or systematic
issues and that's where we plan and that's
where we are.

So we have -- the team is working to
ensure that within the people's -- the RP
system is to allow us to know what's going on
and to track what's going on.

So I don't know if anybody's, you know, a
big wheel or is it a good thing or a bad thing.
Al will know, Joe Maleszewski will know. In
fact, I would have to approve it prior to the
transfer or something of this type happening.
So the team is -- and Rich might be able to
give you an update who is working with that.

And meanwhile we have every transaction
that has occurred that has been verified or
validated by someone to make sure that they
were appropriate. So we have eyes on it and we
know that it involves people, as well as, you
know, process.

But I do -- I think we had a process, I
think what we learned is that we needed to
enhance it, right? And then building it into
the system is where we think the ultimate, you
know, appropriate approach is and that's where
we are now.
I don't know if there are updates on where we are with that. But I just want you to know we spent a lot of time working on this. We're not just sort of assessing, but to find the cause and coming up with a plan to address it. Because part of the plan was to bring it to the team and give us an assessment of what and how much and so forth and make a recommendation. The recommendation is basically what we had already began to initiate.

So we have the opportunity now. You know, looking at the three different positions in that division are open. Rich and I have already talked about some of the pool of applicants coming in. And, you know, we do need to work a little bit harder to get to that issue.

And with this level of experience out here and being here at this time is extremely important. So we have sort of, you know -- sometimes we get -- it helps to have an external set of eyes, so to speak, as we make the very, very important step of adding expertise, you know, in these positions to ensure, you know, that they can operate.
TRUSTEE MILLS: Okay.

TRUSTEE MOORE: Thank you for that. I think the other thing, you know, collectively for this board that we have to realize, because this happened it was such a trickle boom, boom, boom. Okay. We're paralyzed. So I would say taking it even beyond this area, this particular business line and looking at our entire enterprise capacity, subject matter expertise, succession. I mean, we shouldn't get caught offguard and one person shouldn't stop the show, or two or three people shouldn't stop the show. Systems should be in place.

And I know that Joyce did a good job with development of succession plans. But we all know, plans are only as good if they're deployed and implemented.

So I would challenge her to go beyond just this area. Yes, it's a prime case study and example, but it's enterprise wide that we need to look at this.

CHAIRMAN LAWSON: Mr. Chair, not to belabor this, but I have a couple comments and I'll just combine financial and organizational management together.
You know, you'll hear even more tomorrow about the situation in athletics. But I think that that was a bit of a firestorm where you had that situation occur and it was validated. The auditor came in and they told us what happened and what didn't happen, et cetera. So you'll get more on that tomorrow.

But right, wrong or indifferent, we had a policy in place that called for multiple signatures that didn't happen. So in my mind that was a break down in process. But at the end of the day, we still own it. It happened on our watch, so we have to take accountability for it. And we have to make sure, whether it be through people, as well as through having the right people in the right seats that we fix this moving forward.

So that's one.

Number two for me is just kind of a larger organizational thing that I've been wrestling with, and I'll give you a prime example.

I've gone through graduation rates for every college and school for the last three years and I've looked at those graduation rates and I look at the people in those seats and
they're still there.

And it's probably okay for them to be there, but what corrective action have we taken with them to say Mr. Jones, Mrs. Jones, here's where you are, here's where we need you to be, here's the corrective steps that we're going to take to get this.

It's not always about changing the bodies out, but I think it is about very direct and constructive discussions around, you know, we just talked about raising the bar to potentially 79.

I believe that these two gentlemen have that burning desire. My concern is one, two levels below and how do we drive that culture throughout the enterprise?

Because I believe when you talk to these two people, they get that sense of grind. You know, we just kind of had that grind in talking from 71 to 79. But my concern is, how do we infuse that?

And I've talked to Mrs. Barrington a couple times about how do we share metrics. How do we build dashboards. How do we drive accountability down.
And it's not about, hey, this person doesn't belong here. It's not about that. It's about, does that person understand their contribution to the big number and what they need to do to help us get to the big number.

So for me, organizationally, that's where I hope, I believe, that as a board that we can provide direction and oversight to the president, slash, and then secondary to the Provost to say, this is where we want to go. You guys create a plan to get there. But that plan has to fall well below the borderline so those people in line-level positions know what they have to deliver in order for us to hit that big metric at the top.

I don't feel that same sense of burn throughout the rest of the organization. So for me, as I looked at this, yep, financially we had a major break. But I also think organizationally we have some cultural opportunities to enhance the level of oversight, the level of accountability. And I just used that one example as I went through those graduation rates and I said, hey, this one has had the lowest graduation rate for
three years.

One, does she know it? I'm sorry. Do they know it, that person know it. Two, what's being done about it? Not necessarily moving that person out, but coaching, counseling, et cetera. What's being done to inform and then move those results up?

So I feel like, you know, as we start these discussions at the top, my challenge is they have to go deeper into the organization.

TRUSTEE MILLS: Yeah. And just to build off of what you said. I mean, you're right in the sense that it doesn't necessarily mean that people have to leave. But we shouldn't qualify that all the time.

And that's part of my concern is that we -- it feels like we don't want to make the hard decisions, and that's part of our cultural issue.

CHAIRMAN LAWSON: Well, and I don't want to create a -- some of that I agree with. But all I'm saying is I don't want to create a culture where every bad metric means a person turns.

TRUSTEE MILLS: No. But it does -- you
should have a culture that says if you're not --

CHAIRMAN LAWSON: We identify the bad metric. We identify the root cause of it and over time, hey, maybe that person does need to turn. But I'm saying, that shouldn't be the first recourse.

TRUSTEE MILLS: And I'm not saying one or two metrics. Again, because I'm not saying that. But we should have a culture of performance is what allows you to have a seat here, right, and delivering on results is what allows you to have a seat here.

And that's not where we've been. Because I'm like, Kim. I'm not convinced, right, that we don't have these same kinds of issues in other parts of the organization. So, you know, it is people, process and technology, because we had a process that required Dr. Robinson's signature and it just didn't happen for whatever reason.

So there's a control scenario and we've run up against cash issues and we've run up against a bunch of stuff over the last 18 months, in particular, two years in particular,
that it just keeps coming around. And some are
smaller and some are bigger than others.
But it goes to this culture scenario that
I think we need to sort of exploit this, you know,
this problem that we have to create a sense of
urgency within the organization. This has to change
now.

TRUSTEE DORTCH: I do want to commend the
president in taking swift action against -- in
this situation with somebody that was popular.
MRS. WALLACE: Excuse me.
TRUSTEE DORTCH: I got you. Let's not get
into that. But I think the key we have to
understand is under leadership, that we've got
leadership that takes appropriate actions.
And so when we talk about accountability
and we look at where we are, I think Woody's
issue about us being accountable and he's
talking about the situation.
But leadership is everything. And when we
see a change I think as we continue to go over,
we'll see -- I think we'll see much more
improvement.

From the two years I've been on this
board, this board has come together more. I
saw a lot externally, even talking to members of the Board of Governors who have commended what they see now compared to what it used to be.

And I think as we continue to move, working as a team, being able to give our input and be able to accept diverse inputs and thoughts, but we still move as a team.

And I think that's what has built this board to a point now that I feel good and I'm happy when I come to a board meeting. Because some board meetings that you regret having to go to them, but you just go to them and you can't wait for them to be over to leave.

But I've been impressed by our leadership and I respect everybody that we have and welcome our new trustee to the board. I think the chair has been able to manage all the skill-sets and puts it in the right places.

And we've depended on each other to bring to the table their expertise. And I see significant improvement.

So I want to just commend all of you for your leadership.

TRUSTEE LAWRENCE: So this is perilous to
say anything when you've been going an hour,
which I have because I had a minor situation I
had to deal with.

But I would say this, I've never seen
great organization that didn't have really
tough leadership at the top, insistent
leadership. I use the word urgency. It
requires pushing and shoving.

I do think we potentially have a culture
problem here. I think -- let me say this out
loud and then disagree.

I'm a huge fan of President Robinson and
Provost Eddington. But I think both could
stand to be tougher, push harder, kick a little
ass and take some names.

I'm not -- I think that needs to be
balanced with grace and kindness. So people
need to be celebrated. We need to talk about
what's good.

But way before I got on the board we had
graduation rates which were, I think, fairly
miserable. I can think of reasons why we don't
have the graduation rates of the University of
Florida. But what we've got now is
unacceptable.
I know we're headed in the right direction. When I came on the board three years ago, we had -- we were sort of in a swamp. We have significant momentum now. But I think to get to the next level it's going to require some shoving and pushing and insisting and here's who we and here's what we're going to do. This is not about getting along. It's about something way beyond that.

MR. ROBINSON: I wish you could have been at our faculty planning conference yesterday. We heard something very, very similar. But I agree with you totally. We understand that to a certain point. I think the message is beginning to get down, even the students are focusing on how they do things.

My primary message to the faculty yesterday was their role in making sure that they understood they own a piece of these metrics, and a big piece for the faculty.

But we told them about everything else we were doing to support them and our students in and out of the classroom.

So we -- you know, I'm not talking about
any particular employment or personnel issues,
but we understand that it is an honor, you
know, and a privilege to work for the FAMU
University and we all have our fairly direct
charges and we can't afford to take that for
granted.
Because if we're going to build an
organization and really have a succession,
right, you have to have some leveling there,
then that means that everybody has to be
functioning. Nobody can be on the team without
making a significant contribution.
So Mrs. Ingram has started this in some
places. But we know that in several places in
the University we're going to have to beef up,
you know, these skills. You know, I guess
redundancy of the skill-sets that are necessary
for us to be successful. It's not just the
academics side of the house or this side of the
house. It's a lot of places.
So that's why when I sit down and talked
with Rich, you know, it brings a fresh
perspective that's really happening and see it
even better where some of those places are,
right.
And he's a straight-shooter. I appreciate that. And he is recognized, you know, that we kind of -- we avoid, you know, aggressive and tough issues. We'll talk the stories. We ask a number of questions. You know, we don't get there in a hurry. We'll tell you everything else. We don't give you the number. And so we're trying to -- you know, Trustee Moore and others, you know, we know we have to move aggressively. I'm not going to repeat some of the words that Trustee Lawrence said. He's my senior. But I do agree. So we have accepted that challenge, you know.

TRUSTEE MILLS: And so I think -- you know, I think what this evaluation says is -- and to build on Trustee Dortch and Trustee Lawrence's comments is that there's a lot of faith in you and a lot of faith in your team at this organization. And no one really expects everything to be a smooth ride along the way as we build on this momentum. For sure there are things that we have to address. But there are some very specific skills, right, and your ability to communicate. And that gets reflected in both external relations
and internal relations for sure.

That gets reflected I think in some of the fundraising activities. Those are real assets that we have to build on and we have to, you know, again, exploit in these kind of situations to get everybody else on board with that.

So, you know, I think -- you know, the summary sort of accurately reflects what the board's position is on your performance in this year. And I think what we've heard today is that, you know, now we just have to raise the bar to a different level. You know, again, the intermediary steps are probably not enough, right. Incremental steps, is what I meant to say, are not enough anymore. And we can use whatever situation we're in now to launch ourselves to a different place overall in our performance. And we support you.

You and I will get a chance to review the feedback we got for next year's priorities and goals. And -- but in the meantime, you know, heads down -- and I guess it's kicks and hugs,
a combination of kicking and hugging, right.

CHAIRMAN LAWSON: He's a little more graphic.

TRUSTEE LAWRENCE: I think that's right.

TRUSTEE MILLS: So it's that combination that, you know, we want to see you guys implement.

CHAIRMAN LAWSON: I guess in closing remarks, you know, Mr. Chair and I'll ask the vice chair if she has any remarks, is there are a number of good things going on. And I can clearly see progress. I think I'm the longest serving board member and I remember the dark days of those meetings where you need to put on your head gear and you came in here and we did what we had to do.

We've come a long way from those meetings. We've come a long way in our reputation with the Florida governor and the Governor's office and with our external constituents.

But with all that said, we know, we believe that there's more we can do. We believe and we know that we need to do that on a faster pace.
We know it takes resources to do that and we will do our part to help garner those resources. But we want you guys, primarily president and secretary, Mr. Provost, to go at it harder, faster, because we want to get there faster.

But I think what you're hearing from the board is support for the administration. Specific support for our president and the belief in that we have the right plan, but the plan needs to be worked harder.

So I'll say that in closing. And I feel good because nothing I said here was new. The president and I already had a one-on-one about the overall performance.

So and I feel like that's the way it needs to be. All of us need to have those ongoing dialogues with the president about any concern, issue, opportunity that we have. Because there's -- and in an institution this big there's going to be a lot of good news and there's going to be some bad news and we're going to face into both, you know, on a regular basis.

Madam vice president?
TRUSTEE MOORE: Yeah, I actually just echo much of what you said, but also point to this being the opportunity for transparency and candor.

I don't think systems get better when we don't contribute at that weight. We have to have the hard conversations. I think -- and you want that amongst FAMU, because the system is looking at us anyway, so why not make sure that whatever our efforts are, that is stretching and striving, that we talk about that and that we commit all of our efforts, board level, staff level, that we're in it together. It's never to separate. It is to acknowledge that issue and area of opportunity exists. But also we're going to roll up our sleeves with you and join you in that effort to make it better.

So I would say, yes, that there were a lot of great strides made over the course of the year and there were lots of opportunity that we uncovered. There is still much work to be done, but we're going to do it together.

And president, I thank you for your leadership. And as much as I am type A in
nature, I will commit to even working harder
with the team to make sure that we deliver on
the outcomes that we have just set for
ourselves today.

CHAIRMAN LAWSON: So with that, if we may,
let's take a break and then we will come back
and convene with the board assessment.

RECESS

BACK IN SESSION

MRS. BRYANT: I know that if there is a --
I don't want to call it a new vision or a new
mantra. Well, you know what the mantra is
right now for FAMU?

TRUSTEE MILLS: The FAMU rising?

MRS. BRYANT: Yes. You went straight
there. FAMU rising. So as we talked about
various goals, it all connected back to that,
didn't it? From where we are today how do we
continue to rise?

So it starts with anywhere I go on campus,
I should be able to ask a student even, and
especially construction staff, what is it that
we're about and they should say what? FAMU
rising.

We're moving up. From where we are, we
have a different student body. We have a
different goal. We're moving up. We're
rising. And being able to quantify and qualify
through the type of analysis that we're doing
in order to get there.

So I'm excited about what's going on.

Y'all can kind of tell.

TRUSTEE MILLS: Yeah, a little bit.

MRS. BRYANT: I'm excited about where
we're going. So I'm supposed to focus on --
because I'll get into that part and not get to
what I'm supposed to do.

So on your self-assessment so I know that
this is a part that we have to do. Everybody
has it?

Okay. Now, I'm going to -- I won't say
quickly, but go over the actual 20/19, but I
really want to get to the comparative analysis.

But I understand this is required for you to
actually discuss this and vote on it. So I'm
going to go through the singular document
first. But then we're going to use the one
that has comparative data.

TRUSTEE MILLS: What are we doing now?

MRS. BRYANT: You're going to be voting
tomorrow, but you have to go through it today.

So I will admit I found it very interesting, the analysis. So what I'm going to do for the sake of discussion on this first part is to just look at the various quantitative findings and I'm going to ask you a question.

TRUSTEE MILLS: But assume we've all read it though.

MRS. BRYANT: Right. I hope so. Yes.

No. I'm not going to read it to you, by no means am I going to read it to you.

But your first finding was overall satisfaction with BOT regarding its roles and responsibilities. And I think it was a consensus; is that correct?

What does that mean? You've all read it.

I've read it. So now I'm just going to challenge you to help – if someone were to ask me from outside and you said, we have great satisfaction with our roles and responsibilities.

TRUSTEE WASHINGTON: We think highly of ourselves.

MRS. BRYANT: Thank you.
CHAIRMAN LAWSON: I'm hoping what it says is that, you know there are different routes to the ultimate goal. But I'm hopeful that as we go through this it will show that we have a singular focus on improving just the overall performance of the enterprise.

So when it says, you know, we're satisfied with our performance. What I take that is, we're satisfied that we all agree on where we're trying to go.

MRS. BRYANT: Okay.

CHAIRMAN LAWSON: As you get underneath the waterline there are various points of view on that.

But overall the goal is we want to raise our overall performance, so I'm hoping that's what comes through throughout the document.

MRS. BRYANT: Anyone else want to answer that?

TRUSTEE MOORE: Well, it's great that you think we're great. But I saw -- I looked at the area of opportunity, the third and thought, hey, there's some space and opportunity that we need to be addressing and that they have identified.
So I think there's an opportunity for us to figure out what that is and hear from them.

MRS. BRYANT: Absolutely. And that's why I'm trying not to do the three comparative years right now because that is the discussion that we need to have.

If you look at back from '17 to '18 to '19, great improvement, right? Yeah, but not there yet.

TRUSTEE MILLS: Right. It's alignment.

You know, you want the board to be aligned on what its goals are or its role is in managing and improving the performance of the institution.

And I think, and I'll be less disciplined.

But I think that progress from one year to the other shows increased alignment among us about what we're supposed to be doing. Whether we do that well or not, that's a different story.

But what we think we're supposed to be doing relative to our role.

MRS. BRYANT: Okay. So in other words what you're saying to me is that cognitively you have all come to a basic understanding of this is what we're supposed to be doing.
TRUSTEE MILLS: Correct.

MRS. BRYANT: Okay. Let me move over to effective and efficient operations. And this was the one I think that was 100 percent in agreement.

TRUSTEE MILLS: Yeah. And our shoulders hurt from patting ourselves on the back, either that or change the goals.

TRUSTEE WASHINGTON: We can definitely be more effective and efficient, too.

MRS. BRYANT: Is there a tie between the effectiveness and efficiency of the board and the success of the University?

TRUSTEE MILLS: Yes.

CHAIRMAN LAWSON: Definitely should be.

MRS. BRYANT: There should be, right?

CHAIRMAN LAWSON: Yes.

MRS. BRYANT: So as we look at the things that the University, the goals that you've given, the success and your perception of that success, if you rate yourself as being 100 percent doing what we do well, but there's a disconnect on the other side, it does give you reason for some pause; would you agree with that?
I'll come back to it. Yes.

TRUSTEE WOODY: So does that 100 percent mean that we're all on the same page where we need to go collectively? Not that we're there. Even though we're making progress. But as a board we're pretty much on the same page of where we need to go and how we'll be setting goals and how important those goals are as it relates to the overall performance of the University and the other universities in the State of Florida?

MRS. BRYANT: Does anybody want to respond to that? I mean, I don't mind.

TRUSTEE MOORE: I don't think it implies all of that. I think your crystal ball is working a lot harder. It's just a yes or no and I don't think that anybody thought that we were to the left and just not working effectively. But I think if there were a third category --

TRUSTEE WASHINGTON: I was going to say, a scale.

TRUSTEE MOORE: Yeah, or a scale there, I thought that we would have people peel off and be in there, too. Yes, ma'am.
MRS. BRYANT: All right.

TRUSTEE MILLS: That's fair.

MRS. BRYANT: That's fair. I'm going to leave that right there.

TRUSTEE LAWRENCE: I think part of it is that we like each other. We've worked with each other for several years. And we sort of understand each other and like each other and think this University is really important. I'm not sure it's more than that.

TRUSTEE MOORE: Right.

MRS. BRYANT: Okay. So let me tell you what that brings you to, though. Because everyone here on the board should have the same general understanding of what the measure represents. Would you all agree with that?

TRUSTEE WOODY: Yeah.

MRS. BRYANT: Because when you rate it you rate it from your filter. But we need to define what that is so that when we rate it we have some sense of consistency; would you agree with that?

TRUSTEE MILLS: Yes.

MRS. BRYANT: Because that's critical.
That's important. When we start to talk about effective and efficient, we need to be kind of on -- it won't be perfect, but we need to be somewhere on the same page as to what we're measuring from your own perception of your performance as a board.

TRUSTEE WASHINGTON: So what I find interesting in the president's evaluation. We actually have a couple like guiding questions that go under that so that we do have a filter by which to rate and do the evaluation. But for these we don't give ourselves those same sort of like framing questions that might help on the same page.

MR. ROBINSON: Please note that I didn't say that.

TRUSTEE WASHINGTON: I believe in consistency. But I mean, with the shared understanding of what the question is asking, it might be helpful to break it down a little bit.

MRS. BRYANT: I think that's an excellent point. Those guiding questions.

TRUSTEE WASHINGTON: And we might have to --
MRS. BRYANT: Yes. Needs to happen. So who -- just for my own curiosity, who develops your assessment? Who develops the assessment?

MR. ROBINSON: The ATB.

CHAIRMAN LAWSON: Was this an ATB tool that we use?

MRS. BARGE-MILES: No. I think it mostly came from Trustee McCoy when he was with the board. But he worked with our assessment office.

CHAIRMAN LAWSON: Because I just thought it was an ATB tool and we were working off of that.

MRS. BARGE-MILES: No. It's not.

TRUSTEE WASHINGTON: There probably is one out there.

CHAIRMAN LAWSON: So we should probably go to an ATB tool, if there is such a thing.

TRUSTEE MILLS: I just remembered when we were in Jacksonville we had the AGB consultant and we were matching the tool with that.

MR. ROBINSON: Exactly.

MRS. BARGE-MILES: We sent it to him and he, you know, discussed it from that point.

TRUSTEE MILLS: I see.
MRS. BRYANT: All right. We'll move on.

And then there's some reasons why, but I really -- when the question was asked, to perceive reasons why the BOT is not operating effectively and efficiently, there were no responses. But I guess that correlated with the fact that there was no --

TRUSTEE WASHINGTON: Yes or no.

MRS. BRYANT: All right. Then we go to strengths and weaknesses and if we flip now to 5, Page 5. If we could move to the document that has 17, 18 and 19 so that we can -- we'll be looking at 19, but I want to do the comparison as we go. All right. Everybody on that document?

TRUSTEE MOORE: What page is that document?

MRS. BRYANT: It's on Page 7. Now, we're going to talk about '19, year 2019, but for the sake of time we're going to do it in a comparative mode. On strengths and weaknesses. Everybody there? All right. We're on Page 7. It says for spring 2017, '18 and '19.

MRS. BARGE-MILES: So you want to work
from this document?

MR. ROBINSON: Comparative.

MRS. BRYANT: The comparative document.

I'm going to focus in on that, too. I know we have to do that. Everybody has this document?

TRUSTEE MILLS: Yeah, it's on the screen.

TRUSTEE WASHINGTON: It's on the screen.

There you go.

MRS. BRYANT: All right. Let's talk about strengths first for 2019, and then we'll look back.

We said our number one strength, we're in table three, was diversity, commitment, team work and professionalism.

Now as a board, does that represent the breadth of given what you know to be your responsibilities, what your strengths are?

I was looking back at '17 and '18 and I saw leadership and engagement. And just take a gander between the three years and look at 2019. And this was number one. We had three tiers, first, second, third.

Would anybody add anything? I know this has been done and it's historical now. It's in writing. But is that -- diversity means what?
I know -- this will be interesting. What does diversity mean when you rate it?

TRUSTEE WOODY: That was going to be my question.

TRUSTEE MOORE: I think diversity is thoughts and opinions.

CHAIRMAN LAWSON: Well, I took it as professions and expertise bringing to -- being brought to the table by the various people around the board. That's how I took diversity in this context.

MRS. BRYANT: Everybody on the same page?

TRUSTEE WASHINGTON: It's not gender and it's not race. That was my point is that we do need to be a little bit careful about that because if we were talking about Bank of America we wouldn't go straight to diversity, backgrounds and thoughts.

CHAIRMAN LAWSON: Right.

TRUSTEE MILLS: You know, as far as being our top strength, we just need to be -- we need to modulate that some, I think, because we would have a different expectation for the majority of the organization than what I think we have of ourselves.
CHAIRMAN LAWSON: I would agree with that.

But I'm just saying in this context when I took it, when I read this, that was where my thought went. It didn't go to gender. It didn't go to race. It went more to background and experience.

TRUSTEE WASHINGTON: Because we're not gender and we're not race.

TRUSTEE MOORE: And we don't decide it.

That's why, you know, we don't make the selection whether we're here or not.

TRUSTEE MILLS: Yes and no, right? So we give them recommendations at times. And so we -- so there are two things that -- and I was going to save this for later. Can I insert this now?

MRS. BRYANT: Sure. Go ahead.

TRUSTEE MILLS: You know, one of the things that boards have been doing, corporate boards have been doing the last five years, in particular, is doing these sort of skill matrices, right, and diversity matrices, and they sort of evaluate themselves on where they are and then what gaps might exist.

And I would recommend that we do that sort
of following this meeting. And as we get into
the fall here so -- because as we think it, we
have one board opening now and if we think
about how we help, you know, the BOG and others
identify candidates, we need to be talking
about what gaps we need to be filling from a
diversity and a skills basis.

MRS. BRYANT: Okay. So this document
eventually will be online. Okay. So I'm an
outsider, a potential don't to FAMU. Let me go
and see what they are -- what's their critical
strengths, the board. And I see the word
diversity.

Now, I don't have your point of reference.
Remember that. I'm somebody in the public. So
the only point I'm trying to emphasize to you
is that the message you send through this
document has to reflect, you know, who you are.
Diversity is important, obviously. But I don't
know if it might -- well, that's not for me to
say. You all need to consider if that should
be, especially in 2019, what pops up.

And some of the other things that were in
2017 and 2018, I guess that didn't pop up in
this year, I just was trying to -- really
trying to figure out how did it fall off as a priority, like leadership. And it's down in the second tier.

TRUSTEE WOODY: Well, does it mean that we're satisfied with the current leadership or what?

MRS. BRYANT: See, we're back to a filter, aren't we? Because that's not what I thought it meant. What does it mean, leadership, in this context?

TRUSTEE WASHINGTON: The board as leaders.

TRUSTEE MILLS: I mean, my opinion is that it's there as one of our strengths. So it's not -- it's not that we don't feel like we're strong in leadership. I think the other ones became stronger.

MRS. BRYANT: Right.

TRUSTEE MILLS: And then our -- yes. We rely on our chairman, as example, and our vice chairman quite a bit. But I think there's -- other people have stepped up significantly across the board, if you will, across the -- I guess the board is the wrong word. But among the whole table.

And so things like professionalism, our
ability -- you know, our ability to work together is even stronger than, you know, leadership or someone.

TRUSTEE MOORE: More than a single person.

TRUSTEE MILLS: Right. Exactly.

TRUSTEE MOORE: Which to me -- you know, and I think 2017 was more of a point in time, too, of what we --

TRUSTEE MILLS: Crazy time.

TRUSTEE MOORE: Exactly. So we value that.

TRUSTEE WASHINGTON: It shouldn't really be the benchmark.

TRUSTEE MOORE: Yeah.

CHAIRMAN LAWSON: So that is, you know, unfortunately true.

So I think you almost have to look at '18, '19 -- '18 as kind of a good benchmark. '17 -- '16, '17 there's a lot of noise, right. And I think '18 was a little bit more of a normal year, so to speak, as a board. A little bit more of a kind of building out more capabilities, really defining roles, really getting committees working.

So '18, to me, was more of a foundational
year. '16, '17 had a lot of noise in it.

TRUSTEE WASHINGTON: Is that even in like

the reasons why the board is not operating
effectively and efficiently, 2017 versus 2019,

no responses on Page 6, just the prior page.

Yeah, we had some things going on.

MRS. BRYANT: The only point I'm trying to

make to you that you can kind of resonate on is

that you know what you -- how you perceive
given your historical perspective when you sat

here.

But remember, this is a public document.

It's going to be public. Anybody can go and

read this, right? They don't have your point

of view.

So when you start to talk about strengths

of an organization -- and when I read

leadership, so you'll know, my filter was
totally different. It wasn't the chairman. It

was the entire board in terms of leadership for

the University and for the president and it had

nothing to do with an individual.

Obviously the leader sets the tone

internally; however, everybody represents

leadership. Would you all agree with that?
TRUSTEE WOODY: So are you saying the leadership should be in the first year?

MRS. BRYANT: No. I'm not -- no. No.

TRUSTEE WASHINGTON: We need a new survey that's better worded.

MRS. BRYANT: When you start to redo your survey document that you actually put something to help you be on the same page. Okay. That's the only thing I'm suggesting when I look at that. Because I really want to get over to the weaknesses because that leads me into what the chairman asked us to do with regards to opportunities for improvement.

And I'll just stick on 2019 for a minute. Accountability as it relates to performance metrics.

Let's stop there and see if we can get an understanding of what that actually means.

Anybody who, obviously all of you, had input as a weakness would you frame?

TRUSTEE WOODY: And example, what the chairman was saying earlier this morning in reference to the ownership from the deans or the leaders of the different departments. If you have someone that -- for example, well, I
won't pick out a school. But in a department that scored very low on the first time examination rate. And then the year before, and then the second year the same thing, accountability, holding that leader responsible for the performance to students.

TRUSTEE WASHINGTON: So I would take this -- because it's the weaknesses of the board of trustees. I see this as our ability to hold ourselves and figure out how to hold the institution accountable for its performance on these metrics because we have the metrics. We set goals.

If we don't -- when we don't meet those goals there is not a clear accountability structure or enforcement or, you know, how we're going to actually move forward.

CHAIRMAN LAWSON: I guess I'm somewhere between you two in that I took it as having that cultural accountability and having it driven down and kind of like what role do we play in driving that down. That's kind of how I took it.

And I went on this tangent. Like I spent some years in the pharmaceutical industry and
the one thing our vice president would say is
that pharmaceutical rep in territory number one
knows the number of scripts they need to drive
into the market share. If they don't, we'll
never move at the top.

And that, to me, like that same idea plays
ture in our world here. Like the people on the
front line don't know their role in driving
performance, it will never pull up. Meaning,
we'll never get to this big number up here.
I may have even written this. But that
was my whole thing is, how does the board drive
that level of accountability down? And I feel
like we have an opportunity to figure out how
to do that without micromanaging, like stepping
out of the policymaking and into day-to-day
operations, if that makes sense.

TRUSTEE MILLS: Yeah, I don't know that we
should be doing it, right. We should have good
relationships with management and staff, but we
shouldn't be --

CHAIRMAN LAWSON: Well, that's what I
mean. How do you do that without stepping into
the operational capacity?

TRUSTEE MILLS: That's where we give the
objective to the president and then we measure
the results based on what we see from him and
the staff at the end of the day.

CHAIRMAN LAWSON: But I think we have to
set the tone which comes with the objectives,
right? And then I think we all are accustomed
to getting hands on just in our day-to-day
business world. So how do you do that without
going hands on, right? I mean, how do you do
that without getting into the day-to-day
operations, which is definitely not our role
and continue to be more of a policymaking body
versus the hands-on operational body?

TRUSTEE MILLS: Correct.

CHAIRMAN LAWSON: I just see that as a --
I just see that as a challenge because by
nature people in this room have done well in
their respective fields by getting involved in
the day to day, right, and understanding the
day to day.

In this role you're more of a policymaker,
so we have to effectively separate the two.

TRUSTEE MILLS: I think it's what we were
doing this morning, right? Setting a bar high
and higher, right, you know, for the president.
And kind of raising our expectations, really. And then we have to be serious about measuring against that. And then that means at that point we have to rely on -- I mean, we know that Dr. Robinson knows that the rest of the team actually sets the score for him at the end of the day.

CHAIRMAN LAWSON: But I think though that kind of kicking around does everyone agree with that, is a good exercise. In other words, so it goes back to trying to then have commonality of goals, right.

So we kick it around, kick it around. Well, the average number is probably this. To get there is going to take some heavy lifting and moving, et cetera. So I think you're probably right that, you know, how we set the tone, but I think setting the tone needs to be from a consistent voice so that no matter which one of us you talk to moving forward, you're getting the same message, if that makes sense.

MRS. BRYANT: Very much so.

TRUSTEE MILLS: Yes. And we set it on 80, by the way, so stop saying 79.

TRUSTEE MOORE: It's 80. It's 80. It's
CHAIRMAN LAWSON: It was 80, Mills?

TRUSTEE MOORE: Yes. I told you.

CHAIRMAN LAWSON: Okay. That's fine.

TRUSTEE DORTCH: Therein lies the weakness. What we hear is, we all know where we want to go. The weakness is how we get there.

TRUSTEE MOORE: But that's -- I don't view that as our role. I think we are a destination body. This is where we want to get to. The map and how they figure out what stops, what exits, what on ramps, off ramps, that's operational. That's president.

CHAIRMAN LAWSON: Yeah. But -- but.

TRUSTEE MILLS: All butts stink.

CHAIRMAN LAWSON: But my point on that is, yes, I think we set the tone and set the goal. I think they go back and they build a plan. But I also think part of our role in that plan is helping to secure the resources. And for example, the task building. We circled the capital talking to every other official that we knew or could get. So I think that our role in, A, establishing the plan and
the strategy is first.

Once they establish the under-penance of that, then we should work together on, hey, we went to see Representative Taylor. We then figure out what our role is in helping them to deliver on that.

Because we had a big legislative push this year that a couple of us got involved in.

We've got another push with an LBR coming up that a couple of us are involved in.

So it's then how do we use our network to then help us further that initiative. So we're not in the operations, but we're what I believe is truly our role as a trustee is then helping the University secure resources to fulfill that plan that they put in place.

TRUSTEE MILLS: Tommy said it best, right, that they need to tell us what they need from us. And then we can have ideas and all that kind of stuff.

But at the end of the day part of their plan and where they want us to pay is how they're going to execute on these expectations.

MR. ROBINSON: I know this is your own self-assessment and this is what you thought.
If I was a fly on the wall, you know, I would be -- for this particular year anyway, I would be much more -- I would rate it strong political relationships with, I don't know, with both leadership teams.

But, you know, we didn't get to these, you know, major outcomes with the capital financing program. We had to get a law changed before we could go to Washington.

And of course on the $24.8 million, I think is one of the most important outcomes we had in the session. We didn't get there without board members. And I know that everybody did something. And I should be singling out people for this.

But I just want to make sure that, you know -- because I know, right, there are things that you do walking the halls. And then there are other things that happen when you get behind closed doors and go into session.

You know, I know he doesn't want me to do this, but I'm going to have to call him out. I just want to thank all of you for what you've done.

I want to thank Trustee Lawrence for
making a very critical call. We got him out of
bed in the middle of the night for him to make
call on our behalf. And had he not made that
call, we wouldn't be sitting here celebrating
$24.8 million.

My point here is that all of you, when we
needed you in session, I mean, you stepped up.
And there were calls that you made to keep us
on the side, on the senate side. Y'all made
those calls, right?

But to have that one down there for 2019,
maybe for '17 or whenever. But for '19, you
know, that ought to be, you know, one of the
highest in terms of what I saw. All the other
things you did are great, too.

But I would have -- wait a minute. We're
talking about weaknesses? Oh, God. That's
totally in the wrong place. That's just
shocking to me.

TRUSTEE MILLS: It's one of our least
weaknesses, though.

TRUSTEE WASHINGTON: We had to come up
with some.

MR. ROBINSON: Remember, this is going to
be in the public arena. There are people out
there, you know, are in amazement. Because you know where we started a year ago. People are telling us to bury that process and stop.

And here it is a year later and 24 million. I would agree with you that FAMU did an outstanding year in the sense of that.

CHAIRMAN LAWSON: And I know this is -- and I freely admit and Mills will agree. This is digressive, but I do want to share a story.

We literally debated with the Board of Governors over a cast building, myself and the president and a few other people. And we basically were told no. And we kept going and kept going, they said, well, fine, build out your shell with the money you have. And we did it and we, through all the efforts, got the council money.

And two members that were on that call came up to us at the last Board of Governor's meeting and said, you know what, I'm glad you guys fought for what you needed because we were wrong in asking you to quit.

But I think though -- so I say that -- I digress with that long story just to -- I don't want to underestimate the value of some of the
things that we've done by virtue of being a focused, cohesive board.

Yeah, we probably have ten opportunities, but I don't want to lose fact that there are a number of things, whether we get Dave out bed, asking Tommy to call somebody in Atlanta to get us a meeting about the stadium, asking Woody to get Perry on the phone, you know, whatever it might be. Everyone has contributed their fair share in the lane that they play in. So I don't want to miss that.

And yeah, we're going to probably have 10 opportunities and things we need to focus on. But all I want to do as a chair is I want to prioritize them and I want to say let's work on them so that next time around we do the assessment, we can show progress against those opportunity areas.

MR. ROBINSON: I just want to say, madam, that, you know, from my perspective when we called upon members of this board for whatever we needed them to do or whoever we needed them to call, when we needed them in Tallahassee, they came through big time for us. And even on the monies that we don't get, you know, not
always successful, like I say UF.

TRUSTEE WASHINGTON: Did you get that?

MR. ROBINSON: It's what they did. The way this board has, you know, jelled around that, you know, even our students, right? I mean, they spent time walking the halls. But it just bothered me to --

TRUSTEE MILLS: Well, I would only just qualify this as, again, it says, the word is stronger relationships with both political arenas, which I'm assuming is both sides of the aisle. And I don't know that we have in-depth relationships on both sides of the aisle.

TRUSTEE WASHINGTON: We have key relationships.

TRUSTEE MILLS: So I do think there's some opportunity for improvement in that space.

CHAIRMAN LAWSON: Yeah, and I think there are. And I think, quite frankly, as the Board of Governors is changing, you know, some of our key stakeholders are rotating out, that we need to be mindful of needing to redevelop new relationships there, as well.

You know, for example, our auditing and compliance chair is relatively new. We had
Wendy for a long time and she was a friend of FAMU. But now we have Tim Sario (phonetic).
We've got to get to know him more and better understand where he's coming from.

TRUSTEE MILLS: He's a good guy.

CHAIRMAN LAWSON: But, you know, the rest of us don't -- I mean, we've got to build that relationship with him that we had with Wendy, you know, where you can have the offline discussion and get some counseling before the meeting. So I think in addition to being politically savvy with our elected officials downtown, we also have to be politically savvy with our Governing board, as well.

TRUSTEE WASHINGTON: Why don't we just call it external relationships?

MRS. BRYANT: I'm going to suggest that you add to your strengths. I don't know how you want to actually term it. Something that reflects your Legislative success, because you have -- we have to hold the banner. We have to kind of, you know, blow our own horn, like President Robinson was doing such that when people see this they say, well, yeah, they actually did do blah, blah, blah, whatever it
But if it doesn't show up anywhere, you know it, a few more people might know it, but the world needs to know it so when they go to look, there it is. I think we need to add that to it.

TRUSTEE WASHINGTON: Can we also move diversity to the bottom of that? It could be at the top, but the bottom of the top so it's not the first thing that --

MRS. BRYANT: That people read?

TRUSTEE WASHINGTON: Yeah, because people are going to be like, diversity. What kind of diversity.

MRS. BRYANT: I would agree with that.

All right. So I was really focused in on the first one and we went to the third one. And the middle one was university engagement as a weakness.

Does somebody want to talk to me about that?

CHAIRMAN LAWSON: Not about that, but I have another one that I'd like to talk to you about.

You know, the thing that I think about,
you know, as I'm here at the end of my tenure is, we focused a lot of time on trying to get things right and achieve performance metrics in the short-time, right? I don't know if as a board we've spent enough time on five to ten years from now where do we want this place to be. And the next group of people that sit around this table, what types of opportunities do we want to leave them to work on.

And I know why we've not, because we've spent so much time just trying to build and get things in order over the last couple years.

But what I do think, and maybe it's just me because I'm about to rotate off, and that is, how are we setting up the future, you know, for the next group of folks that may not have to work as hard as we did on some issues.

How are we setting the university up for the future, you know. And I define future as more than five years.

You know, how are we -- are we spending enough time in our debates and deliberations thinking about that.

But I think we've had to do some short term things, get money for this, get money for
that, get this person in place, address this
issue that's come up.

But how do we move beyond, you know, two
or three-year horizon and say, you know, hey,
for the guy that sits in the president's seat
after Dr. Robinson, many years from now -- I
caveat that, right? Many years from now, how
does that person -- have we set the table for
that person to be successful right away and not
walk into a sea of problems?

MRS. BRYANT: So that's an excellent
opportunity for going forward. So what
committee would that be assigned to?

TRUSTEE MILLS: Do we still have a
strategic planning committee?

CHAIRMAN LAWSON: Led by Trustee Nicole
Washington.

TRUSTEE WASHINGTON: Why would we have two
jobs? Can we talk about that?

TRUSTEE DORTCH: Give it to Mikey.

TRUSTEE WASHINGTON: Pass.

CHAIRMAN LAWSON: It's actually an idea.

You know, and I don't know all the things that
we need to do, but I do think that, you know,

as we work through a lot of these things. And
we've talked about like succession planning at
the university.

If person A goes down, is there a person
B? In most cases the answer is no. But so how
do we get there and how do we build out things
such that the next president, the next board
chair, the next set of trustees, don't have to
walk into some of those foundational things.
They've already been taken care of. They've
already been built out. And you can just, you
know, hit your roll and run.

So I think, to me, that's an opportunity
area. And like I said, I think I look at it
more now, you know, as I look at leaving the
board it's like, okay, so what do you leave
behind so that others can come in and hit the
ground running without all the heavy lifting.

Did we leave behind a good relationship
with the Governor's office. Did you leave
behind a good relationship with the Board of
Governors. Do you leave behind, you know, a
track record of transparency. And do you leave
behind a true fundraising machine.

So I guess I've been thinking more about
those kinds of things, me, personally as it
TRUSTEE LAWRENCE: You mentioned four times your departure.

TRUSTEE MOORE: I was going to tell him.

TRUSTEE LAWRENCE: This is first I'm hearing about it. Will you be here in an hour or so?

CHAIRMAN LAWSON: A year and a half is not a long -- I have a year and a half left.

TRUSTEE MILLS: And you're already having legacy conversations?

TRUSTEE WASHINGTON: You're already in legacy mode?

TRUSTEE MILLS: I know. You're in legacy mode?

CHAIRMAN LAWSON: I have my eye on a building I'd like to be on.

TRUSTEE DORTCH: Are you trying to tell us you don't want to be with us? I'm trying to understand the university engagement as a weakness. I mean, I'll tell you. I have more engagement and involvement from the university from the support side.

And, you know, I still give credit to Dr. Robinson. I had more worked with, you
know, when I looked back, Fred Humphrey and those and I wasn't even on the board and Fred would calls. He got on his bad list with Dr. Humphrey.

But I think, you know, the different departments with the blessings of the president who called, and my door is always open, and I know many of us get calls.

So the engagement has been great. I almost was ready to resign when I first came on where all these meetings they were having with what I felt was faculty and department business and we didn't need to be in the weed zone. And thanks to the chair we got out of all of those meetings. There were so many calls, but I think the engagement from the university has been welcoming. It's been great. And I like delivering wherever, whether it's, you know, development or the foundation.

They have used us strategically. And I know of others who have been called. And I think that that's -- we're here to serve a purpose.

So I think the engagement has been strong.

From this perspective, I think that the
university has done a great job, at least from
my perspective and calling whenever they want.
If it's a meeting they needed to set up in
Atlanta. And the president never comes to
Atlanta without me knowing. He will pick up
the phone and my first request is, do you need
anything.

And so in that aspect, I know other
cities. And so that, to me, is a strength for,
I think, trusting us as opposed to a weakness
that we are engaged.

MRS. BRYANT: Okay. You all realize that
we keep coming back around to the same thing.
Yes, sir?

TRUSTEE LAWRENCE: I saw in my own head
university engagement in a different way than
is being explained here.

I still think this university is taken for
granted. In fact, frequently in a patronizing
way by an enormous number of people in the
State of Florida, and that we need to have ever
stronger relationships, the business community,
the civic community, the political community,
the education community, the faith community
and not simply the black church I refer to, but
the faith community, generally.

I think we've made progress. I think Dr. Robinson is particularly good at this. We all need to be good at this. But we've barely touched what we needed to do in the way of building relationships.

MRS. BRYANT: Other comments on that?

What I was getting ready to say was that what you're finding out right now is that unless we have a common understanding of what terms mean, we place things in buckets where they don't belong, or we have such a diverse view of what the issue is or is not, that if we have that in here, I'm going to keep saying that we also have it outside of here.

TRUSTEE MILLS: Well, the only problem with that is is that this is someone's comment, right?

MRS. BRYANT: Yes.

TRUSTEE MILLS: So it's hard to come up with a tool and not ask for comments. And so then they're going to come up with a -- I mean, maybe this meant something to someone, right, and that's the person that needs to represent what it means and then we can talk about
whether we agree with it or not, kind of scenario. I don't know that you can limit that at some point.

MRS. BRYANT: Yeah, my point is that, it's a representative of what people think in this room.

TRUSTEE MILLS: Yeah, I mean, I don't think so.

MRS. BRYANT: Right.

TRUSTEE MILLS: I don't agree with that because I could have put anything up there. But my point being is that I didn't know what university engagement meant when I read this, or whoever put it, I didn't know what they meant.

So I was looking forward to hearing what they thought and then I can decide whether or not I agree with it or not. You know what I mean?

But just to see it online, kind of scenario, is a little bit, in this particular case, around comments is maybe just a little bit misleading. Yeah. Because someone felt strongly enough to put it there.

MRS. BRYANT: Right. In fact, the whole
idea is that -- doing self-assessments is that

somebody in this group, several people in the

group thought it was worthy to write down. Out

of all the things they could have written, they

put that on a sheet of paper, which means that

it's a voice that needs to be heard such that

you can better understand that filter,

especially as weaknesses.

TRUSTEE MILLS: Exactly.

TRUSTEE WASHINGTON: Well, and also, I

would say what was the actual response?

Because if several people wrote it and that's

the interpretation or the summary of what like

the -- you know, trying to fit it in that box.

So I would like to see what the actual

response -- like, I don't know if that's the

actual response or a summary of a response.

MRS. BRYANT: Yeah. I don't either.

All right. Let's try and get to the last

part, because it looks like I'm the only person

between you and lunch.

CHAIRMAN LAWSON: I have a question for

you.

MRS. BRYANT: Yes.

CHAIRMAN LAWSON: As you step back and
look at this objectively and you look at all
the feedback, and based on your experience, and
maybe it's not a fair question, but what would
you say would be our top three opportunities as
you kind of read through all of this?
And, you know, you've sat through the
morning. You've heard us go back and forth.
You've heard us talk a little bit about, you
know, we're going to do well, some opportunity
areas.
As you kind of push all that through your
filter, what would you say are three
opportunities, or some opportunities, maybe not
three.
MRS. BRYANT: Right. I'll tell you what I
heard. And I'm probably -- remember, I'm
filtering what I have read and then what I
heard you talk about.
CHAIRMAN LAWSON: This is based on one
morning of observation, is what we'd be
interested in hearing.
MRS. BRYANT: Yeah. That goals, as you
set goals for whomever, whether it's you
setting it for the president or the president
setting it for his people, goals really do need
to be smart.

Because when we set goals without information -- when I say without information, without enough information to understand that the goal is something that can be done, we find ourselves on the back end trying to figure out why it didn't work. Okay. Just impact.

Goals are great. But the whole smart test tells you that goals have to have some sense of reality to it, and it has to have really realistic meaning. And you all have the time frames associated with it, which is good. So that's just something to think about.

Then secondly, coming to an agreement, and I'm just talking board level now, of what the real priorities are that you actually influence and control.

I mean, there's obviously diverse opinions in this room. And it should be because you don't want everybody saying the same thing because you need some more people on board then. Because the only way you grow is that you actually have diverse opinions. Yes, Kim?

TRUSTEE MOORE: I probably question how we're seeing this laid out in the report,
because if you go back to '19 in the comments, there's 10 responses for 2019, which meant that someone had to be selective in the four that they chose. And we just gave the 10 responses. So there's range and variety. So I don't know if priority and ranking really apply here. And the same will hold true for second. You would be led to believe that there's consistency at university engagement showing up a lot. TRUSTEE MILLS: And there was one comment. TRUSTEE MOORE: And then there's like nine more responses. So we may not be using our time right on looking at this as true rankings. TRUSTEE MILLS: Yeah, I was just looking at it. It would be different if you had multiple comments saying the same thing, but you really don't. TRUSTEE MOORE: So we're really trying to defend something that -- MRS. BRYANT: But you don't know. TRUSTEE MILLS: Well, you don't. MRS. BRYANT: I don't know for sure. You don't know, which begs the question for why we need a new instrument. For why you need a new
But I was trying to answer his question about what some of the opportunities might be.

CHAIRMAN LAWSON: Yeah, and that's where I was still trying to -- you know what I mean?

Let's just agree, the tool has opportunity, but right now this is the only data we have.

So from this data, and from your observations, I was just trying to get at, you know, I think we -- you know, there's a laundry list of things that everybody feels we do well.

But I want to try to get into those things that we see as potential opportunities because coming out of here, you know, I would like to have some actions, plans or action steps coming out of here year-round. Those couple things we see as opportunity.

So I just want to try -- and I'm open to having an open dialogue just based on, as you guys look at each other, you know, or look at us as a body, where do you see our gaps or things that we need to do to improve our performances as a board.

MRS. BRYANT: Let me hear from you. What are the some of the gaps? Because you sit here
on a regular basis, where we are, opportunities for what's been described this morning for where you're going as a board, and I will caveat and say, and this gets back to something you all have been discussing, is that to differentiate between what the president does with the people who work with him and what your role is.

TRUSTEE MARCIETTE: So I think in years past there's been a gap between way at the top and then -- which is us. And then like the students way at the bottom, which is me. And the reason I say that is because a lot of times I feel like my role as the student representative here is to make sure that the overall mission of the university is being heard at the lower level of the students. For example, I can walk up to anybody within -- and this is really not my fault, but a lot of the students don't really understand what the strategic plan of the University is or the role or the goals of the president or just our overall objectives.

And I feel like a lot of things that student government does or our leadership -- or
student leadership, I should say, we play a role in that. We can definitely drive those goals forward with the day-to-day activity that we have.

Like let's stop having multiple concerts a year and let's start putting some of our funding towards, you know, like academic programs or academic resources like instead of having Know Your Rights Seminar or whatever it is on the student body documents, let's try to get some funding for like practice exams for the N-CLEX for the school of nursing to drive those rates. Let's start having those discussions.

So like, that's with a big gap in recent years and that's something that I'm really trying to focus on. I know I talk a lot and I apologize for that. A lot of this I'm just stepping into for the first time so a lot of these words I'm like Googling.

TRUSTEE MOORE: You speak great.

TRUSTEE MARCIETTE: Yeah, I mean. So I think that's one of the gaps. So my role this year is to really try to bring some credibility to the SJA president position and more so build
a transition plan for the upcoming so that
it's -- for the upcoming SJA president, because
I don't know who's going to go for it, but
that's not either here nor there.
But just to kind of like build a
transition packet so that he or she is able to,
you know, build onto what I leave behind or
build onto the position that SJA is heading
towards.
So I'm excited to see that and that's my
little two piece on it.
MRS. BRYANT: That's awesome. It really
is.
TRUSTEE WASHINGTON: So I would say one of
our biggest opportunities is we have focused a
lot in the last several years on building data
and metrics and understanding different parts
of the enterprise. But I think we've almost
taken ourselves into metric soup territory
because we have metrics and, you know, we pull
data for different things and it's kind of all
over the place.
So what I would like to see clearer --
fewer, clearer goals with metrics. But ones
that are foundational. So like, not the
activity sort of type goals, but the actual
strategic goals that we can repeat over and
over again and all be on the same page about
and be able to measure our progress.
Because I think we pick goals over here
for this and goals over here for that and plans
over here and have these metrics.
And so we have a hard time wrapping our
head around what’s going on because based on
whatever the talk of the day is, that’s sort of
where we go as far as metrics.
So if we could sort of figure out what is
and what are the priorities, and then as things
come up, foundational issues, critical issues,
where do they fit within our already -- like
where is our strategy and like where do they
fit.
But I mean, I would say, you know, our
strategic plan is doing metrics. Like, we
can't pay attention to everything all the time.
So if we're going to be accountable, what
are the things we're going to be accountable
for, and then how do we drive that through the
enterprise and make it common language for us?
MRS. BRYANT: That's very good. you have
five strategic initiatives --

MR. ROBINSON: Six.

MRS. BRYANT: Okay. Six strategic initiatives. Everything that's done --

strategic initiatives basically says, these are the things that are important to us right now.

It's not the end-all, but they're important right now.

So everything we're doing right now, I should be able to link back to those initiatives. That's the highest level.

And from those initiatives we actually pull out our goals, objects and goals the president has, but then those goals cascade and turn into tactics, such that they know how to get back to the big picture.

So at this level the question becomes, do we have actual goals that are linked to initiatives that bring us to the place where we're trying to go? Whether it's in fundraising -- I mean, any of those other areas you want to pull out is good, but at this level -- we're at a high level.

And obviously you have to have metrics.

The further down it goes in the organization,
the more definitive those metrics become
because they're the people making it happen.

MR. ROBINSON: I just wonder, if I might,
Mr. Chairman and Commissionaire, if there is
another cultural issue that we're dealing with.

And I spent, you know, about three hours
at dinner with Howard University's president
and, you know, we were talking about the
differences in, you know, the private
institutions and public institutions.

And so it reminded me of a sort of an
anecdote I got from the then executive vice
chancellor who spoke at my inauguration at
Washington University.

When we were going through the evolution
from the Board of Regents to this system,
former President Humphrey asked that I take a
look and, you know, see what were the pros and
cons.

I do remember, you know, I got to
Washington University knowing full well it was
a different kind of body, established, you
know, drastically different than what was about
to happen here.

But he did say that the prior function of
the board with, you know, with the private institution, you know, was to raise money.

Okay. And, you know, the difference that I think in the public board is the primary function is sort of oversight, you know, in governance.

So what I think we are challenging sales that, you know, as a board is how do we get into some of these other places, right, fundraising.

Because when you go out, right, if you assume that that's all other boards do is just oversight then, you know, you're really missing the point.

You know, because the fact is they are engaged in fundraising. They're engaged in setting up those political connections and so forth.

So what you have is an understanding that the goals of the president are mutually achieved, right. I mean, it's not like, okay, we gave you these two things to do and you didn't do it. But if you have a product, and I know this is a little bit different, is that, you know, and here's how we make that happen.
I think that's another conflict you really need to try to address with. You know, there is an oversight function and a fiduciary function and all those things are important because, legislatively, you know, statutorily that's why these boards were established. But everybody knows that for those from FAMU or any of these institutions to be successful, the boards do a lot more than that. And that's another cultural issue, too. I will -- I fully understand that they have other appointed duties, but the ones that are not really down are the ones that have been moved in some of these other instances.

TRUSTEE MILLS: So if I could just be specific on some of this, right. So if I looked at kind of like the dashboard, which I think we just -- we have the instruction sheet, but it doesn't have -- I guess it has all the things on here in this document. You know, I'm just curious as to which ones we would like to remove or which ones we should add to that, right.

Because I think the idea is that all of these here are in support of the strategic
plan, right. And I do think they are ones that we should be monitoring. I mean, I feel very comfortable with this document at the end of the day, or whatever's on mine, which I tend to do more.

But I don't know if there are ones that I would add to that or take away from that, because I think these are fundamental which leads to a whole bunch of other downstream success, or I should say it the other way. There's a bunch of other stuff that has to happen to actually achieve these results.

CHAIRMAN LAWSON: Yeah, and I think the idea behind those metrics are two-fold. One is to guide us to where we are trying to go. And two, in prior evaluations of presidents there wasn't a lot of data to support the evaluation going back a few years. And it was, well, I think. Well, I feel this way.

So we were trying to take some of that guesswork out of the evaluation, as well as making sure that we had a way to measure our success along the way, which is why I think we may have gotten into, you know, a few clunking
metrics, so to speak, just so that we have
something to rely on to justify a position.

But now I think -- I did think we're
moving, and we're not perfect, but we're moving
toward metrics that are meaningful as we try to
move our performance.

So I think it's a bit of a balance and
we're learning along the journey, so we're
probably not right yet.

TRUSTEE MILLS: Yeah. I mean, it's fair
to say we want to revisit these and figure out
what should be on the dashboard or not. But I
do think that, you know, we should be in the
realm of not -- not metric soup, but certainly
in quantitative.

MRS. BRYANT: Oh, no question.

TRUSTEE WASHINGTON: There's a difference
between what we have available to us and what
we are sort of prioritizing.

CHAIRMAN LAWSON: I want to change the
narrative to one other idea that I think
hopefully you all would agree.

I think we need to enhance our political
clout to the point that they are calling us
periodically saying, here's a bill that's about
to go through that's going to impact you. What
do you think.

And I think that when you have that
political clout, slash, influence -- and it's
hard to get and it takes years and it takes
building relationships, et cetera.

But, you know, like the phone call that
Dave made in the middle of the night, things
that I know that Woody's done and others.

I think for us as a board we want to work
to elevate our stature in those circles to the
point that, you know, Woody and I have got
called about appointments. What do you all
think about this appointment.

I think that's where we want to be. You
know, we want to be getting the phone calls to
say, what do you think. Not, wow, how are you
going to react to this now that it's been done
to you, versus being on the front end of that.

And it's hard to really like put that into
words. But to say it another way, I think we
want to increase our political influence, in
all circles, you know, whether it be BOG,
whether it be the Governor's office,
Legislatures, et cetera.
MRS. BRYANT: And that's everybody.

TRUSTEE MOORE: Yeah, so that's why I add to that. That influence and status and stature, I mean, those are great. But I think it has to be coupled with outcome and results.

I mean, people are attracted to things that are working well. So whether it's one year or five years, if you are doing something outstanding people look for things that they can tell. And if you give them something to tell, then I think the rest comes with it. So I agree, but I think performance to get in there.

CHAIRMAN LAWSON: Yeah, you have to have performance to get in the circle. We want -- but there are certain things like in the conversation around the removal of the bottom three, you know, in my mind there should have been more conversation with us directly about how do you feel. How do you think this is obviously going to have a positive impact on you. But like, would you do it differently, et cetera? You know, that was done to us and that was a positive, but it was done to us. We weren't a part of the process, you know.
Now, I think we want to be in the posture of working with the people that are designing those things. So, again, we are a part of the process. And it's not done to us, it's done with us, in my opinion.

And that's not easy to do. We've had some luck in certain circles. But I think that --

Dave, what I was saying, and I think you would agree, we need to raise our political stature such that when things are happening in the capitol or at the Board of Governors around policy, there's a question or phone call to us to say, what do you think versus, oh, my God, how are you going to react to it that it's been done.

MRS. BRYANT: Yes, ma'am?

TRUSTEE CAVAZOS: I think everything that has been said has been great. I'm coming from a different perspective in terms of just looking at the evaluation tools. I wasn't here when it was done. And I don't know what the involvement of the board is with respect to faculty.

I mean, we are the educators, so we are the ones that are the forefront of our
students. We are the ones that are -- want
their success because we are passionate about
what we do. But I don't see any sort of
engagement with our faculty with respect to
what we can do and how we can be engaged in
this process.
I mean, I'm the representative, but
there's nothing here that I've seen on these
documents that reflects who we are and what we
do and what we bring to the table.
We know that there are some challenges
that we have in terms of being effective in the
classroom, but nevertheless, we're the
forefront. We're the one responsible for the
success of our students. We're the ones that
are responsible for educating them and making
sure that when they leave this institution that
they represent, as well, and that's to get a
job after, right? This is all part of the
measurement.
But we are effective in making sure that
happens. Without us, where are the students?
It's all great to have goals and plans and
strategic outcomes, but where are we in the
process and what considerations do we take into
from a board perspective as to how we can contribute, how we can become more effective because that's where our passion is. That's why we're here.

And what can the board recommend and also provide to us as a faculty, as a whole, to be appreciated in the investments of our time and our energies.

I mean, we are 24/7. Students have our phone numbers. Students, we're more than just an educator, we're counselors and we're everything else.

So I just -- because I don't see anything here, I don't know whether that's ever something that's being considered. If not, I would love to see some sort of an evaluation, too, that incorporates who we are as faculty and how we provide, you know, a benefit to --

TRUSTEE MILLS: May I ask a question? So responsible for the education of the students.

TRUSTEE CAVAZOS: Not just that, but in everything else, yeah.

TRUSTEE MILLS: So would you -- because I almost feel -- so first of all, I hear your voice. And I know one of the comments that I
had talked about is we don’t do, quote, unquote, employee, slash, faculty engagement surveys like, you know, in some respects that we probably should do in some respects, too.

But otherwise, I almost feel like everything you do is fully integrated in the fabric of this, right.

So I tend to look at the measurements and I say, Bachelors degrees awarded, I'm thinking we’re relying on the faculty to get us there, right?

When I see our graduation rates, a big -- my intrinsic portion of it says, you guys own that, our graduation rates and our degrees and all is -- actually, many of the metrics here I sort of feel like the faculty owns that in many respects. Do you disagree with that?

TRUSTEE CAVAZOS: And they need to know that.

TRUSTEE MILLS: Okay. And that's a different aspect.

TRUSTEE CAVAZOS: They need to know that. That's a totally different aspect.

TRUSTEE MILLS: Totally, yeah. Yeah.

TRUSTEE CAVAZOS: I mean, we do work, you
know, and we're passionate about what we do.

But do we know that and is that communicated?

TRUSTEE MILLS: And back to the chairman's point earlier --

CHAIRMAN LAWSON: One of my theories is like if I were to talk to a dean or a department head, could he or she tell me the number of students they need to graduate out of their department for their department to make its goal and for us to make the larger goal.

Now, my guess is some could, some can't.

But, you know, we have an opportunity to work with Dr. Eddington on, you know, how we deliver the message down because you guys -- and it's kind of like the student, right? You are really the reason we're here because we can't do it without you guys and we can't do it without, you know, the students in the classroom performing.

So I think it's good feedback. I would ask you to continue with that if you don't feel like we're hearing you loud enough. Continue with that voice so that we can incorporate that discussion into what we do. And I think that's the value. I really think that's the value of
yourself and your student because we do get hung up in the political arena and are we bringing in enough money and are we doing this right.

And we may not always think first about the student and then obviously about the faculty. So please keep that in mind for us.

TRUSTEE CAVAZOS: The faculty could be involved in the political arena.

CHAIRMAN LAWSON: Particularly you guys also, I mean, in local Orlando.

TRUSTEE DORTCH: I think in credit, too, you have to give credit to your predecessor. We didn't have any discussions in this board meeting or any board meeting without her weighing in.

TRUSTEE WOODY: She would weigh in.

CHAIRMAN LAWSON: Weigh in and wear out.

TRUSTEE DORTCH: If we went off track, she brought us back in. And so that was the way. She was the liaison for us, and that's very important. Both of you are very key to whatever happens to the university, and I think that in infinite wisdom of those who put the system together, having the faculty and the
senate representation and the SJA president is very important because whenever we're having discussions, one, we've got -- you've got to weigh in. If we're off track, you've got to weigh in. And also bring to the table these kind of things.

So I think that the important thing is we've not, from my time on this board, there's never been a silent voice. And we know that you're going to continue that and that's very key to how we move forward.

CHAIRMAN LAWSON: And fresh eyes into what we do. I think, that's key, as well.

MRS. BRYANT: I'm going to -- I've been given three or four signs that it's time for me to wrap up.

CHAIRMAN LAWSON: I think this is a valuable discussion. It's a once a year opportunity for us to look in the mirror at what we do.

We're constantly telling these guys what they need to do, so I think this is a good opportunity for us.

So I guess the question, before we get to Dr. Eddington, is there any board member that
feels there's an opportunity area or an issue
they'd like to put on the table about how we
perform that we haven't discussed?

TRUSTEE DORTCH: I think Kim made a very
valid point. This is going to be a public
document. And if one person has an opinion,
it's important that we get an opinion, but it's
bad to have something published that does not
represent --

TRUSTEE WASHINGTON: But is that going up
or is it just the '19? Because that's the
summary document, which is not required.

TRUSTEE DORTCH: Let's be clear on where
this document goes. If anything is done, it's
a public --

TRUSTEE WASHINGTON: It is a public record
but it doesn't have to be posted.

TRUSTEE DORTCH: If somebody doesn't know
who is working, we have to give them the
opinion and that's president.

And to give a document as we're talking
that does not represent what we think we are.

And I think if one person had an opinion, it's
very important to hear from them and
understand.
But if you’ve got 99 percent that says, that’s not my opinion, do you put the one percent up and people think that that's our attitude that the board thinks that it needs to be X, Y, and Z?

I'm asking our expert, how do we make sure that's an accurate representation of where we are in our thoughts? Because that document, if I do an open record, you've got to give it to me.

MRS. BRYANT: Oh, I'm sorry, Mr. Robinson.

MR. ROBINSON: I'm sorry, too. But in terms of this document, it is what it is. If somebody requested this document, you know, you would have to give them this document as it is.

Now, if you wanted to go back and have a version two of this, but you can refine it in any way you want, you can do that, as well, and then post that document.

TRUSTEE MILLS: So to be clear and not to make too big a deal out of this, the first one -- the first one we don't have an issue with. They're all trying to summarize Page 6 and Page 7. And the second one, and maybe the third one, are just ones that people picked
out. And that's our internal team. She didn't
do that but that's our internal team.

TRUSTEE DORTCH: The technology is the
issue.

TRUSTEE MILLS: Yeah. And so those would
be the ones if we wanted to try to address
either items or, you know, whatever.

Although, when I look at all these
comments, it is hard to sort of pick any theme
out of it.

MR. ROBINSON: If you want a story,
though, I can pick any one of these and write a
story --

TRUSTEE MILLS: Yeah, which is good.

TRUSTEE MOORE: I just think that just as
you mentioned, when you pull the document that
this thing comes up university engagement that
we were all collectively as certified members
engaged really was two out of twelve or two out
of ten. So I just don't think that it
represents the kind of work that was done.

TRUSTEE MILLS: Correct. Is it possible
to go back and --

MRS. BRYANT: Go ahead.

TRUSTEE WASHINGTON: We should probably
consider taking out a ranking system and maybe just doing a general summary.

TRUSTEE MOORE: Yeah.

TRUSTEE WASHINGTON: Like a -- because it does lead itself -- even with like the diversity and leadership being in the second tier, it leads itself to conclusions that aren't necessarily reflective of where we are.

So again, maybe just of the top three restraints, maybe we just find a way to summarize those. And then as far as the weaknesses and then the other areas.

So that might alleviate some of the concern around how things are ranked and people's interpretation of, you know, of us.

CHAIRMAN LAWSON: I agree. So that was one thing we needed to do.

MRS. BRYANT: Can I just comment on that particular thing?

CHAIRMAN LAWSON: Sure. Sure.

MRS. BRYANT: Is that, that your next time you do this, if you have another instrument, that will help you to --

TRUSTEE WASHINGTON: Reinforcement.

TRUSTEE Dortch: Give the medicine to kill
the instrument.

MRS. BRYANT: I'm saying that because -- otherwise, you get those kind of results.

Okay. I'm done with that.

CHAIRMAN LAWSON: So I guess go to the last -- my last question is, just so that we don't overlook anybody's point of view, is there any other opportunity of area that you'd like to put on the table, maybe that you forgot, that you didn't put in the document but that you want to put on the table that we need to discuss? All is clear?

MR. EDDINGTON: Quick suggestion around opportunities, I think, for the board to consider.

You know, we spent a lot of time talking about goals and really that's a good framework of the performance model as it should be.

But I would think that the board before that was going to spend some time thinking about some thing beyond that around what FAMU is and where we want FAMU to go.

The perfect example is, if you recall, we did the accountant and plan presentation and I think it was Governor Levine who said, hey,
man, what do you all think about establishing
goals in the top five. And you said something
that you all think is worthy.

And as I reflect on that, I said, you know,
I don’t think we, you know, spend time thinking
beyond and saying, hey, what is our role as a
top producer of graduates and certain
disciplines. What do we want to shoot for. If
we want to be a top producer of black
engineers. So it’s just a suggestion, an
opportunity to carve out a little bit of time.

TRUSTEE WASHINGTON: Some visionary time.

MRS. BRYANT: That’s correct.

MR. ROBINSON: Madam Chair, before we go,
I do have answers to your question earlier.

So on the fundraising, so as of June 30th,
2019 we’ve raised $11,000,675 so and so dollars
compared to the same time in ’18 with
9.5 million. New cash gives, and this is part
of your question, was 4.6 million versus
3.6 million the same time in ’18. Pledged
collections as of June 30th was 5.4 million
compared to $661,000 at the same time in 2018.
Pledges of 1.6 million compared to 5.2, that’s
probably why the next number is going to stand
The pledge collection rate is 337 percent for that one year. I think it's because of the larger number of pledges and a larger number of pledge collections that were made. So I tried to explain that to you because I know --

TRUSTEE MILLS: Well, that last one didn't make any sense.

TRUSTEE WASHINGTON: It's how many pledges they collected this year versus last year, but that's because we had that big -- that 5 million.

TRUSTEE WOODY: Is that how you get the 300 percent?

TRUSTEE WASHINGTON: It's not the percentage. It's 300 over last year. It's not the percentage. It's not the conversion rate.

TRUSTEE MILLS: Yeah, we need the conversion rate. But the other pledges collected of 5.4 million, that was converted to cash basically?

MR. ROBINSON: Yes. Well, the pledge collections of 5.4 million.

TRUSTEE WASHINGTON: That includes the
5 million?

MR. ROBINSON: Yes.

TRUSTEE MILLS: Okay. So it's 400,000 compared to 600,000, excluding the one-time event.

MR. ROBINSON: I think they can't even get to it, because the 5 million is in there distorting it.

TRUSTEE MILLS: Right. Right. That's what I'm saying. Just take the 400,000 compared to the 600,000. Okay. I got it.

CHAIRMAN LAWSON: Thank you for facilitating this. Hopefully we were not too disruptive.

MRS. BRYANT: Not at all.

CHAIRMAN LAWSON: Not only is this a requirement, but I think it's good for us as we've gone through the president's goals and president's evaluations to go through self-assessment and level set what we expect of him moving forward as well as what we expect of ourselves moving forward as far as a governing body of the institution.

So this is time well spent. I did identify -- I have four. I'll probably narrow
it down to three. I'll work to give these
three items. I'll review the three with me
here.

But student engagement, how do we, as a
board, reflect more student engagement? We
talked about our metrics and the importance of
them but making sure they're meaningful.

And raising our political footprint, our
political voice, it's going to be an
interesting one and it's a challenging one
because it takes time.

And then have we put a stake in the ground
around areas where we just want to be best in
class name, you know, our preeminence. But
hey, just making this up, pharmacy. Do we want
to be the number one producer of
African-American pharmacists in the country?

So putting our stake in the ground around
a particular thing that we can own in the
academic space.

So those are the four that I took away.

And if there are others that you all think of
during lunch or what have you, you know --

TRUSTEE WOODY: Give me them again.

CHAIRMAN LAWSON: I'm sorry. It's really
enhancing our student engagement, fewer meaningful metrics that tie to our strategic plan, raising our political footprint or political influence, and picking an area or picking a focus to truly be best in the class around. So four.

And so what we'll do now is transition.

Let's take a true break for lunch. If you guys don't mind, we could maybe confine lunch to 30 minutes. We'll then have an hour of open dialogue before it's time to head out to Brooksville. We'll give a true 30-minute break for lunch and phone calls. And that's not a lot of time but we're trying to stay on schedule.

I think this morning time got a little away from us. But it was good dialogue. And again, this is our once a year opportunity to do this. So I want to thank our facilitator for the morning. I want to thank Trustee Mills for leading the discussion in performance and goals.

TRUSTEE MILLS: It was all right.

CHAIRMAN LAWSON: I still want to thank you anyway.
TRUSTEE LAWRENCE: Is this your last meeting?

CHAIRMAN LAWSON: No. So let's take a break and come back at 1:00.

RECESS

RESUMED

CHAIRMAN LAWSON: Okay. So this is an interesting part of the workshop, because this is set aside for us to openly discuss some key topics or areas of interest.

But we have to be careful as we discuss these topics to not draw firm conclusions or board positions on these because technically, as you guys know, we can't openly discuss items that are going to come before the board for a vote.

So as we discuss these, I'm going to ask the GC to keep us between the white lines such as that we can discuss them and share some perspectives, but we can't come to like a board consensus, which would in my mind, almost infer a board vote.

So we're going to make an attempt to discuss some of these. These are topics that some of you shared with me. These are some
topics that I had on my own, things that I
would just like to have an open dialogue about.
And at various points in time we may ask a
particular staff member, particularly
Dr. Eddington because he owns a lot of things,
for opinions, additional input, et cetera.
So as we go through this laundry list of
topics, feel free to say, you know what, that
one's a little redundant. I feel like we beat
it up already this morning or, you know, no
need to discuss that because we just discussed
it a few minutes ago.
So not led to the order of these topics.
They're not in any order of importance. But
these are just things that either you shared
with me that's on your mind or that I put on
the list to talk about.
With the time that we have allotted, we
won't nearly get through half of them,
probably. So I'm going to stop talking and let
us get into it.
And the first one is around performance
funding. And I've asked our facilitator to
help us through these, so we don't get bogged
down.
So we'll hit the first topic. And in a roundabout way I think we've talked about it to a degree. And I note the provost has a matrix that's showing how these resources are allocated. So maybe, Maurice, without any further discussion you can share with us your thinking about allocating the resources, because I think the overall objective is, we want to drive the performance metrics higher. So that's agreed upon. Yes?

So, you know, Dr. Eddington, maybe you can share with us the methodology you went through.

MR. EDDINGTON: Yeah.

CHAIRMAN LAWSON: And we're getting the funding spreadsheet now. And I know it's a formal topic tomorrow. Not to be voting on. It's an informations topic so we can't talk about it.

MR. EDDINGTON: And I won't go into detail unless you want me to.

CHAIRMAN LAWSON: No. No. I think it's just all of us get orientated to it because the thing that I've been asking the Provost and the president for, as we talk about all these initiatives and various parts of the university
and we bring them into one place and see how
the funding is allocated over them in one
spreadsheet.

MR. EDDINGTON: And let me start kind of
going backwards and try to address the
methodology, because it did become clear to me
from talking to the chair and vice chair, that
because we’re in this every day we assume that
you all are seeing the same thing.

So we had this conversation, how does all
this align. And I’m like, oh, you know, this
plan and then you all helped me to see.

No. You all are not looking at it the way
we are. So just to kind of put that into
context, what we have been doing is we started
clearly with that strategic plan and because
the president and myself we were integral in
the development.

We have always been very comfortable with
the plan that’s been developed to do what its
key priorities have been.

And so we have been using that strategic
plan as the road map. And then when we think
about funding and priorities, we look at the
opportunity that the university has to acquire
additional funding. And we have been looking at the Legislative funding request to process. And we have been looking at the performance funding allegation process, right. And then the third planning document that's in there is the accountability plan. And so we took the strategic plan and then every year we used that to develop the accountability plan. And they map onto each other very directly. And then when we have these special funding opportunities like here we are in the performance funding, we mapped those priorities onto the accountability plan. And so we have been trying to very consistently take that approach. And so what this matrix is intending to do is you'll see in the far left column it lists the three high-level priorities that are in the accountability plan. And then we tried to align the themes, which are the initiatives column. This is how we view these things. And then the description is very specific areas where funding is being allocated. And just kind of -- let's try to map this out as
you all had requested.

But that's our general methodology. And the part of that is when we develop the strategic plan, and even more so now, we try to spend a lot of time following the framework to help us identify where the money needs to be. We've done a lot of internal analysis assessment, and talking to some of our sister institutions. And that's what you see reflected in terms of why we want to address it. And this is a good example.

You all as a board said -- actually, let me use a different -- this is even better. Transfer services. You all very specifically, because Trustee Mills asked Dr. Hudson, because he keeps quoting you, what do you need to do to make a quantum leap, is what you said. So we sat down and said, deal them. Trustee said, what do you need do to make a quantum leap. We started with this incremental thing. I said, no, what do you need to be able to position us to be able to recruit, retain and graduate more FSC AA transfers. I said, well, we need a transfer services office. He said,
then tell us what you need. We mapped out the positions and the structure and then we put a dollar amount on it.

So on this document, then you see somewhere on AA transfers. And we said, okay. Now, where are we going to get the money.

And we said, okay, we've got performance money. And we took it a step further. We said, the performance fund allocation is nonrecurring. But because we have critical needs like transfer services, because we need to expand our advisement significantly, why don't we use that as the seed money, right, to establish those positions now and then we will use other sources from recurring fund revenue.

Our original plan was to see a stepwise fashion, get to LBR money when it comes, that was a five-year process. We heard you all say, we don't have time for that.

So the president said think differently about it. And so we've attached urgency to those critical needs, like support services, transfer services, the performance metrics,

right?

Those are some of the considerations that
have driven us to figure out where the dollars
should be going. That's what you see in
that -- for the most part in that description
column.

CHAIRMAN LAWSON: So I think, you know,
this is a busy spreadsheet. But I think it's
good because it allows us to do the crosswalk
from the initiative to the money to which
metric it goes against.

There was a question about faculty, right,
in our earlier discussion. And there's quite a
few dollars allocated towards faculty
excellence.

Now, the challenge with those dollars, as
we know some are them are recurring, some of
them are nonrecurring.

So we have to strategically do what we can
with -- you know, with what we have. This year
we had an influx. Hopefully next year we'll
have that luxury, as well.

But, you know, I won't say I understand
100 percent of every objective on here. But I
do appreciate the lay of the land so that I can
follow the dollars across the initiatives.

And then I think it's a bit of a
rhetorical question that we should always be
asking ourselves, and that is, as we look at
this and learn more and look at more data,
would you want to tweak this allocation in any
way to increase our performance.
And I think that's a -- it's just a
rhetorical question, not for you guys to
answer. But I think it's an ongoing question
for the president and Provost.

And this is the thing I like about the
budgeting process. Yes, we mark this all down.
But if we see an urgent need to go harder or
deeper in an area, just come right to the board
and say, hey, fellows, ladies and gentlemen, we
found a better idea. We need to move money,
just go through the appropriate process and
then make that move.

So this is a good framework, but we don't
have to be so rigid that if something comes up
that's a better idea, a bigger idea, we can't
course correct the allocation.

MR. EDDINGTON: One of the things you all
have done today -- okay. You may not know you
did this, but I'll tell you, you did it and
it's very notable. You gave us a mandate. You
were always talking about, I think the number's now 80, right. And you all put a time frame on it. You gave us a mandate. And what you told me, right, and you told the president, and I know he's going to tell me already, so I'm just trying to cut to the -- the minute we get back, Maurice, you need to do what you've got to do to get a point. But what's helpful is when we think about this kind of approach, the same way you all asked about the quantum leap on the transfer students, you all have said that we've got to get to this point. And you said, we are empowered to think outside the box and come back to you, we need you all's help. And when we say, hey, we've got to move some money around. This is not what we wanted to do, but we have to do it to achieve these goals, you know.

CHAIRMAN LAWSON: And I think I would say that to you, as well as the interim CFO, that if you see a bigger, better idea, if you see an opportunity -- let's not be bashful and have to wait for a quarterly meeting to get us on the phone.
But like I don't want to be so rigid in the budgeting process that we can't adjust if we see a better idea or these dollars are getting a lot of traction.

If I can invest more, I can do more over here. I think this is a great start, Maurice. So thank you for putting this out there.

TRUSTEE MILLS: Can I ask a couple questions?

CHAIRMAN LAWSON: Yes.

TRUSTEE MILLS: So my question, obviously, you know, when you go from $12 million to $30 million, there's like a lot of questions.

So part of it is is that describe to me your process for scrutinizing these expenditures.

So I know that, you know, you said, you know, this is what we need to make the quantum leap. But then there's an okay, but, kind of process, right?

MR. EDDINGTON: Not -- not --

TRUSTEE MILLS: Talk to me about that.

MR. EDDINGTON: Yeah. And when you say scrutinize, do you mean --

TRUSTEE MILLS: Well, when someone says
it's going to be $4.5 million for faculty and
staff retention. That's a number that somebody
gives us, but usually every CFO's first answer
is no, until we come back and kind of validate
that, right?

MR. EDDINGTON: Yeah. So and you may be
asking how did we come up with that number, as
part of your question.

TRUSTEE MILLS: Yes. But also how you
scrutinized it or evaluated it. So somebody
came up with a number, I got that.

MR. EDDINGTON: Yes. Yes.

TRUSTEE MILLS: So I got that.

MR. EDDINGTON: That number really came
about more from what we thought we could get in
terms of carving out from what we had, right.

Meaning, we have five, 600 faculty,
several hundred staff. We know if we wanted to
make substantive bonuses or salary increases,
it's going to be more than this total here.

What our proposal is was saying, you know
what, we must begin to do something to address
this need around faculty, staff salaries and
retention as we map out.

All these priorities with the resources
that are on the table, what we said is, what can we carve out that's meaningful. So the performance funding, that 13.7, you know, we could have put all of that into there 100 percent directly. But we said, let's at least carve out a sliver and begin to make a dent.

And so the 2 million, we came by that number even more so because it was what we felt comfortable pulling out of there without sacrificing other areas as opposed to actually saying, you know what, the need is -- because the need is bigger than the money that you see on the spreadsheet. And so that's how we got the 2 million number.

And then similarly on the other numbers, hey, we have the 7 million. We have some priorities. One of them is faculty staff.

What can we feel comfortable about carving out, again, to complement the 2 million and get us up to 4.5 to begin to address this year that issue.

So that number is a little different than all the other numbers. The other numbers are driven by the goal, right. Advisors, we want
to get to this number, what are the costs, then
we back it.

TRUSTEE MILLS: Okay. So we had talked in
the past, a few times in the past, I think,
about -- for these key initiatives, you know,
there's like a sources and uses document,
right.

So I'll just pick one. I'm just going to
make this up, right. So college school
programs, students success initiatives,
2.4 million bucks.

So the question is, there's a uses column
that says this 2.4 million bucks is going to be
used in these eight ways. And then there's a
sources that says, we're going to get the 2.4
from either our current operating budget, some
other savings reallocation, performance
funding, 13 million bucks, whatever part of
that 13 million bucks.

So there's a sources and uses on every one
of these key initiatives, so we can actually
see where this money is coming from.

Like I don't know where the 30 million
is -- I know we've got $13 million in
performance funding, but 13 is less than 30.
MR. EDDINGTON: Which one are you looking at?

TRUSTEE MILLS: I'm looking at the bottom.

MR. EDDINGTON: Yeah. Okay. So the sources document is similar to this if you think of it in terms of columns.

TRUSTEE MILLS: I got you.

MR. EDDINGTON: So it's really a column. Look at the performance funding column. All right, where -- PBF allocation.

TRUSTEE MILLS: Okay.

MR. EDDINGTON: Right. We said, we have needs on the left, the description and the initiatives. And then the source of funding is PBF allocation. We have 13 million. And we said, okay, we know what our critical needs are across the board. What can the performance funding allocation address. And then that's how we map those 2.7.

TRUSTEE MILLS: Okay.

TRUSTEE WASHINGTON: And then the 30, I guess, is an accumulation of all the pots of money that has 19/20 or 18/19 on them.

TRUSTEE MILLS: So how --

MR. ROBINSON: To your first question,
Trustee Mills, and starting with the monies you're on. You know, we have had this discussion about, we've got to do something with faculty. As we talked about in 2017 and how we're going to, you know, implement that. But at the same time there's a collective bargaining issue and we need to go through those appropriate steps.

But as we pointed out the fact that yesterday out of the performance-based funding we've carved out 2 million for that. And then in terms of reallocation of the savings that we talked about this morning, there's another 2.5 million.

TRUSTEE MILLS: And that's in this -- okay. The reallocation.

MR. ROBINSON: That's in the --

TRUSTEE MILLS: That's the 3.7 -- or 3.8.

TRUSTEE WASHINGTON: Yes. That's the 3.7 at the bottom.

CHAIRMAN LAWSON: The faculty and staff retention.

TRUSTEE MILLS: Oh, just on that one. I'm sorry. I was looking at the total line.

So what are the world-class faculty and
scholar numbers?

TRUSTEE WASHINGTON: They're just appropriated.

MR. ROBINSON: Those are appropriated and they have to go to those specific programs.

TRUSTEE MILLS: Got you. So that is the source of -- that is a funding source.

MR. EDDINGTON: Right. Right.

TRUSTEE MILLS: That's what was confusing me about it. I thought it was a program we were implementing and I didn't see any money aside from it.

TRUSTEE WASHINGTON: So my question is the LBR allocation. Is that E and G funds, I'm assuming?

MR. EDDINGTON: Yes.

TRUSTEE WASHINGTON: Because we actually -- I was like, we didn't get LBR operating dollars.

MR. EDDINGTON: We got it two years ago, right. It's recurring.

TRUSTEE WASHINGTON: Oh, okay.

MR. EDDINGTON: 6 million.

MR. ROBINSON: We got goals that go all the way at the end that you'll see in yellow.
That's what we're asking for.

TRUSTEE MILLS: For next year.

MR. ROBINSON: You have to factor that in.

CHAIRMAN LAWSON: The one thing, too, to think about -- and I guess I was just kind of wrestling this, as well, is there have been a couple years of compressing and conversional faculty salary. And we just can't correct it all in one year. So it's got to be a process over time to try and, you know, make up for those people that have had their salary compressed over time and not able to get increases. So we're trying to make it up in, you know, bonus dollars that have been nonrecurring until we can get some recurring dollars to address it long-term.

And some people may like that, some people may not. But we saw it as, this is the only opportunity we have today to try and address the salary issue of faculty.

MR. ROBINSON: So we've committed to that.

As we said yesterday, we know there's a much bigger problem to solve, but we don't think it's trivial because we know it's not the final solution.
CHAIRMAN LAWSON: Right. Because for a
couple years, I won't say neglected, but we
haven't done things that we need to do for
faculties conversation-wise. So this is an
attempt to get there. It's not going to fix
it, but at least it's a step in the right
direction.

TRUSTEE CAVAZOS: So just how is that
process going to be in terms of those faculty
members' salaries have been compressed and now
the proposal is probably give them some type of
bonus, just for my curiosity.

MR. ROBINSON: So here's what we can fix,
you know. The present issue is a huge number.
And you know when you don't have raises to give
or been able to give -- well, since I've been
here, we've given one and that was in 2017.
You know, if you go back -- how far do you
want to go back on this? That's a rhetorical
question.

TRUSTEE CAVAZOS: Yes. I know.

MR. ROBINSON: And no one has put those
cards on the table to fix that. So what I'm
trying to do with this proposal is, at least
let's stop the bleeding, right, because we've
got enough to do and there may be some opportunities. But we do have another opportunity that we're working on, the chairman and I and there's a special request. We really do some catching up, big time.

But that proposal is in the works. We're working it through the channels, as we speak. But we know that that takes a much bigger, you know, chunk of money to fix. You can take all of the 13, even if it was concurring, and you're still not getting enough.

CHAIRMAN LAWSON: And it still has to be worked through union, as well, to make sure that they are in alignment with the performance aspect of it.

But we -- I think collectively we felt that, hey, we have some money now. Let's do what we can now, knowing that it's going to be a bit of a process. Because it's been neglected -- let's say, not properly addressed for a few years.

TRUSTEE CAVAZOS: Thank you.

TRUSTEE MARCIETTE: I don't want to shift the conversation or anything like that but my biggest area of, not concern, but interest is,
of course you can probably guess, is student financial support.

So for some reason students think I know the ins and outs of scholarships and things like that, so my phone gets blown up. So I just had a couple questions.

One, what is the persistence grants, like what is that?

MR. EDDINGTON: Oh, okay. So one of the things that we looked at in terms of the best practices of student success that institutions have done is, you know, above and beyond scholarships -- that's another initiative -- is looking at your students, right, and trying to provide targeted financial support for a specific function.

One is something we call a retention grant. The president alluded to this earlier.

So let's say we had those students who began in the fall of 2018 and they count on that ABR performance metric. And then if we know what number can come back this fall and meet the criteria and meet that metric. So we provided them with some financial support to address any unmet needs.
So if a student say has a $1,500 balance, and that's potentially stopping that student from enrolling in the fall as a sophomore and they enroll they're going to contribute to that number, we allocate money to address that financial need. And that's what we call a retention grant to get them to come back.

Then there's a persistence grant, or a similar, but it's more towards the students matriculating more and has an unmet need. You know, they say, oh, I can't come back in the spring because I owe $2000. And we look at that student and we say, that student is in good standing and there's a good probability that if we support that student they will continue towards graduation, that's a persistency, to let them persist.

And then there's a completion, there's another version. Students towards the end say, you know what, if this student is at or near the point of graduating and are in good standing, maybe they're one or two semesters from graduation and they have a balance, this is probably the biggest problem with schools like us.
We say, you know what, let's invest and
give them a completion grant. Raise the gap on
what they can afford, keep them in school for
one or two semesters and they graduate them,
right. So that's the approach to those grants.

TRUSTEE MARCIETTE: Okay. So follow-up to
that would be, how are those students
identified or how do they get access to those
grants. Do I tell them, hey, like go talk to
Dr. Hudson. Hey, go talk to --

MR. EDDINGTON: Right. Right. So these
dollars, ideally we wouldn't treat that way.
You know, there's money for those type of
things. SOS dollars, alumni. This is more
institutionally driven. We're doing analytics.

TRUSTEE MARCIETTE: Okay. So then you are
searching for the students.

MR. EDDINGTON: Oh, yeah. We're searching
for students who are going to need them. The
difference is, there might be a student who --
making a scenario -- who started six years ago
has an unmet need of a thousand dollars. If we
give that student a thousand dollars, they're
going to graduate in a certain major.

Take another student who started three
years ago and needs a thousand dollars and
they're going to graduate in chemistry, which
one would you fund? Well, you're going to fund
the one that's in chemistry because, A, he or
she will graduate in four years. So they'll
contribute to that metric. And chemistry, that
will contribute to the programs of strategic
emphasis.

So these dollars we need to hold and we
need to direct them by strategic. That's the
difference in the approach.

TRUSTEE MARCIETTE: Got it.

MR. EDDINGTON: So there's a lot of
analytics. I mean, we've really got to monitor
data and target those people and then go to
them.

MR. ROBINSON: Not that you think there
are criteria around this so there's dollars.
They're very tailored about who gets those.
Those are completion grants. But they have
some criteria around students getting those and
so forth.

But, you know, they do that in conjunction
with the association and Dr. Hudson. So that's
the referred two type category. They use their
term to try to get to these students.

TRUSTEE MARCIETTE: And then my last question would be, I see under scholarships which was seven and that's the reallocation enhancement. Are those going to support new scholarships or existing scholarships?

MR. EDDINGTON: So that's going into Dr. Hudson's general scholarship pool. I don't exactly know how he allocates them.

MR. ROBINSON: He's probably going to use those for, you know, merit-based funds, I would suspect.

TRUSTEE MARCIETTE: Like a DSA?

MR. ROBINSON: Yeah, those types.

CHAIRMAN LAWSON: Good questions. So, you know, I think, you know, in the next couple boards we've kind of hit on as far as outcome and strategic allocation.

Are we allocating the right resources to improve. A lot of the early questions really tied to making a leap in performance funding.

And two, are we allocating the resources to get the outcomes that we want.

And then the next one, and I'll skip down to item -- bullet point number three, because I
feel like we've covered everything above there.

And I think this is one that we've had some interest in for a little while now, and it's really looking at our talent at every level. You know, starting with the president's leadership team and making its way down.

Because I just feel like, and I'll tee this discussion up and then let it move around.

In an ideal world when Dr. Eddington moves off to do something else, there should be another person in that shop that can step up to be Provost. You know, in an ideal situation we should have a decent -- not at every single position, but in most, a decent bench of talent that, you know, when senior-level people move on, there's somebody in that department that's seen what they do, watched them perform, and knows the ins and outs of the University and can move up.

Now granted, there are always times when we do need to reach outside to bring in a specific skill-set or just a new perspective.

What I think we've seen too many times where we don't have ready-now people are critical roles.
And I think it’s an opportunity area for us I’d just like to kick around with you all for a second. And then, the good news is we can’t vote on this, so we can talk about it in detail. But I do want to have an outcome that we can refer back to Mrs. Morgan in HR on Monday what we’re looking for.

TRUSTEE MOORE: The comment would be around cross-training, as well, because I think we’ve seen people are so siloed with specific functions and tasks and duties, they know that. But if you were to, you know, ask them what your colleague next to you does, they don’t get the big picture.

CHAIRMAN LAWSON: I think if we have an opportunity in the hiring process where we have vacancies now, you know, top level and below, to hire really, really, really good people that can transcend a job or two within the institution. You know, so I think for example, the controller or a budget manager, et cetera, as we look to staff those positions, okay, as we look to staff those positions, really going after strong quality that can do that job and
maybe with a stretch can do that job or with a couple years' experience can definitely do the next job.

So I just -- I think that as we are looking at vacancies and moving people around, I just feel like we need to have a little bit more mindful eye to, you know, a successful plan by the department.

Because, you know, we have good people, but I just -- you know, there are a couple jobs that have sprung open and we kind of look around and say, whoa, you know, how are we going to fill that one. Who are we going to fill that one with.

You know, it's just I think an opportunity area. So it sounds like everybody agrees so it's not really a --

TRUSTEE WASHINGTON: What's the status of our succession plan in the process?

MR. ROBINSON: Mrs. Ingram is compiling that in a couple of places in the organization. We haven't released it and I don't know exactly what the timeline is, but she's been working on it. She's not starting from scratch. She has a couple places in our union. So as soon as
she feels ready, that can be ruled out.

TRUSTEE MILLS: Is there any way we can accelerate that because we have -- how many employees do we have between faculty and staff,

1,100?

TRUSTEE MOORE: There's a bunch of them.

TRUSTEE MILLS: Seven hundred and fifty?

MR. ROBINSON: It's 500 faculty.

TRUSTEE MILLS: 500 faculty and then -- so less than a thousand people.

MR. ROBINSON: Maybe a little over a thousand.

TRUSTEE MILLS: We're kind of rolling on two years we've been talking about this thing. And that's just like -- that should be done -- a thousand people can be done in 60 days, kind of thing.

And the faster we get that assessment, again, the faster we get our baseline and we can start this process.

MR. ROBINSON: Right. So we'll go backwards and make sure that we get Mrs. Ingram to give us an update at the next meeting and then go from there. We need to accelerate it.

CHAIRMAN LAWSON: Okay. So that's really
not a voting item. It’s just an item that the
president can take back to the HR team to do.
You know, we’ve talked about it in the past.
And then next item here, item B, you know,
we’ve talked about it in the past and focused
on our law school. And just for a backdrop,
you know, this is obviously not a voting item
or open for discussion.
For a backdrop I think all of us want this
school to first, you know, to have higher
passing ratings. And as far as secondary, we
want the school to flourish.
There’s some concerns about where the
school is located, given all the development
around it. And the enrollment -- catch me on
my facts if I’m wrong -- the enrollment has
declined over the last couple of years and we
-- am I wrong, it hasn’t declined?
MR. ROBINSON: It nationally has, but it’s
been pretty stable.
CHAIRMAN LAWSON: It’s stable at our
school?
TRUSTEE WASHINGTON: Absolutely.
CHAIRMAN LAWSON: So that’s not accurate.
So enrollment is stable.
But we want to see the performance of the school improve. And I know that starts with the dean situation and then from there, you know, that person has to, you know, do their assessment and then start to share with you and the president around where they want it to go.

But we keep it -- we want to keep it on the forefront because it's a valuable resource to the University.

For those of you that know the history and how we lost it and how we were able to regain it, but it had to be outside of Tallahassee. That was the agreement that was struck.

So it's a valuable, valuable asset for us to have that professional --

TRUSTEE LAWRENCE: You mentioned the territory we're in, Orlando. I'm certainly aware of the history, but what's the current challenge there and the territory?

CHAIRMAN LAWSON: The large number of economic development going on around the law school, some percentage divides Central Florida and Valencia. It's just the situation where, you know, they're having law-related programs literally in our back door.
MR. ROBINSON: Yeah, so UCF has a downtown campus now just, I mean, you can walk within 10 minutes.

TRUSTEE LAWRENCE: But Orlando is a given, as far as we know, and will be a given, as far as we know, in terms of location, right?

CHAIRMAN LAWSON: Well, yes and no. Like there's always this issue of duplication of state resources in the same city.

MR. ROBINSON: It was mandated in that the law school be somewhere on the I-4 corridor.

And there are several cities, including this one that --

TRUSTEE LAWRENCE: What law schools fit in the I-4 four corridor? Barry has a law school there.

MR. ROBINSON: It was -- it had to be -- my understanding is that it was --

TRUSTEE LAWRENCE: Well, what else is in that corridor?

TRUSTEE MARCIETTE: Stetson.

TRUSTEE MILLS: So to be clear, this really should be looked at -- I get the concept that there's potential competition for him, potentially is that where you're headed?
But UCF doesn't have a law school, right?
So to be more clear, this is really more about our ability to take advantage of the opportunity that's there, right?
They're bringing infrastructure, resources and talent pools. And what we need to do is execute and step up to actually take advantage of the opportunity.
We've been invited to the table many, many times with zero follow-up. And so, yes, we're starting to kind of get a bad reputation. Like, you keep coming to the party and never bringing a gift.
So we've got to change that around. And if we do that, that opportunity still exists.
We should be thinking positively about all the infrastructure -- all the stuff that's being built around.

CHAIRMAN LAWSON: We need to understand -- you know, how do we take advantage of those opportunities, you know. And maybe there needs to be a catalyst for that, as well. I know you've had some discussions, but I think the question is, how do we and what role can we play in that development.
Because, you know, I just -- you know, for me, I think it is a huge asset for us to have. And I think that we own the responsibility for making sure that it flourishes, right. And so I think the question is, how do we take advantage of those opportunities. We clearly know, you know, the dean search is out there. So getting that person in place and having him or her, you know, establish their priorities. But it's one of those things where, you know, we want it to be strong. You know, it's not -- it's not in Tallahassee. It's in Orlando, but we want it to be strong and flourish.

TRUSTEE DORTCH: Leadership is everything. You look at how North Carolina is sitting, it's flourished in its law school. There are Maynard Chaps in the world who graduated from them, Thurgood Marshall, Howard, Southern University Law School that's strong. I think leadership has got to be first and foremost. You've got to have top leadership at the top in terms of the dean and the faculty because you've got also people who are going to draw
individuals to the school.

And I think that's -- we've had a long gap in that for a long time. So that's got to be a priority.

But when you look at the engineering school we had that we kind of quasi-have. Then you look at the pharmacy school and the school of business. We've got all of the makings to be one of the best universities in the world.

We've got all the components that we talk about how do we feel, but it's got to be excellence in terms of leadership in all those. And I know the president is trying to move on that, but that becomes the single most important factor to really move.

CHAIRMAN LAWSON: I agree, Tom. And I think the other thing we need to look at, too, is what infrastructure are we bringing to them from Tallahassee?

You know, so fundraising is an example.

Where do they fit into our fundraising strategy? Do they fit into our fundraising strategy?

You know, so I think it's -- you know, it's not about them not being part of FAMU.
But how do we more ingratiate them? How do we more engrain them?

And in Dr. Friday-Stroud's fundraising strategy there's a component for the law school and there's a -- I don't know if there's a fundraiser for the law school or not, but they fit into that.

In recruiting through Hudson, there's a connectivity point to the law school as you're out, you know, looking at students and we run into, you know, this graduate student and another person that may be a good candidate.

Are we, you know, cross-following people. The answer might be yes. But I just think, as my wheels start to turn on, you know, we want them to be better, but we also have to invest in them and make sure we're connected with them to be better and then leverage these little opportunities.

So it's more, I think, of an opportunistic discussion around, you know, this is a prize-possession of hires. How do we make it better. You know, I mean, first we talk about licensure passage rates and how we -- what programs do they need in place to rise to that
goal, et cetera.

So start there and then fundraising, other things. How do we continue to drive this engine, you know, that we have?

TRUSTEE WOODY: Well, I think Trustee Mills is the leader in that whole development concept with downtown in Orlando.

My concern is that when Trustee Perry and I went down there just concern -- and this is for when we get -- we select someone to be the dean there, they have to be aggressive.

Aggressiveness and get involved in the community process.

Because we've got, just like you said, you've got Valencia. You have UCF right around us. And they came -- on the date that we had the meeting down there, the subcommittee that -- the committee that you put Trustee Perry and I in on, they came and gave a personal, I think because of Trustee Mills, a personal plea for us to get involved in the process. And I'm not so sure that we followed up on that.

TRUSTEE DORTCH: Georgia State University started its law school I guess now maybe 10 or
15 -- 15 years ago.

But the University of Georgia, Emory and Mercer were the standard there. University of Georgia blew everything. And then Georgia State came in and within a decade had the highest passing rate of every graduate of the law school and outperformed all three of those schools and been there for decades.

So it's also the amount of studying and success. How did they do that? How did they go to that point?

And then you take Albany State. Albany State started a nursing program. Their students pass with the highest rate passing in the nursing exams of all the schools that had nursing programs, that included Emory and all this.

So you look at success, but in the law school case how did Georgia State do that? I mean, you've got to ask yourself and have those conversations. And Georgia didn't even want them to have it. Emory didn't want them to have it.

CHAIRMAN LAWSON: I think this is a great dialogue, but I think this could also be like
we were talking earlier like, you know, a
couple marquee programs you want to be known
for. You know, law could become one of those,
right?

So I threw it on there as a thought
provoking topic but I think it's one that we
need to get our arms wrapped around how we do
it. You know, I know probably right now it's
not a lot to be done until the leadership comes
on board. But I think we need to have some,
you know, real solid dialogue around what do we
want to be when we grow up, right? How do we
get there? What are all the connecting points.

I even think about but -- you know, and
I'm not a lawyer but, you know, the internships
and clerkships in the community, how strong is
our reputation as we send our students out into
the community? I don't know.

TRUSTEE CAVAZOS: Well, it's very strong
in terms of the -- field case manager,
externships and our students are getting some
great jobs right now. Because I can talk about
there's 2000 19/20 graduates, most of them have
some type of legal job.

And so we are strategically located for
that reason, even though they're building
around us, we shouldn't be afraid of who's
coming in, because that could be another fear
to the law school of getting top students.
I've been at the table with them a number
of times and it never went anywhere because,
you know, leadership.
So that's very key in where we're going in
the dialogue that we've had. But I let the
legal clinic programming for things that we
wanted to do, it never manifested because of
money. They couldn't do matching grants or
whatever it was.
And we need someone who is not afraid to
take that step. And, of course, the support of
the University in terms of matching grants
because of it. We could have gone in a lot
further in terms of community connections and
it just wasn't.

CHAIRMAN LAWSON: So I just think, you
know, just the message is, I think, from this
board, and this is a nonvoting issue, but I
think clearly we have an interest in elevating
the stature of the school and programming in
that market.
And I know it sounds like we're getting pressed for time, but I wanted to dive into fundraising for a second, if I could. Just because it's such an important monster for what we do.

For me, one of the challenges for fundraising has been, I was confused over who was doing what for what. And what I mean by that is, you know, there's the athletic thing, there's capital campaign for FAMU rising, there's NAA, save our students.

So what I asked Dr. Friday-Stroud for was just some clarity around who's doing what for a particular initiative, so that if a person wants to give a dollar to science-related activity, they know where to go. If they want to give a dollar to athletics, they know where to go. If they want to give a dollar to student scholarship, they know where to go. I feel like she made some progress there, probably a little more work to be done.

But I just think that all of us kind of agree. And it's hard to put it into words, but our brand is stronger than the resource pool we're bringing in, for lack of a better term.
So how do you -- how do you harness that brand power to bring in more dollars, private, corporate, foundations, et cetera? I'm not a fundraiser. I don't know the answer. But I think we need some more time diving into that opportunity.

Dave has always said to me -- you know, I tell Dave, Dave, we just brought in X millions of dollars. He'll say to me quietly over the phone, so. It's not that much.

So I think that we need to really look at -- and granted, we're fortunate to have the 135 million in the endowment. That's a great thing. But how do we bring in more given the footprint, the cache of the brand FAMU? How do we leverage that to bring in more dollars? I don't know the answer to it, but definitely want to spend some time on it.

TRUSTEE WOODY: I was sitting at my desk one day, and I was just counting up -- but I went to my home computer and looked up stars and things and persons that graduated from FAMU. There was over 60 people still living. And for the life of me, I can't understand --

and this is not being critical -- but for the
life of me I can't understand why we have not 
reached out, and from their standpoint since we 
love FAMU, that they're not giving more towards 
the institution.

MR. ROBINSON: I guarantee there's not a 
matter that I haven't reached out.

TRUSTEE WOODY: Okay. Good.

MR. ROBINSON: We have a very exhaustive 
list and we've prioritized people that we've 
reached out to. There are a set rules 
prohibiting those and at the level that they 
could do is where the challenge is. It's one 
of the questions we had --

TRUSTEE MILLS: You have to speak up.

Sorry.

MR. ROBINSON: You know, he's had two or 
three maybe -- President Howard had 
four percent of allotment.

Ours, you know, we are approaching that 
level and, you know, we don't miss anybody. In 
particular, we don't miss those persons that we 
know how to passionately give millions of 
dollars. So that's what I focus on primarily.

Those are the individuals that I focus on.

We could -- you know, we've got to talk or
put a proposal in front of all them and market
some of them.

But I do think that, you know, for the
ones who give, they give. But it's the same
ones year in and year out and we're kind of
wearing them down. We have to expand in that.

But I will say this, though, there are a
lot of other sources of revenue of sources and
funds and gifts outside of the alumni. But I
think if we're really going to turn giving
around with FAMU, we're going to have to leave
it within our own ranks.

And so we can be exempt on ourselves.
Alumni giving -- I'll tell you, when I go to
one of these foundations outside of the
university friends, the first question I get is
what are you doing. You know, they want to
know. And, in particular, the foundation.

I have good news to share with them on all
this. But then they know that the numbers
don't add up to exactly 125 endowment FAMU for
an institution with 70 to 80,000 graduates.
The other misconception is that although,
you know, a lot of institutions receive monies
from corporate entities, et cetera, it's a lot
of who's working those channels, too. They're
the ones working and making that happen, too.
And so it's the right giving and using an
influence where they were and then a sphere in
which to penetrate those.
You know, we want to know who you know.
And we've worked with Dave to get his -- you
know, he's invested in a lot of those
leadership people. And we need you to open up
your Rolodex, too.
But the misconception is is that somebody
else is going to fall out of the sky and take
care of FAMU. We need to leave no stone
unturned. And that's the best question, are we
doing our part?
TRUSTEE MILLS: Have we ever done
independent studies of why people don't give?
So of the 90 percent of people who don't give,
do we understand why not?
MR. ROBINSON: Yes. That seems to be, you
know, two major issues. The primary one that I
keep hearing within our ranks, is I had a bad
experience in financial aid. You know, the
shower didn't work in the dormitory. You know,
I know I should have gotten an A out of the
class and I got a C.

And what we try to tell people is that, in spite of all of that your degree from FAMU got you here or there. So the primary answer from what we've seen is people not associating some bad experiences with the justification for not giving.

On the other hand, I believe --

TRUSTEE MILLS: And do you have that report that we could see, or that research that we can see?

MR. ROBINSON: I'll look it up. But I want to know, Trustee Mills, is that there's a -- there's a lack of appreciation for the whole idea of giving back.

When you've been a recipient of so much, maybe the culture hasn't been engrained in you to give, except for at the church, right.

You think you've done your part. You're in this or that organization and you've given. But this idea of, you know, you've given until you're numb, hasn't been engrained in some.

TRUSTEE MILLS: Yeah, you hear that a lot with international students, but I've actually never heard that among Americans. But that's
interesting -- an interesting concept.

TRUSTEE LAWRENCE: One, in my view, has so much to do with relationships. People give to people. We need to work harder in that area.

As a graduate of the University of Florida where there's a $3 billion campaign going on now. And I don't have any expectations of that sort. But $11 million is significantly less than we can do.

The extraordinary thing that FAMU has that I did not realize until I went on the board three years ago, the loyalty to this school is stunning, more so than the University of Florida, I can promise you. And people do love being gators and so forth.

But I learned from people all the time in South Florida. They went to FAMU. It is a highlight of their whole lives. And there have got to be those people who are going to give us more or give us something.

There are also people that are, in my view, who are outside the African-American and black communities, who, if told the story and heard it and cultivated it over a period of time would love to see this school succeed in
big ways. But we have to start thinking bigger
in order to make that happen.

CHAIRMAN LAWSON: I agree. That's good.

Thank you.

So ladies and gentlemen, this has been,

you know, in my mind a very productive morning

session. I do want to thank the staff for

organizing it and I want to thank our

facilitators. I want to thank the president

and the board for providing commentary input as

we walked through the review, as well as the

board assessment.

At this point what we'd like to do is

transition to the next phase, which is a trip

to Brooksville. It's not required. If you

don't feel like riding the bus, please, you

know, stay back. But please join us for dinner

at 6:30.

There's room on the bus for staff, if you

would like to join us for the ride out to

Brooksville. If not, please stay back, get

work done. But please join us for dinner at

6:30 at Jackson's.

Linda, Jackson's is the name of the

restaurant? It's right next door.
MRS. BARGE-MILES: Yeah, when you come back you just walk right next door.
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