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CHAIR CRIDER: Okay. Good afternoon. I would like to call the meeting to order. Dr. Lyons will be back in just a second.

Ms. Franklin, can you call the roll, please.

MS. FRANKLIN  Yes.

Mr. Askew.

(No response.)

MS. FRANKLIN  Mr. Bell.

(No response.)

MS. FRANKLIN  Ms. Castillo.

(No response.)

MS. FRANKLIN  Dr. Crider.

CHAIR CRIDER: Present.

MS. FRANKLIN  Dr. Curry.

TRUSTEE CURRY: Present.

MS. FRANKLIN  Mr. Dyke.

TRUSTEE DYKE: Present.

MS. FRANKLIN  Mr. Felton.
(No response.)

MS. FRANKLIN Mr. Isaacs.

TRUSTEE ISAACS: Present.

MS. FRANKLIN Dr. Lemus.

DR. LEMUS: Present.

MS. FRANKLIN Okay.

Dr. Lyons.

PRESIDENT LYONS: Here.

MS. FRANKLIN General Schwartz.

(No response.)

MS. FRANKLIN Mr. Shelton.

TRUSTEE SHELTON: Here.

MS. FRANKLIN Ms. Thompson.

TRUSTEE THOMPSON: Here.

MS. FRANKLIN Mr. Vradenburg.

TRUSTEE VRADENBURG: Here.

MS. FRANKLIN Madam Chair, you do have a quorum.

CHAIR CRIDER: Okay. Thank you.

Okay. The first item on the agenda is Resolution on the Approval of Masters of Arts Degree and Adult Education.
Dr. Curry.

TRUSTEE CURRY: All right. Coming from the Academic Affairs Committee, we now have time to discuss the approval of Master of Art's degree.

TRUSTEE CURRY: And I will just read, rather than going through all of the "Whereas's," I think we know enough about this.

I will just read this. And it says, "Now, therefor, be it resolved that the University of the District of Columbia is hereby authorized to implement the Master's of Art's in Adult Education Degree Program in accordance with the attached proposal, provided that funds required to implement the program shall not be obligated until they have been identified and reprogrammed with the existing university resources."

Madam Chair, having gone through all of this and just looking at the "Whereas's" and the "Therefor's," I move that
we approve the Master of Art's Degree and
Adult Education Programs.

TRUSTEE ASKEW: Second.

CHAIR CRIDER: It has been moved
and seconded. Any discussion?

(No response.)

CHAIR CRIDER: Hearing no
discussion, all in favor of the motion, vote
"Aye."

(Ayes.)

CHAIR CRIDER: Any opposed?

(No response.)

CHAIR CRIDER: Abstention?

(No response.)

CHAIR CRIDER: The motion carries.
The next item on the agenda -- and
thank you for that. That was one actually,
that we were to have done --

TRUSTEE SHELTON: Last time.

CHAIR CRIDER: -- at the last
meeting, and -- and in our zest to be
finished, I think we skipped that, so we took
care of that this time and I thank you for
excusing our oversight from the last meeting.

The next item on the agenda is the
couple of resolutions related to the strategic
plan, and we have termination of academic
programs and then the approval of the Vision
2020 Plan.

So, I guess we go to -- I think
what I am -- what I would rather do is to go
through the strategic plan, any -- and then
approve the plan and then the academic
programs, unless you have an issue.

Is there some reason that you want
to -- the approval of the academic programs
first?

PRESIDENT LYONS: Thank you, Madam
Chair.

The -- when you terminate academic
programs there should be a record of that so
that it can be communicated to the middle
states as necessary and the U.S. Department of
Ed, if necessary, so that is why specific
action needs to be taken on those programs.

CHAIR CRIDER: Okay. And I could do that --

VICE-CHAIR BELL: So I am just -- because I do agree that we need a specific action, but is there a reason why you want that first before we approve the plan, or do we --

PRESIDENT LYONS: I guess if you want to approve or delete those programs and they are not a part of the plan that you are voting on. But, don't worry about it. Let's --

CHAIR CRIDER: Okay. All right.

PRESIDENT LYONS: Thank you.

CHAIR CRIDER: Okay. What I would like to do is go through the -- the strategic plan and specifically, after our last meeting there were some actions that we asked for, specific to some of the things that we saw in the strategic plan.

So, I would like to do that first,
and then go for the approval of the plan and then the termination of the programs, since the termination of the programs are included as part of the plan.

Okay. So -- and what we are not attempting to do today is to go back and revisit everything that we have already approved.

So, the only discussion that we should have today would be on those items where we ask the administration to either make revisions or provide us with additional information.

And, in terms of that, we had -- I think we asked for additional information on the Master's of Special Education.

PRESIDENT LYONS: Bachelor's.

CHAIR CRIDER: Was it the Master's or the Bachelor's?

PRESIDENT LYONS: The Bachelor's.

VICE-CHAIR BELL: The Bachelor's.

CHAIR CRIDER: The Bachelor's of
Special Education. Okay.

And we wanted to have more information relative to the questions that Trustees raised.

PRESIDENT LYONS: Where is the provost? Step up to the mic, Provost.

CHAIR CRIDER: Good afternoon, Dr. Petty.

PRESIDENT LYONS: They sought more information. When we left the meeting there was a --

CHAIR CRIDER: Oh. And we transmitted to you a piece on the undergraduate special education program. I am glad to answer questions about it if you have any.

TRUSTEE ASKEW: Madam Chair, if I may.

I don't really -- I don't really have any specific questions. What I do want to -- what I do want to say is I do want to thank you, Dr. Lyons, and also thank you, Dr.
Petty, and everybody else that was involved in
getting us the data.

We were able to get data not only
from the administrators at the institution,
but we are also able to get some data from the
people who actually teach the courses, and who
are also seeking additional resources from the
university for special education.

And the information that, at least
I had an opportunity to take a look at, one of
which was an independent study related to
whether or not there was relevancy to the
special education program.

And I think, from looking at that
information, there certainly was a compelling
case, and even a conclusion that special
education was important here in the District
of Columbia and it was also, you know, aligned
with where I believe the Mayor is trying to
focus on some of his attention.

The other piece from the
administration obviously was very, very
helpful, as well, and so I think, based upon that, that I assume the administration came to the conclusion that retaining a special education undergraduate degree program was appropriate.

I also understand that Dr. Petty, you have released a hold on, I guess, admission into the special education program and that the administration at least is looking -- some of the faculty members who are involved in seeking grants and stuff are looking forward to building a student base that supports what they believe to be -- and what some of us believe to be a demand for it. So, again, I don't really have any questions.

DR. PETTY: Well, I think you probably have a misunderstanding, though.

TRUSTEE ASKEW: Okay.

DR. PETTY: The administration position is that what I did on the last Board meeting was, I removed a hold from any program
that the Board had not specifically voted to terminate.

I felt that that -- there has been so much emotion associated with that, I felt that was the appropriate thing to do.

The university continues to recommend that the undergraduate degree in special education be terminated based upon a failure to attract students.

We don't deny that there is not a need for it. But, there are a need for lots of things that the university cannot afford to offer because of student enrollment, and we have cut other programs based upon student enrollment.

So, our position is that that program should be terminated. The programs that were reopened included elementary education, which you did vote last time to reinstate.

But, I did it for all of the programs that were actually closed temporarily
by former Provost Baxter in order to really clear that issue.

And so, I didn't take action to terminate the programs for you voted for, either, because, as Dr. Lyons pointed out, to close admission to a program or to terminate a program, we need a signed Board resolution. And so, I was respecting the rules.

TRUSTEE ASKEW: So, I guess it is just articulated a little bit differently than what you just articulated.

DR. PETTY: Yes.

TRUSTEE ASKEW: The entire strategic 2020 plan on this. My assumption, after reading all the information was that the recommendation -- and I assumed it was coming from the administration, is that we retain this, because it was on the list.

So, I don't want -- I don't want to get into a debate of whether it is or not, but at least my understanding of what is included in this document on several different
pages is that the Bachelor's degree in special education is one of the program offerings that we will continue to offer, and that the Master's program, at least from a number of these pages is that we are eliminating despite -- I know that there are some who would like to see that retained, and that there is an opportunity.

So, not trying to revisit that.

DR. PETTY: Yes.

TRUSTEE ASKEW: I am just trying to make sure that what I read is -- because she just said something different than what I read last night.

And, if what I read is true, then I don't really have any other questions. But, if it is not --

DR. PETTY: Okay.

TRUSTEE ASKEW: -- then it creates some level of confusion, at least for me.

CHAIR CRIDER: Okay. So, what I thought -- what I though I heard, Dr. Petty,
was that with respect to the programs that the Board last -- at the last -- or the November Board meeting, the Board approved elimination of 17 programs.

DR. PETTY: Exactly.

CHAIR CRIDER: And so the program, this program that we are discussing was not included in that elimination.

And so, you are not bringing that program back, or asking right now for us to consider elimination of that program. It may be something that is revisited at another time, but right now, is off the table.

Is that -- is that what I am hearing?

DR. PETTY: I --

CHAIR CRIDER: Or is that not what I am hearing?

DR. PETTY: What I am -- what my position is, and that of the dean -- I am afraid the dean is not here yet, is it simply had not been acted on by you, so we kept it on
the list of currently-offered programs.

Do you see what I am saying?

CHAIR CRIDER: Yes.

DR. PETTY: Because you did not
take action, we couldn't put it on a list of
terminated programs.

CHAIR CRIDER: Right.

DR. PETTY: It is still before
you.

CHAIR CRIDER: Okay. Okay.

MR. ROGERS: Madam Chair.

CHAIR CRIDER: Yes.

MR. ROGERS: Michael Rogers. And
we are not -- you are right. It is not on the
agenda tonight.

CHAIR CRIDER: Right.

MR. ROGERS: Because there was
information you requested, information you
received.

I met with the Dean, Dean Massey,
about where we are at this point. And there
is continuing discussion. I don't think that
if -- following the lead of my colleague Provost, she says that her recommendation, in spite of, you know, what has been written, is still that it be eliminated, but that is not before you would like to get another shot at that.

CHAIR CRIDER: Okay. Okay.

MR. ROGERS: We wanted to --

VICE-CHAIR BELL: So, I am sorry. When you say "continuing discussion," you --

CHAIR CRIDER: Yes, sir.

VICE-CHAIR BELL: I just don't know what that means. Does it mean within the department, though --

MR. ROGERS: Well, within the department. Between the Provost and the dean --

VICE-CHAIR BELL: Okay.

MR. ROGERS: -- and the administration.

CHAIR CRIDER: Okay. I just wanted -- right. So --
TRUSTEE ASKEW: I just want to make sure that this program gets a fair chance. All right? Because, as my understanding -- I mean, it is my understanding that -- and again, it may have been some kind of hold, it maybe wasn't terminated before, but there was a hold on getting people --

I just want to make sure, if we will retain it -- to me, I thought the programs that were retained -- you know, and I know that people have varying opinions, and we have gotten data that says one thing, and other data that says something different.

But, I do want to make sure that the programs that we are retaining, that we are investing like we need to to ensure if they are successful.

If this is proving that special education is not, you know, is not going to work, then I am worried about that, because a -- what I would like to see that is, now what
we are starting to admit people into the program, you know, it really is up to the faculty and staff to do what we expect that they would do to ensure that this program is successful.

And, if it is not, then, just like any other program, as I think some other trustees have said, that it will be back up for administrative review as well as Board review, for termination.

But I do hopefully -- you know, now that we have made the decision we are moving forward and not trying to --

MR. ROGERS: I think we will be back here in March.

TRUSTEE ASKEW: Okay.

MR. ROGERS: And I don't think much will happen between now and March in terms of the status of this particular program.

TRUSTEE ASKEW: Okay.

MR. ROGERS: In terms of
presentation, after discussion between -- with the dean, personally, we are unsettled. You know, it is not -- we are not of one mind yet.

TRUSTEE ASKEW: Okay.

MR. ROGERS: Admittedly. So, we are coming back to you when we are of one mind so that you will be -- have clear guidance in terms of what we are recommending.

CHAIR CRIDER: Okay. I think essentially, our action for tonight relates to the 17 programs that we have already approved. We are not introducing or looking to eliminate any additional or take any additional actions on academic programs.

We ask for more information. We got the more information, but we are not adding that to the -- to the list.

PRESIDENT LYONS: And there is no vendetta. We are not out to prove that programs won't work and we are going to beat you up and prove that. I mean, that is not what it is about.
CHAIR CRIDER: Okay.

PRESIDENT LYONS: But I am glad you said that.

MR. ROGERS: Right.

CHAIR CRIDER: Okay. The second area where the Board wanted more information with respect to the plan was on the administration's recommendation to eliminate intercollegiate athletics.

We voted to defer the elimination pending presentation of alternatives by administration. Is that something you were prepared to discuss tonight?

PRESIDENT LYONS: Yes. We did send you a proposal which included a number of options in terms of facilities and opportunities for fund-raising.

We -- it included the increase of student fees, so we presented this to you to kind of fill that hole that recommendation.

CHAIR CRIDER: Okay. So, basically, the request to eliminate athletics
is off the table. You guys have proposed, within the plan, alternatives to that and --

PRESIDENT LYONS: Well, following -- it was clear to us that the Board was
directing us to look for other ways to come up with the resources that we would have reprogram from athletics.

CHAIR CRIDER: Okay.

PRESIDENT LYONS: And that is what we did.

CHAIR CRIDER: Okay. Are there any questions or discussion relative to the athletics issue as it is presented in the plan tonight?

TRUSTEE SHELTON: I am glad to see that there was no significant change. I think the --

I will say it on the mic. I thank the administration and the team for keeping the athletic program alive, and I think that the athletic department will work within the guidelines that have been suggested in the
plan.

CHAIR CRIDER: Okay. Trustee Dyke.

TRUSTEE DYKE: I just want to make sure I understand. So, what you are saying is that you will go back and look at these various options and take those steps to come up with the --

PRESIDENT LYONS: We have already looked at our options, yes.

TRUSTEE DYKE: I know, but my point is -- but you had a lot of different options on it. My question is --

PRESIDENT LYONS: But then we did. We had a number of options and then we made some specific recommendations.

TRUSTEE DYKE: Okay.

PRESIDENT LYONS: And we will go through those. Where fee increases are involved we will have to, of course, come back to the Board.

And I do want to make a point that
I made at our meeting yesterday, is you -- because we are proposing fee -- a number of fee increases, and we are aware and mindful of the financial status of our students.

So, what we did was to look at the proposed no fees and go back and look at expected family income and came up with an idea as to how much money from the new fees we would have to roll back into scholarship and student financial aid, because we don't want to increase the fees and lose 300 students because they are not able to pay.

So, we have figured out pretty much what we would need. And the private institutions call that a discount rate kind of thing, but we figured out approximately how much money we would need to try and cover that hole.

CHAIR CRIDER: Trustee Vradenburg.

TRUSTEE VRADENBURG: I just have a few questions about -- I take it the recommendations are on page 12, 13 and 14 of
the mail -- your letter to us or your memorandum to us.

The first recommendation is bringing forward cost savings from academic program eliminations, and you estimate an additional $2.7 million over six years in savings as a consequence of being able to do that.

But there is a cost, obviously, to bringing those costs forward, and that is the cost of buying out 75 percent of the personnel affected by the elimination.

But you don't identify -- and you say that there are two possible sources of the cost of buying those people out. One is D.C. Council, and the other is to take it out of our fund balance, but you don't identify how much it is going to cost to buy out that first year of program elimination.

CHAIR CRIDER: I had the same question.

PRESIDENT LYONS: You have the
same question?

CHAIR CRIDER: Yes.

PRESIDENT LYONS: Michael, do you have those dollars? Because, you are right. Those are the two options for --

TRUSTEE VRAENBURG: That is the first question.

PRESIDENT LYONS: -- funding the buy-out. Right.

MR. ROGERS: It is in the neighborhood of three to three and a half million dollars that we are looking to -- that we estimate the buy-out would -- would cost us, based on the program eliminations that you have identified -- that have been identified.

TRUSTEE VRAENBURG: So you are expending three to three and a half million dollars in order to save $2.7 million?

MR. ROGERS: This is in the first -- in the first year --

TRUSTEE VRAENBURG: Right.

MR. ROGERS: -- what we are doing
is that, if we are unable to get support for
the buy-out, we will defer some of the
approved investments into '16.

The buy-out is a one-time expense.

So, if we do it in '15, if we are forced to do
it in '15 we will have those dollars available
to roll forward into '16 and to continue the
investment in the plan.

TRUSTEE VRADENBURG: Still not
understanding this, because the proposal, the
recommendations before us are that we buy
these out so that, in fact, we begin to
realize the savings in fiscal '15.

And, by doing that, and beginning
to realize those savings in fiscal '15 --

MR. ROGERS: Right.

TRUSTEE VRADENBURG: -- we save
$2.7 million. But it is going to cost us $3
million.

MR. ROGERS: Well, yes. The
investments that we are -- excuse me. If we
-- we ask that we use the fund balance in '14
so that we can buy out now and have the $3.6 million available for -- for '15, that is what we would -- because, if we do it now, using the fund balance, that is one approach.

If we can't do it now and we have to use '15 money to do it, then we have less to invest in the approved strategic plan investments in that year.

TRUSTEE VRADENBURG: Got the point, but I just don't get the arithmetic, because you are saying in this recommendation, on the top of page 13 you are going to generate $2.7 million in savings and you are saying it is going to cost us $3 million to three and a half million dollars to do that.

MR. ROGERS: That is the --

TRUSTEE VRADENBURG: I am still not understanding the arithmetic.

MR. ROGERS: Patrick, do you got that number? Let's see here.

(Off-mic comments.)

MR. ROGERS: Right. Okay. Well,
that is right, because the -- we will generate
the cost savings from the academic
eliminations. That is what it has come down
to.

When we started this discussion it
was much higher than that, but we approved --
we approved 17 programs and not 23, so to
reduce the amount available to -- from the
savings.

Now we are coming back and saying
we still have this obligation for the faculty
that would be affected by the reduction in
force as a result of the elimination.

That estimated cost is $3. -- say,
$5 million, thereabouts, general ballpark.
That is a cost.

The savings from the academic
program is $2.7, and so that is a savings.
So, yes, we have to spend -- if you -- if you
cut it that way, in that particular year we
have to spend that amount of money in order to
save the $2.7 million. That is the way the
arithmetic works out.

And then, the rest of it for the
plan is generated from the fee increases, the
tuition increases and the fee increases.

TRUSTEE VRADENBURG: That is also
another issue. That is another set of
questions.

MR. ROGERS: Okay.

TRUSTEE VRADENBURG: Where do you
get, from the three to three and a half
million dollars, either out of our fund
balance, or going to go to the D.C. Council.

MR. ROGERS: That is correct.

TRUSTEE VRADENBURG: And what is
the prospect of getting three to three and a
half million from the D.C. Government?

MR. ROGERS: We -- we start our
performance hearings this week or next week,
and we will have discussions and see where it
goes, but we present the --

CHAIR CRIDER: Excuse me.

MR. ROGERS: -- two alternatives.
CHAIR CRIDER: Excuse me. We need to table the specific discussion around dollar amounts right now with respect to any buy-out's, in particular because of some of the collective bargaining unit negotiations that are going on.

So, we can do it in closed session or talk about it at a later time.

TRUSTEE VRADENBURG: Okay. How much is in the fund balance now?

MR. ROGERS: Where is the CFO? I think, from our prior discussions, there are about eight. No, there are about four.

There was a larger number, but there are commitments made, again, some of which are related to collective bargaining and other activities, but there was a larger number, and some of you may have heard a larger number tossed about, but it is not clear and unencumbered.

TRUSTEE VRADENBURG: So, essentially, we would consume the fund
balance.

PRESIDENT LYONS: If we had to take --

TRUSTEE VRADENBURG: Right.

PRESIDENT LYONS: If we took that much out of it.

TRUSTEE VRADENBURG: Right.

PRESIDENT LYONS: The idea, without getting into violating what the Chair said, the idea is to try -- the buy-out idea is to try to move the strategic planning agenda head as quickly as we can.

We want it to be a meaningful document and if we were able to do that, then we could start the reinvestments early and move the plan.

We do not want to be in a situation where we have a beautiful living document, but no resources available to move that agenda.

TRUSTEE VRADENBURG: I understand the rationale, but the arithmetic, to me,
seems suicidal. So, I will take the specific
to take your admonition, Madam Chair.

My next question is on the
established revenue expectations for
intercollegiate athletics.

You are going to ask them to
generate twice the revenues in fiscal '15 that
they did -- or are doing in fiscal '14,
realistic. Or, is that just a number pulled
out of the hat?

Is there a plan behind that on how
to double the revenues from the
intercollegiate sports program?

PRESIDENT LYONS: No, it is
realistic. We talked about additional support
from athletic boosters and, of course, we have
made a pitch as recently as last weekend to
try to encourage that to happen, and we talked
about other revenues in the facility that --
that things that could be done in the athletic
facility, itself, in terms of rentals, ticket
sales, concessions, et cetera. So, we think
that number is realistic.

TRUSTEE VRADENBURG: And, at the
same time, reducing athletic, intercollegiate
athletic costs by $500,000.

PRESIDENT LYONS: Correct.

CHAIR CRIDER: Along those same
lines, I had a similar question in terms of
are there either infrastructure or some
additional investments that you all would have
to make in order to achieve this twice, you
know, as much revenue than what you have now?

You know, you are going to have
more people or, you know, how are you going to
specifically get to that?

I mean, I see you smiling --

MR. ROGERS: Yes.

CHAIR CRIDER: -- but I don't know
what that means.

MR. ROGERS: What that means is,
yes, we hope so. I mean, there are -- I think
the director of athletics would agree that we
all hope for more attendance at all of the
athletic activities, and we have got to put some effort in that to support the athletic program, both in terms of marketing and special -- special initiatives to draw people there, and that is where the extra revenue comes from.

CHAIR CRIDER: So, where are the cost of that, those activities in here? Are they in here?

MR. ROGERS: Generally, we are launching a marketing program now as a part of the enrollment plan and so we will be able to help them with some of this new branding that we are doing, both for external and internal communications. So, we will be able to help them do that, yes.

It is not -- you know, we haven't set aside specific dollars for that initiative. I think that using existing internal resources plus the marketing contract that we have with providing -- allow us to provide support to -- to the athletic
department in building attendance at their --
at their games, and also working with them in
terms of seeking out sponsors for athletic,
you know, activities.

That is a part of it, too.

CHAIR CRIDER: Does this also
include freezing the number of athletic
programs that we have right now to their
current number so that there wouldn't be any
additional programs added in the next couple
of years?

MR. ROGERS: In the plan that we
have, we did not contemplate additional
programs. Certainly, no dollars have been set
aside but I think that -- that if there are
new programs that are warranted based on
activity, that is something that the athletic
director will discuss with the -- with the
president, and the president with the Board at
that point.

But, we had not -- we did not
develop this program -- this strategic plan
contemplating any additional athletic program.

PRESIDENT LYONS: Madam Chair,
every athletic director, including our own has
ideas for growth, and I would be disappointed
if she came to me and told me, "I am not
thinking about any new programs, ever."

We -- we have discussed some new
programs, not as a part of the strategic plan,
but general direction in terms of where the
program is going, how it might add to our
diversity issues in terms of sports, and I
indicated to her that we really need to sit
down and map out sort of a long-range plan for
intercollegiate athletics.

There is a concern and a need for
a couple of assistant coaches in lacrosse, but
once the athletic program gets to a certain
number of participants, and assistant coach as
appropriate, but -- but again, those dollars
and numbers are not included as a part of
this, and wouldn't change that.

And, of course, I would come back
to you with a proposal to start any new programs.

CHAIR CRIDER: Trustee Schwartz.

TRUSTEE SCHWARTZ: Mr. President, could you say if there is an ongoing plan to assess the current programs we have to make sure that it is effective and efficient and the monies that we are putting behind it is worth the while.

PRESIDENT LYONS: Yes. Yes. There is. That is why the athletic director and I are going to be sitting down, talking. In fact, she did propose some activities and things that she would like to do, moving forward with the program.

And, as I said before, we kind of look at things piecemeal. Let's sit down and talk about the total program, and we will do that, and that would involve looking at current programs as well.

TRUSTEE SCHWARTZ: And looking at the number of students we have participating
in each one of these sports to make sure that
there is a bang for the buck, if you will.

PRESIDENT LYONS: Correct.

CHAIR CRIDER: Trustee Askew.

TRUSTEE ASKEW: Thank you, Madam Chair.

First of all, let me just -- just echo some of the concerns or questions that were made that related to -- let me just echo some of the questions and concerns that were already articulated by some of my fellow Board Members, but I guess let me just first start off with, I certainly do appreciate the administration's and other's willingness and the time that it took to kind of go revisit this issue of athletics.

Now, as I said originally, I don't think that some of the -- the intangible things were really attributed to the value of an athletic program, the granting opportunities, the overall enhanced student experience, the opportunity to foster good
alumni who have pride like our fellow Trustee Jerome Shelton, who has demonstrated that if you keep, you know, his -- if you keep his colleagues who are fellow student and athletes engaged, what they can do to help raise the spirit of the institution, as well as just the value associated, when you look at the GPA's and the graduation rates.

And I don't necessarily think that, you know, that is truly captured in the overall value to what some of our student athletes actually bring.

However, you know, having said that, again, I do appreciate the number of options that were explored as a result of our -- out last Board meeting on this.

But, as much as I appreciate it, as has been pointed out, you know, the athletic program, you know, though it -- at least in this proposal will continue to exist, that there are some expectations that are being placed on students in the name of
athletics that certainly, at least raise some
questions, and maybe some concerns.

And I think, even your, Dr. Lyons,
has kind of pointed out that the way we are
going to do this is by increasing some fees
and, while at the same time, asking for them
to operate with less.

Which brings me to -- I mean, some
of the other options that were explored as a
way to either kind of balance the burden that
will be placed on students, overall, because
the student -- I guess the athletic fee will
be on all students full time, as well as part-
time that will be prorated based upon, I guess
how many credits they are carrying.

You know, I had mention, and what
is included in your options is, you know, some
of the facility situations, and I know that a
number of factors were -- were included in the
overall decision to -- in the recommendation,
but, you know, I -- it is hard to get past the
fact that we have a community college, 801
North Capitol Street that really is draining the institution.

And even from your own numbers, I mean, it is -- it is going to cost us about $5 million a year to maintain it over the next, I think, what, 13 years, and I think the number comes out to be about $65 million.

And at $65 million, to be quite frank -- frank with you, I just don't know how we overcome that maintaining the current plan and considering the recommendations that had been made today.

You do also say that, you know, if you set out different options for those, and you say if we were to move the community college to Bertie Backus, and back to the Van Ness Campus, that it would cost us $11 million.

And I understand that. But, in the long run, it would save us $54 million, which is a significant amount of money, and we could do a whole lot with that.
And again, I understand the $11 million up-front cost. And I also understand the politics associated with it.

But, in the end, I think, you know, as we talk about this whole governance thing and doing what is right for the institution and as we think about, you know, where we want to be in the future and associate that with our business statement, I -- I think we have got to find -- I think we are hard-pressed to stay in this situation as we are today.

All right. I mean, because even if you took you're a, option 2, option A-2 that is on page ten -- and again, these are just rough numbers based upon the information that you gave me, I mean, we would -- you know, we could still, you know, which basically is -- is that we occupy a part of the space and then we lease part of the space.

All right. And then you say that the up-front -- the cost of -- of this option

Neal R. Gross and Co., Inc.
202-234-4433
would be about $5.5 million.

And so, you know, if you -- if you -- you know, if you, you know, take, you know, half of the 65, because they have half of the space, you are at 32.5, then you take out the $5.5 million you are at $25 million worth of savings, which I think is a good sell.

I mean, because that way we are -- and again, this is my view, we are maintaining a precedent, and we are taking into consideration all factors, but we also are -- I believe we would be in a position of a leverage point.

I mean, you know, Government, if you want us to fully occupy this building, you have got to be a partner with us to do it.

I love 801 North Capitol Street from a location standpoint. I think it gives us great visibility, you know, and I understand that.

And -- but I also recognize, you know, as some of my fellow colleagues have
pointed out from a financial standpoint, we
have to be aware of all of these things, and
we have to be willing to explore every option
that is available to us, because the $27
million of savings, again, after the 5.5
investment to renovate parts of, I guess, Van
Ness or part of Bertie Backus to get it, where
you can get people, I think it releases some
of the burden from our students.

It could potentially relieve some
of the burden from our students because you --
when you look at -- I mean, a 20 percent
increase in an athletic fee that goes from, I
guess, $103 to $231, then you look at a $50
career services fee.

I mean, it just begins to -- to
accumulate while at the same time we are
indexing our tuition rate and a large part of
that is -- is going to help us in our future.

So, I would like to -- there are
other options that I would like to hear --
hear about as well that have been presented,
but we are not part of the recommendation.

But, I would like to understand

why --

PRESIDENT LYONS: May I respond to that?

Two things. We do have in our enhance request we are asking the City to pick up the increase in the lease amount for $801. That is in the current enhancement request for '15.

TRUSTEE ASKEW: Yes.

PRESIDENT LYONS: The bigger issue of 801 is the timing. We didn't include that because of the timing and, even if we had the money, what it would take by the time you go to Middle States, the U.S. Department of Education, the person who -- the owner of the building to get free from the lease, et cetera, et cetera, we just said that the timing would not be such that we would be free to put that money into 2015, 2016.

So, that -- that was the issue.
It couldn't happen quickly enough to be a benefit to the strategic planning, the first couple of years, and maybe even longer, given that most of what would have to be done is outside of our control.

The thing that would be controlled, of course, would be for the Board to direct us to do it. But then, virtually everything else depends on the action of others, and so that is why that wouldn't be a viable option for the strategic plan and back-filling.

TRUSTEE ASKEW: I appreciate that and I agree that the timing, you know, would take a little bit longer, but I also do believe, just as, you know, for some of our academic programming you have set out kind of 2014, kind of what -- you know, what the programs are in 2015, kind of looking forward to, you know, what we are going to do, HR program.

So, I mean, this is 2012 strategic
planning, and I don't -- I think there is
opportunity to incorporate in here some
transition from 801 or at least -- and it may
be -- and it may not hit until 2016, 2017, but
it will be before 2020, because I have seen us
get things done like that, and at least that
-- so, I want to be reasonable about it, but
I do think there is room to further explore
and incorporate what our plan is with 801
North Capitol Street, because I -- I really
wouldn't want the District to think that we
are going to -- you know, that we believe that
we can handle $65 million through -- it is
just -- and particularly when we have an --
you know, we can identify some space, you
know, on campus or at Bertie Backus.

CHAIR CRIDER: I think, Mr. Askew,
the point that you are raising is, you know,
probably one of the most critical and
important points that we have to consider over
the next, you know, several months and years.

And I just want to be real clear.
I don't know that we have ever been on the record with respect to the unfunded mandate that was the community college.

We are not fighting -- this is not a fight about whether we need a community college or not.

However, we incurred somewhere close to $8 million in unfunded expenses because of buildings that we had to get.

It is not saying those buildings aren't important, but nobody gave us any money for that. And so, having to go into our existing money that pretty much as been flat, to fund four sites, you know, is a lot of money.

And so, I think it is appropriate -- we are willing to keep it, if they are willing to give us the money to fund it. I think that is appropriate.

There is a note back in the financial section that specifically identifies that the -- the delta between our revenue and
expenditures is an $8 million deficit.

You know, and it -- you know,
sometimes I misread stuff, but I think I read that right. If that is true, then, you know, essentially, it is the cost of the buildings that is contributing to the deficit that we have.

And, unless we figure out a way to pay for those buildings -- and I do believe that -- that the City should be our partner in paying for those buildings. That is $8 million we agree -- I mean, Mr. -- Trustee Dyke was here.

We agreed to do the community college. We believe that the community college was the right thing to do.

I don't know at the time that you all anticipated when you voted to do that that you were going to add buildings to the tune of $8 million that quickly.

I don't know, because I wasn't on the Board at that time, but it is an $8
million expenditure that we have never been
reimbursed for.

And so, we have got to have this
discussion. It is an uncomfortable
discussion. It is certainly a discussion that
is not, you know, viewed favorably by the
administration probably before we get out of
this room good, somebody downtown will already
know that we had this discussion, you know,
because it is not something that they are in
favor of. So --

PRESIDENT LYONS: What does that
mean, Madam Chair?

CHAIR CRIDER: You know what I
mean.

PRESIDENT LYONS: I am kind of
slow, too.

CHAIR CRIDER: Yes, sometimes you
are.

PRESIDENT LYONS: I don't know
what it -- I don't always get stuff.

CHAIR CRIDER: Okay. You know
what I mean.

PRESIDENT LYONS: Well, let me -- seriously, now. The -- this isn't something that the administration is unfavorable about. I mean, you were --

CHAIR CRIDER: Moving out of 801?

PRESIDENT LYONS: That is correct. That is correct. The issue.

CHAIR CRIDER: I could have something here that is different. We actually have something on the record that is a little different than that.

PRESIDENT LYONS: Well, I don't think you have ever -- well --

CHAIR CRIDER: And then -- oh, wait. Let me be clear about administration.

PRESIDENT LYONS: Yes.

CHAIR CRIDER: I am not talking about you, "administration."

PRESIDENT LYONS: Oh. Praise the Lord, then.

CHAIR CRIDER: Yes. When I mean
"you," I will say "university."

PRESIDENT LYONS: Okay. All right. We are straight.

CHAIR CRIDER: Right.

PRESIDENT LYONS: Okay.

CHAIR CRIDER: No. Let's be clear that, you know, people want us to stay and have these presence -- and have the presence in the community, which we need to have.

I am not saying that. The issue is how do we pay for it.

PRESIDENT LYONS: Yes.

CHAIR CRIDER: We never got money to pay for any of these buildings, and I am willing to open up any buildings they want us to if they give us the money to do that.

So, if -- in your discussions with them, with all your friends and stuff downtown, get them to give us the money, and we don't have to have the discussion about moving out of 801 or anything else.

But -- but the fact that we are $8
million -- if I am reading this right, our deficit is $8 million and our expenditures and buildings specific to one -- one area is $8 million, I don't that is a coincidence. And some kind of way we have got to fix it. It has got to be balanced -- and I will say this and then I will move on. We can't continue to take that out of the main campus and the students at the main campus. And, for me, that is where the alphabetic issue resonated for me, was that the main campus gave up a lot. And one more thing coming from them just seemed unfair to me as we look at $8 million in buildings that were never funded. 

PRESIDENT LYONS: Absolutely. Yes.

CHAIR CRIDER: So, at some point we have to have a serious discussion. We will have to take a vote and we will have to swallow and, you know, we take the punish -- the punches as they come for us, but this is
an issue that we have to deal with.

We can't afford to continue to carry these buildings and -- and the maintenance. It is not just that we have the -- we are paying the maintenance costs for the buildings.

You know, there is something like a $60 million price tag just to bring P.R. Harris up to, you know, where it should be in terms of an inhabitable building.

You know, so I worry about whether we have some liability related to -- what happens if somebody gets hurt over there?

So, you know, I think those are all legitimate questions that we need to fix the building issue, and then we will just -- we will move on.

TRUSTEE ASKEW: And, Madam Chair, again, I mean, I absolutely agree with you. And, again, I hope that in between, respecting the timing piece of that, I do think that -- I mean, there are some opportunities, some
challenges today, but some potential opportunities within the next two to three years dealing with these facility issues that I hope will make its way, as this is an evolving document, as I understand.

CHAIR CRIDER: Yes.

TRUSTEE ASKEW: Into -- into this document, but I think the planning needs to start to your point today, because we recognize that there will -- will take some time, and we are going to need -- we are going to need to make some tough decisions.

Should I wait until you --

CHAIR CRIDER: I just have one more question on intercollegiate athletics and this won't be a popular question, but it reflects my lack of information or knowledge about Division I, II and III and all of that stuff.

And so, one of the questions I have is, we are a Division II. You know, is there any wisdom in exploring being something
other than Division II, and what does that really mean for us?

Are there savings that would be associated with that? And I don't know what that means. That is why I have to ask the question.

PRESIDENT LYONS: Let our athletic director start with that and then I will pick up because we -- can we ask the athletic director?

Because, I looked at -- I looked at the Division III. It would cost more money to go to Division I.

And I looked at Division III and I was not convinced, really, that there would be enough savings to really justify going from Division II to 3, but we will let our athletic director speak.

MS. THOMAS: Clearly, Division I -- I am Patricia Thomas, Director of Athletics.

Clearly, Division I is not that
avenue that we want to go. And, Dr. Lyons is correct. I think that going to Division III would actually cost the university more dollars.

Initially, we would incur penalties, determining -- in terms of when we would announce a potential move to reclassify to Division III, a monetary penalty.

Division III requires more sports in terms of sports sponsorship. Right now, Division II, the minimum is ten sports, and that is where we are right now, which is precarious, in itself.

Moving to Division III would require 15 sports -- additional sports. We would also lose the potential in terms of -- of grant and aid. There is no athletics grant and aid in Division III.

And so, right now, we are realizing a little under a million dollars in athletics grant and aid out of pocket from student athletes, their contribution in terms
of tuition and fees is at 854.

I think that moving to Division

III, we would lose that revenue potential in
terms of tuition dollars back to the
university.

CHAIR CRIDER: Okay. Thank you.

TRUSTEE ASKEW: Madam Chair, while
she is up there.

So, I assume you have seen the
recommendations, the recommendations that --
the administration's recommendations for the
new fees and so -- so let me -- and the cost
reduction.

So, what are your thoughts on a
cost reduction of $3 million? I mean -- and
this is between '15 and '20 -- fiscal year '15
to '20.

So, do you have any particular
thoughts? Because, the question is -- and I
think it has been asked by a number of Board
Members is, we are asking you to generate --
we are asking students, under the umbrella of
an athletic fee to generate $2.1 million between '15 and '20, and we are also asking you to, between '15 and '20, to generate $1.6 million in revenue, while at the same time, asking you to reduce your budget over that time by $3 million.

So, what is your comfort level that you can achieve the objectives as presented in this proposal because it means a lot to us because we need to make sure it is a reasonable, or not.

MS. THOMAS: I appreciate the question.

I think that it is very, very important that the Board understand what the net costs are in terms of what the university is expending in terms of operating the athletics department.

And my argument, again, is that at the end of the day when you look at the revenue and when you look at what student athlete out-of-pocket contribution is towards
tuition and fees, the next expense is really about $2.5 million annually to operate the athletic department.

I think that the projected revenue question is realistic, quite frankly. What you are suggesting is realistic.

I am looking forward to the day that I can publicly announce that athletics will continue to survive on this campus so that I can go out and make those asks, and continue to generate the corporate relationships that we started two years ago to continue to raise that kind of revenue.

And I am very confident that we can continue to do that on a very large scale. I am very, very confident that the alumni in particular are very, very excited about what we are doing and that we can continue to make those asks, and raise revenue in those regards, as well.

I think that we can take a look at how we are packaging athletics grant and aid,
and that is something that actually the compliance committee was looking at about two years ago under the direction of William Nelson, as a matter of fact, and looking at more creative ways to repackage athletics grant and aid so that the revenue is, again, realized back to the university so that we are packaging grant and aid in a way what student athlete grant and aid is packaged towards tuition and fees back to the university, and more of the out-of-pockets costs are contained in areas that not necessarily are going to the university.

Although, certainly, when we complete the -- the student center, I would like to see that the Board portion be something that the university could realize revenue in those kinds of ways as well.

I hope that answers your question.

TRUSTEE ASKEW: So, the short answer is that you -- even with the costs -- with the cost reductions, you feel confident
that you can achieve the revenue -- the revenue objectives as presented?

MS. THOMAS: I am very confident on the revenue projections as well.

I -- you know, perfectly honest with you, I think that the grant and aid piece will be very, very tricky for us and, again, but the message is that we need to send, particularly to prospective student athletes, to potential donors, to corporate sponsorships is that this university supports athletics and that I can go out and send that message and move forward.

TRUSTEE ASKEW: Okay. The question has been asked and answered, so -- I appreciate your response. That is very, very helpful.

MS. THOMAS: Thank you.

CHAIR CRIDER: Do you have more on athletics or are we --

TRUSTEE ASKEW: No, still on -- the only reason it is still on athletics,
because they had tied everything to athletics, the proposals.

So, I don't have any more questions of you, Ms. Thomas, but I -- it is on the options more so than it is --

CHAIR CRIDER: Okay. I mean, I guess the big question, or maybe the concern that you are hearing from all of us is, in fact, you have tied so much to -- I mean, we asked you to do this.

We asked you to come up with an alternative because the Board was -- was reticent to specifically eliminate athletic programs.

And so, we recognize that, you know, these are -- alternatives are in response to what we ask you to do.

There is, thought, I think, a little bit of anxiety about what happens if, you know, and "if" isn't here yet.

PRESIDENT LYONS: Right.

CHAIR CRIDER: Maybe what -- you
know, what we are doing is having to trust

that, in fact, you guys have looked at these

proposals and that these proposals are

realistic and that you will be able to hit

these targets and that we will hold you

accountable to hitting these targets.

You know, that we can't afford for

you not to make them, just because so much is

tied to that.

And so, you know, I think that is

really where -- where we have to go with this.

PRESIDENT LYONS: Let me also add

that, as a reminder, you know, if we don't

have the resources to implement the new

initiatives, they don't get initiated.

So, we are eager to -- to project

appropriately, raise the resources. If

athletics is approved, then certainly

athletics, by everyone's indication is an

important part of the university, then we

don't want to beat it down to the point that

we have got the worst program in America.
So, if we -- we have a document, and there are a lot of strategic plans that don't go any further than the shelves because there are no resources to implement the document.

We have proposed a number of things that would allow us to really make this a real document. You know, the math may be questionable in some few instances or there may be some issues in terms of what might have been a more viable option, but at the end of the day there is a certain amount of revenue we need to implement this plan fully.

And if we don't generate it in any one of these categories -- that is why internally I mentioned these student fees, because we realize that the purpose is not to drive students away.

We are trying to increase our enrollment, so we have to do what we need to do in terms of scholarships.

The whole plan, the whole idea is
to -- to identify resources -- do you have your foot on something --

CHAIR CRIDER: No. It is not me.

PRESIDENT LYONS: The whole plan, idea is to generate the revenue to put into the activities.

You know, for example, I want to -- you know, and one of my fears coming into this meeting was that we were going to spend so much time on page six of Appendix B and those kind of things, that we would lose sight of the overall intent here, is that there are some major initiatives that we are trying to fund.

And, as much as I want to see us move into the area of online education to the -- at the degree level, we have courses.

But, as much as I want to see us move in that direction, if we don't generate the revenue, then we may not be able to do that, you know.

So, we are just -- so,
understanding we are trying to be realistic to
identify a pool of dollars so that we can
implement the plan, but we will have -- there
will be -- we will have to come back to the
Board for some of the approvals.

We may have to come back to the
Board and say, you know, we have found a
better option. We were going to do A, but it
looks like B may be a better option.

So, you know, again, when you say
this is a living document, let me assure you
that a lot of time has been spent to look at
all of this because, again, this is about
moving the university forward and not just
producing a document.

And there has been a lot of
excitement generated in the community about
many of these new initiatives, but it does
take resources to make it happen and we don't
want to -- we don't want to fail to generate
revenue, or we just become like everybody
else, just need to -- I shouldn't say
"everybody else," but far too many institutions.

TRUSTEE VRADENBURG: I would like to just press you a bit on this, because the choice here was eliminating intercollegiate athletics with the consequence that over the course of six years we would generate $16 million more in assets to the institution.

Your recommendations, which you are pleading are necessary to raise revenue, as an alternative to that, are going to raise less money and have less resource to the university.

It is -- in fact, you generate $10 million over that six-year period. So, in fact, if you had those two choices, eliminate intercollegiate athletics, the institution has more resource than accepting your recommendations as the alternative.

So, this -- you know, I -- I recognize the intense feelings around intercollegiate athletics, but this is not a
financial decision that is favorable to the
institution.

It is unfavorable to the
institution. And if you look at D-3, and I
recognize you don't want to look at paragraphs
in some appendix --

PRESIDENT LYONS: We would look at
--

TRUSTEE VRADENBURG: Well, because it says, "If nonoperational funding for buy-
out's is not available it is likely -- it is
likely that investments tied to enrollment
growth and self-generator revenue growth will
be delayed by a year and negatively impact the
implementation of this report."

So, this -- this alternative set
of recommendations is putting us already this
institution, if it is only going to generate
between ten and $15 million in additional
assets over six years, it is walking on a
tightrope.

This puts that tightrope even
thinner, taking the alternative recommendations.

I couldn't agree more with Joe Askew, that we have to tackle 801 North Capitol, because there are bigger monies there than what we are talking about here.

But, the alternative set of recommendations puts us in a weaker and tighter financial position than eliminating intercollegiate athletics.

We may decide to do that, but understand that it is an -- it is an adverse financial decision for the institution, except for Joe's pleading that we take into account intangible -- the intangible benefits of recruitment and retention.

And I don't discount that. I think there is something real there. It is just difficult to quantify when you look at the revenue situation of the institution.

CHAIR CRIDER: Let me just announce that Trustee Castillo is on the call.
I would like to announce that

Trustee Castillo is on the call.

SECRETARY CASTILLO: Thank you,

Madam Chair.

CHAIR CRIDER: Right. She was

here for the roll call. Okay.

If there are no further questions

on athletics, I would like to just move to the

-- the other area where we asked for --

TRUSTEE ASKEW: Madam Chair.

CHAIR CRIDER: Yes. I am sorry.

Trustee Askew.

TRUSTEE ASKEW: Again, and the

only reason -- and the only reason, again, and

-- you know, when I look at this, again, I

appreciate the administration, the university

exploring, you know, all the options.

And I don't -- and I believe that,

to make up for some of this gap -- because, I

think at the end of the day, and I think Dr.

Lyons was saying this.

I mean, this is really about
finding, I believe, a gap for the $16 million. All right.

So, we are saying athletics, but the reality of the matter is that we associate a dollar amount to it.

And, you know, from looking at the options, though, some of them we can -- we can get to more immediately, you know, the tuition, the fees.

Some of these, again, I believe, you know, somehow we should place some value in year three or four or year four or year five, year six, all right, which I think over that period of time will reduce some of the shortfalls that may exist immediately, in points that my fellow colleague Vradenburg just mentioned.

Because I -- I mean, there are options here. You know, there is one option about the -- about -- because today, you know, if you take -- you can take 12, 18 hours and the cost of your tuition is exactly the same.
All right. And your analysis -- I mean, we could generate $2 million annually because it says $1.1 million in revenue for the semester by increasing the undergraduate full-time rate to 15 credits.

I mean, that is $2 million, and you can still be a -- and -- and again, I -- I don't believe that should be taken off the table.

I think that we should, like what -- I think the focus should have been, even in the beginning, not on one particular, and we should have gotten a -- like we got this time.

Options.

And options that, if we had to or if we need to, we can execute on. And I believe, you know, that is -- that is -- and again, it doesn't necessarily -- again, we can play around, you know, with that, but there is an opportunity there.

I mean, we would be one of the few institutions -- we are already one of the few
that does that. I don't think there is -- I haven't seen any institution in this area, whether it be a small institution, historically black college, large college that actually does that.

All right. And it would have -- it wouldn't impact every student, because when you look at the percentages of students who are part-time versus who are full time, I think the impact, though I understand that you may have some fall-off, you know, but in the out years -- and I don't think that -- in the not-too-distant-far-years, that there could be.

So, I would hope that, you know, as we look because, I mean, it is a very valid point, you know, where it is 16, we got the 10. There still are some questions about the buy-out, which I think is a -- was a great question that I think we are going to have to pursue a little bit more.

But I do think that there are also
some other things in here that can be thrown
in as to -- or this can be rearranged in a
different way because right now -- you keep
asking about athletics.

I am only saying athletics, Madam
Chair, when I really just want to have a
discussion about the overall options.

CHAIR CRIDER: Right. Right.

I think if there are some specific
things -- you know, I am concerned. I think
I have been saying this from the beginning,
that -- that 801 is not in here already.

I understand the challenges for
801, but I think I would have hoped to have
seen a plan for 801 and the savings related to
801 in there.

And so, you know, even -- even if
it didn't happen until 2018, it shows that we
are thinking of how we -- how we get out of it
and what the potential savings are for us.

That is a big chunk of expense for
us that, again, we never received
reimbursement for, and we are continuing to
manage at a level that we have been for a
long, long time.

And so, if there are things like
that, I think to your point, Trustee Askew,
that should be in the plan, maybe we could
have those in there.

If this is a living document, then
it can be added at -- at some point when you
all can figure out.

But I think, you know, part of the
-- the concern here is that you can't wait --
you know, we can't wait for two more years for
you to add it in here.

Some of these things we need to
see more immediately, and the action in terms
of, again, these facility costs, I think we
have got to deal with sooner rather than --
rather than later.

(Off-mic comment.)

CHAIR CRIDER: It is not me.

(Off-mic comment.)
PRESIDENT LYONS: Madam Chair, so that we can move this agenda along, it would be possible, and I think appropriate for the Board to approve the strategic plan with the understanding that -- that there be further conversation about that particular financial piece.

I don't mean contingent, because I don't think it would be in our best interest to walk away and say, "We will approve it contingent upon doing that," but "approve it with the understanding that it is a living document and that we would continue to explore the financial models.

Because, we have spent a lot of time on -- on this and, you know, we were looking at it from a certain perspective, just as the phasing-in and things like that.

I mean, there are options on the table and things could change if, for example, the City decided to approve our enhancement request to pick up the lease, that would be
additional dollars coming in unexpectedly and perhaps Trustee Askew would reduce a little to hit on the athletics department, you know.

So, there are things. I just -- it has been made very clear that there are questions about the whole financial piece.

We -- we attempted to do what you requested, and we do talk a lot about 801, the issue is that we didn't program it for the out years. I think that is what you are saying.

CHAIR CRIDER: Right.

PRESIDENT LYONS: That, even if it is something that would take, you know, three years or so, that we could still be considered for the out years.

But the point that you made earlier is well-taken. I don't know that the trustees have ever voted, as you are suggesting.

So, -- but, we hear you and we understand what the concern is. And again, I would hope that, quote, we could keep our eye
on the prize but with the understanding that,
you know, we could continue to discuss the
finance piece for that particular $4 million
with the finance committee and come back and
-- and continue to respond.

CHAIR CRIDER: Okay. Additional
questions on the plan here.

Trustee Shelton.

TRUSTEE SHELTON: General, as
always. I am still concerned about the
community college language.

My concern is initially, based on
the fact that it is efforts and activities
that should apply to all of our colleges on
campus, and all of our schools.

The second thing is, is that the
budgetary support that is necessary to get us
get the community college on sound footing and
solidly based, should not debilitate or injure
the university.

And, nothing in this language
continues, supports the idea that we will, A,
continue to make sure that the university budget and financial support is in place and also come -- you know, the plan that we are proffering will then engage the community school to find its footing financially.

And I think that we need to be sure to incorporate something that says that the -- the budget for both institutions should not injure each other in the process.

And I think that is the final result. I do suggest that all the college and university should be held accountable for all of those things, but the real issue is about making sure that both institutions are on sound financial footing and our plan should speak clearly to that for the university and the community college.

And when we use it as number two, it is -- what we are trying to say is it is our number two goal is to make all of our colleges financially sound using the systems that are in place.
Again, something has been passed to me, and there was some preliminary, you know, okay, again, and that is what I am most concerned about as I thought about what has been taught -- what has been said in the conversations that I have is, again, we have got to make sure that both institutions have the money to go forward and not one stepping over on and through the other.

CHAIR CRIDER: Yes.

TRUSTEE SHELTON: And that is --

CHAIR CRIDER: Right. Yes.

PRESIDENT LYONS: Madam Chair.

CHAIR CRIDER: Yes.

PRESIDENT LYONS: We -- I have just distributed a sheet which is a go-to. We had a meeting Sunday afternoon and Trustee Shelton raised a question.

And we changed the language in Goal 2, Objective 1 under recommended strategies because we were not trying to say that the community college would be the only
program activity school where we would seek to
provide, ensure funding.

We were trying to say that we
would meet the requirements, middle states and
those who have looked at requirements of
separate accreditation would see that we were
trying to mirror that language.

But it did -- it did cause some
confusion and send a message that we were not
trying to send. So we modified that to say
"Ensure middle states requirements are met to
facilitate the separate accreditation."

So, that would speak to the first
part of Trustee Shelton's concern.

But, as for the second part, you
know, I am not sure that the university needs
to have a goal that says, you know, that even
suggests a main campus community college
division of any kind.

There are many ways to get at the
concern that I think Trustee Shelton is
making, but I don't know that going back,
modifying the goal, unless it was just a very
generic statement that the administration
would endeavor to strengthen all its academic
programs financially is maybe a strategy
somewhere, but I would think that you wouldn't
want to change the goal.

This goal, again, relates to the
separate accreditation issue and trying to,
again, pick up the language that would be
satisfactory to middle states.

CHAIR CRIDER: I think that
Trustee Shelton's concern, when I read the
revised language, it was difficult for me to
discern a distinction between what we had in
the prior plan and what we -- because, all the
other language pretty much stayed the same.

And the other -- before we use the
words "independent" versus --

PRESIDENT LYONS: Independent.

Right.

CHAIR CRIDER: -- "separately
accreditable," --
PRESIDENT LYONS: That is correct.

CHAIR CRIDER: -- but everything explaining what that mean is still in the document, for the most part.

So, one of the questions, I think, when I read this, I understood where Trustee Shelton's concern was coming from, and it really goes to if the -- I think. If I am misstating this incorrectly, Trustee Shelton can tell me.

But, when you read this -- the language here, you know, we would want to make sure that we transition a community college to separate accreditation and there is no compromising of the main campus.

And I don't know how you say that, you know, in a document like that, but I think that is really the intent here, that the integrity of the main campus stays intact as does the community college as it transitions to independence.

Now, I actually went to the middle
state site to read how they define "separately accreditable," and there was some language in there that talked about if the separately accredited -- the branch campus and the institution to be separately accredited didn't move within certain time frames or certain things weren't done, that it provided a risk to the university as well.

And that concerned me. So, you know, I think we really are looking at the integrity, trying to maintain the integrity of both institutions as we move forward on this. At the end of the day we want all of the institutions to survive.

So -- was that -- that captures your concern?

TRUSTEE ASKEW: Thank you very much.

CHAIR CRIDER: Okay.

PRESIDENT LYONS: And, Madam Chair, I actually agree with Trustee Shelton.

CHAIR CRIDER: Okay.
PRESIDENT LYONS: On that matter.

CHAIR CRIDER: Okay.

PRESIDENT LYONS: We do -- you know, we understand that there is no benefit to the university system, to use that comment, if we destroy the main campus in order to achieve separate accreditation.

I mean, I guess -- you know, when you are working on this on a daily basis, there are just certain assumptions that we have, but Trustee Shelton and others, I am sure, want to make certain that -- that that is clear that, you know, we are not suggesting that we would move to separate accreditation at any cost.

CHAIR CRIDER: Right.

PRESIDENT LYONS: That is not the spirit of it and that is why we so quickly changed that language, because we weren't trying to send that message.

You know, I don't know if there is a bullet that can be added without any
question.

Trustee Shelton, did you -- was there a place where -- but of the overall concern is consistent, Madam Chair, with what you have.

Again, this is a -- this is a goal, this is a direction and you certainly have ample opportunity, as we come back to you and work through the community college committee, to make certain that we are not getting the main campus.

CHAIR CRIDER: Right.

PRESIDENT LYONS: So, you know, you have another, quote, bite at the apple on this. So --

CHAIR CRIDER: Right. Okay. Are there other questions, comments?

(No response.)

CHAIR CRIDER: If not, I would like to entertain --

TRUSTEE ASKEW: Madam Chair.

CHAIR CRIDER: Yes.
TRUSTEE ASKEW: I am sorry. There was a point I wanted to make on the options.

CHAIR CRIDER: Okay.

TRUSTEE ASKEW: And then -- I am sorry. There was a point I wanted to make on the options. I wanted to follow up on a question that was raised about enrollment at our last -- last meeting, and just one thing about the vision, and I will try and make it real quick.

On the foundation, you know, I understand that we have set an objective of -- it looks like at least $2 million, and this is on page four for the foundation.

And, as I said before, I just think we have to be just more aggressive than that. You know, I was taking a look at what other institutions that are peer institutions of some that at least appear to be peer institutions.

And, you know, when you find out that you typically have about a four to five
percent get-back rate. Now, I say that for
peer institutions, about 20 percent and above.

There is one article that actually
even mentions the university and its alumni
donation -- donations, and it says, basically
we are -- you know, where there is rambling is
at about, you know, three year, one percent.
The University of the District of Columbia has
averaged .1 percent.

I think that there is a huge
opportunity for us to do better than $2
million. And, particularly when you look at
our budget in the proposed budget to operate
this institution is about -- based upon, I
think, the numbers in here, about $159
million.

And you have other schools who,
again, who have, you know, similar things but,
you know, what they all say is, you know, when
President Swygert raised that $275 million in
five years, you have got to think big and not
settle for the small figure.
All right. The president over at Fayetteville State similarly, you know, they said, "Look we got to think big." You know, they have a campaign going on for $25 million, started off with 1.4, and because they thought big, they actually ended up getting $7.1 million.

All right. I believe this institution has a great opportunity to not only foster -- to begin to -- and I think some of this is being done, but we have studied this for years.

I do not want to see another study on fund-raising.

CHAIR CRIDER: Right.

TRUSTEE ASKEW: We have invested -- I mean, I am telling you. Every administration, we have studied this, studied it, and we just -- we just haven't gotten it right. But the time to study -- it is time to really implement, you know, implement, get folks.
And a lot of this stuff says, I mean, really, you start -- when you start, you do start off with your existing alumni, and I think this report points out the significant number of our alum actually live in the Metropolitan Area, which is untrue for some other schools. So, they are reachable.

Some of the steps are making sure -- and again, I see that there is an enhancement in the Alumni Affairs Office, and on a foundation side that will -- will help do this, but starting with students, helping them -- beginning with the students, something to understand the value of giving back.

And, of course student services plays a large part in that. So, I am really hoping that we take a little bit more aggressive position on this.

And I think we have spoken about this for a while. It is a question that we get asked all the time.

And again, you know, if we are
saying we are raising $2 million per year and
our budget is what it is, it is just -- I
mean, it is hard to reconcile.

CHAIR CRIDER: Yes.

TRUSTEE ASKEW: And I am not
saying -- I am not saying you jump out there
and you get $20 million every year. I am not
saying that. But, $2 million. I think some
of us are nonprofit organizations, and they
have, you know, nonprofit organizations, and
a million dollars, to raise a million dollars,
I mean, it is just -- you know, they do it.

And I have got to believe that the
resources that we have in this Board, in our
administration, in our faculty and staff and
in our alumni, that we can do better than $2
million.

CHAIR CRIDER: Yes.

TRUSTEE ASKEW: And again, I hope
that, as we refresh this document that we have
a -- a focus in this particular area, because
I do think we need to demonstrate -- because
it also shows others who are thinking about investing that we -- that we, too, are serious about our institution, and leveraging our resources to bring it back.

So, that is just a comment. I see Mr. Rogers over there. I am not necessarily asking for a response, but I would hope that -- that we refresh kind of what we do there and hopefully we will see that number and we will understand what the plan is.

CHAIR CRIDER: Yes. I think we look at that as a minimum amount, but we have some work to do.

I think we, also, as a Board, have to be a little bit realistic that, you know, the university has been battered a bit.

TRUSTEE ASKEW: Yes.

CHAIR CRIDER: And we haven't always been presented in a fair light, and so we have got some work to do to build up that reputation and to bring things to a point where people willingly open up that pocketbook
and give as we see in other places.

And I think we can do that. I believe that the plan sets the stage for us to begin that process of, you know, getting a more positive message out about who we are, what we are about, and hopefully, as we do better with that, we will start to see more support in terms of fund-raising activities and those things that will go on.

Trustee Vradenburg, did you have a comment?

TRUSTEE VRADENBURG: I take it that the motion soon to be on the floor is going to be for the whole vision 2020 plan, with the recommended changes so that the administration, this administration is put forward with respect to intercollegiate sports.

So, I just wanted to say that I am going to vote for it, because I do think this plan, overall, is repositioning this university very well.
It is cutting back in costs and looking forward to some revenue enhancements, but also as investing in a number of areas we need to invest in.

I will simply express a reservation, and not a contingency, that the financial elements of this plan still keep us right on the tightrope.

You know, for over six years we are going to build assets, increase assets by $10 million. It is not a thriving university.

And so, I am going to associate myself with the remarks of Trustee Askew about 801, about -- about the advancement of the university in the philanthropic sense, about your efforts with the City.

Everything we can do to drive increased revenues above and beyond what the financial assumptions behind this plan right now say, as well as on the cost side, to be much more and aggressive and thoughtful about
where, in fact, we can cut costs, because I don't -- I think this university, to be a really, truly great university in five and ten years is going to need more financial sort of margin than what we are -- we are building into the financial plan underneath this -- this very visionary repositioning of the university.

So, I -- I will end up voting for the plan, but I will end up voting for the plan, but I will simply express that remark and not contingency.

CHAIR CRIDER: Okay. Other comments?

(No response.)

CHAIR CRIDER: Did you hit a ball?

TRUSTEE ASKEW: No. I think that was foundation. I had a question about enrollment.

On the enrollment side, and again, I think I asked this question and we asked for some data.
CHAIR CRIDER: Right.

TRUSTEE ASKEW: So, I don't think it is too far off. But, so the enrollment is 20 percent over the 2015, 2020, and I think my question where I was seeking clarity is -- is that just a 20 percent overall growth in the student population, or is that 20 percent related to each unit of the university?

Because, I think, if you just say 20 percent, you could get most of that in the community college.

And, let me tell you, to George's point, still not achieve your financial objectives because, I mean, our -- the money that goes into it and the money we get back is much different than what you get from the undergrad and what you put in, and what you get back.

So, again, when I see the 20 percent, what I didn't still get a clear picture of is whether this is a 20 percent is kind of balanced approach, or whether this was
a 20 percent overall comprehensive, you know, number that we are looking for.

MR. ROGERS: I think we had a brief discussion at the end of the last Board meeting.

If you look at D-7. Figure 7, projected incremental enrollment increases, and you see the distribution annually and by academic unit.

TRUSTEE ASKEW: Yes.

MR. ROGERS: Okay. So, we anticipate more of the enrollment at the Baccalaureate and graduate level. We are not projecting any increase in the law school.

You might question that, but the simple fact is, is that the trend nationally is -- in law schools is downward, and you want to stem that and try to stabilize that to keep the drop from being, you know, as great as it could be. But we have not projected that in this plan.

There is also a dip in the
community college enrollment, and so we have reflected that in how we have projected here.

There has been an increase this semester in undergraduate school involvement, so we hope that will continue. So that is the answer to your question.

It is a distribution by year by academic unit based on our understanding of the market.

PRESIDENT LYONS: Let me -- let me add to that. If we are about to attract an enrollment management person with the skills that I am hoping they will have, they will drill down ever further and look at the colleges and schools, the departments and begin to project enrollments even at that level.

And that is what I would expect of that person coming in in that position.

TRUSTEE ASKEW: Great. Well, I appreciate that. I mean, this is helpful.

And the other question, the other
-- which is related to this and just the
student. I mean, this goes back to kind of
almost the facilities piece of it.

Right? Because -- and I saw
something that -- I am sure you will meet with
the deans to talk about the different schools
and kind of whether or not there are
enrollment projections related to the School
of Business and Law School and stuff.

And the reason I just say that is
because, you know, we have also allocated
space. You know, we have made previous
decisions, and space cost us.

All right. So, you have got to
have students to occupy the space. So, -- so,
and particularly like for the law school and
the school of business where we -- we
renovated those based upon data that we got on
growth.

The Law School -- you know, I
think the Law School was -- was fitted to
house, what, up to 500 students? Somewhere
close to that. All right. 645. So now --
and I think we -- are we even at 300 now?

CHAIR CRIDER: We are about 300.

TRUSTEE ASKEW: Three, about 300?
Okay. So, I assume, based upon your
projections, that -- and I will get to the
Business School next, but I assume, based upon
your projections, that it is zero, that we are
now looking to do something else with some of
that space that we had originally thought
would all go to the Law School.

And again, I saw something in --

PRESIDENT LYONS: We --

TRUSTEE ASKEW: Yes.

PRESIDENT LYONS: We did present
that -- we didn't plan to come in and walk
through every academic department and program
this evening, but we do have, again, an
appreciation for the issue you are raising
because we say that the first floor of the
current School of Law, for example, would be
a good place for some retail space that would
generate revenue.

TRUSTEE ASKEW: Yes.

PRESIDENT LYONS: So, we are trying to look at it in that fashion.

TRUSTEE ASKEW: Okay. Yes.

And the same with the School of Business. Now, what were they projecting? What were they projecting?

And again, I am not trying to get into a bunch of detail, but again -- space --

PRESIDENT LYONS: Well, that is where we are going, though.

TRUSTEE ASKEW: Yes. Yes.

PRESIDENT LYONS: I mean, we did not come in prepared to go through every department.

TRUSTEE ASKEW: Okay. I will -- I will leave it -- I will leave that alone, but --

PRESIDENT LYONS: Well, we are trying to get where you are going. I mean, that is what I am --
TRUSTEE ASKEW: So maybe if I can just get a follow-up with some of the information, that would be fine, but again, the reason I asked is because enrollment --

PRESIDENT LYONS: Absolutely.

TRUSTEE ASKEW: -- and space costs, and that is what I was trying to -- what I was really -- the point I was really trying to -- trying to make.

CHAIR CRIDER: You have more?

TRUSTEE ASKEW: Yes.

CHAIR CRIDER: Okay.

TRUSTEE ASKEW: Yes. Two -- just two of them.

CHAIR CRIDER: Okay.

TRUSTEE ASKEW: Just on the vision statement, you know, I -- I am not -- I am just throwing this out there, and I took at look at some various vision statements, and I am not looking to make any real substantive change to the vision -- vision statement.

But, I do think that here were
some of us who had some conversations about
the vision statement on the Board, and thought
that maybe it could be strengthened a little
bit.

So, I -- you know, because today
it says, "The University of the District of
Columbia will empower its graduate to be
critical and creative thinkers, problem-
solvers, effective communicators and engage in
service-driven leaders in the work force and
beyond."

Which, for a vision statement, I
think it is generic -- is somewhat generic.
Right?

CHAIR CRIDER: Yes.

TRUSTEE ASKEW: And at least my
view, and from some of the other vision
statements that I have seen, you know, it
really focused on kind of the mission
statement, kind of where you are, and in your
vision statement, where -- kind of where you
want to be.
And I would just offer this, whether it be for a matter of discussion or, you know, or not, you know, as a suggestion.

And basically, because some -- you get a number of them, they start -- they start off with "to be recognized," or "to be a center of."

CHAIR CRIDER: Yes.

TRUSTEE ASKEW: And so, my though, which I think, using words that we use in the document, itself because, you know, we talked about making sure that we are student-centered and that we are demand-driven.

And I think, if -- you know, if you look on, you know, page nine, under goal one it talks about being student-centered and demand-driven.

So, perhaps, you know, since this is part of what this is about, as a way to enhance what we already have, maybe something to the effect like to be a student-centered and demand-driven university system that
empowers its graduates to be critical and
creative thinkers.

And again, it just goes back to
relate to, I mean, what we are hoping to be
able to achieve, what our vision is.

So, it doesn't make any real
change, substantive change, but it does talk
about what we -- what our vision is in a -- in
what I think is a short way without getting
into, you know, all of the other stuff.

And again, I think by saying
student-centered and demand-driven, because we
have talked about making sure our courses
reflect the demand in the marketplace.

CHAIR CRIDER: So, would there be
a problem with that? I mean, I don't know
that we have to -- we could still do a vote,
unless you have a problem or concern with what
Mr. Askew is suggesting.

PRESIDENT LYONS: Madam Chair, if
the Board wants to vote to change it to
incorporate that language or to change it, you
know, do it now and then it is done.

CHAIR CRIDER: So, if that is the kind of language you want -- you know, again, I don't want us to go through and --

TRUSTEE ASKEW: I am not. This is it. This is for me. This -- this --

CHAIR CRIDER: Okay. I am just saying, I don't want us to go through and try to wordsmith every line.

TRUSTEE ASKEW: Right.

CHAIR CRIDER: But I do think that when we talk about mission and vision, those things are the responsibility of the Board to, you know, to be responsible for that.

And so, if there is something that makes you more comfortable that really reflects what we believe the university is about, I think it should go in here.

If you are comfortable, I think you could -- we could -- we could approve the plan with the language change that you provide as far as the vision statement is concerned,
so I don't think we have to hold up approving the plan.

I know every time we say something, I feel you get a little tense over here.

PRESIDENT LYONS: No, no. Well, it is --

CHAIR CRIDER: I am not trying to hold that up at all.

PRESIDENT LYONS: Madam Chair, I know that and I -- I know that. I just don't want the Board to leave here with -- you all met again and still haven't approved --

CHAIR CRIDER: We are going to -- we are going to take an action on this plan.

PRESIDENT LYONS: That's why maybe you failed at the -- but seriously, though, if -- if Trustee Askew has wording that the Board feels is more appropriate and wants to vote on that, then -- then do it, it is done.

I mean, I don't -- so, rather than -- well, maybe you all will get back and maybe
we will do this, that and the other --

CHAIR CRIDER: I am not suggesting

--

PRESIDENT LYONS: Yes. No, I know. But if it is --

CHAIR CRIDER: What I am suggesting is that what I heard, unless other Members of the Board object, what I heard from Trustee Askew sounds fine.

I think he can just give you that language to insert. We can vote on the plan, approve the plan with the language change and not have to go through -- I don't think we have to vote on his language change.

I don't think we would have to do that just to put that other language.

VICE-CHAIR BELL: Well, point information there, because I -- I do think that, as a Board, that we have to vote on the mission, the vision and the core values.

Right. So, it is one thing to approve the plan, which I am fine with doing,
but I do think that certain items that are within the plan -- because this is not a delegation of authority. So --

CHAIR CRIDER: Well, let me --

VICE-CHAIR BELL: Or, is it?

CHAIR CRIDER: I don't know, because I thought than, in approving the plan, with the exception of the termination of the programs, that we approved what was in the plan, and that to separately have to go through and approve everything, we didn't need to do that.

Because the -- let me just be -- let me be real -- real transparent here, because the legal staff did -- did recommend that, that we do an approval resolution for mission, vision and core values and, to me, I didn't think we needed to do that.

So, I thought if we approved the plan, it went with that.

Trustee Felton.

TREASURER FELTON: Thank you,
Madam Chair.

I don't have any objections to Trustee Askew's recommendations. My concern is that I view this as a living document. I mean, there are -- there are plenty of changes that we can make.

I think that, as the plan gets implemented, we will get excited. We will have new expectations. We will be really concerned about how a lot of this is -- is phrased.

So, you know, we can make the change tonight, but I would think that, as we continue to update, there will be -- there will be other changes that we will want to make to reflect our new energy about UDC and where we want to go.

I am just reluctant at this point -- and again, I can live with it. But, about even making this change, because -- and I come prepared. You know, had that been a call, I might have also had some language and --
CHAIR CRIDER: Yes.

TREASURER FELTON: -- I didn't prepare quite like Trustee Askew.

But -- but, that doesn't mean we all don't have some meaningful changes we would like to make. But, we have invested quite a bit in this and we hope to get a lot in return.

And I just -- I just want us to be cautious about even doing this.

TRUSTEE DYKE: Yes. I would -- I would just echo what my fellow trustee just said.

I mean, I read this, and I came here prepared to vote on what was presented, and I would just as soon go ahead and vote on that.

CHAIR CRIDER: Okay.

TRUSTEE SHELTON: Madam Chair --

CHAIR CRIDER: Trustee Shelton.

TRUSTEE SHELTON: Well, I was going to say that when there is a discussion
or dispute it is better to decide vote it up
or down, and then to let it fester.

If you are in favor of the changes
in this specific area that Mr. Askew has
presented, I would tend to think that a motion
voted up or down would be the appropriate
step, or second it. If it is seconded, to go
forward.

CHAIR CRIDER: Okay.

TRUSTEE SHELTON: That way, we
don't have to debate it, and it is a
correction that can be made immediately and
without jeopardizing the objective, which is
to move forward on the vision.

CHAIR CRIDER: Okay.

TRUSTEE SHELTON: So, in that
state of mind, I second the motion by Mr.
Askew to correct the language as described by
Mr. Askew to the vision.

And, if there is -- I second his
motion, so that we can get to a vote on it up
or down.
And he is going to -- he is going
to re --

CHAIR CRIDER: Wait.

TRUSTEE SHELTON: Yes.

CHAIR CRIDER: Can I just get a

point of order?

TRUSTEE SHELTON: Yes.

CHAIR CRIDER: I am not certain

that I heard a motion.

TRUSTEE SHELTON: Well, that is --

I am trying to make a motion.

CHAIR CRIDER: Okay.

TRUSTEE ASKEW: Madam Chair. So,

look, again, I mean, I respect what some of my

fellow colleagues have said. I had a
different interpretation when I come to these

meetings.

CHAIR CRIDER: Okay.

TRUSTEE ASKEW: I mean, this
document was something that was to be
deliberated today. It wasn't you come here

and you have to accept this -- these
recommendations, or not.

   CHAIR CRIDER: Yes.

   TRUSTEE ASKEW: It was that we would come here, we would deliberate and then that -- you know, and we would make adjustments just as we did at our last meeting.

   So, I certainly didn't believe that, and I don't think that is the way we have operated in the past on.

   This has not been finalized. So, what we -- and so, again -- and again, I didn't mean to make it a big deal. All I was trying to do was enhance, because, if you read it today -- and, again, I have had conversations with other Board Members.

   There was -- it was -- it would be helpful just to enhance it just a little bit. And again, I didn't mean for this to -- I thought that this would pretty much, you know, go over smoothly.

   I will make the motion because,
again, I do believe that it doesn't take away
99, 97 percent of what is there. All it is,
it just -- in my view, it just basically says
what we have already said in the document.

So, so moved, Madam Chair.

TRUSTEE SHELTON: Second.

CHAIR CRIDER: It has been moved
and seconded. Any discussion?

PRESIDENT LYONS: Would Trustee
Askew read the proposed language?

TRUSTEE ASKEW: Yes, I will.

It is to be a student-centered and
demand-driven university system that empowers
its graduates to be critical and creative
thinkers, problem-solvers, effective
communicators and engage service-driven
leaders in the workforce and beyond.

So, the language that would be
added is to be a student-centered and demand-
driven university system that empowers, and
the rest is the same.

CHAIR CRIDER: Any discussion?
TREASURER FELTON: Just read it one more time.

TRUSTEE ASKEW: Okay. To be a student-centered and demand-driven university system that empowers, and the rest of it is the same.

TREASURER FELTON: Okay. Would you accept just the minor --

TRUSTEE ASKEW: I would --

TREASURER FELTON: -- and I think we would be cleaned up. You have to put another couple of words --

CHAIR CRIDER: Well, I think the University of the District of Columbia would stay --

TRUSTEE ASKEW: I would take out the University of the District of Columbia.

TREASURER FELTON: In order to be this -- in order to do this, we will -- we will empower or the University empowers or --

TRUSTEE ASKEW: No. Well, it is just what we want to be. We want to be a
student-centered and demand-driven university system that empowers its graduates.

It already said -- it already says "empowers graduates." So -- and again, maybe I will just -- you know, so it is already moved and seconded?

TRUSTEE SHELTON: It's been moved and seconded. Up or down.

VICE-CHAIR BELL: So, I am sorry. So you are dropping the University of the District of Columbia and it says -- starts with "Will be a student-centered and demand-driven university system that empowers its graduates to be critical and creative thinkers.

TRUSTEE ASKEW: Well, I started with "to be a student-centered and demand-driven," but if yours -- if yours works better, then that is fine.

TRUSTEE SHELTON: Yours is the one we are working with, Mr. Askew.

TRUSTEE ASKEW: That is understood
because it is a university -- it is a university strategic plan.

And again, if you -- if you look at other institutions, most of them don't start off with --

CHAIR CRIDER: Okay. Let me do this. Okay? If there is no further discussion, I would like to call for the question.

All in favor of the change proposed by Trustee Askew, vote "Aye."

(Ayes.)

CHAIR CRIDER: I am sorry.

TREASURER FELTON: I am sorry.

Bell -- Bell said something a little different from what is --

VICE-CHAIR BELL: No. I was just asking for a point of clarification. I just want to make sure everyone is clear that he is removing "The University of the District of Columbia" from the front of it, so that it would read, "Will be a student-centered and
demand-driven university system that empowers its graduates to be critical and creative thinkers."

TRUSTEE SHELTON: And the question is still before us. You can vote for it or against it.

CHAIR CRIDER: All in favor, vote "Aye."

(Ayes.)

CHAIR CRIDER: Any opposed?

(No response.)

CHAIR CRIDER: Any abstentions?

(No response.)

CHAIR CRIDER: The motion carries.

TRUSTEE ASKEW: Madam Chair, one last thing, I promise.

CHAIR CRIDER: Yes.

TRUSTEE ASKEW: And this is -- this is because I spoke to this before.

CHAIR CRIDER: Okay.

TRUSTEE ASKEW: And I -- on page 50, there is a statement in there that says,
"Many employers express the opinions that past graduates from the university didn't have the necessary skills to perform their duties."

I asked this -- I asked directly this of the people who did the -- who did the work and who met with all of the employers, the 78 employers or whatever it was, and I asked them at our retreat did employers say that, and they said no.

All right. So, I don't know where this comes from, but it was in the original document that we were presented, and I just don't believe -- if that is not the feedback that we got, why are we putting something in our document that other people -- again, we all know that there is some work to be done, but I am not -- I am not quite sure where it came from, because it didn't come from the entity that did the reviews of the 78 -- of the 78 businesses.

CHAIR CRIDER: Okay. So you are saying the consultant that did the report for
us --

TRUSTEE ASKEW: Yes.

CHAIR CRIDER: Said that he did not have this --

TRUSTEE ASKEW: He said that he did not.

CHAIR CRIDER: Okay.

TRUSTEE ASKEW: That is not what -- that is not right. That is what he said. And I asked him specifically, with others in the room.

CHAIR CRIDER: Do you have an answer for that?

MR. ROGERS: Could I address that, please?

CHAIR CRIDER: Yes, Mr. Rogers.

MR. ROGERS: I think that if you go back and look at Scott Learning's report, you will find that sentiment there.

We didn't make this up. We have no reason to make this up.

So, I think that perhaps, when
confronted with it, you know, Scott may have, you know, may have wanted to -- wanted to say something else, but that information, that sentiment was reflected in the document, and that became one of the things that we wanted to challenge and focus on.

That is why we have the investment in the career services and professional development center, to better prepare our students to enter the workforce.

So, I am not comfortable sitting back and accepting that somehow that this -- you know, we didn't know where this came from. It came out of that report.

TRUSTEE ASKEW: And if it did, Madam Chair, like I said, we raised the issue at the meeting and if he is saying that it did, then I will just take a look at the document.

CHAIR CRIDER: Okay.

TRUSTEE ASKEW: And verify. So -- yes.
CHAIR CRIDER: Okay. Trustee Felton.

TREASURER FELTON: I guess I am doing what I just disagreed with my colleague. I think the point is, why would we include language that attacks our students without documentation, anyway?

Even if they did say it? So what? What does this get us by saying our students are ill-equipped to handle jobs? Why would we say that? What was the -- what is the advantage of having that in there?

PRESIDENT LYONS: They are talking about page 50.

MR. ROGERS: As a part of the strategic planning process we -- in every stage we took the information presented and presented it as -- as data on which to build a foundation for the recommendations that -- and investments that we made, made in the plan.

So, this was one -- maybe, you
know, looking at that particular language, maybe it shouldn't be in there. And it wouldn't make me unhappy if we amended that, but it did come from the consultant report that we received.

CHAIR CRIDER: Okay. Let me just ask one final question, and then I would like to move this.

And it just goes to, when we were talking about the -- we made reference to the attained report, and everywhere we go we are faced with the attained report and the language about us being out of line with everybody else.

And I don't know that I ever get an answer to this question.

Is the staff that provides the services or works with the workforce -- I think it is about 100 staff over the workforce development program. Are they included in our base numbers when we look at costs per FTE?

MR. ROGERS: They are -- my
understanding, they are not, because they are
not -- they are mostly grant-funded. They are
not --

CHAIR CRIDER: The staff --

MR. ROGERS: -- in degree -- in
degree programs.

CHAIR CRIDER: The staff, not the
-- not the --

MR. ROGERS: Oh, the staff. I am
sorry.

CHAIR CRIDER: Right.

MR. ROGERS: The staff. I think
they are. The staff are, unless -- huh?

(Off-mic comment.)

CHAIR CRIDER: So, we count the
staff.

MR. ROGERS: The staff. If they
grant-funded, they are not, but some of them
are not grant-funded, I would assume. I don't
know.

But we can drill down on that

question.
CHAIR CRIDER: Okay. Because, the only question that raises -- and maybe that is the right way you do it.

MR. ROGERS: Yes.

CHAIR CRIDER: What I don't understand is if -- you know, we are serving 3,000 workforce students, those students don't get counted, but the hundred staff members that work with them get counted and go against us in this cost per FTE number.

And that doesn't seem to make sense to me. If the students aren't counted, it seems that those hundred positions shouldn't be counted, either, and some percent of time for administration shouldn't be counted, you know, that goes to those programs.

And so, I would like to -- not to adjust the stuff here, but just to, you know, give me an answer once and for all on what goes in that cost per FTE number specifically as it relates to workforce development
programs and also the educational programs and
causes where I understand we are serving some
huge number of people.

MR. ROGERS: Right.

CHAIR CRIDER: And there is a
staff that goes along with that that aren't
counted in that number as well.

So, you know, I would just like to
understand what makes up that cost per FTE
number, because that is one of the things in
our marketing, I think, that we have to come
back and speak to.

MR. ROGERS: Okay.

CHAIR CRIDER: Okay.

MR. ROGERS: We will come back to
you on that. I think that the methodology
should be sharpened and we will come back to
on that.

CHAIR CRIDER: Okay. Thank you.

If there is no further discussion
on the strategic plan, I would like to -- oh,
sorry.
VICE-CHAIR BELL: I want to go back to this point about what we are approving because, again, I support the plan, but I just want to make sure that for those areas where we need Board resolutions for approval, are we saying that the plan will constitute that approval?

Because, when I went through the plan, the elimination of majors, the establishment of the general associative science degree, the community college advisory committee, approval of mission statement, vision statement, core values.

We are being asked to do the definition of shared governance and -- and also at some point we are going to approve a student bill of rights.

Are we approving those now, or are we expecting that they --

CHAIR CRIDER: Okay. The expectation is that they will bring those back to us at the appropriate time.
When they have a student bill of rights, that would come back to us at that time for our approval.

VICE-CHAIR BELL: Okay.

CHAIR CRIDER: The definition of shared governance, that hasn't been developed yet, so when they develop that, that will come back to us.

VICE-CHAIR BELL: Okay.

CHAIR CRIDER: So, I thought that all -- that all we had to vote on outside of the plan was the elimination of the majors.

Now, if there is some other opinion going back to legal counsel back there, that we need a resolution on mission, vision and core values, then I need to -- to know if that is what we have to do, or will mission, vision and values be covered if we vote for the whole plan.

PRESIDENT LYONS: It would be covered.

CHAIR CRIDER: That is what I
think.

PRESIDENT LYONS: It is a part of the plan. So, effective tonight --

CHAIR CRIDER: Okay.

PRESIDENT LYONS: -- this would be the vision approved February 18th, 2014.

CHAIR CRIDER: Okay. Well, that was -- that was what I thought.

VICE-CHAIR BELL: We would have to approve the elimination of the degree program separately, but we approved the plan?

PRESIDENT LYONS: Correct. There is a -- because, we do have to be able to identify when those programs were discontinued, and I think we will do that separately and for the middle states.

VICE-CHAIR BELL: Although I view that as a disconnect, because if the plan does, the action plan does it, but --

CHAIR CRIDER: Let's see. I see the same thing.

DR. PETTY: I understand it would
be the specific recommendation to terminate programs.

PRESIDENT LYONS: Well, that is what I --

TRUSTEE ASKEW: That is just the plan.

PRESIDENT LYONS: Yes. Rachael was saying that -- that we understand that you need a specific resolution for middle states for the program discontinuation.

VICE-CHAIR BELL: Okay. And then for the creation of the general associative science degree which is also in the plan.

At some point in the future we will come back and be presented with something --

PRESIDENT LYONS: With academic programs. Any of the academic programs would have to go through the campus and Board approval process.

CHAIR CRIDER: Okay.

TRUSTEE ASKEW: The same thing
with the tuition and --

PRESIDENT LYONS: Correct.
Correct. Correct. That is correct. That is correct.

VICE-CHAIR BELL: Well, that is the way I view it as a map and --

CHAIR CRIDER: It is a map.

VICE-CHAIR BELL: -- make sure that this wasn't somehow constituting some type of delegation of authority and that it should be the Board document approving that.

CHAIR CRIDER: Okay. Let me just read the resolution, part of the resolution here.

"Whereas, the Board of Trustees and the interim president" -- "Whereas the Board of Trustees has reviewed the final vision 2020 strategic plan as distributed to the Trustees by the interim president on February 6th" -- this should have today's date in it, though.

PRESIDENT LYONS: That is when it
was sent to you, yes.

CHAIR CRIDER: Oh, okay.

"February 6th, 2014, and whereas the Board of Trustees and the interim president recognized that the final vision 2020 strategic plan is a living document and that additional research and information may impact the proposals in the final vision 2020 strategic plan.

"And, whereas the Board of Trustees and the interim president acknowledge that certain actions proposed in the final vision 2020 strategic plan will require presentation to and subsequent approval by the interim president, the Board of Trustees and/or a relevant local or Federal legislative executive or regulatory body, and therefore, be it resolved that the Board approves the vision 2020 strategic plan, including all appendices as attached.

"Furthermore, be it resolved that the Board authorizes the interim president to take any and all actions within the authority
granted to him by the Board of Trustees to
implement the vision 2020 strategic plan as
approved."

I am looking for a motion to
approve the resolution.

TRUSTEE THOMPSON:  So moved.
TREASURER FELTON:  Second.
CHAIR CRIDER:  So moved. Moved
and seconded.

Any discussion?

All in favor, vote "Aye."

(Ayes.)

CHAIR CRIDER:  Any opposed or
abstentions?

(No response.)

CHAIR CRIDER:  That motion carries
and we voted for the -- oh, yes.

Trustees Castillo and Lemus, are
you still there?

TRUSTEE LEMUS:  Yes. This is

Gabby.

CHAIR CRIDER:  Okay. We just
didn't hear your vote.

TRUSTEE LEMUS: Sorry about that.

CHAIR CRIDER: So you vote approval, right?

TRUSTEE LEMUS: Yes, I did.

CHAIR CRIDER: Okay. Trustee Castillo --

SECRETARY CASTILLO: Yes. I approve it.

CHAIR CRIDER: Okay. Thank you.

So, we had unanimous approval of the vision 2020 plan. And thank you for that. This has been long and sometimes painful, but we got it done.

So, with -- and we still have reservations, but we will work through it, you know. That is all we can do.

The next is the termination of academic programs, and the resolution for that -- is it in the book?

Okay. "Whereas, the university has completed a comprehensive analysis of its
academic programs and has identified a number of academic programs that have low internal or external demand, did not produce consistent positive outcomes and not current, require resources not presently available or display other indicia of underperformance or lack of relevancy, therefore, be it resolved that the Board of Trustees approves the elimination of each of the academic programs identified below, provided that such eliminations are carried out by the president in a way that is consistent with university rules and regulations required for the discontinuation and the 17 programs are graphic communication technology, a BA in sociology, mass media BA, graphic design BA, physics BA, math/statistics MS, history BA, special education MA, marketing BBA, finance BBA, procurement and public contracting BBA, economics BA, management information systems BBA, nutrition, food science BS, environmental science, general BS, environmental science, water
resources BS and environmental science, urban sustainability BS."

I would like to entertain a motion to approve the termination of those 17 academic programs.

TREASURER FELTON: So moved.

CHAIR CRIDER: It has been moved.

Is there a second?

TRUSTEE THOMPSON: Second.

CHAIR CRIDER: Any discussion?

(No response.)

CHAIR CRIDER: All in favor of, vote "Aye."

(Ayes.)

CHAIR CRIDER: Any opposed?

(No response.)

CHAIR CRIDER: Any abstentions?

TRUSTEE CURRY: I abstain.

CHAIR CRIDER: One abstention.

TRUSTEE LEMUS: I abstain. This is Gabby.

CHAIR CRIDER: Two abstentions.
VICE-CHAIR BELL: Make it three.

CHAIR CRIDER: Three abstentions.

Trustee Shelton, Castillo --

PRESIDENT LYONS: No.

CHAIR CRIDER: Or Lemus.

PRESIDENT LYONS: Lemus.

CHAIR CRIDER: Trustee Lemus and

Trustee --

PRESIDENT LYONS: Curry.

CHAIR CRIDER: -- Curry. Okay.

Thank you for that.

Is there any new business?

Mr. President, do you have any new business?

PRESIDENT LYONS: Well, I wouldn't call it new business, but Trustee Curry asked me to share something with the Members of the Board that I shared with him a short while ago.

Today, I attended a luncheon meeting of the National Center for Families Learning at the Renaissance Hotel, and a young
man brought greetings to the 600 people assembled and talked about growing up in the District and his home being used as a drug haven and all that comes with that and how he ended up in the foster care system and out in the street, et cetera.

To make a long story short, this gentleman was a young was so dynamic that one of the vice presidents of Toyota said he would like to clone this young man a thousand times and take him around the country.

And then the young man indicated that he was leaving Cheney University and coming to the University of the District of Columbia, to the applause of 600 people so assembled.

And I must say there was one there who applauded, perhaps, louder than anybody else. But, truly, this young man, Ikise Walker, very sharp. The kind of student you certainly would want to have here, very impressive.
And he said he was coming in the fall and I said, "No, I want to get you here this summer."

So, we are going to try to work with him and see if we can get him in this summer. But, he was extremely impressive.

In fact, while I was trying to get his attention, there were a number of people asking why wasn't he transferring to their institutions.

So, stay tuned.

CHAIR CRIDER: Okay.

PRESIDENT LYONS: Thank you, Madam Chair.

CHAIR CRIDER: Thank you.

Any additional remarks or anything from anyone?

TRUSTEE ISAACS: Madam Chair.

CHAIR CRIDER: Yes. Trustee Isaacs.

TRUSTEE ISAACS: I believe there were some questions about the law school
graduation that had been raised by Trustee
Askew, and I wanted to know if we could
address that.

CHAIR CRIDER: Sure.

TRUSTEE ASKEW: Yes. I -- it
really wasn't my question. It was actually
Dr. Lyons' question, and I asked for a
clarification of the question because it --
the way the information was reading was as if
the law school doesn't have a separate -- and
I am very familiar, as you know, with it, as
well.

TRUSTEE Isaacs: Right.

TRUSTEE ASKEW: And so I just
clarified that there is a -- there already is
a separate graduation.

I thought that there was something
more than that that was being asked.

TRUSTEE Isaacs: No. That is
actually incorrect.

PRESIDENT Lyons: Yes. That is
not a -- that is not a -- I guess it depends
on what you call a graduation.

    I mean, we are beginning to call
everything, every time people assemble. For
example, people talked about a graduation we
had here a few weeks ago with 600 workforce
students.

    So, that my understanding is that
the law school conversation was related to a
commencement, a graduation -- in a formal
graduation ceremony where the provost would
present the candidates for graduation to the
president and with the authority that you have
vested in me, I would certify that they are
graduates.

    See, right now -- I will tell you
how this came up. I attended the program, and
I was calling it a program. I wouldn't call
it a -- I attended the program last year.

    And, as I circulated among the
family members they kept talking about, "Oh,
this graduation was wonderful. This
graduation was wonderful," and I am trying to
say, "Well, what graduation?"

And the truth of the matter is
that we did everything but confer the degree. There were speakers, students walked across
the stage, received things in their hand and
all of that and I said the only thing we
needed to do was to confer the degree and we
would have a law school graduation.

So, I did talk with the provost.

We have no problem with that. As you know,
law schools have a graduation and I mentioned
it to the Chair to get the Board's approval
and then we will get back with the law school.

But we are talking about a

TRUSTEE ASKEW: Yes. So, I think
that where the confusion -- like you said, you
do a -- I have been through -- to that
graduation, and it is -- it is -- it may not
necessarily be like, you know, I actually get
the official -- because you only get
officially conferred, but you walk across the
stage.

The president is usually there --
is usually there, and is involved and he is
sitting on the stage and all, so a part of the
program.

And so, though, I guess we are
going into the word, but the experience,
even based upon the input that you have
received, would lead someone to believe that
it was a graduation ceremony, except, you
know, -- and they may title it different.

But my point was -- because I
think -- I think you got right at the -- right
at the real point. The real question is, what
it seems to be is, is that maybe there is a
thought that we will have this graduation at
the law school and then they are not -- they
don't necessarily have to come to the -- and
you don't have to come, but there is -- people
don't feel compelled to actually have to come
to the graduation -- university-wide
graduation.
And, all I was saying is that, I mean, there are also other schools that have similar, as you know, programs.

And so, if we -- do you really want to get into -- do you really want to get into what we -- well, you know, we have a program. It should -- you know, what is the -- what is the distinction between a law school -- and again, I don't think anybody is prohibited from coming to the university-wide.

And again, if it works for your schedule, I -- you know, I just wanted to understand what the real -- what the real -- what was really being asked here.

And I think Madam Chair probably hit it on the head because of the experience at the university is a graduation.

TRUSTEE ISAACS: If I may, because I had a conversation with Dean Broderick this afternoon to get the clarification, to help clarify things for you, hopefully.

From the students' perspective,
the thing that we don't get at -- what we refer to as convocation as opposed to graduation.

We don't get hooded, so there is no recognition of the degree that we have earned after our three years of work.

The other piece to this is, we literally have family and friends coming from all over the world. I mean, we have -- you know as well -- better than I do, probably, the diversity in the student body over there.

It is -- we think, unfair, quite frankly, to ask those families to incur the extra expense of staying the extra day and the truth is, at least according to Dean Broderick, that our attendance at the -- the university level graduation is minimal, at best, on any given year, so there really wouldn't be an impact there, like pulling people away from that event.

Coupled with the fact that the -- my understanding, the hodding ceremony, it is
a little more involved, and it takes up time which, given the bigger crowd at the university, it adds to their time sitting in the seats and we just think it would probably be good for everyone concerned if we could handle it all there.

TREASURER FELTON: Just a question. Didn't -- what change did we make with the community college? Didn't we separate those?

CHAIR CRIDER: No. There is one graduation. It is one.

TRUSTEE ASKEW: Yes, but they did -- they used to graduate. They had their -- at one point in time they had their own separate ceremony.

Then it became a budget issue. Right. It became a budget issue and they now graduate with -- so, we have done it a couple of different ways.

Again, I -- you know, if it works, then that is fine, but I do think it varies,
student participation at graduation, because I have been to a number of them, both the law school and the university-wide, and others have, as well.

So, it is various -- it depends upon the college you are comparing yourself to. And again, if it is something that Mr. President is comfortable with in his administration, I just -- if you get asked a question by -- you put yourself in a certain situation now, when you agree to do that, right, because I expect at some point in time the community college is going to come back to you and tell you they want to have their own graduation, because they have already done it before. History tells us that.

PRESIDENT LYONS: But you can say no. I mean, you know, it is just -- I don't know what the connection is, but all I am trying to do -- you know, we are calling everything graduation.

TRUSTEE ASKEW: Yes.
PRESIDENT LYONS: Like I said, now, 600 people that work for us last week and the Mayor stood up in a public meeting and talked about the graduation because that is what people are calling it.

Now, here we have this. The graduation. All we are trying to do is formalize it. As you said, the only thing that we didn't do last year was to confer the degrees, and then it would be done.

So, we are simply saying that we don't see any problem with it. Let's move forward. Is there any -- and I asked the Chair there, are there any problems with it from the Board? And, if not, then we --

TREASURER FELTON: So, the question is, is it okay to confer the degrees at the law school --

PRESIDENT LYONS: And really have a commencement or graduation ceremony, formal ceremony.

TRUSTEE SHELTON: It is my
understanding that that graduation is a
celebration of the university's efforts to
move students forward.

When you begin to disintegrate the
students off on sidebars, you take away from
the celebration of the university, college or
high school.

You can have all of the
convocations that you want, all of the family
moments that you want, but the graduation is
a university-wide celebration.

That is why I didn't weigh in. My
objection is that we are a university
graduating these graduate students, these
undergraduate students and all of the students
in our program.

And that is the university's
celebration of its efforts to improve the
lives of all of its students, and that is my
reason for reluctance for these separate
graduation ceremonies.

PRESIDENT LYONS: There are law
schools all around the country that --

TRUSTEE SHELTON: I am sure there are.

PRESIDENT LYONS: -- that have the same respect for all of their students and the same definition that you give, and they have a law school graduation.

So, this isn't anything that is trail-blazing or, you know, unique at all. You know, and again, like I said, we are doing all of it now, but conferring the degree and I was not surprised that the parents were not there following this past year because they thought they had graduated, and told me so.

I mean, that is what put this idea in my head, but I don't think it shows any conflict or distancing or anything at the university system when you have a -- a law school graduation.

TRUSTEE SHELTON: We define our graduation. Now, if we decide that the graduation, law school, community school, but
what I heard -- partly what I heard was, other people are defining our graduation because we are not defining our graduation.

And I think we need to establish what -- you know, just what the question is. If we are going to have a separate law school graduation, a separate -- we need to say that so that there is no misunderstanding.

But as we said here, the parents thought they were going to a graduation and the Mayor stood up and said -- thought that he was going to a university graduation.

Since we haven't defined our graduation, other people are defining it for us.

Now, that is what I think is the coming attraction. So, that is why part of my objection. The university has to celebrate its delivery of services to the children, the students. That is all.

CHAIR CRIDER: Trustee Felton, were you going to say something?
TREASURER FELTON: No, no. I --
it is clear. So, is this permanent? Is this
this year? I mean, what -- what is the --
PRESIDENT LYONS: My proposal is
permanent.
TRUSTEE ASKEW: But it -- right.
But it would depend on, again -- we have seen
a bunch of different -- because, it does. It
just -- I mean, you can -- we can say that the
community college integration into the
graduation is permanent today.
But, we all know that things can
change. Right? The community college could
grow and all of a sudden there is a need to --
I mean, -- and again, I -- my point is -- my
point is, is that -- I mean, again, just as
long -- I mean, if all these things are being
considered and the president decides that that
is the way to go while, you know, during his
-- while he is here, then that is fine.
PRESIDENT LYONS: But now, you are
minimizing it because it doesn't have anything
to do with "while I am here."

It has to do with what is natural and accepted throughout the country in terms of law schools. You know, and --

TRUSTEE ASKEW: So you are saying -- it are saying it is not accepted both ways, because we see it both ways.

CHAIR CRIDER: Yes. Well, and, see, I think that is the -- that is the issue. It is done both ways. I mean, my niece graduated from the University of Maryland and they have -- their colleges each have their own graduation.

And so, I think it is up to us to decide. I personally, you know, didn't see an issue. I didn't expect to have this much discussion about it, because I didn't see that it was an issue.

I know that those law school students expected that it was done, and when you go to the general graduation, very few of them participate.
And so, what are we really changing by agreeing to this, since they already are not participating?

I think -- I absolutely think it is the president's decision to make. So --

TRUSTEE ASKEW: And I -- and again, I think we agree, because I have said that three times already.

CHAIR CRIDER: Right. Right. I think it is -- I think it is your decision, Jim.

I mean, look, and saying this to Jim, I think -- sorry. In fairness to the president, he asked our opinion. If he didn't ask our opinion we probably would have been annoyed by that.

So, he asked us. We have given him an answer, and I think that is the end of this discussion.

Okay. So, you know, you can just let us know what we are going to do.

Okay. Any other questions or
issues or discussions for tonight?

And, again, just let me thank you for the work that we all did in this -- in this plan, and for finally getting it to approval so that you can begin the work, and we will look forward to you bringing back to us as you implement various components of the plan for approval.

PRESIDENT LYONS: And I want to thank all of you Trustees, and faculty staff and students, alumni and friends of the university who worked on it as well.

CHAIR CRIDER: Okay. So, motion to adjourn the meeting.

VICE-CHAIR BELL: Second.

CHAIR CRIDER: Okay. Good night everybody.

(Whereupon, the meeting was concluded at 7:25 p.m.)
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