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5:10 p.m.

CHAIRPERSON CRIDER: Okay, thank you. I'd like to call the meeting to order. Ms. Franklin can you call the roll please?

MS. FRANKLIN: Certainly. Mr. Askew?

TRUSTEE ASKEW: Present

MS. FRANKLIN: Mr. Bell?

(No Response)

MS. FRANKLIN: Ms. Bennett?

TRUSTEE BENNETT: Present.

MS. FRANKLIN: Ms. Castillo?

(No Responses)

MS. FRANKLIN: Dr. Crider?

CHAIRPERSON CRIDER: Here.

MS. FRANKLIN: Dr. Curry?

TRUSTEE CURRY: Here.

MS. FRANKLIN: Mr. Dyke?

TRUSTEE DYKE: Here.

MS. FRANKLIN: Okay, Mr. Felton?

TRUSTEE FELTON: Here.
MS. FRANKLIN: Dr. Lemus?

TRUSTEE LEMUS: Here.

MS. FRANKLIN: Dr. Lyons?

TRUSTEE LYONS: Here.

MS. FRANKLIN: General Schwartz?

TRUSTEE SCHWARTZ: Here.

MS. FRANKLIN: Mr. Shelton?

TRUSTEE SHELTON: Here.

MS. FRANKLIN: Dr. Tardd?

TRUSTEE TARDD: Here.

MS. FRANKLIN: Ms. Thompson?

TRUSTEE THOMPSON: Here.

MS. FRANKLIN: Mr. Vradenburg?

(No response)

MS. FRANKLIN: Mr. Wyner?

(No response)

MS. FRANKLIN: Madam Chair you have a quorum.

CHAIRPERSON CRIDER: Thank you Ms. Franklin. At the ex -- an Executive Session was held on -- at the September 16, 2014 Board of Trustee Meeting. All matters acted upon in
Executive Session were proper.

Okay, the next item on the agenda is approval of the minutes for September 16, 2014.

TRUSTEE: So moved.

TRUSTEE ASKEW: Seconded.

CHAIRPERSON CRIDER: Moved and second. All in favor?

(Chorus of Ayes.)

CHAIRPERSON CRIDER: Thank you.

We now move to the action items on the agenda. As you can see, we have several action items to take care of.

And then we will have an Executive Session -- a brief Executive Session after we do the action items. Okay.

So the first item on the agenda comes under the Academic and Student Affairs Committee. Major General Schwartz?

TRUSTEE SCHWARTZ: Madam Chair, this item of the Seventh Master Agreement between the University of the District of
Columbia and the University of the District of Columbia Faculty Association/National Education Association was discussed during the Academic and Student Affairs Committee, the joint Committee that we had on the 6th of November. There's a FIS to accompany, this resolution, they certified that the funds are available.

Therefore Madam Chair, now therefor be it resolved that the Board of Trustees here by accepts the recommendation of the President. And hereby approves the Seventh Master Agreement between the University of the District of Columbia and the University of the District of Columbia Faculty Association/National Education Association.

And be it further resolved, that the Board of Trustees hereby approves the new salary scales as attached and pending approval of the City Council, submitted by the Academic and Student Affairs Committee. Dated 6 November 2014.
CHAIRPERSON CRIDER: Okay. Is there a motion?

TRUSTEE FELTON: So moved.

TRUSTEE ASKEW: Second.

CHAIRPERSON CRIDER: Okay, moved and second. Discussion?

TRUSTEE ASKEW: Madam Chair?

CHAIRPERSON CRIDER: Yes, Trustee Askew?

TRUSTEE ASKEW: Just a couple of quick questions. Just to make sure those of us who were not able to attend the Committee meeting are properly abreast.

So you know, one of the things that I saw in here was that there is a different pay scale -- there are two different pay scales. And one of which I assumed represents the step approach, which I think as a part of this Seventh Master Agreement, we were -- or the University, which includes all components of the faculty component to it, was moving from a step to a merit base.
So I guess my question first of all is, are the two attachments of the salary schedules, is one reflecting the step approach which we're going away from?

And what's going to be presented to the -- what is being presented to this Board, and if approved, will be presented to the Council, is the second schedule, which looks like it's more merit based and includes the three percent increase?

MS. PETTY: That's correct. We're moving -- the Seventh Master Agreement takes all faculty to a step system.

But because there were really adjustments, this Agreement, the arbitration award actually goes backwards for some years. We haven't had a contract for some time.

I believe the step scale was updated for just the interim period. But everybody will be on merit as of the date of the approval of the Seventh Master Agreement. All faculty will be on the step scale.
TRUSTEE ASKEW: So all faculty will be on a step scale or a merit scale?

MS. PETTY: I'm sorry, the merit scale. The merit scale.

TRUSTEE ASKEW: Okay. All right.

Okay, okay.

MS. PETTY: Yes.

TRUSTEE ASKEW: So we're moving away from the step scale which we have here, if we approve it today, and we're moving to the more merit, which is you don't have all the steps in between, but rather a range of what the salary could be according to --

MS. PETTY: That's correct. And that system was adjusted to reflect the three percent cost of living effective for this year.

TRUSTEE ASKEW: Okay, so like for example, the highest salary on the step scale is $108,000.00 round it off to $109,000.00. And then the highest level -- and this is for a distinguished professor, goes to -- so from
$109,000.00 to about $118,000.00.

And that represents three percent?

Because it seems a little -- and I can't do
the numbers in my head.

MS. PETTY: It's more than three
percent. But I think there was an expansion
of the scale.

Is Ms. Blanchard here? Because
her office did the -- the scales were actually
developed by HR. And so I want her to respond
to that.

TRUSTEE ASKEW: No problem, okay.

MS. BLANCHARD: Myrtho Blanchard,
VP HR.

TRUSTEE ASKEW: Yes, how are you?

MS. BLANCHARD: Well, thank you.

TRUSTEE ASKEW: Good, good. So my
question is, is I'm just trying to -- from
reading the information you know, if this is
approved, there's going to be a three percent
increase in salaries across the board as a
result of this Seventh Master Agreement.
And so what we were looking at is,
when you look at the highest salary range for
a distinguished professor, which is at a 14,
you're at about $109 -- the max is
$109,000.00. And then when you look at the
merit base, the highest range or the highest
you can go for a distinguished professor is
$117,000.00.

Which is greater -- which is about
a ten percent difference. So the number I
assume reflects the three percent plus
something else. I mean are we increase -- I
mean it looks like we're increasing the range
by more then three percent.

MS. BLANCHARD: It should only be
three percent. I don't have it in front of me
right now. I will look at it and confirm.

TRUSTEE ASKEW: Okay.

MS. BLANCHARD: But there were two
salary scales which we looked at based on the
request of the award or based on the results
of awards. Three percent for the -- as they
were standing, three percent for the step base
and three percent of the merit base.

    And if it appears to be different,
let me take a quick look at it because I don't
have it right in front of me.

    TRUSTEE ASKEW: Okay. Okay.

    MS. BLANCHARD: Let me pull out
the previous salary scale, because it's two
separate salary scales. One for the step and
the other one is the merit.

    TRUSTEE ASKEW: Right, which is
what right now we're looking at the step based
faculty salary schedule.

    MS. BLANCHARD: Okay.

    TRUSTEE ASKEW: And then the
second document is the merit faculty salary
schedule.

    CHAIRPERSON CRIDER: I think maybe
just for clarification what it shows on the
merit based scale is a minimum salary. Let
them finish their conversation and then we'll
finish.
Are you leaving? We aren't done yet. Okay.

So the question I was asking to try to clarify where the confusion is from my perspective, the merit scale that's included in our binder shows two salaries. A minimum salary and a maximum salary and nothing in between. That's where the merit idea comes from.

MS. BLANCHARD: Correct. Correct.

CHAIRPERSON CRIDER: Are you saying that the difference from the minimum to the maximum should be three percent?

MS. BLANCHARD: No ma'am.

CHAIRPERSON CRIDER: Is there anything else -- okay, what should it be? Because that was what I thought we read.

MS. BLANCHARD: And that's why I was stepping out to get the previous salary scale. In the merit base, you have a range from --

CHAIRPERSON CRIDER: In this -- in
the merit or the step?

MS. BLANCHARD: The merit.

CHAIRPERSON CRIDER: Okay.

MS. BLANCHARD: Okay?

CHAIRPERSON CRIDER: All right.

MS. BLANCHARD: So from a minimum to the maximum.

CHAIRPERSON CRIDER: Right.

MS. BLANCHARD: The minimum started somewhere. That minimum went up three percent. The maximum started somewhere, it went simply to three percent.

CHAIRPERSON CRIDER: Okay.

MS. BLANCHARD: So that range -- that range from one place to another, both range went simply to three percent. On the steps, everything across the board went three percent.

In the step base, it just went up three percent. That's all the calculation we did.

CHAIRPERSON CRIDER: All right.
So are you saying then that anybody that's a distinguished professor, their salary would be $108,974.00 --

MS. BLANCHARD: If they're on the step.

CHAIRPERSON CRIDER: Right?

That's the minimum. When does the maximum apply? Because it -- I'm not understanding why there would be a three percent increase showing here on the maximum unless you're talking about an overall three percent adjustment.

Because there's only two salary bands as presented here. A minimum and a maximum. So is everybody at the minimum?

MS. BLANCHARD: Okay. The full range went up by three percent.

CHAIRPERSON CRIDER: So are you still using the range that was the old step scale?

MS. BLANCHARD: No, because there are two. There -- because right now -- and
those one steps will no longer be under steps.

CHAIRPERSON CRIDER: Right.

MS. BLANCHARD: But you needed a step to see any back pay you were going to give folks up to now. And from then on, you're not going to use your steps anymore.

Everybody will then be on the merit base. Which was simply increased by three percent.

CHAIRPERSON CRIDER: Okay. So are you saying then that once you do this retroactive payment, right? That under this what you're asking us to vote for, the minimum amount that they would be paid, including the retroactive amount is $108,974.00 --

MS. BLANCHARD: That is correct.

CHAIRPERSON CRIDER: And the maximum amount that they would be paid, including the retroactive is the $117,691.00?

MS. BLANCHARD: Well no --

MS. PETTY: No. Of the range is such that a person can be anywhere within that
range.

CHAIRPERSON CRIDER: Right.

MS. PETTY: But the minimum is $108,000.00. And they cannot exceed $114,000.00. But they can be anywhere in that range depending upon what their current salary is when we move them over to the scale --

CHAIRPERSON CRIDER: Right.

MS. PETTY: And the three percent differential that gets added to that salary.

CHAIRPERSON CRIDER: Right.

TRUSTEE CURRY: So, just to add to that, you grouped in the merit pay distinguished professor and professor together. And the minimum salary for the distinguished professor/professor is about $109,000.00.

How does that compare with the regular professor salary at step 14, which is $102,000.01? So it seems like you've combined the distinguished professor and professor, give them one at $100 -- basically
$109,000.00. And then you have the max at $118,000.00.

But when I look at the professor at step 14 and compare it to distinguished professor, you're looking at $102,000.00 versus basically $109,000.00. And I'm not understanding that difference?

CHAIRPERSON CRIDER: Right. I mean if you do the three percent, it's like $111,000.00.

TRUSTEE CURRY: Right.

CHAIRPERSON CRIDER: I mean it would be from $108,000.00 to $111,000.00 if you add the three percent.

TRUSTEE CURRY: But even with that, you're still grouping distinguished professor with professor.

CHAIRPERSON CRIDER: Right.

TRUSTEE CURRY: And then you've still got the bump up.

TRUSTEE ASKEW: But your question is different then mine.
TRUSTEE CURRY: I know.

TRUSTEE ASKEW: Because I'm still at the $117,000.00.

TRUSTEE CURRY: Yes.

TRUSTEE ASKEW: And I still can't get there.

CHAIRPERSON CRIDER: It ranges.

TRUSTEE ASKEW: Yes.

MS. BLANCHARD: The ranges were already established. The only thing we did for this current award is to increase the entire range by three percent.

Whatever salaries people are at can be, if we're speaking just simply of the merit salary, they can be anywhere between that. And I can -- we -- and neither Dr. Petty or I can't answer questions about where particular positions or rank can fall.

But when we're just speaking of the salary range or the scale, it was increased by three percent based on what was requested by the award. So when you look at
the full range, a person can be anywhere depending on where they're coming from if they're within that range.

But the range itself only moved up three percent.

CHAIRPERSON CRIDER: All right, I'm going to Trustee Richardson.

TRUSTEE BENNETT: Bennett.

CHAIRPERSON CRIDER: I mean Bennett. Sorry. I'm thinking of a movie star.

TRUSTEE BENNETT: I have a question. My question though is I thought I heard you say you took where people are already at and you added three percent to the minimum.

MS. BLANCHARD: No. Not where people were at. Where the previous salary range was.

TRUSTEE BENNETT: Where it was.

MS. BLANCHARD: Correct.

TRUSTEE BENNETT: So you added
three percent to get the minimum number?

MS. BLANCHARD: To get to --

TRUSTEE BENNETT: So how do we get
what the numbers were before? Because that's
I think -- that's what's doing this.

MS. PETTY: Well, that's what Ms.
Blanchard says that she was going to her
office to get for you. Because we had --
three quarters of the faculty were already on
a merit scale prior to the negotiation of this
contract.

This contract moves everybody
there. That's the reason you have two
different pay scales, because we had to adjust
the step as well as the banded, okay.

The banded is for merit. Now I
just caught that they have collapsed
distinguished and professor together.

TRUSTEE BENNETT: And that's the
issue that -- part of the issue we are having
with that.

CHAIRPERSON CRIDER: Well they
keep adding the three percent each year. I mean is there only four bands. You know, it's like four band -- I'm calling them bands. There may not be. You know, I'm not an HR professional.

So but if you go three percent four times, you'll eventually get to the $117,000.00. So the most that they could do is four increases until the $117,000.00, or are you -- I guess I'm not clear on how you get from the $108,000.00 to the $117,000.00 in the band?

So the most that they can get -- right.

TRUSTEE CURRY: They haven't explained the process. They were just dealing with the number. But it's probably a merit base based on whatever that merit scale is. And then do you do a mid point of that? Or a percentage of mid point based on how folks fell in a given range? Or What?

MS. PETTY: No, the bands don't
have -- well they would have a mathematical middle ground.

TRUSTEE CURRY: Yes, exactly.

MS. PETTY: But we don't identify a middle point for them. A person who for example, we're having promotions now. If you're promoted, you -- your salary has to move at least to the minimum point in the band that you're moving from.

If you're moving from assistant to associate, you'd at least have to be. But if you were actually on a step or within the band towards the end of the scale, you may well move towards --

TRUSTEE CURRY: Into a new band.

MS. PETTY: Yes, to another point.

TRUSTEE CURRY: Wow.

TRUSTEE ASKEW: And I'd just like to make sure we've got the right answer. You know, so I mean, I know we're speculating as to what might have happened or what may be the case.
But I'd like to just have certainty as to what the response is.

CHAIRPERSON CRIDER: Yes. Because I mean if I understand correctly, this $117,000.00 is not the end of the scale. Because it's got to be if each year it goes up three percent.

So this is four years. If somebody is here ten years, they're going to be evaluated more then four times, right?

MS. PETTY: Well, the bands are --

CHAIRPERSON CRIDER: So is this the only deal? Is it like -- is this only dealing with the contract up through 2014?

MS. PETTY: Exactly.

CHAIRPERSON CRIDER: Okay. So we have no idea what the salary scale is beyond 2014?


TRUSTEE FELTON: Madam Chair?
CHAIRPERSON CRIDER: Trustee

Felton?

TRUSTEE FELTON: Perhaps again, you can give us a sense of how long. But I mean I think all the folks are saying is just start with a number and show them how you got to the next numbers.

Is that something you can compute before the meeting ends tonight?

MS. BLANCHARD: Absolutely. We have it.

TRUSTEE FELTON: Well, why don't we just defer that decision until we come back.

MS. BLANCHARD: Absolutely.

TRUSTEE FELTON: If they ask that Joe, that's the only -- I mean that's the issue you really want to know.

TRUSTEE ASKEW: Yes, I mean it is. I mean but, let's be clear. The max and the minimum for a distinguished professor is
$108,000.00. Right? It's not like the other steps that you see here.

That you know for -- you know like for professor, it could go from -- if you're looking at the step chart, it goes from $66,000.00 to $102,000.00.

TRUSTEE FELTON: Right.

TRUSTEE ASKEW: That -- so I understand the range. I mean, and you just take out the steps and you just say here's your minimum, here's your maximum. I understand that.

I started with the distinguished professor because the maximum and the minimum is $108,000.00. And so now going to the merit system, it looks like that the minimum salary, and again, you brought out a point that this is including professors and distinguished professors, but there's also a point where professors actually start off at $66,000.00.

Right?

So that's a whole other confusing
part of it. But if I just stick with distinguished professor, and on the step level there's a maximum and the minimum is the same, how do we -- again, I'm still trying to figure out how do you get to the $117,000.00?

I understand if the $108,000.00 went up three percent. Right? And if the answer is it went up three percent you know, for each year to get to the $117,000.00, I could probably understand that.

But nobody's told us affirmatively that that's what the answer is.

TRUSTEE FELTON: Was the salary max higher? I mean was the salary max just simply three percent less then the $117,000.00?

CHAIRPERSON CRIDER: I want to make sure that we know what we're voting on and how we it got there.

TRUSTEE CURRY: Well unless you give them an opportunity to come back and present it, it's be done.
CHAIRPERSON CRIDER: So let me ask Mr. -- let me ask Trustee Schwartz. There's been a suggestion that we table this one to allow them time to come up with the salary scale. Do you have an issue with that?

And then we can move onto the next --

TRUSTEE SHELTON: I second that suggestion.

CHAIRPERSON CRIDER: Okay.

TRUSTEE SCHWARTZ: Yes ma'am.

Also, they said they can get back to us almost immediately. Yes.

CHAIRPERSON CRIDER: Before the meeting ends. Okay. So let's do that and then go on to your next resolution. If that's okay with the body. Okay, thank you.

I thought that would be fairly easy.

TRUSTEE SHELTON: It's opening night.

CHAIRPERSON CRIDER: Is that what
it is? Okay. The next one Trustee Schwartz?

TRUSTEE SCHWARTZ: Yes ma'am. The next resolution deals with approval of the terms --

CHAIRPERSON CRIDER: I'm sorry, let me just stop you for one second because this one it -- oh, they left out the room. This next resolution also deals with compensation.

So are we going to run into the same issue with this one as we did with the last one?

TRUSTEE BENNETT: It looks --

CHAIRPERSON CRIDER: It looks like it?

TRUSTEE BENNETT: It looks like it because all of the same scales should apply here too. It's the same issue.

CHAIRPERSON CRIDER: So let's go to the one after this.

TRUSTEE SCHWARTZ: Okay. The third resolution deals with the remission of
tuition funding for the UDC, David A. Clark

School of Law.

TRUSTEE: Second the motion to accept.

TRUSTEE FELTON: Could we -- what is the difference then the one in the book on the one hand --

TRUSTEE SCHWARTZ: Hold, we've got to move.

TRUSTEE FELTON: You made a motion, I've just seconded it.

CHAIRPERSON CRIDER: I think we do have a correction about this one. Do you want to go into that please?

TRUSTEE SCHWARTZ: Yes ma'am.

Yes, during the Academic Student Affairs Committee meeting, we voted on this resolution. However, the face does not support the resolution as written. The face supports a two year resolution.

And the resolution as written is three years. You'll find on your table in
front of you, a new resolution which is for
two years. Which then is supported by the
face that is written.

So a motion to accept that
resolution, the two year resolution for FY '15
and '16 rather than FY '15, '16 and '17 that's
in your book.

CHAIRPERSON CRIDER: It's been
moved. Is there a second?

TRUSTEE BENNETT: Second.

CHAIRPERSON CRIDER: Moved and
second. Discussion? Discussion? Trustee
Askew?

TRUSTEE ASKEW: Okay, so the only
thing that's different here is that we're
approving the $700,000.00 for two years as
opposed to three?

CHAIRPERSON CRIDER: Correct.

TRUSTEE SCHWARTZ: That's correct.

TRUSTEE ASKEW: Okay. And is
there a fiscal impact statement that --

TRUSTEE SCHWARTZ: Yes, there is.
TRUSTEE ASKEW: That follows in here?

CHAIRPERSON CRIDER: Yes, it's in your packet following the original resolution. There's a fiscal impact statement.

TRUSTEE ASKEW: For the two, okay.

CHAIRPERSON CRIDER: Right. And the fiscal impact statement supports the -- or acknowledges sufficiency for two years.

TRUSTEE SCHWARTZ: '15 and '16 as opposed to three years.

CHAIRPERSON CRIDER: Right, '15 and '16 rather than '15, '16 and '17.

TRUSTEE ASKEW: So if it were -- but if you added the three years, we're saying that the FIS would be negative?

TRUSTEE SCHWARTZ: The analysis based upon the FIS is only for two years.

TRUSTEE ASKEW: Right.

TRUSTEE SCHWARTZ: So the funds were only certified for two years. '15 and '16. There was no certification of funds for
'17.

TRUSTEE ASKEW: Okay, okay. And the only reason I ask that question is because previously I think we approved this on a three year basis.

TRUSTEE SCHWARTZ: Right.

TRUSTEE ASKEW: All right. So -- and so now we're going on a two year. And I'm just trying to figure out the rationale as to two versus three. And I don't have a particular position at this point in time. But I'm just trying to --

TRUSTEE SCHWARTZ: I don't either. But the FIS that was presented that supported the resolution was presented only for two years.

CHAIRPERSON CRIDER: Let's just ask him. I mean Mr. Rickford is here. He can let us know the rationale for the two instead of three.

TRUSTEE ASKEW: Okay.

MR. RICKFORD: Don Rickford, Chief
Financial Officer. The rationale is stated at the bottom of the FIS that there was an internal discussion about the amount of remission of tuition in the different programs that we have.

That there needed to be a study because it's turning out to be quite costly for the University to continue to do this. It isn't specifically directed towards this program, but we said it would give us enough time to complete that review and come back to the Board if we feel that the third years is justified for that amount based on the review that we will do.

CHAIRPERSON CRIDER: Questions? Trustee Felton?

TRUSTEE FELTON: So just a clarification. So let's suppose it cannot be justified. So it would be that the amount is just frozen at that level at that point?

Then what happens? What do you do about the third year?
MR. RICKFORD: It would either stay frozen, go up or down.

TRUSTEE FELTON: But if you say you don't have it and you can't support it, it just --

TRUSTEE: Excuse me your microphone just went off.

MR. RICKFORD: I didn't know it went off.

TRUSTEE FELTON: I'm sorry, say that again.

MR. RICKFORD: I said if the study supports it, it can go up or down. We will then present a resolution to that effect.

TRUSTEE FELTON: So if the study says you cannot support this --

MR. RICKFORD: If a study cannot support it, we will not recommend it.

TRUSTEE FELTON: And so does the tuition go up or what would happen?

MR. RICKFORD: Well the tuition will go to the standard tuition that the other
students that are not getting this remission normally would be.

TRUSTEE FELTON: All right.

CHAIRPERSON CRIDER: Trustee Shelton?

TRUSTEE SHELTON: Unless the Board decides to re-look at this process and reconfirm it?

MR. RICKFORD: That's correct.

TRUSTEE SHELTON: What I understand we're doing is, is we're -- based on the information we have, we're accepting the monetary costs, but we're doing it for two years. We will have an evaluation that will allow us to determine whether or not is what the real impact and make a better decision on the third year to follow.

And I think that's what we're asking his office to tell us. And they've done that. And we've almost agreed to accept this risk. But we also have to know it.

TRUSTEE ASKEW: So, Madam Chair?
CHAIRPERSON CRIDER: Yes Trustee Askew?

TRUSTEE ASKEW: So I just need just a straightforward answer, right? Because you're saying in the fiscal impact, the direct financial impact on the proposed resolution is a loss of net tuition of $700,000.00 for each year, the '15 and '16.

And the opportunity cost that's incurred by the unavailability of these funds to support other critical needs of the University. So my direct question is are you saying that the money is there to support the $700,000.00 for the two years?

MR. RICKFORD: Yes. But the budget that we have considers that that remission of tuition will be granted. So we will get lower tuition effectively from the law school overall for the amount to be covered.

TRUSTEE ASKEW: I understand, but in your fiscal analysis, you took in
consideration the decrease in enrollment of students at the University. So I'm saying this, I'm needing you to say this because -- so my question is again very specific.

Does the budget support a $700,000.00 subsidy which I support, let me tell you in theory, but you're the finance person, right?

MR. RICKFORD: Yes.

TRUSTEE ASKEW: Does the budget support the $700,000.00 for 2015/2016? That's all I'm asking. It's either a yes or no.

MR. RICKFORD: Yes. And we have taken that into consideration, yes.

TRUSTEE ASKEW: Okay.

MR. RICKFORD: And we will accommodate that, yes.

TRUSTEE ASKEW: Okay.

CHAIRPERSON CRIDER: Trustee Bennett?

TRUSTEE BENNETT: Thank you Madam Chair. I think we have in our package and at
the Academic meeting we talked about that the remitted tuition allowed the school of law to attract students in order to increase revenues in tuition to the University.

But here we're having -- we're seeing that it's a $700,000.00 deficiency if anything. So I was wondering how did we arrive at that figure in taking sufficient, if we didn't have it, how much lower it would be? I'm still trying to figure out.

MR. RICKFORD: No, I didn't say that there was a deficiency. I said we will not collect $700,000.00. Effectively we are reducing the tuition we charge to certain students who receive this remission of tuition award.

TRUSTEE BENNETT: Right. So I was wondering if looking at that figure, because what we were told in the last meeting was that that somehow helped to increase revenue from tuition from the law school. And you're saying it doesn't.
It actually decreases it because you're giving this remitted tuition. So I was wondering how did we arrive at this figure?

MR. RICKFORD: Well look, net, you're collecting less money. There's some who will argue that by giving the remission of tuition, more students come.

But if they're coming at half price, the question is at some point, you'll be losing money. Absolutely.

TRUSTEE BENNETT: But if they don't come at all, then --

MR. RICKFORD: Well --

TRUSTEE BENNETT: Then you'll really lose everything.

CHAIRPERSON CRIDER: But I think you know, that it --

MR. RICKFORD: There is no -- no study was done that I've seen that shows that it increases enrollment. That is -- people have said that, but we've seen no study to really support there.
And what I'm seeing is that we should do a review of this whole process. Look at things like that. And make a determination that going forward, what the University can afford to do.

We are going to have a remission of tuition program to some extent to one degree or the other I believe. But I don't know that we have the facts to support this.

CHAIRPERSON CRIDER: I think it is. Thank you Mr. Rickford. I think it's responsible for us to take a look at this and any other financial assistance programs that the University -- that the University engages in. I think that is responsible from a fiduciary perspective.

And so, we can't keep on forever and ever and ever just handing money out like we grow it you know, I'm not printing it in my basement. So you know, I think this is responsible for us to do.

And what this motion is, or the
resolution is, to go ahead and support it as we have always done it for the next two years. This year and next year. And then for the third year, we should have sufficient information and maybe be able to make a really intelligent decision about whether we support it going forward. And at what level.

And so I think that this is something that makes sense for us to do. And it's not saying that we would deny it. And look, I don't want to get into a debate about whether or not the assumption that it draws more students is right or wrong. I have no idea.

I know that enrollment across the campus is down. And so I have no idea whether we would have seen more students if the tuition remission had been higher or lower. I'm not going to argue that.

But the study is supposed to be designed to tell us that.

MR. RICKFORD: yes, that's
correct.

CHAIRPERSON CRIDER: So I think it is responsible for us to do that. Trust -- I mean Mr. President?

PRESIDENT LYONS: Madam Chair, I think the importance of this conversation is the fact that our finance people just want to make it clear to all of us that when we do remissions and waivers, that that means that there are dollars that we would not be collecting. Not just the law school, but anywhere that we do waivers of fees, then that's money you do not collect.

And it's easy for folks to think that you know, you can do waivers and it vanishes in the air someplace or -- but just the real money that is not collected in whatever program. So I think that we need to look at and understand all of the programs that have -- involve waivers for the Board's edification.

CHAIRPERSON CRIDER: All right.
TRUSTEE ASKEW: Madam Chair?

CHAIRPERSON CRIDER: Trustee Askew?

TRUSTEE ASKEW: So I just want to say you know, I absolutely agree. And again, I just recognize when we went down from three to two, it just raised just a certain amount of questions.

You know, I also -- I mean, we're doing this, we're giving $700,000.00 because we're actually looking for a return on it.

CHAIRPERSON CRIDER: That's right.

TRUSTEE ASKEW: I mean so it's not just we give you, you know, $700,000.00. You know, we're looking for a return that leads to a return that's above the $700,000.00 investment.

So again, I look forward to the study.

CHAIRPERSON CRIDER: Right, me too.

TRUSTEE ASKEW: And if you know,
it's prudent for us to do the two years, which
I wholeheartedly support, I certainly want as
a graduate from the law school, but being
responsible for the institution as you point
out, enrollment is down in the entire
institution.

So I think that the fact that you
have articulated that such a study will be in
progress, to me is very hopeful. And I also
think to external stakeholders that will be
helpful as well.

CHAIRPERSON CRIDER: All right, I
think it's time for us to have metrics and to
really show numbers about what we do. We've
got to track our performance. And if we're
not living up to what we say we're doing, then
we've got to reevaluate how we do business.

So this is long overdue in my
perspective. So I think this is fine. Any
further discussion of this issue?

If not, I'd like to call for the
question. All in favor vote aye.
(Chorus of ayes.)

CHAIRPERSON CRIDER: Any opposed?

(No response.)

CHAIRPERSON CRIDER: Thank you Jim. Any opposed or abstention?

(No response.)

CHAIRPERSON CRIDER: That motion carries. So the next resolution?

TRUSTEE SCHWARTZ: The next resolution deals with the approval of the Bachelor of Science Degree in Biomedical Engineering Degree Program. Motion to accept this resolution as written.

CHAIRPERSON CRIDER: Is there a second?

TRUSTEE ASKEW: Second.

CHAIRPERSON CRIDER: It's been moved and second. Any discussion?

TRUSTEE ASKEW: Madam Chair?

CHAIRPERSON CRIDER: Trustee Askew?

TRUSTEE ASKEW: All right, so I
got to squint to read my own writing here. So let -- I guess I want to get an understanding of the -- my question is actually again with this particular program, it's not really about the program. It's probably more so about the finances and the enrollment associated with it. Not the substance of what the program will and will not do.

But one of the questions that I had because I was -- there's a chart that was provided that -- and it was very difficult to read. And I know my eyes won't, so you know, so somebody might have to help us with this one.

But there's a chart, it sets out the non-academic policy proposal, the first year budget projections. It sets out --

TRUSTEE SCHWARTZ: What page are you looking at?

TRUSTEE ASKEW: I'm sorry?

TRUSTEE SCHWARTZ: I'm sorry?

CHAIRPERSON CRIDER: It's page 24.
TRUSTEE SCHWARTZ: Okay.

TRUSTEE ASKEW: So what I was really -- what I was trying to figure out, in looking at the numbers on this page, you know, the total program cost in the first year were at $115,000.00, right? And as I understand it, and please correct me if I'm wrong, this program is actually the -- what it said in the qualitative analysis, is that we really don't need any additional FTEs for this --

TRUSTEE SCHWARTZ: That's correct.

TRUSTEE ASKEW: Because they were going to be taught from staff who's the mechanical engineering.

TRUSTEE SCHWARTZ: All ready onboard staff, that's correct.

TRUSTEE ASKEW: Right. So when I saw the second year projection, and again in a quantitative analysis, it says after the -- it said two things. It says one, and this is in the fiscal impact statement as well.

TRUSTEE SCHWARTZ: Um-hum, yes.
TRUSTEE ASKEW: You know, it said that we could -- there wouldn't be any real additional cost. And the staff was going to raise $70,000.00 each year.

And in fact in the fifth year, I think in the fourth or fifth year, and again it's hard to read these numbers. But I think it says even in the fifth year it goes up until you add a person. And then they bring in an additional $30,000.00 to get you up to $100,000.00.

So from looking at the chart, I'm trying to reconcile that the budget will stay constant pretty much over the next three years. And this is just a qualitative analysis.

But when I look at the graph, the chart that you have here, again the first year is $115,000.00. And again, this includes your faculty -- I guess this is the faculty members' salaries because this is just the cost.
The next year the number goes down. And then in the next year the number goes up to $122,000.00. And again, I do understand that from some of the quantitative analysis, there's going to be if -- once you increase the number of students, you're going to need more labs, which are going to push what some of the costs are.

And though I see increases in equipment, I don't necessarily see increases on the facility side. So could somebody help me -- just help me with what these numbers, because maybe I'm just looking and interpreting it differently and wrong.

So could somebody help me with the numbers?

TRUSTEE SCHWARTZ: I'm not sure -- the Dean's here, thank you.

DR. SHETTY: I'm Dev Shetty. I'm the Dean of the School of Engineering and Applied Science.

TRUSTEE ASKEW: Okay.
DR. SHETTY: The numbers as you said, the first year is covered by a faculty member from mechanical engineering whom recently we have recruited. She's the one who has a degree from MIT and a Masters from Stanford and Bachelors from UMass.

And she's leading the program, Dr. Laura Thompson, she's already here.

TRUSTEE ASKEW: Welcome.

DR. SHETTY: Now the -- that salary, she's a part of mechanical engineering program. That shows her salary.

Now one of the problems we have in the School of Engineering and Applied Sciences, it's hard to attract new faculty members at the current standard to live. The ceiling of $65,000.00. So it is very difficult to attract qualified PhDs at that level both in engineering and computer science.

So what we have done is in the last couple of years, we tell the faculty that
we give them their summer salary, so that's why that remains only for two years. So that is the big raise you see.

The $95,140.00, then the second year it goes down because the person does not get the summer salary. So that's the decrease.

And then in the third year, I mean if the number of our biomedical engineering program, we expect it to grow. Straight away we are going, already we have seen an application of 20 students to come to the first year.

But by the third year we expect 50 students. And we are going to --

TRUSTEE ASKEW: How many?

DR. SHETTY: 50.

TRUSTEE ASKEW: 50. Okay, this says 40, but okay.

DR. SHETTY: Yes, 40 to 50 students. And we are likely to have a new faculty member that is what you see in the new
facultymembersalary.

TRUSTEESAKEW: Okay.

DR.SHETTY: The third year. And then regarding the other resources, our faculty had been very active in, so average they raised quite a lot of grant money. Last year they had raised more than one million. So most of them are mechanical engineering faculty. So we are averaging that and showing it over five years.

TRUSTEASAKEW: Okay. So then -- so and I also note in your qualitative analysis you mention the -- you mention that you're actually recruiting from within the University. So in other words you're moving -- it looked like you're moving students who have an interest prior to their junior year, who are either in mechanical engineering or the computer science.

DR.SHETTY: Right.

TRUSTEASAKEW: And so, what impact -- because right now, what impact --
how many graduating students do you have from
those programs? And what impact will that
have on a number of mechanical engineers that
will be left?

And the reason I ask that, because
you know, when you determine whether you're
going to discontinue a particular major, is
based upon -- one of the major factors is how
many students you actually have in it.

DR. SHETTY: Right, right.

TRUSTEE ASKEW: So -- and again,
I'm just going on your strategy. Because it
seemed to be on the front end, you were really
recruiting from the inside. And so unless --
and so are you -- I understand building the
program, but are you -- I don't want you to do
yourself a disservice by now all of a sudden
you're not -- you're graduating very few
mechanical engineers and computer science
because you've pulled from that existing base
as opposed to recruiting new students to come
in and start the program.
DR. SHETTY: Right. The focus is to recruit students from outside, not from inside at all. You know, but in the process there may be students who are in the civil mechanical, electric, computer science, might get interested.

That's what we are seeing. People are inquiring about it. But most of the students I think 80 to 90 percent of the students will come from outside from the schools -- also from the community college. We're reaching out to community college, both of our own community college and Montgomery Community College and PG Country where we have already articulation agreement.

So the numbers if you look at our growth in the last four semesters, School of Engineering and Applied Science have been growing. So compared to 2012 we have 30 percent more students now.

And it is happening across the lines, civil, mechanical, electrical, computer
science. So it will continue to grow. This I see as added extra students to the existing number of students because of several reasons.

We have been talking to a number of industries who are a part of AMI, Association of Minority Associate Engineers. And one company, Boston Scientific has told us that they are going to give us two scholarships. One scholarship tuition free for a biomedical engineering student. And second scholarship is for the summer you know. So this is just with one company. But we are likely to reach out to many more and try to see -- to attract more scholarships to this program.

TRUSTEE ASKEW: Okay.

DR. SHETTY: So to answer your question, it will not only help this program, but it will also help the other programs also. So it will not take away anybody from the other programs.

TRUSTEE ASKEW: Okay.
DR. SHETTY: I see it as a strength because there will be synergy with other schools, the School of Gerontology, with the College of Arts and Science where the biology is being taught. So I see all the development in the area.

And also relationship with the NIH and we already had been talking to National -- we have a hospital, Albert Einstein Hospital in New York City. So that interactions will grow because of this program.

TRUSTEE ASKEW: Okay. And again, my questions were financially based and then obviously the student based, which also means the finances. So I appreciate it. It looks like a great program.

It looks like Catholic and University of Baltimore are the only two institutions that actually have this particular program. I do like the fact that because it's -- I do like the fact that it is also a pathway for students to go to medical
DR. SHETTY: Right. That is one - - that is one other distinction. Among the 14 HBCUs where there are engineering programs, there are 14 of those, this will be the second institution. Only one other institution has a biomedical engineering program.

And none of them in the close vicinity. So that is a sort of an added advantage for us.

TRUSTEE ASKEW: Okay, thank you.

Thank you Madam Chair.

CHAIRPERSON CRIDER: Trustee Felton then Bennett.

TRUSTEE FELTON: Yes, Madam Chair, I'm just going to add my support for that strategy. Because certainly as we look at other universities across the nation, these are fields that where there will be jobs. And the whole thing is about workforce development.

And so this program will help the
University because it will bring, in my opinion, you know, greater recognition and certainly partnerships that have not existed before. And again, as we talk about dealing with the image of our University, I think this is a very positive move.

CHAIRPERSON CRIDER: Trustee Bennett?

TRUSTEE BENNETT: Thank you Chair. Definitely, I'm in total support of the program for one because I think George Washington or Georgetown was just considering this program as well to have it in their own curriculum.

So I think meeting this type of program I think attract more high school students to looking to go into this field here instead of going to other schools that are probably outside of our vicinity. So I think very well done program. Thanks.

CHAIRPERSON CRIDER: Let me just ask -- I'm sorry, did I see another hand? Oh
no. Let me just ask. When do you anticipate this program starting? And the real question goes to the discussion we had before around the salaries.

And so was the budget projection included here based on current salaries, or is it based on salaries going forward under the Master Agreement?

DR. SHETTY: Yes, these are based on the current salaries. Existing salaries.

CHAIRPERSON CRIDER: The current salaries. Okay. And so the budget would need to be adjusted to reflect the --

DR. SHETTY: The increase.

CHAIRPERSON CRIDER: Negotiated salaries coming out of the Sixth Master Agree -- Seventh Master Agreement? Or whichever Master Agreement it is.

DR. SHETTY: Right. Right. Yes, that's it.

CHAIRPERSON CRIDER: So I guess we really need to see the chart to reflect what
the actual budget would be using the salaries that have been negotiated under the Master Agreement.

DR. SHETTY: Right.

CHAIRPERSON CRIDER: Yes.

DR. SHETTY: But anyway, since there are existing faculty, we are not going to hire anybody.

CHAIRPERSON CRIDER: Right, but the existing sal -- the existing faculty are the faculty that would get the increases anticipated in the Master Agreement.

DR. SHETTY: Right.

CHAIRPERSON CRIDER: Which means that your budget would increase by some amount. Not because you recruited new faculty, just because that faculty is here and will receive those increases unless they're adjunct or something like -- even the adjunct I think had a -- they don't get the increase. But these are full time -- this is a full time faculty person.
DR. SHETTY: Right, full time faculty.

CHAIRPERSON CRIDER: Who would be impacted or entitled to receive that increase, correct?

DR. SHETTY: Right. Because the existing faculty is the mechanical engineering faculty.

CHAIRPERSON CRIDER: Okay.

Trustee Bennett?

TRUSTEE BENNETT: All those unionized faculty members which would fall under the contract, I think that's what the Chair is asking, is all the faculty who you have budgeted here in this plan are a part of the NEA?

DR. SHETTY: Right. Our faculty, full time faculty are part of any union.

TRUSTEE BENNETT: And that's what the Chair is thinking.

CHAIRPERSON CRIDER: Yes. They just need to -- I think what we're looking for
is you know, what the actual budget would look
like for the program. I think you hear
support for the program itself.

DR. SHETTY: Right.

CHAIRPERSON CRIDER: But just the
budget document needs to be adjusted to
reflect what we think the budget will be based
on that Master Agreement.

DR. SHETTY: Sure.

CHAIRPERSON CRIDER: So I think
that we could vote to approve the resolution
and then we would ask the administration to
provide us with an adjusted budget for the
program.

TRUSTEE SCHWARTZ: And the FIS
too.

CHAIRPERSON CRIDER: And the FIS
to support that. Okay. Any other discussion?
Okay, all in favor of the motion vote aye.

(Chorus of ayes.)

CHAIRPERSON CRIDER: Any opposed?
Or abstention?
CHIEF PERSON CRIDER: That motion carries. Thank you Dean Shetty. Yes.

PRESIDENT LYONS: I just want to mention something to you and not open it up tonight for discussion. But at some point, and you may have been alluding to this in your questioning.

At some point the University is going to have to address differential salaries when it comes to the specific disciplines in fields. So I mean that's got to be addressed at some point in the future.

CHIEF PERSON CRIDER: Okay. Let me just say, I was going to say this as Dean Shetty was taking his seat for Board members who were not aware. The Engineering Department just went through an accreditation visit and they did very well and are expected to receive back a positive accreditation. So congratulations Dean Shetty.

(Applause)
CHAIRPERSON CRIDER: Okay. Thank you. Mr. Chair of the Committee?

TRUSTEE SCHWARTZ: Yes, Madam Chair committee of the whole. The next resolution that the Committee took up was the naming of the campus and building facilities policy. Attached in your booklet is that policy.

And we are looking to pass a resolution adopting that naming policy where the Board will be responsible for naming buildings on the campus. So we as the Board of Trustees seek to generate contributions and revenue from donors and commercial entities by providing naming opportunities for facilities and subdivisions thereof.

Now therefore be it resolved that the Board of Trustees of the University of the District of Columbia hereby approves and adopts the naming of campus buildings and facilities policy as attached. Submitted 6 November.
All in favor of --

CHAIRPERSON CRIDER: Is there a motion?

TRUSTEE SHELTON: The motion granted, so moved.

TRUSTEE THOMPSON: Second.

(Laughter)

CHAIRPERSON CRIDER: Mr. Chair. It's been moved and second. Discussion?

TRUSTEE FELTON: Yes I have a question.

CHAIRPERSON CRIDER: Trustee Felton?

TRUSTEE FELTON: Yes, I couldn't maybe I just misinterpreted here. I couldn't -- I want to be sure we don't tie ourselves down in terms of particularly the honorary naming and the donor naming.

Most universities understand there should be some allowance for these honors.

But at the same time, it's really a means by which universities are increasing their
revenues.

So I couldn't -- I couldn't tell from this, and this is again policy, not a specific regulation, but I couldn't -- I didn't see the safeguards here to ensure we don't get emotionally attached to honor -- having honorary -- buildings in honor of with no money and very few opportunities left.

We don't have that many opportunities here on the campuses.

TRUSTEE SCHWARTZ: Madam Chair, in the last real statement where it says the Board of Trustees seek to generate contributions and revenues.

TRUSTEE FELTON: Right.

TRUSTEE SCHWARTZ: So it shows the initiative here to generate funds not or in an honorary fashion, but more in a fund raising fashion.

TRUSTEE FELTON: I guess my question is, would you see that as they produce I guess procedures or regulations we
would -- because they wouldn't necessarily
have to come to the Board. I just want to be
sure that the opportunities are preserved
actually.

TRUSTEE SCHWARTZ: Yes, right.

Absolutely.

TRUSTEE FELTON: So how would we
do that? I mean it's not in here.

TRUSTEE ASKEW: Well now so
Trustee Felton, so the revocation of naming
section, is that your issue? So you're
cconcerned that if we give a building a name
and -- it's the concern and again, I don't --
Mr. Rogers can probably answer. I didn't see
that he was here, so I'll defer to him.

MR. ROGERS: Madam Chair, it's a
pleasure. The policy, first off the principal
is that it's the Board's right to name
buildings on this campus. And the policy sets
out a structure recognizing that buildings may
be named for several purposes.

One is for commercial
sponsorships. Another is for legacy naming, which is what you're talking about.

TRUSTEE FELTON: Correct.

MR. ROGERS: So it is not -- the policy does not prevent legacy namings. But it does set out a structure of items to you know, consider.

I think that most of the building naming policies that I've seen have focused on providing a structure for the commercial naming. Because that sometimes can you know, get away from you.

But here, this policy does not limit the Board's ability to name buildings on the campus after some great professor or founder or whatever.

TRUSTEE SCHWARTZ: Or Board Chair.

MR. ROGERS: Or Board Chair or whoever.

(Laughter)

TRUSTEE ASKEW: Nice shot there General.
TRUSTEE FELTON: Well, my concern is not that it restricts it, my concern is that if you -- I mean you tell me, how many buildings we have that would be subject to that? And it's a finite number.

MR. ROGERS: That's true.

TRUSTEE FELTON: So my experience is again the Board's going to get emotional about naming because they do respect many, many folks who have made major contributions when in fact that does not bring us any revenue.

MR. ROGERS: I understand. And the purpose in bringing this is really more focused on the revenue side, the revenue opportunity. But not in any way seeking to limit the Board's ability to name buildings for legacy purposes if it be their desire.

Another principal here that we set out is that we do a market analysis to try to estimate the value of a naming opportunity. Not just for the student center which we most
prominently have in mind. But for other buildings on campus as well.

And so we may see upon doing a market analysis that there's a greater opportunity for some buildings in the marketplace for getting naming sponsorship in others, or donor ship if you will. And some may be reserved for legacy.

But that is something that comes back to the Board.

CHAIRPERSON CRIDER: And I think if I read the proposal correctly, they're also beyond buildings, they do talk about other opportunities beyond buildings, so.

TRUSTEE THOMPSON: I have a curiosity question. We have onboard on this campus the David A. Clark Law School. Now I remember David Clark and Antioch and they weren't together.

And after his untimely passing, the school was named for him. Was there a process then?
MR. ROGERS: I can't answer that.
I don't know. If someone from the law school
-- that's be -- I don't recall.

TRUSTEE ASKEW: Well let me just
say this. I don't know what the Board's
process was, but as somebody who actually
testified at the Council of the District of
Columbia in support of naming the law school
the David A. Clark School of Law, I know that
there was discussion involving people who have
a vested interest in the institution.

What I can't speak to is what the
Board did. Now, again, I know what I think
they should have done which is similar to what
we're talking about now.

TRUSTEE THOMPSON: Yes, that was
my concern.

TRUSTEE ASKEW: But the whole
thing was -- and actually it wasn't the David
A., it was the David Clark School of Law to
keep it at DCSL, which was part of the
conversation.
MR. ROGERS: And I think if I recall, that was done by the City Council was it not?

TRUSTEE ASKEW: I'm sorry?

MR. ROGERS: Was that naming opportunity was made by the City Council, not by the Board of Trustees?

TRUSTEE ASKEW: Yes. Well, I don't recall -- again, I can only speak to the fact that the matter came before the Council. As odd as it may seem, but again, who -- I didn't know the -- I mean I had no idea.

But they did have a hearing specifically on it. And it was the Council certainly had weighed in. And whether or not they had a legal right to support the naming of it or not, I don't know.

TRUSTEE THOMPSON: Would we have to go back through the Council for whatever we decide on?

CHAIRPERSON CRIDER: I wouldn't think so.
TRUSTEE THOMPSON: I would hope not.

TRUSTEE ASKEW: Now the only other thing is now the only reason it may get a touch, I don't necessarily know if it's on the name. So let's just assume -- we get a multi-year contract over a million dollars, then at that point in time.

TRUSTEE THOMPSON: That's fine.

CHAIRPERSON CRIDER: Trustee Bennett?

TRUSTEE BENNETT: Thank you -- thank you Chair. I realize that a document that we are asked to vote on today says draft. So I was wondering, the explanation why it's still in a draft stage when we're asked to vote on it?

MR. ROGERS: It becomes final when the Board votes.

CHAIRPERSON CRIDER: Everything is draft until we make a vote.

TRUSTEE BENNETT: Okay.
TRUSTEE FELTON: But I think this is a good example of my concern. So I just --
I mean, I know you're going to promise us that you know, you'll take care of it in the procedures. But I don't know, if my colleagues are comfortable, I'm just not comfortable.

CHAIRPERSON CRIDER: Yes. Dr. Lyons and then Trustee Shelton.

PRESIDENT LYONS: Madam Chair I think Trustee Felton raises a valid point. And -- but to the extent that the Board gets caught up in its emotions, then it's moving away from the revenue generating experience.

I think your point is well taken. I mean there may be one legacy individual that everybody might agree to for this University. But then I'm sure there are another half dozen that other folks feel might rise to that level.

And if you do all of the naming without receiving a gift, then you're -- you
have named your buildings. And you've moved
away from all these numbers. But you haven't
generated any revenue.

And again, this was presented from
that perspective. But I don't -- other then
this coming back to the Board, I don't think
we can write anything in the policy that would
preclude the emotional concern that you have
about legacy recommendations coming forward.

CHAIRPERSON CRIDER: Let me just
say for now unless I read incorrectly. Under
Item G, naming when no donor gift is involved.
That may be the attempt to mimic that.

Because it says no more than one
facility or property at the University shall
be named after any one individual unless they
are donors. So that seems to imply that the
motion is already taken care of with this
statement so that we wouldn't be able to just
you know, name every building here.

TRUSTEE FELTON: So your
interpretation is there's a maximum of one
building that can be named?

CHAIRPERSON CRIDER: Well unless I'm reading this wrong. And you know I did go to DC regular school, which is --

MR. ROGERS: The policy was intended to limit a legacy trust level.

TRUSTEE FELTON: To what?

CHAIRPERSON CRIDER: First it was -- who was next? Jerome -- Trustee Shelton, then Trustee Askew.

TRUSTEE SHELTON: Thank you. I presume at some time there was no policy. And what we're doing is establishing a policy that as practice dictates, we will be operating from and editing and correcting as we go forward.

Without a policy in place, the City Council, the Mayor, anybody is free to do whatever they want to do. So establishing our own policy as best we can, is the fundamental first action that needs to be taken in this process.
Now as we discover corrective actions need to be taken, then we're correcting a policy, not creating a policy in crisis. So I encourage us to vote for and move forward. And hopefully we will reap the benefits of it.

CHAIRPERSON CRIDER: I do think --
I mean again, to Trustee Felton's point though, all of us are time limited on the Board. And the policy should you know, go on and on and on even after we're all gone.

So you know, I'm looking for some guidance in that area makes sense. And that may -- that sentence may give us some of that, I don't know.

TRUSTEE FELTON: Well I interpret this as no more than one facility or property should be named after any one individual. But you could have six properties named for an individual without any money.

CHAIRPERSON CRIDER: So I could have six buildings, Felton?
TRUSTEE FELTON: No. But six buildings could be named by the six of us. That didn't bring you any money. Because you have limited only one for that name, but not the fact how many of the names you have.

CHAIRPERSON CRIDER: Okay, the fact that it has different interpretations means it's not clear, we need to fix it in some way.

TRUSTEE FELTON: Yes. Right. But I agree with you. I mean if we're saying we're going to limit the number of facilities to one unless superseded by the Board or something like that, then I'm okay. But right now, I can find ten people that maybe everybody would like and we get no money.

CHAIRPERSON CRIDER: Yes, I read it differently, that we could -- we could do that emotional naming for one facility unless you know, they were donors. And then we could do more.

But let's figure it out. I think
Trustee Askew was next and then Trustee Lemus.

TRUSTEE ASKEW: I've got a couple of clarifying and then one or two questions. So I mean, but basically what you said, because you point out in your memo that the Board reserves the actual authority to actually name.

MR. ROGERS: Right. That's in the DCMR.

TRUSTEE ASKEW: That's in the DCMR and in the statute.

MR. ROGERS: Right.

TRUSTEE ASKEW: Because you refer to the statute. And then on the -- so for -- you have some definitions, and I'm looking at page one, and it says the term facilities, and I assume in the first definition, that is what definitely needs -- because up here you define facilities as a building, structure, plaza, open space, recreational field, that that is pretty much where the Board would have to weigh in and give approval.
And I don't know, I'm just asking the question. Am I reading it right? And then in your second paragraph it says facilities does not include like you know, a hallway, libraries, rooms.

MR. ROGERS: Right, interior spaces. Right.

TRUSTEE ASKEW: Interior spaces. So just for clarity reasons is it -- is there a distinction between when the Board would be required to approve? And again, I haven't seen the actual statute --

MR. ROGERS: Right. Right.

TRUSTEE ASKEW: To see whether or not it actually defines it as a building.

MR. ROGERS: Okay.

TRUSTEE ASKEW: You know, and I'm not -- and again, I'm not asking you to do anything, I'm just asking the question.

MR. ROGERS: No, no, I understand. And the emphasis is on the Board's right and responsibility to name buildings.
TRUSTEE ASKEW: Okay.

MR. ROGERS: And I you know, I did not separate that right between internal -- interior facilities and the first definition. I just didn't.

TRUSTEE ASKEW: Okay.

MR. ROGERS: So if it's the --

TRUSTEE ASKEW: I just want to avoid the -- because I know how things work here.

MR. ROGERS: Right.

TRUSTEE ASKEW: See we will -- you know, you'll have a Board member such as you know, I don't know, myself and Dr. Crider or Reggie, you know, may interpret it you know, a little bit differently.

And again, I just want to make sure that there is a clear process so that there's no disruption associated with you know, what the interpretation of where the Board actually can. Because I do think that there are -- there may be situations where you
I don't necessarily need Board approval you know, for a $10,000.00 naming right for a classroom for the year.

I don't know. I'm just throwing something like that out.

MR. ROGERS: The Board policy on that is if we establish policies that set out the threshold level for naming particular spaces, then that's the policy.

TRUSTEE ASKEW: Yes.

MR. ROGERS: Then that's the policy. And then the Board does not have to be you know, involved in the actual naming as long as it meets that criteria.

For instance, if a boardroom is designated to be -- require a $50,000.00 gift and that's what the Board has determined, that's the value of that naming opportunity and we get that, we tell you who provided the gift. Not for approval, but for information because you've already established a policy under which we've been operating.
And let me say as an addendum to that, I think that further in our development and advancement, we want to come back with just that kind of layout of as we look around the campus and put a value on the naming opportunities across the campus so that you can establish that policy. And we can follow those procedures.

TRUSTEE ASKEW: And then on the -- and this is on page three, and this is the part of G, Roman Numeral two, and this -- at the end of the sentence, it says when a proposal for naming in honor of an individual involves services to the University in an academic or administrative capacity, proposal shall not be made until the individual has been retired or deceased for at least five years.

And so I'm just trying to figure out the relevancy. I mean I know historical practice is that you don't recognize somebody until they've been you know, have passed away.
But I do think there's a trend these -- I think there's a trend these days where you know, maybe that school of thought is not as relevant today.

And particularly when somebody is you know, very accomplished and may you know, excel in those particular. So was there a re -- was there a particular -- and it may be, is there a reason for waiting until the individual has been retired? And does retired mean dead here? It says retired, I don't know.

TRUSTEE: Retired or, then you resend in it.

TRUSTEE DYKE: There is a difference between retired and dead. I will respond to that.

(Laughter)

TRUSTEE ASKEW: I hope so, yes.

MR. ROGERS: Well, let me just say, on that policy, you know, we looked at a lot of you know, policies around. And this is
one -- this is not a hard sale. It seemed to be that in a lot of the policies that this kind of policy was represented.

But in terms of our preference here, I think you know, it's whatever the Board's preference is.

TRUSTEE ASKEW: Yes, Madam Chair I, you know again just because you know, for example you know, Dorothy Heights, you know I mean I've heard her speak on a number of occasions. And she talked about just how much she appreciated the things -- the in kind things that people did for her before she actually -- and we know she really didn't retire.

And so in my mind you know, a little discretion in this particular area. So maybe it is our general practice. But I would hate to be in a position where we've said you've got to basically be retired or have been deceased for five years prior to -- and again, I don't know if we'll ever get to that
point. But I do think that we're mature
enough to have a little flexibility in that
area.

TRUSTEE DYKE: Madam Chair, I'm
going to have to drop off. I hope you still
have quorum without me here.

CHAIRPERSON CRIDER: I do. I do,
thank you.

TRUSTEE DYKE: Okay. And by the
way, I need to give you a call tomorrow for
another matter then that.

CHAIRPERSON CRIDER: All right,
I'll be around.

TRUSTEE DYKE: Okay. Bye, bye.

CHAIRPERSON CRIDER: Bye, bye.

TRUSTEE TARDD: I'm just looking
at item eight here that gives -- that says
flexibility. And I think that this item gives
us the flexibility.

TRUSTEE ASKEW: What is that item
eight?

TRUSTEE TARDD: I'm looking at
page six.

CHAIRPERSON CRIDER: Yes. I got it, all right.

TRUSTEE TARDD: We may never, yes -- and we -- and it's a policy. If the Board feels strongly about something, we can amend that policy.

TRUSTEE ASKEW: Yes, but why would you bring it if you -- and again to me, to use this section to override the other section, it's a -- it's an apparent conflict.

CHAIRPERSON CRIDER: I mean we could just add -- I mean I think to your point, I mean we could just add language there that says you know, unless the Board you know, determines some other appropriate -- I don't know the language.

But you could add something that would you know, let this be the general practice or theory. But gives us the ability if we wanted to specific here. I mean I think I had a similar question on number -- see if
I remember my Roman numerals. It must be four.

Because this reads no facility or property shall be named after seated, elected or appointed officials.

TRUSTEE SHELTON: That was my only shot.

CHAIRPERSON CRIDER: Oh, I'm sorry, well I want you to --

TRUSTEE SHELTON: No, I'm just teasing.

(Laughter)

CHAIRPERSON CRIDER: I share -- I share all the time, so.

TRUSTEE SHELTON: No, that's not what I meant, my only chance, yes.

CHAIRPERSON CRIDER: No, I'm not offended. So I guess I'm -- I had a similar question then. Why would -- why wouldn't we?

I mean you know, President Obama has school buildings named for him all over the place, right? And he's certainly seated, elected and
appointed.

And he's over everything over here. At least I think he is. So, I'm not certain why. And I think we would look for some of the same flexibility there. If there is an elected official or appointed person or even somebody that's seated that we thought made an extraordinary contribution, why wouldn't we have the flexibility to name, so?

TRUSTEE FELTON: Madam Chair?

CHAIRPERSON CRIDER: Trustee Felton?

TRUSTEE FELTON: Okay, in response to you, I think the difference between this, two and four, it says no property should be named, which gives us the flexibility, we're not bound. The problem with number two, it says shall not be. And perhaps that could simply be should not, which could give you the flexibility that that is.

CHAIRPERSON CRIDER: Okay. We could do that. Are you comfortable with that
Trustee Askew? Of changing the --

TRUSTEE ASKEW: That's a wrong --

that's probably the wrong question to ask an

attorney just because shall or shall not is a

term of legal art.

CHAIRPERSON CRIDER: Okay.

TRUSTEE ASKEW: And should is not.

But you know what? You know to me again,

Madam Chair you've raised the exact same --

I'm having the same if we wanted to name a

building. And I think that there is something

in here that -- because I mean, I assume some

of these would just be in kind -- kind of like

we're honorary, you know.

Because I don't think President

Obama is going to negotiate a deal with us for

a couple of million for his library with his

name on it, right? It really is going to be

-- but I think that there is some language in

here related to --

TRUSTEE FELTON: So you're saying

that should would not work for you, is that
the bottom line?

TRUSTEE ASKEW: You know, if Madam Chair and you're good with the should, then I'm fine.

CHAIRPERSON CRIDER: Well see, that's when I take -- you know, I take off my lawyer hat periodically. And I'm looking at our law student over there agreeing with you.

TRUSTEE ASKEW: But you know, I would be more -- I -- I don't know that -- right.

CHAIRPERSON CRIDER: I think maybe you know, if we could -- in general I think there's agreement from the Board that this makes sense. There's a couple of rough edges that we need to just work through.

But I don't want to you know, if we -- we don't have to sit here and maybe belabor all of that. I think in generally what you're hearing is that the Board wants to preserve its right to be able to make some exceptions to what you have here so that it is
not viewed as something that we cannot do,
despite I think what you've pointed out
Trustee Tardd, that language being there.

I think we are looking for more
flexibility, particularly in Section G around
what the Board is able to do. So what I would
suggest is that we take the vote on approving
the policy -- I know you have something. And
then we can work on you know, getting language
that we're comfortable with.

MR. ROGERS: Yes. And I think
that's appropriate. Let me say that the
overriding guideline is we wanted procedures
under which we could make revenue off of our
real estate.

Secondly, not to take away at all
the Board's right to do legacy naming. These
under this Section G, this provided some
guidelines. It says right up at top, in rare
instances when no donor gift is involved, we
recommend the following.

Now we can simply change that word
to give more flexibility in saying should if
Trustee Askew in number two would accept that
as a way to go. Given the overall intent of
the policy is to preserve the Board's right as
the ultimate naming authority in the future.

CHAIRPERSON CRIDER: Well I think
what I would suggest you guys do and Trustee
Lemus want's to have a comment, and then I'd
like to move this on.

TRUSTEE ASKEW: I got one. I got
one -- one --

CHAIRPERSON CRIDER: Okay. I'll
give you one more. But let me just say, I
think that this is going to fall under your
committee anyway.

TRUSTEE ASKEW: Is it my
committee?

TRUSTEE BENNETT: It is now.

TRUSTEE ASKEW: Okay, it is now.

CHAIRPERSON CRIDER: Didn't it
come up in your committee last week?

TRUSTEE ASKEW: No, it was his
CHAIRPERSON CRIDER: Okay, was it yours? Oh, okay. Well maybe this should be a joint Academic and Operations, I don't -- because advancement falls under you.

TRUSTEE ASKEW: No, it falls under him.

CHAIRPERSON CRIDER: Advance is un -- I can't even remember what I did. I'm losing my mind.

(Laughter)

CHAIRPERSON CRIDER: So I mean what I would suggest again, so that we're not sitting here in this meeting trying to wordsmith, is send it back. We can vote on the proposal, but there's still a policy that has to be developed that goes with this.

And that you know, that's going to be maybe run through the Committee. And I'm looking at you, I'm looking the right way?

Right Joe? Looking the right way?

TRUSTEE ASKEW: Yes, yes.
CHAIRPERSON CRIDER: Okay. And maybe we could do that instead of trying to belabor here it should say this word versus that word. I think you hear the concerns that the Trustees have voiced. And then we can fix it and that.

TRUSTEE ASKEW: He's just going to have to make sure that the language in the actual policy is clear. Because what he'll be doing is really guidelines which are -- and you know, which is basically has -- this is the framework.

MR. ROGERS: Right.

TRUSTEE ASKEW: Which you'll have to work from. That's fine with me Madam Chair.

CHAIRPERSON CRIDER: Okay, great. Now you have one more comment and then Gabby?

TRUSTEE ASKEW: After that.

CHAIRPERSON CRIDER: Trustee Lemus?

TRUSTEE LEMUS: Thank you. So my
comment is more a conceptual one. I do a lot of fund raising constantly, actually. And I do not believe that a legacy naming necessarily has to preclude fund raising.

I think what we could do is you know, let's say the students voted and they wanted to name on the faculty, they wanted to name something after a wonderful professor or something, and that professor is still alive and not retired. Because they've accomplished, I don't know they got a Nobel Prize in physics.

I'm aspiring here, I'm very aspirational. I think we could do -- obviously do a fund raiser around that. And then that's another opportunity. Everything is an opportunity for fund raising. And I'll leave it there conceptually.

TRUSTEE FELTON: I like that. I agree.

CHAIRPERSON CRIDER: Trustee Askew?
TRUSTEE ASKEW: Okay, so then my -
- I'm sorry. So then just on -- this is on
the naming duration.

TRUSTEE FELTON: What page?

TRUSTEE ASKEW: And this is on
page five. And you may have -- and this may
have been -- and this is just on a building or
a facility's name in recognition of a donor
would generally be effective for the useful
life of a -- useful life of the
building/facility. Right?

And I -- and I think I may have
answered my own question or there may be --
well my question was why not more defined?
You know, like if you give us however many
millions of dollars, and again, depending
because you said in your analysis, that
typically -- and I guess you used Coastal
Carolina as an example.

And you basically said that if
it's a $40 million facility, you typically get
like from four to 24 percent, 25 percent of
whatever that range is. And that almost to me should dictate how long you actually have name rights.

Because if you come in on a short end and you get the same value that you potentially could have gotten you know, and I do believe that there should be flexibility, and maybe in the guidelines you'll kind of set some -- set out more specifically some of the thresholds, but I don't think that if we give some -- if somebody gives us let's say the four percent of $40 million, I don't think for -- you're looking at useful life on the building, I mean they're really getting -- their getting a -- I mean, they're getting a very good deal.

And so would just want to make sure that you know, in that particular area, you know, I mean the useful life of the building, you know is there a way we can come up with something a little bit more that you know, it maybe useful life of the building.
But you know, you're coming with a lot of money.

MR. ROGERS: I think -- let me tell you where that comes from.

TRUSTEE ASKEW: Okay.

MR. ROGERS: I'm thinking back as doing the drafting. We started at a point, if you remember our first discussion in the Audit Committee, at a 51 percent contribution for new construction. So the building -- the policy that says for the useful life, the contribution was for the useful life was really intended for those contributions that would reach that threshold.

Further research determined that the -- not to say it will never happen, but the probability of getting to 51 percent is much less. But if you look at the bottom of that paragraph under 5(a), it says at the discretion of the University, naming may be time limited.

And what I had in mind there for
instance, if for one of our buildings, if
someone wants to have a license agreement for
a period of time based on our evaluation of
what they should pay, then it should be time
limited for a period of time. It may be five
years, it may be ten years.

So I think the policy does give us
discretion to do that. But if someone comes
and say you know, I really want to be
associated you know, with this University for
the rest of my life and my family to be
associated. And you're building this new
building, and here's 51 percent, I think that
might call into play you know, naming for the
useful life of the building.

So it's still in policy that's
there.

TRUSTEE ASKEW: Yes, again, I
think that is good as long as there's the
flexibility to do these deals where you know,
we can define what the number of years are
based upon the investment. And just like you
have in another section, maybe they get first
right of refusal after like ten years.

MR. ROGERS: Right.

TRUSTEE ASKEW: And we go and you
know, we would kind of reset kind of where we
are. And if you're comfortable with that Mr.
President and the administrations comfortable
with that, because you did add that.

MR. ROGERS: Right.

TRUSTEE ASKEW: So I mean, so I do
appreciate that. I understand.

CHAIRPERSON CRIDER: Okay. Any
other discussion, questions? You're good?

TRUSTEE FELTON: I'm just not
clear on the actual language of the motion.

CHAIRPERSON CRIDER: The motion --

TRUSTEE FELTON: That you expect.

CHAIRPERSON CRIDER: The motion
itself was that which was laid out by the
Committee Chair. And where we have landed --
that was motioned and second. Where we've
landed is you know, essentially we're going to
vote whether we accept or not this motion.

And then it will go back to the
Committee for some of the specific languaging
that looks like Trustee members are going to.

TRUSTEE SCHWARTZ: Madam Chair, we
are voting on the resolution and the backing
to the resolution would be the policy itself.
We have identified some areas that need some
fine tuning.

CHAIRPERSON CRIDER: Yes.

TRUSTEE SCHWARTZ: The refined
policy will then come back to the Committee
for final vote.

TRUSTEE ASKEW: Madam Chair?

CHAIRPERSON CRIDER: Yes, Trustee
Askew?

TRUSTEE ASKEW: Just on the issue,
because I'm thinking through it, and again, it
may be that Trustee Felton can give me some
help with this. I'm sorry, I just don't want
-- when things -- when there's a conflict
where one thing says useful life and then the
other thing says you've got discretion of the University may be limited, I mean how do you -- if somebody asks about that, how do you reconcile the conflict between the two?

I mean again, I support the overall thing. But maybe we can -- as you look at some of the wording, maybe we can clarify some of that language so it doesn't seem -- because again if I read -- when I read useful life and then I come down and say at the discretion of the University, I'm a little bit conflicted between -- I mean, what is the actual policy?

Is it at your discretion? You know, length of time? Or is it useful life? And again, I'm just going through --

MR. ROGERS: Well, you have the option of useful life if in your determination the donation warrants that.

TRUSTEE ASKEW: Okay.

MR. ROGERS: But if the donation doesn't warrant that, then that last sentence
gives the administration the discretion to
bring back to the Board a deal that is more of
a license deal.

TRUSTEE ASKEW: And all I'm asking
is just -- I support what you're saying, I
just would like for it to be more clearly
stated in the policy, that's all.

MR. ROGERS: Okay. All right.

CHAIRPERSON CRIDER: And I think
the Chair of the Committee understands where
you're going and what you're looking for. And
that we will rest assured that he'll give us
that, right? Make sure we get that.

TRUSTEE SCHWARTZ: Yes, ma'am, we
still need to refine.

TRUSTEE FELTON: And the same with
the multiple namings, I want to clarify this.

CHAIRPERSON CRIDER: Right. I
think the whole when it goes back to the
Committee in terms of the policy itself,
you've heard the concerns and that he'll be
able to make sure that the policy reflects
what the concerns have been stated here. And
we should be okay.

TRUSTEE ASKEW: But we're voting
on it today?

CHAIRPERSON CRIDER: We're voting
on the resolution today. On the resolution
today.

TRUSTEE ASKEW: Okay.

CHAIRPERSON CRIDER: Any further
discussion?

TRUSTEE FELTON: But the
resolution says you adopt the language as
attached.

CHAIRPERSON CRIDER: But this is
not the policy.

TRUSTEE BENNETT: It is the
policy.

CHAIRPERSON CRIDER: Okay, it does
say that.

TRUSTEE ASKEW: Yes, but you know,
I think this is -- can't we just use the
technical and I mean this is really a
technical, it's not -- you know, we're not really changing the substance of it.

    CHAIRPERSON CRIDER: Yes.

    TRUSTEE ASKEW: There's really a technical and clarifying change that we often give the general counsel in the office.

    CHAIRPERSON CRIDER: Yes. And so what's the language that we usually use?

    TRUSTEE SCHWARTZ: From the amendments? We do some.

    TRUSTEE ASKEW: Technical and clarifying.

    CHAIRPERSON CRIDER: So there's -- so how would you state that in terms of --

    TRUSTEE ASKEW: Of who would leave to make technical and clarifying -- clarifying, right.

    CHAIRPERSON CRIDER: Okay. So do we understand the revised mo -- can you restate the revised motion Mr. Chair?

    TRUSTEE SCHWARTZ: Technical and --
TRUSTEE ASKEW: So we're not -- so all we're doing

TRUSTEE FELTON: Adopt that consistent with the technical and blah, blah, blah.

TRUSTEE BENNETT: Yes. Subject to technical amendments.

TRUSTEE FELTON: Subject to technical and clarifying changes.

TRUSTEE BENNETT: Yes.

CHAIRPERSON CRIDER: It's good to have a law student at the table. Okay.

TRUSTEE SCHWARTZ: Substitute to technical changes.

TRUSTEE BENNETT: No, clarifying.

TRUSTEE ASKEW: Technical and clarifying.

TRUSTEE SCHWARTZ: And clarifying changes.

TRUSTEE BENNETT: Yes.

CHAIRPERSON CRIDER: Okay. All in favor of the revised resolution as we have
just discussed, vote aye.

    (Chorus of ayes.)

CHAIRPERSON CRIDER: Any opposed?

    (No response.)

CHAIRPERSON CRIDER: Or abstentions?

    (No response.)


TRUSTEE SCHWARTZ: Madam Chair we move to Resolution F dealing with the revised procedures for the conduct of elections for alumni members of the Board of Trustees University of the District of Columbia.

Therefore, be it resolved that the Board of Trustees of the University of the District of Columbia hereby approves the attached procedure for conduct of elections for alumni members of the Board of Trustees.

TRUSTEE FELTON: Second. Are you moving it or are you done?

TRUSTEE SCHWARTZ: I'm good.
TRUSTEE FELTON: I have a question.

CHAIRPERSON CRIDER: Yes, let me - - so it's been moved and second. Discussion? Now Trustee Felton?

TRUSTEE FELTON: Yes, I just had a clarification on 2.0, official mailing list. I can understand why you would eliminate six months as being probably not necessary. But in the absence of having to find some period, it leaves sort of the alumni, I'm not sure when they might receive the list. See 2.2?

CHAIRPERSON CRIDER: Yes.

TRUSTEE FELTON: I mean maybe there was some discussion in Committee meeting?

CHAIRPERSON CRIDER: You're looking for a response, right?

TRUSTEE SCHWARTZ: I'm trying to remember did we discuss --

MR. ROGERS: Mr. Chair, we had proposed to eliminate the six month
requirement because --

TRUSTEE FELTON: No, I understand

the elimination of six.

MR. ROGERS: Okay. And we did not

put in a substitute for that because we are

every day up until we get this memo out, we

are correcting that database to get it as you

know, have it as accurate as we can.

We have built a database based on

if you recall the discussion, the alumni
directory project from last summer with Harris

Connect. And they came back and as Trustee

Thompson said, we -- it wasn't a -- it did not

produce the results that we had hoped.

We got three thousand changed

address in that process out of 35 thousand

plus that were sent. We have worked with

putting those addresses that we have against

the National Change of Address database. That

has yielded some other changes in the

database.

We have identified alumni from
various subgroups in the city like you know,
D.C. teachers et cetera. And trying to
collect addresses there.

So we expect once these procedures
are approved and the RFP is finished for us to
select an election consultant to have this
memo ready to go within the next couple of
weeks so that we can start the process. And
at that point, the database will be as up to
date as we could possibly have it given all of
our efforts.

So we -- this is a continuing
process.

TRUSTEE FELTON: Oh, I understand.

But by eliminate -- by having no time frame,
I just don't see how, you're just subject to
so many charges and allegations.

TRUSTEE ASKEW: Now, now Madam
Chair, and thank you Trustee Felton, because
I had the same question. And maybe it
shouldn't be six months. But I do know that
if you are an alumni, the alumni mailing list
is your base of people who you know who
actually can vote for you.

I know for me I -- you can sign up
for the alumni mailing list. You can sign up
and I leveraged the mailing list in order to
educate people on my campaign. And if you
leave that up until -- I mean if we don't --
I mean if you just -- if you don't have a
finite time when you've got a specific kind of
mailing group, you could either create an
advantage or disadvantage.

Because I mean, you just don't
know. And so for me, it was always good to
know what that base of people based upon
what's been certified and you know, by the
folks, to know that you know, by the mailing
list that I'm working off of you know, again
without knowing when it -- that mailing list
-- I don't know how to -- or a potential
alumni doesn't know how to get to those people
to educate them.

MR. ROGERS: You don't get to them
until the election period. And a call for
petitions has been issued. And then
everything that we have is available to the
candidates.

And let me say this --

TRUSTEE ASKEW: No, no, the
mailing list is the list that has already been
scrubbed and determined that these people are
eligible to --

MR. ROGERS: Right, right.

TRUSTEE ASKEW: Right. So what's
the distinction you're making?

MR. ROGERS: The distinction I'm
making, that is the list. What I'm saying is
that once you have qualified as a candidate,
that's when you begin the process of
communicating to people --

TRUSTEE ASKEW: Correct.

MR. ROGERS: To sign your petition
and to support your campaign. That's when
what we have in terms of a mailing list is
available to you.
But let me say this. These elec-
- these rules are for the eminent campaign.
We cannot meet a two month deadline or else we
cannot meet the election for this time around.

So for future elections, if you
want to re-institute the six months or I think
sometimes three months is probably more
reasonable, then that's fine. But for this
campaign, changing the policy now would put us
behind the eightball.

TRUSTEE ASKEW: We're creating
exceptions.

TRUSTEE FELTON: Clarify, the
policy says six months. The current policy is
six months.

MR. ROGERS: The current pol --
no, the policy was applicable for the last
election five years ago. And we proposed
these rules for this election. That's why we
eliminated the proposed elimination of the six
months because we had this continuing
challenge of sorting through the alumni
database.

It's triggered by --

TRUSTEE FELTON: So it's only for this election? And we'll have different rules for the next one?

MR. ROGERS: Excuse me?

TRUSTEE FELTON: And we shall have different rules for the next one?

MR. ROGERS: I think so, because there was discussion in our previous conversation about some changes that some Board members wanted for -- to these election rules. And it was discussed with the Alumni Society and they asked that there not be changes for this time, but they would consider them for the next time and be supportive for the next round of elections.

CHAIRPERSON CRIDER: Right. But it doesn't seem to me that each time we face an alumni election that we would have to approve election procedures. I mean if there are you know, parts of the procedure that need
to be changed, that's one thing.

But to have to come back and re-
vote each time there's an alumni election, a 
new set of procedures doesn't make sense to 
me. Trustee Bennett, did you have some -- did 

I see your hand?

TRUSTEE BENNETT: I did have one 
small comment to ask. Remember in our last 
Committee meeting, Trustee Thompson, she 
pointed out that the mailing list was -- the 
accuracy of it. And you alluded to it earlier 
about the study was less then successful.

So I was wondering, the level of 
technology that we put into finding these 
addresses, for example, I was an investigator 
and how I would track down where people live 
is using the software on the websites that are 
available. And you can find anyone, even 
their phone numbers.

So how have we been using that to 
become more efficient?

MR. ROGERS: Harris Connect as the
contractor used -- employed some of those procedures. We have not employed those procedures as yet. And that is a -- that's a further measure.

But I think that one thing that we are working on is to make it -- simply make it easier for alumni to change their addresses online on our website. It is not the easiest thing to do now.

And I think some software we bought just several years ago did not work out. And we discontinue it. And so we're looking to make it easier for alumni to change their addresses and to communicate with them and give them a basis to be more interested in what happens here. And over time we'll get more of them involved.

TRUSTEE BENNETT: Okay, thanks.

CHAIRPERSON CRIDER: Let me just ask, what's the time line with respect to the alumni election so I can fully understand this issue related to this updating of the list?
MR. ROGERS: The time line goes until November to February. Our target was February 15 for a candidate to be declared the winner. So that we would have time should there be a protest, to sort out the protest so that a -- someone could be seated by the May 15 deadline.

CHAIRPERSON CRIDER: Okay. And in the past, what was the time line like? Because you're saying November to February.

MR. ROGERS: February.

CHAIRPERSON CRIDER: And that included the nomination process.

MR. ROGERS: Yes, yes.

CHAIRPERSON CRIDER: The campaigning process.

MR. ROGERS: Yes.

CHAIRPERSON CRIDER: And the actual vote.

MR. ROGERS: Stacy you want -- you have any further on the past? You don't? Okay, fine. All right. Since I wasn't here.
But based on what I've seen, that has been the window.

CHAIRPERSON CRIDER: So, okay.

TRUSTEE THOMPSON: In my memory, for what's it worth --

CHAIRPERSON CRIDER: Yes, I'm looking at the Trustees here for mine.

TRUSTEE THOMPSON: It seemed like we were involved from November until the end of February. And around March it was announced what the outcome was. And then we took place when the next person moved out.

MR. ROGERS: Right.

TRUSTEE THOMPSON: So that's kind of where it's been for my two rounds.

MR. ROGERS: For the last two elections that I've looked at, you know the material, that was the time frame.

CHAIRPERSON CRIDER: Okay.

TRUSTEE SHELTON: But just for the record, the last three elections have been this kind of race to -- the last three
elections have been this race to completion, okay. And the Board has been challenged to deliver a practice that gets us through to the end of the election.

And then for whatever circumstance it fades into the foreground. The effort by management to complete this task is critical that it be done now. Warts and all. That's why I'm not listing a number of concerns that I've already addressed because we will have to come up with a final for the next election.

We hope that administration will give us a timely process for the election of alumni and student representatives to the Board. Each of those elections have been challenged in their processing over the last three elections, or -- that I'm aware of.

Okay, so this is just another effort to get it done so we that we can move forward and hopefully --

CHAIRPERSON CRIDER: All right.

And I don't think that you hear people saying
we don't want to do this. I think it's again a question of clarity and exactly you know, what will happen.

I mean, if in fact the period was November to you know, November to February, we're into November now already. So you know, this notion of you know, updating at whatever point, prior to the conduct of the election, you know, I think is the one we're trying to debate now.

And whether it makes sense to leave it like it so up to the day before, I could be updating stuff. That doesn't seem to make sense. I think if we could propose an alternative to that, you know that makes sense and understanding that for this election it may not work.

But I don't think it makes sense to have us coming back every, you know every election time to approve a policy. We can accept -- we can accept a policy and approve a policy and create an exception for this one
election. We can do that.

         You know, but I'm not comfortable
with the idea of if these are the procedures
that make sense as Trustee Shelton says, warts
and all, that we take the warts and all. But
you know, -- well, I won't be here five years
from now, so I guess I don't have to deal with
it.

        TRUSTEE SHELTON: And I think
that's been the philosophy all along.

        CHAIRPERSON CRIDER: What's been
the philosophy?

        TRUSTEE SHELTON: Ma'am, there --

        CHAIRPERSON CRIDER: So that is
not the philosophy I'm dealing with.

(Laughter)

        TRUSTEE ASKEW: Madam Chair?

        CHAIRPERSON CRIDER: Yes?

        TRUSTEE ASKEW: You know, I'd like
to propose an amendment here. Again, I mean
I do think, I am supportive of what's being
provided here. And as you can recall, you
know, we asked some of these questions or we
started asking some of these questions at our
last meeting.

And I think most of my -- or and
others' concerns can be you know, addressed.
I still do firmly believe that there needs to
be an official mailing list within a certain
period of time prior to the conduction of the
elections.

And you know, if the -- if the
candidates are found to be eligible, and again
someone will have to help me with this by
January or whenever it is. Because I can't
remember when our eligibility was established
to be a candidate.

And you want to have the -- if
you want to have it in March you know, April
or March, I know the rules require that you
know, you just got to make sure you have the
-- and I think you get a little bit longer
than that. I think you get into April when
the elections actually have to take place per
the stat -- for our regulations I think it's
April.

Which to me you know, so maybe
changing this to you know, three months prior
to, will satisfy not only this current issue,
but I think you won't necessarily have to come
back to us. The reason that this language
prior to -- six months prior to was put in
here, is because of the constant -- and I'm
not putting this on you Mr. Rogers.

But I'm telling you from
historically, since I have been a part of the
alumni elections process, and I think there
are others who can attest to this, there has
been a breakdown in this particular area along
with others. And so there was a thought that
the Board needed to ensure that the
administration that was responsible for these
elections, had some direction as to when these
candidates should receive this.

So Madam Chair, you know having
said that, I'd like to propose an amendment to


change that to not less then three months
prior to the conduct of the elections. And
again, based upon the time line that's been
given, and again I don't know if Stac -- I'm
thinking, I'm pretty sure it's April.
Somewhere the elections have to have around
about April.

I think that that will give -- and
again, the email -- the mailing list will
never be perfect. I mean there's not an
institution -- right, we know that. But I do
think that based upon the information we've
heard, the database supposedly is much better
then what it was five years ago.

And every time I turn around I'm
getting something in the mail that asks me.
And I'm happy to see that, that asks me has
your email address changed? Has you number
changed?

TRUSTEE THOMPSON: I haven't
gotten one.

TRUSTEE ASKEW: Not emails, I've
gotten little post cards. I don't know.

TRUSTEE FELTON: You got a postcard?

TRUSTEE THOMPSON: Not one thing?

TRUSTEE ASKEW: Yes, yes. I do see those, you know. But my point is, is that I do believe though not perfect, I do think that the -- as I understand it, that we're in a better place. As long as you've gotten Mary's email addresses that she has hand delivered to the administration, you're good -- on more then one occasion, you know. I'm sorry.

MR. ROGERS: I keep trying to get Mr. Shelton's list from D.C. teachers, but he won't hand it over.

TRUSTEE SHELTON: I keep sending you dribs and drops as they come in.

TRUSTEE ASKEW: But Madam Chair, I'd like to propose --

TRUSTEE SHELTON: I second.

TRUSTEE ASKEW: Thank you very
much.

(Laughter)

CHAIRPERSON CRIDER: I'm sorry, I do have one other discussion -- one other question though, and that's I guess a procedural question that I probably don't want to hear the answer. But does this have to go to that comment period and all of that? Because it's in -- it doesn't have to do that? Okay. I like that answer. All right.

Okay, so all in favor of the motion as amended vote aye.

(Chorus of ayes.)

CHAIRPERSON CRIDER: Any opposed or abstention?

(No response.)

CHAIRPERSON CRIDER: That motion carries.

TRUSTEE SHELTON: Just a point of information?

CHAIRPERSON CRIDER: Yes?
TRUSTEE SHELTON: 1.4, Mr. Rogers, if you will look at the minutes from the Committee meeting, there was an adjustment to that paragraph. But I will not belabor the --

MR. ROGERS: That 1.4, if you look at the draft it has the comments in it.

TRUSTEE SHELTON: Oh, okay. Okay, I'm looking at the wrong one. Thank you. My apologies everyone.

MR. ROGERS: It's been accommodated sir.

TRUSTEE SHELTON: Okay, I'm done.

TRUSTEE ASKEW: And Madam Chair -- Madam Chair, just one last thing. Again, I do for those that -- there was a discussion last time, because I asked whether or not we had discussed the inclusion of the Community College, a graduate from the Community College, a degree was actually eligible.

And I see, and I will note that I understand that this has been discussed with the Alumni Association. And everybody's on
the same page that someone who has graduated
and received a degree is also added.

The other thing is --

CHAIRPERSON CRIDER: So the
addition of Associate Degree satisfies that,
right?

TRUSTEE ASKEW: Yes. And
Associates and it's a degree, so it's -- but
I would just for purposes of you know, because
I know we have a section that says official
alumni mailing. I don't have a definition in
front of me.

But depending upon who you talk to
and what generation, a mailing may not be an
email, right. And so I would think just for
clarity purposes that you may want to define
what mailing actually means.

And again, you may have to -- I'm
sure the University does a combination of
both. And it should. But I just note that
mailing means different things to different
generations these days. And you might want to
care for that.

And particularly since we just
added a base of -- a population that could be
you know, 18, 19 years old and they're -- like
that's just not the way that you communicate
with them.

MR. ROGERS: So for clarification
purposes going forward, so as I understand the
Board's actions tonight, we cannot begin the
election process until 90 days from the date
on which the Board Chair signs the resolution?
Or is it tonight?

TRUSTEE ASKEW: No, the election
process is under the existing -- yes, so you
don't need any -- you don't need, I don't
think you need any Board action with the
exception of just the mailing list.

TRUSTEE SHELTON: The Board has
approved this to go forward.

TRUSTEE SCHWARTZ: That's correct.

MR. ROGERS: Okay. Is a mailing
list available?
TRUSTEE ASKEW: But I see your
question. Because one of the things that may
not be redlined, because I think we also took
away the signature. Or I think it reduc --
didn't you reduce the signature requirement
from like 100 to 25?

MR. ROGERS: No, no. That was a -
-

TRUSTEE FELTON: That's for the
students, the student trustee.

TRUSTEE ASKEW: Oh, sorry. Okay,
sorry.

TRUSTEE SCHWARTZ: Which one are
we?

TRUSTEE ASKEW: No, no, they
corrected me. I was wrong.

CHAIRPERSON CRIDER: Yes, that was
a different -- the other elections.

MR. ROGERS: Okay, I understand
the Board's actions.

CHAIRPERSON CRIDER: Okay, thank
you.
TRUSTEE SCHWARTZ: Madam Chair?

CHAIRPERSON CRIDER: Yes?

TRUSTEE SCHWARTZ: We return to Resolution A?

CHAIRPERSON CRIDER: Yes.

CHAIRPERSON CRIDER: Under the Seventh Master Agreement for clarifying discussion has already been moved and second. And we can now do some clarifying discussion on the scale.

MS. PETTY: The first shows the step scale as of 2007 and 2013. The second, the banded merit schedule as of 2007/2013. And if you'll look at those, you'll see that each of them actually, you see the three percent reflected there in the increases in the scales.

Every current faculty member is on currently the 2007 -- a 2007 scale. The new scales will take them to their new three percent increased salary scale. This will provide us a basis for actually determining
the back pay that's due for them for FY '14 and establish their new salary for FY '15.
Okay.

You can see that very clearly on the step scale. But you can't see it on the banded scale. But rest assured, every faculty member at each of those ranks is at some point on the band, the appropriate band. Okay.

And so what we'll be doing is -- it's already been done actually in the calculations of the costs of the increase. We've calculated three percent for each of their salaries along that banded scale.

I'll stop there. Are there any questions on that?

TRUSTEE ASKEW: So is that a three percent per -- is that a three percent per year?

MS. PETTY: Not three percent per year.

TRUSTEE ASKEW: Okay, then right.

MS. PETTY: Actually the agreement
gave a lump sum payment for back years to faculty depending upon the length of their tenure at the University. But it awarded to faculty members a three percent increase for fiscal year '14, 2014. Okay, effective October 1, 2013. Okay?

The last submission that you have in your Board package actually was an error. The law school combines its professor and distinguished professor ranks. And that -- not the numbers from that scale, but that configuration was used. It's incorrect.

If you'll notice the last -- the 2007 banded scale had separate scales for distinguished professor and professor. And you see that now carried forth into 2013.

There has always only been one salary on the step scale for distinguished professor. Okay? And that continues in 2013, with just a single salary. There is currently one distinguished professor at the University, and that's his salary. Okay?
So you have the correct scales now. And I'll entertain any questions about them.

CHAIRPERSON CRIDER: Trustee Bennett?

TRUSTEE BENNETT: Thank you Chair.

Thank you so much for clarifying why we now -- so currently what we're being -- what we're voting on is the collapsed distinguished professor into the professor, correct?

MS. PETTY: No, no, no, no. What you're voting on are the FY 2013 scales.

TRUSTEE BENNETT: Right.

MS. PETTY: Both banded and step.

TRUSTEE BENNETT: So this is the new one that we were asked. Because the one that's in our packet combines them.

Distinguished and --

MS. PETTY: Right. And it's incorrect.

TRUSTEE BENNETT: So that's incorrect?
MS. PETTY: That's incorrect.

TRUSTEE BENNETT: So this is the one?

CHAIRPERSON CRIDER: This is correct.

TRUSTEE BENNETT: Okay. So my other question then if we were not using a step system in 2007, but yet we have some type of range here also. So did we use the ranges in the step system to come up with the ranges we have here? Is that right?

MS. PETTY: No, in 2007 there were two separate scales, faculty under the Sixth Master Agreement could opt to be either on the step system or the banded system.

TRUSTEE BENNETT: Got you.

MS. PETTY: In -- under the new contract that's being approved tonight, every faculty member will move to the banded scale. But in order to do the calculations of salary for that three percent increase that was to take effect on October 1, 2013, we've devised
a salary scale for the salary -- for the step
scale also.

TRUSTEE BENNETT: Totally
understood.

MS. PETTY: Okay.

TRUSTEE BENNETT: Yes, that
answered my question on that. The last
question to that was in our last meeting the
issue came onboard that the agreement was
signed by the Faculty Board. Has that been
resolved?

MS. PETTY: It has not been
signed.

TRUSTEE BENNETT: It has not been
signed? Okay, thank you.

CHAIRPERSON CRIDER: Trustee
Askew?

MS. PETTY: I want to add one
other point. And that is that the contract
calls for a 15 percent increase in the upper
limit of the lower three ranks. So
instructor, assistant professor, associate
professor.

In FY '15 those bands will increase at the upper end by 15 percent. Or at both ends by 15 percent. Okay? They'll be adjusted by 15 percent. And that will relate -- that's designed really to facilitate hiring.

If you'll notice the salary scales are very low at those levels. And we hire at those levels. And for the faculty that are at those levels, they're very low. So there will be a 15 percent adjustment on both ends of those bands.

CHAIRPERSON CRIDER: Thanks for adding, that makes a little more sense. And also, did you apply the back pay before you did this adjustment?

MS. PETTY: Well there was no -- the back pay is a lump sum, one time payment.

CHAIRPERSON CRIDER: So this was a lump sum. So you applied the lump sums and it brought -- so it would have brought all the
professors up to this minimum salary?

MS. PETTY: No, the lump sum does not get added to base.

CHAIRPERSON CRIDER: Okay.

MS. PETTY: The base salary that we use for the calculation of the three percent is the current faculty's salary.

CHAIRPERSON CRIDER: That's on this --

MS. PETTY: That the faculty member earns wherever they are on the step or banded scale.

CHAIRPERSON CRIDER: Okay. Right, and so -- you know, I'm a little slow, so if I'm at step ten today, right? That says $91,063.00.

MS. PETTY: You're a professor step ten.

CHAIRPERSON CRIDER: I'm a professor at step ten.

MS. PETTY: All right.

CHAIRPERSON CRIDER: And if I do a
three percent, then that's $93,794.00,
somewhere in that range?

MS. PETTY: No. If you were a
professor ten today, your salary would be
$88,411.00. Step ten, right?

TRUSTEE BENNETT: No, that's step
nine you just read.

CHAIRPERSON CRIDER: Okay, so
that's in 2007.

MS. PETTY: But that would be your
salary today. We use that for the
calculation.

CHAIRPERSON CRIDER: Okay. So
what's the $91,063.00 that says effective
October 1, 2013?

MS. PETTY: That would be where
your salary would go as of October 1, 2013.

CHAIRPERSON CRIDER: Okay. I
think my question is still the same though.

MS. PETTY: Okay.

CHAIRPERSON CRIDER: Whether it's
$88 or $91. If I am at $88,411.00 today, you
apply three percent to that, right? Which
takes me somewhere around what, $92?

MS. PETTY: $91,063.00, it's on
the top scale.

CHAIRPERSON CRIDER: See I was
right, okay. So we still will have -- or will
we still have this variation in salary?
Because not everybody is going to hit this
minimum salary, right? Will all of the
professors wherever they are along this line
end up at the minimum of $108,974.00?

MS. PETTY: Well, the minimum --
that's for distinguished professors. The
minimum for professor --

CHAIRPERSON CRIDER: I'm sorry --
of $66,201.00?

MS. PETTY: Right. Everybody who
is a professor will be higher then $66,201.00
when we move them over to the scale.

CHAIRPERSON CRIDER: But less then
the $110?

MS. PETTY: But less then the
$110, exactly.

CHAIRPERSON CRIDER: So it's still a bunch of steps, right? It's still a bunch of steps.

TRUSTEE CURRY: If you look at step one, that's where the bases are.

CHAIRPERSON CRIDER: Right.

TRUSTEE CURRY: If you go from professor all the way down. And then this would have graduations along the way, there are gradations along the way.

CHAIRPERSON CRIDER: Right. Right. But it's still -- you know, I guess I'm reading this as it's still a bunch of steps. Because -- you can call it a band or whatever you want, but it's still a bunch of salaries along the way to get from the $66 to the $110.

MS. PETTY: But you don't have to be limited to an increment that is the difference between the steps here. You can perhaps move by $3,000.00 or $5,000.00 rather
then the $1,000.00 or $2,000.00 difference that's on the end there.

                CHAIRPERSON CRIDER: Right.

                MS. PETTY: Does that help?

                TRUSTEE SCHWARTZ: Based on some merit process.

                MS. PETTY: Yes.

                CHAIRPERSON CRIDER: Right.

Because I mean it sounds to me like the only difference really, I mean we adjusted the salaries by three percent in each band, each step, right? And now instead of it being an automatic increase as you do in a step, it is an increase based on merit, but it's still in a step.

                TRUSTEE: But it doesn't have to be just that step.

                TRUSTEE ASKEW: The step is not --

                CHAIRPERSON CRIDER: I understand.

                Right, but it's still a step, right? It's still a step.

                TRUSTEE LEMUS: It's an improved
It's an amount.  Yes.

MS. PETTY: Well, it's an amount.

CHAIRPERSON CRIDER: Okay. I may not be using the right terminology, but it is not two salaries, a minimum and a maximum.

There are a bunch of salaries in between --

MS. PETTY: Oh yes. That's correct.

CHAIRPERSON CRIDER: That minimum and that maximum, that range. And you get to the range because you used what was the steps before, applied three percent and you come up with what their new base is.

MS. PETTY: Well we get to where we place them in the range.

CHAIRPERSON CRIDER: On the range.

MS. PETTY: Right.

CHAIRPERSON CRIDER: Right.

MS. PETTY: Yes.

CHAIRPERSON CRIDER: And so if I could have 100 people in four different
ranges, I'm going to apply three percent, I might apply six percent, whatever I choose.
I'm not going to have all of the professors at $110,282.00.
They're going to be somewhere between those two. And that wasn't clear to me initially with what was presented to us.

MS. PETTY: All right.

CHAIRPERSON CRIDER: So you're still using in my mind -- you're still using the steps to get up to some new base. And from that you'll do your merit increases on whichever you want to.

MS. PETTY: That's correct. Well, for some segment of the faculty we're using the steps.

CHAIRPERSON CRIDER: Right.

Unless they merit an increase, they won't get an increase.

MS. PETTY: That's right.

CHAIRPERSON CRIDER: It's not like the old day where you just move from -- I got
that part.

MS. PETTY: Okay.

CHAIRPERSON CRIDER: Well it was not clear from what was presented before how you got from this minimum to this maximum. And I think that's where we got a little stuck.

Did you have something Trustee Askew?

TRUSTEE ASKEW: No, no. You know, I'm just -- and again I apologize, I'm just trying to -- I'm still stuck on the distinguished professor.

TRUSTEE SHELTON: There's only one.

TRUSTEE ASKEW: Is there only one?

MS. PETTY: Well on the step scale there is only one. I think he's -- there's only one salary there on the step scale for distinguished professor.

TRUSTEE ASKEW: Right. So how did you get to -- right, exactly.
MS. PETTY: But we had a banded scale since 2007 that had a low point and a high point.

TRUSTEE ASKEW: Okay.

MS. PETTY: If you look at -- and look at your second -- look at this one.

TRUSTEE ASKEW: Yes, I see this one. I just don't see it on the -- I was again, because we're comparing the two.

MS. PETTY: No, not necessarily. They are different scales.

TRUSTEE ASKEW: Okay. Okay. I'm looking at -- because the numbers are the same, they're starting off you know, --

MS. PETTY: Some of the numbers are the same.

TRUSTEE ASKEW: It's start -- you know, so when you got $38,746.00, I see $73,846.00. And so that's -- it's throwing me -- you're saying they're not the same, look at them differently. But I'm not quite under -- I'm still caught on the distinction.
And particularly again, I'm just you know, if the $108 started somewhere on like step number nine or something and it went up to $117 then I -- or let's say in this case $112 or something like that. And then you did the three percent.

And I could see -- maybe I could rationally see how you might have gotten to the $117. But I just -- it's just sitting there on its own. But you're telling me not to compare, don't look at them, they're apples and oranges.

MS. PETTY: Well you can compare it here. This $117 is three percent higher then the $114 that was the maximum on the distinguished professor scale in 2007.

TRUSTEE ASKEW: Okay.

MS. PETTY: Okay?

TRUSTEE ASKEW: Well previously you didn't -- okay, I got it.

MS. PETTY: All right.

CHAIRPERSON CRIDER: Trustee
TRUSTEE SHELTON: Two points --

two -- when you're computing salaries for
employees, you use an average salary to
compute the generic amount of money that goes
up to. You use a generic salary of all your
people.

You don't just -- you eventually
come down to the individual cases, but you
start off with a generic projection based on
the midline salary for all the employees you
had.

MS. PETTY: Oh, yes.

TRUSTEE SHELTON: You base your
fundamental estimation on that group of
people. And then you build the salaries for
each individual off of that projection.

What we appear to have here is a
collective projection but not an individual
projection of the salaries. And it's -- we
really need to understand that this is a
projection of the spread of salaries in that
professor group.

But the individual salaries will be established based on where they are right now.

MS. PETTY: Right.

TRUSTEE SHELTON: That's number one. This is an arithmetic problem that HR does. They do the arithmetic. All they're letting us know is that it will be in this range, okay.

Now that's my addressing this arithmetic.

CHAIRPERSON CRIDER: All right, I think I got that.

TRUSTEE SHELTON: Okay, but we're -- but we can't say what each salary is going to be. We can only say that the lowest person in line will get this much and the highest person in line will get this much at the beginning. And that's it.

CHAIRPERSON CRIDER: Right. But I don't think that anybody -- unless I'm misin
TRUSTEE SHELTON: Okay, well that's what I said, I have two. So I can get that on in.

CHAIRPERSON CRIDER: Unless I misinterpreted the question, I don't think anybody was asking what did Professor Shelton get or what will Professor Bennett get. That wasn't the confusion for me. That wasn't the confusion.

TRUSTEE SHELTON: Okay, all right.

CHAIRPERSON CRIDER: So.

TRUSTEE SHELTON: I missed the confusion.

CHAIRPERSON CRIDER: Okay.

TRUSTEE SHELTON: But my question that I'm going to try to shift and you can come back to it later, is we're being asked to sign this document as a Board approved. And the organizations that we've negotiated with have not signed.

What is the impact on our
authorization to this contract without an agreement from the workforce?

MR. BARASH: Scott Barash, General Counsel. It's really a question of timing. Some -- sorry.

CHAIRPERSON CRIDER: All right Scott.

MR. BARASH: It's really a question of timing. We have been told by the Association's counsel that they don't have any objection to the language of the Agreement. The Board has to take action at this regularly scheduled meeting.

We have to send this down to the Council as well as I think you know. And we're hoping to do that in time of the Council to take action on -- at it's December 2 session on an emergency basis.

So that's the timing. There are a lot of moving pieces here. And there's no reason to think that it won't get signed by the Association.
CHAIRPERSON CRIDER: I think let me just ask maybe one question. This went to arbitration, right?

MR. BARASH: Yes.

CHAIRPERSON CRIDER: This went to arbitration --

MR. BARASH: Yes.

CHAIRPERSON CRIDER: And I thought what happens in arbitration is that each side is represented by somebody and the arbitrator makes a decision based on the facts as presented by both sides. And that the arbitration then is binding.

Is there something that is not binding about this arbitration?

MR. BARASH: No. This is binding arbitration. You are absolutely correct.

CHAIRPERSON CRIDER: Okay. So to the extent that we have a decision by the arbitrator, is that the right word?

MR. BARASH: Arbitrator.

CHAIRPERSON CRIDER: By the
arbitrator -- we have a decision by the arbitrator, then it is up to the University and the Faculty Association to live by that arbitration person's decision.

MR. BARASH: That is correct.

CHAIRPERSON CRIDER: If they don't, what happens?

MR. BARASH: We would bring an action to enforce that. But we have no reason to think that that will not happen.

CHAIRPERSON CRIDER: Right. I'm not saying that it would. But I thought I heard Mr. Shelton's concern was if there is not buy in by the faculty yet on this decision, why are we discussing this?

And I guess my question is, does the arbitration essentially take care of that?

Whether they agree totally or not.

MR. BARASH: Yes. It is binding arbitration. You're absolutely right.

CHAIRPERSON CRIDER: Right.

TRUSTEE BENNETT: Thank you.
CHAIRPERSON CRIDER: I'm not taking questions from the audience.

TRUSTEE BENNETT: And is everything in the agreement arbitrated? All the elements that we're asked to vote on tonight, are they terms that have been arbitrated or are there some that are not?

MR. BARASH: There were some terms that were negotiated and agreed to prior to the arbitration. There were two broad points that went to arbitration.

The compensation piece that we've talked a lot about. And the faculty evaluation piece. Those were subject to the binding arbitration process. So there were two parts to it.

TRUSTEE BENNETT: So the follow up to that. So therefore the parts that were not arbitrated, currently, they're not binding even if we vote yes tonight?

MR. BARASH: But they've been agreed to.
TRUSTEE BENNETT: Okay.

TRUSTEE SHELTON: And the money will be -- we're authorizing the money -- we're authorizing the money as of the vote. Is that what we're doing? When we make this vote, whether they sign it or not, we've authorized the economic gains?

MR. BARASH: It has to be approved by Council. And they will -- the Association will have to sign the agreement.

TRUSTEE SHELTON: Before it's approved by Council?

MR. BARASH: Yes.

TRUSTEE SHELTON: Before at least --

MR. BARASH: Well actually, I'm not sure about that. I'm not sure about that.

CHAIRPERSON CRIDER: When you say by Council, you mean City Council? It goes down to City Council?

MR. BARASH: City Council.

TRUSTEE SHELTON: So you're saying
in the norm -- my experience with the process
is that managers sign last. Labor agrees and
then the management signs.

What I'm discovering here is
management is signing and labor is still
negotiating.

MR. BARASH: I don't think anybody
is still negotiating.

TRUSTEE SHELTON: But still, they
haven't signed.

MR. BARASH: I don't think anybody
is still negotiating.

TRUSTEE SHELTON: They have not
signed. So therefore they're -- they're still
open. Let me say it that way rather than
negotiation they're still open. They have not
signed.

MR. BARASH: We have no reason to
believe that there's any issue with the
contract, either the binding arbitration or
the proceeding items that were negotiated. We
have no reason to think that.
TRUSTEE SHELTON: Please understand at my hesitation is because this has been a very extended negotiation culmination --

MR. BARASH: Yes it has.

TRUSTEE SHELTON: That has gone steps forward, backwards and sideways in the five years I've been here. And I would like to finally have it come to a culmination so that we can move fully forward. And I don't want a surprise.

MR. BARASH: I don't want a surprise either. This has been a challenging process I think for everyone long before I got here. And I think that we are hopeful that we are bringing it to a close.

And again, we have no reason to believe that it won't come to a successful close and that the Council won't approve it. And that the Board will approve it. And that the Faculty Association will formally approve it as well.
TRUSTEE SHELTON: Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON CRIDER: Trust -- I mean Dr. Lyons?

PRESIDENT LYONS: Madam Chair. Trustee Shelton, we -- I guess when I say Trustee Shelton, it turns off the things.

(Laughter)

PRESIDENT LYONS: You know, as you said this has been going on a long time. Both parties submitted proposals. The arbitrator ruled in our favor. Now it has to be ratified.

And I don't -- I don't see any reason why after we have submitted a proposal, it has been accepted by the arbitrator, that we would not get your approval this evening.

TRUSTEE SHELTON: Well, I'm not saying that I'm not. I just want to make sure that -- I'm trying to make sure that the discussion about the potential options that are still out there, is presented from the chair I sit in. Because that potential is
there until they sign.

And I don't know you know, how we
got to here exactly. But we got to here by a
long road. And I would like to have this in.
And I would like for the employees to get
whatever compensation has been agreed to as
quickly as possible.

PRESIDENT LYONS: Well that starts
with your approving the --

TRUSTEE SHELTON: And I'm not just
starting to make sure the discussion --

PRESIDENT LYONS: that starts with
your approving it this evening. If you don't
approve it this evening, we couldn't go
forward with the faculty bonuses, et cetera
that are on the table.

TRUSTEE SHELTON: Yes, I know,
that's the --

CHAIRPERSON CRIDER: Trustee Askew
and then Trustee Bennett.

TRUSTEE ASKEW: Yes, so just let
me say, I mean I do understand what Trustee
Shelton is saying. I mean in an ideal world
I think the parties, the direct parties who
are involved you know, would have both parties
would have signed it.

And we would have been celebrating
as the actions of both the faculty members as
well as the actions of the administration so.
And I think that just because of the history
of us getting to this point, 2007 you know,
that we just want to make sure that -- and
again, this is not about delaying.

This is just wondering if there
are any particular outstanding issues that are
known to us today that would prevent them from
signing it. I don't think -- I don't think we
should delay it. And I don't think Trustee
Shelton is saying that we should delay it.

He's just merely pointing out the
fact that the party -- one of the most
important parties has not signed the document.
Though, it looks as if they've received it.
And so I think that that's just a natural
question.

But let me just ask a question on the financing or the funds to support the lump sum as well as the three percent COLA going back to 2007. Right, we're going back to 2007 correct?


TRUSTEE ASKEW: Have those funds been -- has I believe -- have those funds been put in a fund? Have they been sitting in an account and are the funds you know, available to ensure that we can you know, accommodate and meet our commitment to the Agreement?

MR. RICKFORD: Yes, Don Rickford, CFO. Yes, all of the funds have been accrued. And we are ready to pay it as soon as you all have passed it. And when it is signed we will be in a position to pay that immediately.

TRUSTEE ASKEW: All right. And just one other question related to this. Since you're up there now and for the non-union issue that we're taking up next. And
we're doing that because there would be some unfairness if the non-union employees did not receive a COLA increase.

Is that money in the budget? Is three percent in the budget?

MR. RICKFORD: We've accrued for that already.

TRUSTEE ASKEW: Okay. Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON CRIDER: Trustee Bennett?

TRUSTEE BENNETT: Just to supplement what Trustee Askew spoke about. I don't think any of us as Board members are opposed to having a happy faculty. As a student I am all for having my faculty happy and their salaries paid.

So we're just trying to make sure that the I's are dotted and the T's are crossed. And make sure everyone leaves the table what they deserve at the end of the day.

CHAIRPERSON CRIDER: I think you know, essentially it is our responsibility or
our obligation as trustees to sign off on what has been negotiated. It's up to the faculty group to sign off when they feel com -- I can't -- you know, we can't control what or when they sign off.

If there's unreadiness, I think they have to deal with that. But our obligation is to sign off on this agreement that has been presented to us.

And you know, we have the option if we're uncomfortable with what's being presented to vote no if that's what we want. You know, if we feel that there is some unreadiness.

But I think we are trying to act responsible here in you know, accepting and agreeing to this tonight. Okay? Any further discussion?

TRUSTEE BENNETT: Call for the question.

CHAIRPERSON CRIDER: All in favor vote aye.
(Chorus of ayes.)

CHAIRPERSON CRIDER: Any opposed?

(No response.)

CHAIRPERSON CRIDER: Abstentions?

(No response.)

CHAIRPERSON CRIDER: The motion carries. Thank you.

The next one is the non-faculty.

And for the record, I'd just like to just put on the record that we did receive a written correspondence from the President of the Union on this issue. So -- and that was circulated to each Board member.

TRUSTEE SCHWARTZ: Madam Chair?

CHAIRPERSON CRIDER: Yes?

TRUSTEE SCHWARTZ: The next resolution deals with the approval of the terms for the compensation of the department chairs and continuing full time non-faculty members -- non-union members.

Now therefore be it resolved that the Board of Trustees hereby accepts the
recommendation of the President. And hereby
approves the terms for compensation of the
department chairs and continuing full time
non-union faculty.

There is a financial impact
statement that follows this resolution which
certifies that the funds are available.

PRESIDENT LYONS: Move acceptance.

TRUSTEE BENNETT: Second.

CHAIRPERSON CRIDER: So moved --
moved and second. Any discussion on this
resolution? Discussion? Trustee Bennett?

TRUSTEE BENNETT: I would just say
it's only fair. All the members who, the same
faculty, they should have the same pay scale
as what we just approved. So it's only fair
that we do so.

CHAIRPERSON CRIDER: Other
discussion? Questions? All in favor vote
aye.

(Chorus of ayes.)

CHAIRPERSON CRIDER: Any opposed
or abstentions?

(No response.)

CHAIRPERSON CRIDER: That motion carries as well.

TRUSTEE SCHWARTZ: Madam Chair --

CHAIRPERSON CRIDER: Thank you

Trustee Schwartz.

TRUSTEE SCHWARTZ: That completes this.

CHAIRPERSON CRIDER: This is Trustee Schwartz' meeting. Okay, let me just say though, I want to thank both -- all of the Trustees really. This was the first time we had a -- our Committee meetings with the new configuration.

And I think the Chairs did a remarkable job in dealing with the issues in Committee and moving them forward. So I thank -- I really do thank you guys.

(Applause)

CHAIRPERSON CRIDER: Okay. The next is the -- that was all of the action
items, right? Great. So report of the Chairperson. I don't have one at this point.

Report of the President, Dr. Lyons?

PRESIDENT LYONS: Yes Madam Chair.

I in the interest of time I would like to move to the presentation related to Title IX if that's okay?

But let me do two things. First of all, I want to welcome a new member of the family, Dr. Diane Phillips, the CEO of the Community College. Dr. Phillips started when, Monday?

DR. PHILLIPS: Monday.

PRESIDENT LYONS: And so she's busy on the job on the case. Dr. Phillips, would you please stand and we'd like to just hear from you.

(Applause)

PRESIDENT LYONS: If you can give us one minute.

DR. PHILLIPS: I'm curious with
the process here.

(Laughter)

DR. PHILLIPS: So this is my first Board meeting. I've been onboard two days now. Let me say, I am honored with the opportunity to be here as the CEO of the University of the District of Columbia Community College.

I spent this day, day two traveling all through the building, 801 N.E. Capital Street -- North Capital Street N.E., I'm still learning. And I met students, faculty, staff. I spent the day with students, faculty and staff.

And the thing that kept coming from that experience is that the University of the District of Columbia Community College is no ordinary community college. The students are absolutely fabulous. They are delighted with the faculty.

I heard time and time again from the students in the building what a wonderful
educational experience they have. And how
delighted they are with the education they're
getting and with the faculty.

And I got to be honest with you,
as the new Chief Executive Officer, that is
exactly what I wanted to hear from the
students. And today that was just a meeting.

I hope to begin my tenure with
what I call a listening tour. I've got some
folks on the staff, I had a staff meeting
yesterday, they're putting together a
transition plan for me on people that I'll be
meeting inside the institution and externally.

Tomorrow I'll be meeting with Dr.
Petty and her -- and the Deans and her staff.
So it has begun. I've met with several Board
members already. And I just want to say it's
a fabulous time to be here. I have nothing
but hope for the future of this institution.
Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON CRIDER: Thanks Dr.
Phillips.
(Applause)

PRESIDENT LYONS: As you can see, she's a bundle of energy. Madam Chair, I have to tell you this, during a previous visit to town, Dr. Phillips was in the car and Dean Kim Ford took her to a certain location.

And when I told one of the members of City Council that the two of them were in the car together, he said you know, that car must have flown on its own, there was so much energy between the two of them sitting in the same car. So -- but we're happy to have her with us.

And I do want to thank the members of the Search Committee, which was chaired by Mamei Willie-Bonglo. The members were Patricia Myers, Dean Carl Peters, Trustee James Dyke and Mr. Donald Rickford. Ms. Marilyn Hamilton and Ms. Kim Ford.

They did a tremendous job. And I want to thank them for their work.

CHAIRPERSON CRIDER: Can I just --
let me just add to that. I'd like to thank
the Trustees too who were able to interview
with the candidates. And I was very pleased
that the Trustees fell out at the same place
as the Search Committee. That doesn't always
happen.

And so I think it proves that the
formula worked. We got it right. And
supported being able to support what the
Search Committee recommended.

And also you know, one of the
things that was important to us is that we you
know moved forward. We are one University.
That the Community College is in fact a
college within the University System.

And that to the extent that you
know, that is the position that the Board of
Trustees has taken and we will continue to
take that as long and as far as I can see from
this point on. And Dr. Phillips understood
that that was important to us.

And so we are excited about her
being here and being able to take over the
helm of the Community College. We expect
great things. Expect a lot of support from
your staff. And it sounds like it's working
already. So, glad to have you here.

PRESIDENT LYONS: I'd also like to
make another introduction. A number of years
ago, some of us were concerned about the
dearth of black college Presidents. If we
removed those who have worked in historically
black colleges, there were few.

And so a group of those Presidents
that left that meeting put together a program.
And it's called the Millennium Leadership
Institute. It was initially established to
help identify individuals that might move into
a Presidency -- African-American individuals.

But then the program was later
expanded to include women and other academics
of color. We are assigned, those of us who
have been involved in the program, are
assigned a protégée. And I want to introduce
my protégée who is here tonight, Dr. Welden Jackson.

He's the Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs at Bowie State University. So I wanted you to meet my protégée.

(Applause)

PRESIDENT LYONS: And so he will be shadowing me, following me. I hope he'll help take some of the blows and that -- they didn't tell you that that comes with it. But we're happy to have him here.

I had indicated to you that I was going to try to bring a special topic to the Board each meeting. We're going to focus on the self study at the next full Board meeting and share with you where we are. And raise some issues that we have concern in terms of the visit.

But tonight we're going to talk about Title IX. As I said to you before, there's probably no item effecting higher
education right now that's having more of an impact then Title IX.

Just this afternoon for example, the Commissioner of our athletic conference and I were talking and the NCAA is even having a special session for University Presidents at its annual meeting to deal with Title IX. And our own Director of Athletics, Pat Thomas has been invited to participate in a panel at the NCAA annual meeting this year. A panel on Title IX.

So we had planned at our last meeting to have Sislena and Mr. Ramsey -- Bill Ramsey present to you, but we bumped them in favor of enrollment management. But they remain faithful and said that they would come back at this meeting and make a presentation.

So I've asked them to come forward. Dr. Ledbetter, would you like to step forward. We say about -- we'll I know you'd like to do. You've been waiting for three months to do this.
So we'd like you to take about 15 minutes. I know you've prepared an hour presentation. But take about 15 minutes. And then we'd like to give the Board members an opportunity to interact with you and raise questions.

DR. LEDBETTER: All right. Dr. Sislena Ledbetter, Director of Counseling and Student Development.

MR. RAMSEY: Brian Ramsey, Title IX Coordinator.

DR. LEDBETTER: And we're here to talk about three things that really represent the protection of all assault victims. So we're here to talk about Clery, which is the reporting act that you probably are hearing a lot about, it's in the news.

We're here to talk about the Violence Against Women Act. And we're also here to talk about Title IX. And all of that really is the culmination of a big effort that started many, many, many years ago.
But in January 2014 the Obama Administration decided that they were going to launch a new commission. And the culmination of that commission was released in a report in October 2014. And it's called the Not Alone Report.

So we're going to kind of take turns so as not too bore you, talking about Clery, Title IX and the Violence Against Women Act. And Brian is going to talk more about the details of the Title IX reporting.

Because it really, really, really, sexual assault happens on campuses every day to women and to men. And it's a very, very serious issue. For UDC we are -- if you've noticed in our Clery report, our numbers are pretty low. And that's for several reasons.

And one is because we don't have on campus housing. So Clery recommends -- Clery requires that we report all sexual assaults that happen or issues of domestic violence. Any interpersonal violence that
happens on campus.

So our numbers are really low because we don't have those reports because we don't have official housing. Except for the 150 students that are in the Consulate in Archstone.

MR. RAMSEY: All right. For Title IX, which is prohibition of sex discrimination, which basically is now the focus of sexual assault, sexual violence, stalking, domestic violence. For too many of our nation's young people, college doesn't turn out the way it's supposed to.

One in five women are sexually assaulted while on college. Most often it happens during the Freshman year or Sophomore year. And a great majority of the cases, 70 to 80 percent, she knows her attacker, whether as an acquaintance, a classmate, friend or ex-boyfriend or boyfriend.

Many of the survivors are what is called incapacitated assault. Basically this
is where someone has been sexually abused
while they were drugged, passed out, drunk or
otherwise incapacitated. It's unfortunate.

And although fewer and it's harder
to gauge, college men are also being
Victimized. The administration is committed
to turning the tide.

The White House Task Forces to
protect students from sexual assault was
established January 22, 2014. Which was a
mandate to strengthen Federal enforcement
efforts and provide schools with additional
tools to help combat sexual assault on
campuses.

And Dr. Ledbetter is going to talk
about some of the initial steps. There's many
more steps that we're going to be taking, but
these are the initial steps that we have
started.

DR. LEDBETTER: So to come into
compliance, and we don't have to be in full
compliance because the rule of the legislation
sends that we have to make a good faith effort.
So that is the rubric by which we measure this
year.

We have to be in full compliance
as of October 1, 2015. So we have a year to
get our act together. But we've been working
really hard.

We've created a climate survey
that students have reviewed as well as staff
members. And that is going to be launched on
December 3.

MR. RAMSEY: Right there is also
training that's launched by Human Resources,
which I'm a part of, for staff. And it's
being procured by the same agency which is
Workplace Answers.

We actually launched it in
October, the end of October. And we're hoping
that all the staff members will be in full
compliance in the sense that they've actually
taken the training. We're hoping by the end
of this year that that will take place.
DR. LEDBETTER: And we're using the same vendor because we think it's important that students, faculty and staff see the same information. So Workplace Answers will also be doing the video, the training called Student Empower.

And after much discussion about how it will be launched, we're going to be requesting that it comes behind the MyUDC portal so that all students have an opportunity to not only take that. But also take a campus safety video we're procuring. And also take the alcohol policy so that we remain in compliance with Title IV.

So we are bundling it and despite the funding, we're -- the lack of funding, we're making sure that we commit the necessary resources to make sure that we remain in compliance.

We're also going to be working with Dr. Petty and Dr. Webster on faculty development. And doing a training with them.
We've got a lot of information to share. So we're hoping that we'll be able to buy a little bit of time during faculty development week in January.

We did a training with 120 athletes in October 2014 talking about interpersonal violence. Working really closely with Pat because whenever issues come up with athletes, we have an extremely close relationship with the counseling center.

We also have a great partnership with Men Can Stop Rape. That is an organization, nonprofit organization in the District of Columbia. And we've been working with them on several partnerships.

In 2012 we launched an app called UASK, University Assault Services Knowledge. And that app has for all of the consortium universities, information at every student's fingertips if they download the app on any smartphone where they can access resources where if they find themselves on Georgetown,
they can pick up UASK, tap the app and find a counseling center.

If they find themselves at Catholic, they can tap the app. So it's an extremely useful tool. And students have reported that they have actually used it.

We also are partnering with Men of Strength because part two of the 901 Report says that we have to find a way to engage men. So we're working with Men Can Stop Rape and we've already started a group called Men of Strength.

And we've had -- they meet every other Friday on campus. The first meeting was two Fridays ago. And there were 22 men in attendance. It was phenomenal to see the multiple generations in the same room just rapping, barbershop talk about things that are really taboo.

Because when you get brothers and/or sisters in a room and you start talking about things like sexual assault, when you
start talking about all the myriad of social issues because any oppression is raw depression, then you really see something organic happening.

And that's what we -- I had to hold the sisters back because they were trying to enter to get a slice of pizza or to get a flyer. But we really did honor that boundary and allowed the guys to talk about some of the things that they can do.

Because most often, although we do know that you know, there are three million victims of domestic violence and interpersonal violence a year that are women -- that are men and four million that are women, we know that there are -- that most often the perpetrator is the man against the woman, okay.

We have procured funding, $7,500.00 a year for the next three years. The first check will be cut September 2015 if we signed on the dotted line, and I think we did. D.C. Coalition Against Domestic
Violence. We're in partnership with them in a consortium grant.

And really what it is, is to create branding messages and to develop training. And it's not a lot of money. But we know how to make a little bit of money go really far.

So we're excited to be a part of that effort. And we've been meeting with them for the past couple of years. Every couple of months they call a meeting and we talk. So we're excited to be at the forefront of that.

And I think I'm standing in front of you as payback because Dr. Lyons was called in on a meeting. As he said, I gave up his email address and his phone number. And so he was called in.

But he was able to meet Eric Holder and did a lot of good things. So they really look to UDC as a leader in this effort. And we're excited because when I see the names across, I see his name right there. And he's
always on point.

Then -- you talk about the It's On Us Campaign, because --

MR. RAMSEY: That's right. There was an It's On Us campaign launch at the White House a couple of months ago. Dr. Lyons honored me by allowing me to use his invitation to go to the White House.

It was an awesome experience.

PRESIDENT LYONS: Would you repeat that?

(Laughter)

CHAIRPERSON CRIDER: Yes, repeat that. You don't have to.

MR. RAMSEY: Well when I went, I really was able to see the impact all the way from the President of the United States and also the Vice President of the United States. I was really -- been able to see how important it is to the administration.

And it's just as important to us here at UDC. Especially I can feel the impact
from Dr. Lyons wanting me to go. And it was
an honor for you to allow me to go.

So I did repeat that.

DR. LEDBETTER: Okay, all right.

MR. RAMSEY: Also Dr. Ledbetter is

-- there was a video added to the public

safety presentation. It's called One Too

Many. And also Ledbetter, Dr. Ledbetter is --

has taped a domestic violence promo with UDC

TV in September 2014, this year.

And also I just wanted to mention,

I'm also on MyUDC as a contact person for

students. So they know who to report it to.

They know that they have a resource. And

also, I am also on the monitors throughout the

campuses including the Community College. I'm

on the monitor.

So I'm hoping that my name will

get out there and that there will be more

reports.

DR. LEDBETTER: Right. Because

that's what you often see. And sometimes when
you look at Clery next year and you hear you
know, that the chief has entered a significant
in -- you see a significant increase in
reporting, it doesn't necessarily mean that
there are more assaults happening on campus.

Oftentimes as we've seen since the
NFL fi -- the video. Since that was released,
we've seen a spike in reports. And I expect
with more news in the media with sexual
assault, I suspect that it's going to continue
to increase.

We are also developing a sexual
assault bill of rights that the students and
staff are now reviewing. And they've given me
back a draft. And the one thing that they
don't have that I would like for them to
include is an amnesty clause.

And basically what that simply
means is if you're caught doing something
within reason, but if you're caught doing
something and you know it's not right, but you
witness or a party to a sexual assault, we
will grant you amnesty if you come forward and report that sexual assault.

Because we know that when there's a fear of being reported, that the numbers for reporting go up. So we're working on that.

Then we have a -- so item number three is how can the government help schools respond effectively when a student is assaulted? We're partnering with the Office of Public Safety to procure an app called Live Safe.

And essentially what this app is, it's an escort, it's a texting tool, it is a tool that will allow you to connect with either friends, either you know, public safety. And it essentially allows you to video or take pictures of your surroundings. So all you do is turn the app on and for example sometimes I'm up in my office late at night. And maybe public safety doesn't have someone who can walk me down. I can turn on the app and say Todd or Chief or
Brian, I need you to walk with me to my car.

You touch the app and it starts recording.

The other thing that we're doing is we are convening a sexual assault response team. We have a threat assessment team that we are both a part of and work pretty often and very diligently on that sexual assault re-- on their assessment team.

But we're going to be expanding it to include faculty and staff members. Because we're going to need a larger voice. And we are going to -- so we're going to need everybody's voice, health services, athletics, academic affairs, to work with us on that.

You can jump in at any time if I'm going -- if I'm saying too much. And then the last thing is we're improving and making more transparent the work that we're doing.

In the coming months, the categories if you -- I'm going to call it out because you probably have heard that we got dinged on the Clery Reporting.
So the Huffington Post while it is not necessarily a peer review journal, dinged us, right. And they dinged us on failing to report three categories. The domestic violence, the sexual assault and stalking.

So those three categories were left off. And the government is saying you can't leave them off. Even though our numbers were zero, you can't leave them off.

We're not a great thing, but that did mean that we're not in compliance. Okay, we have until October 1, 2015 to become compliant, okay.

So we will have those categories. I believe that Mr. -- Chief Culmer has gone back and amended that report as we discussed. And then we're also going to be amending our judicial code.

So we've got a judicial code that is pretty broad. And while we have been dealing with sexual assaults and domestic violence and interpersonal violence globally,
we've been dealing with it and adjudicating
it, we have to include the language. The law
says it's not enough to deal with it, you have
to have the specific language in your
policies.

Which brings me to policy. We
have a sexual -- we have a harassment policy,
a Title IX harassment policy.

MR. RAMSEY: Right. Anti-
Discrimination and Harassment Policy.

DR. LEDBETTER: That's right.

MR. RAMSEY: It was just revised
in July of this year.

DR. LEDBETTER: Um-hum. But we
don't have a sexual assault, dating violence
and stalking policy. Smruti and I have been
going back and forth. OGC and I have been
going back and forth on whether to create a
separate policy or integrate the language into
the present policy.

And I think right now our best
thinking is we need to have it separate.
Because we want victims and users, consumers of this policy to be able to access this policy, use it and there's a presumption that the policy that we have now, the Anti-Discrimination feels more staff and employee driven. Whereas the sexual assault, domestic violence, is clearly to protect our students.

MR. RAMSEY: But just to be clear, if someone were to come forward, with the Anti-Discrimination and Harassment Policy as it currently stands, if it's stalking, domestic violence or dating violence, those categories that are supposed to be included, that would all -- that would be taken in consideration. Because it's still considered sex discrimination.

It falls under that category and it would be investigated by me. But it just needs to be actually delineated out and actually said. As opposed to just covered.

DR. LEDBETTER: And last two items is that we are -- when we work with all of our
policies, from soup to nuts, including our
trainings, we will be making it clear that
victims have a right to report or not report.
To seek medical attention or to go to
authorities.

Right, so they can go to
authorities. They can go to counseling or
they can choose not to report. And that is
about making sure that we empower the victim.
It's a victim empowerment model where we allow
them to take control.

And that's why oftentimes you see
victims come out years later. It's because
perhaps who knows how the case was handled.
They might not have felt empowered for coming
forward.

And then finally, we have a Red
Folder campaign that we're going to be
launching. And that is going to include our
crisis protocol. It's going to be four sides.
It literally looks like a folder, back and
forth.
But it's going to share with the entire University community on how to address students who seem to be in distress. From those who have been sexually assaulted to just those who have been assaulted. To those who have been victims of any type of injustice related to assault or distress.

And we'll be launching that probably in the -- what semester are we in? Spring? Fall?

MR. RAMSEY: Fall now so it will be spring.

DR. LEDBETTER: Spring. In the spring. So we're finalizing it now. So that is it.

PRESIDENT LYONS: Chair before you open it up, I just wanted to say that we're working very hard on sort of two fronts. One is compliance, which we've got to do. And it seems like stuff comes to us every week.

But we're also concerned about the safety of students. And being victim
advocates to the extent that we can. And that's demonstrated of course by the many -- excuse me, activities that we have going.

But they're definitely two fronts. And they're both a lot on our plates. But the staff is working very hard to get it done.

CHAIRPERSON CRIDER: That's great. Great. Thank you. I think the presentation was wonderful. And you know, very thorough and information that we needed to hear.

Before I open it up for questions on this, let me just acknowledge and thank -- I think our student Trustee was responsible for this. There are a number of students that are in the audience. And I'm really glad to see that we have students here.

And I just want before they tip out, acknowledge that we have several students. And we're glad that you are engaging with us. And hope to see you at most of our meetings.

(Applause)
CHAIRPERSON CRIDER: And I'd like to open it up for questions or comments related to Title IX.

TRUSTEE SCHWARTZ: Madam Chair?

CHAIRPERSON CRIDER: Trustee Schwartz?

TRUSTEE SCHWARTZ: One of the opening lines that I have within my agency is that sexual assault is a crime. And we treat it as a crime first where we call local authorities and they deal with the issue right up front.

Is that the strategy we're using here on campus also?

MR. RAMSEY: Well under Title IX it's a different standard in terms of the investigation. It's a preponderance of the evidence. And regardless of whether a criminal investigation goes forward or even if the threshold is met beyond a reasonable doubt in a criminal case, the investigation for Title IX purposes still goes forward.
So it's completely a separate track. So one of the -- I think one of the great things about Title IX is that it allows victims to actually have a case without having to meet the threshold of beyond a reasonable doubt.

And where they have to be sometimes even traumatized by going to a court and facing vigorous cross examination and of course it's a part of a due process and everything else. But I think Title IX gives that possibility that someone can go forward with a case with Title IX and possibly not be able to go forward with a case in criminal court.

CHAIRPERSON CRIDER: Trustee Felton?

TRUSTEE FELTON: Yes, thank you. It was an excellent presentation. I have two short questions. One, you said the numbers are low. But I have no sense of what low means. Can you just share those numbers?
And two, are our campuses within the metro area rated or ranked? And if so, where do we stand in relation to others in the area?

DR. LEDBETTER: So regarding those three categories, we're at zero for 2012, because the report lags a year behind.

TRUSTEE FELTON: Okay.

DR. LEDBETTER: Right? I have a full report, it's 22 pages with all of our categories. I can tell you that the highest is alcohol abuse.

So we report everything from what happens off campus, like if P.R. Harris has a shooting, we report that. If UD -- not the student involved. But if anything happens near the campus you'll get that in the report, VNS as well.

So we've got pretty robust numbers. But for domestic violence, stalking and what's the third one -- domestic -- and dating violence, those were zero for our
reports.

And those -- the categories again, we thought we could leave them off, and they were left off, but they can't be. You have to put the categories and put zero. So --

MR. RAMSEY: But again, it's just good faith effort at this point.

DR. LEDBETTER: Right.

MR. RAMSEY: Because it's not until the 2014 numbers come out next year that compliance is going to be an enforcement.

TRUSTEE FELTON: So is it your impression that other campuses are having a little more difficulty?

DR. LEDBETTER: They are.

TRUSTEE FELTON: Okay.

DR. LEDBETTER: In fact so I can't -- I don't -- this is not necessarily factual, but I do -- I have heard that some of our campuses with residential facilities on them have far higher numbers of sexual assaults.

CHAIRPERSON CRIDER: Trustee
TRUSTEE BENNETT: I want to thank you Dr. Ledbetter and you gentlemen for doing such a great job, a great presentation. I do have though a comment about the judicial code. I'm so glad that that was brought up. Currently on the Hill there was a blip with some code issue where a young man sued the university. And got like million dollars on damages based on their judicial code.

And it turned out that it you know, his incident was not true. And he sued for the damages that resulted from that.

Because as we know, sexual assaults and stuff bears on someone's moral turpitude, that what we call it? And so it influences you getting into law school or any other profession of that nature when you have that on your transcript.

So we have to make sure that our code is in a way where we are not making decisions that will affect where -- we want to
consider the victim most definitely. But we also want to consider the person being accused of the offense. So we have to find our balance there.

DR. LEDBETTER: That's right.

That's right. And we're working on that because you know, we just had a presentation today that the laws are constantly changing. I suspect that you know, every other day I get a training opportunity across my desk.

So I believe the training and the iterations of training will catch up with the laws once we're actually fully compliant. But I suspect that we have yet to reach which looks like a final say on how this execution will really roll out when we start talking about changing our judicial policies.

MR. RAMSEY: Well one of the things that we -- that I can do as a Title IX coordinator if an investigation has launched, I can actually institute interim relief under the Anti-Discrimination and Harassment Policy,
even without having any findings of facts.

So I can arrange for relief with
the Office of Public Safety to make sure that
they get escorts to and from the classroom.
And other types of relief without even having
found against the respondent yet.

But that's one of the great things
about Title IX is that you can do that.
Whereas if it's a criminal case, you're not
necessarily going to be able to get that type
of protection.

You may be able to find a
protective order, you might be able to get
one. It's just a higher standard with the
criminal case as well as protective orders.
Whereas Title IX I'll be able to institute
relief right away without having a full-blown
hearing in front of a court or tribunal.

CHAIRPERSON CRIDER: Trustee

Lemus?

TRUSTEE LEMUS: Thank you. Thank

you so much for doing this. I'm a big
believer of an ounce of prevention is worth a pound of cure.

So I kind of have a three point question and it seems divergent now that I'm looking at it. Do we have an LGBTQ sort of sub-policy? The other is on the issue of counseling and because I do feel that counseling is a very important aspect of all of this.

And then the third point is around -- and I'm sorry if you said it and I missed it. Have we reviewed our facilities in terms of lighting and all these types of things?

I mean it's another burden cost wise, but it's important. Especially garages and moving from point A. I mean I appreciate the app. You know, it's always nice, but lights are good.

DR. LEDBETTER: Lights are good.

So the first one was TAG. We have a TAG Alliance. That's our LGBTQ group and they are covered under very explicitly under our Anti-
Discrimination and Sexual Harassment Policy.

Very explicitly.

And then your second question was counseling. And we provide counseling services. We have three licensed counselors. Two of them are psychologists. One of them is a licensed clinical social worker.

We have five GW residents that work in our counseling center. And we have three psychiatric residents and an MOU with St. Elizabeth Hospitals that partner with us and can prescribe medication to themselves down at 35th and K Street.

So we have them covered. We partner with outside if they come with their own clinical teams, we can partner with them. It is free. We are confidential and we provide them with a full range of services and then their facilities.

So we got a grant a couple of years ago to get money to redo all of the -- I don't know if you even know this Kim, to
redo all of the lighting at your facility. I don't know, did you know that? Right again.

Okay, I don't know about that answer, but we -- we are in full recognition that lighting at some of our campus sites is not quite up to par as you know, VNS campus is -- redone it's lighting.

And -- but this Live Safe app is really sort of our stop gap given the resources that we have. Because we had a -- I believe we budgeted upwards of like $170 to $200 thousand in just lights for that grant.

But you know, we weren't funded, we don't get them all. But we go after many. So yes. So to that answer, we are definitely thinking about lighting because lighting is good. And we're just kind of doing the best that we can with what we have.

CHAIRPERSON CRIDER: Other questions?

TRUSTEE BENNETT: No, just a com -

- a follow up question to the question that
you asked Trustee Lemus. Have we been talking
with our facilities to see how they may be
able to help out with the lighting issue that
the Trustee brought up?

DR. LEDBETTER: Yes. So we're in
partnership with them. In fact we're in
partnership with them with Live Safe, the app.
So we work -- we, Title IX, threat assessment,
counseling center, all of us, we work pretty
closely together with the campus community.

So you know, if Barbara wants to
drop $170 thousand on the counseling center to
help install -- she's probably thinking the
other way around, right?

MS. JUMPER: No, I'd like to think
you've made some significance --

DR. LEDBETTER: Yes, yes.

MS. JUMPER: In lighting around
the campuses throughout. It has absolutely
more to do with the existing ones.

DR. LEDBETTER: Yes, that's right.

MS. JUMPER: And a lot of
surveillance.

    DR. LEDBETTER: Oh, that's right, surveillance cameras are up, that's right.

    PRESIDENT LYONS: Barbara would you come to the mic please so that we can pick up your comments. Thank you.

    MS. JUMPER: Good evening. I was just saying, I'm sorry I spoke from the back of the room. But I would say that we have made some significant investments in lighting throughout every campus to include P.R. Harris.

    But not enough. We know there's more to be done. In addition, I think we've done a significant improvement in terms of surveillance on every campus. So there is almost no where you can go on any campus now and not see a camera that will be recording activity.

    So I don't want to leave the impression we have not made investments. We really have. There's always room for more.
And we will always continue to focus on that

I don't think there was anything

else there. Was there any other question?

TRUSTEE BENNETT: Thank you.

MS. JUMPER: Um-hum.

TRUSTEE ASKEW: Okay, Just one

other question, just because if you had said

there were -- just because you said that they

were shooting near P.R. Harris. So how many

of those did we report?

DR. LEDBETTER: Let's see, how

many shootings? I know you have this

committed to memory, I just wanted --

TRUSTEE ASKEW: Yes, which is --

DR. LEDBETTER: Hold on. Okay, so

aggravated assault, two. Arrest, robbery,

hold on. Or robbery. Okay, so three.

Three 2010, zero reported in 2011.

Two reported in 2012 on campus and one off

campus, non-campus building or property. No

sorry, non-campus building or property one in

2012. Public property two. So none on
campus, just around campus.

TRUSTEE ASKEW: Okay and that's robbery? You said that was robbery versus --

DR. LEDBETTER: Yes.

TRUSTEE ASKEW: But with a weapon?

DR. LEDBETTER: Yes, yes.

TRUSTEE ASKEW: Okay, all right.

TRUSTEE SHELTON: Were they student victims or were they citizen victims?

DR. LEDBETTER: Well, I don't know of any student victims.

TRUSTEE SHELTON: Because one of the things that our media does very well is report the largest facility in the area of these events.

DR. LEDBETTER: Right. Right.

TRUSTEE SHELTON: Rather than defining where they are. But it is negotiable if you can get in contact with the media centers and outlets to reduce your name. I know that it happens in Montgomery County and I know it has happened in the District to try
to keep you name off of the association with
the street events that are not your
responsibility.

DR. LEDBETTER: That's right.

CHAIRPERSON CRIDER: I'd just like
to ask one, unless somebody else has a
question? I'd just like to ask one question.

You talked about a committee that
you have that you're putting together, that
you will include all of the departments. I
think that's what I heard you say. And it
sounds like it's a planning group?

DR. LEDBETTER: Yes.

CHAIRPERSON CRIDER: Okay. And I
just wanted to know how you engage students in
that and is it your plan to include students
as part of that group or not?

DR. LEDBETTER: Yes. So the
sexual assault response team, I think is to
what you're referring.

CHAIRPERSON CRIDER: Okay.

DR. LEDBETTER: Will be a lot
broader. We have a core threat assessment team and we debated about whether we would keep it a core group or we thought we would expand it to include all of the you know, really engaged and interested parties. That would be students.

That would also be athletics, academic affairs and all of the groups that really have a vested interested, which is everybody. But that can afford the human resources to participate whenever there's a sexual assault.

And to also help us with the launching and the planning of all these activities that are really going to be legislated for us to do. We have to do these things. So we're trying to spread the wealth.

CHAIRPERSON CRIDER: Okay. Thank you. And is there other questions? Did you have something else?

TRUSTEE LEMUS: Very briefly. And I had asked if there were fraternities and
sororities on campus? Oftentimes you find that when there's parties and those kinds of things that where you kind of see the challenges. So engaging them up front might be helpful.

DR. LEDBETTER: Yes, absolutely.

CHAIRPERSON CRIDER: Okay, thank you.

DR. LEDBETTER: Thank you.

MR. RAMSEY: Thank you.

(Applause)

PRESIDENT LYONS: That concludes our report.

(Laughter)

PRESIDENT LYONS: Let me just mention two things though. We didn't talk a lot about alcohol. Now I do want to say that there was nothing in this report intended to speak against campus housing. So I don't want anybody to think that we don't want campus housing.

CHAIRPERSON CRIDER: Well, it's a
much -- well, why are you looking at me?

PRESIDENT LYONS: Madam Chair I wasn't looking at you. I wasn't looking at you Madam Chair.

CHAIRPERSON CRIDER: My housing issues are much bigger than this.

PRESIDENT LYONS: Oh, I understand. I wasn't talking about you. But you know, you do have -- no.

You do have additional problems when you have campus housing. There's no question about it. And so you know, we have to deal with that.

The other thing is alcohol. Because there's a very direct connection between alcohol and some of the behavior that you have. And I know that we're on that piece.

And finally, they kept mentioning threat assessment teams -- well you knew I was going to say that anyway. Well, I've got some concerns about whether the treat assessment
team can handle the Title IX stuff.

   And you know, it's conversation.
I mean the threat assessment team does good
work. Don't misunderstand me. But on Title
IX I'm just wondering whether the new
committee you're putting together might better
-- work better.

   So we're having those kind of
ongoing conversations. Thank you Madam Chair.

CHAIRPERSON CRIDER: Okay. Thank
you. The Committee Reports from the Executive
Committee. The only thing that I would like
to report is that the Board is moving forward
with the Presidential search. And a
communication went out from the President that
identified the Search Committee members.

   So we are hoping that we will be
able to accomplish and complete that by the
early to late spring so that we can have a new
President in place before the start of the
next school year. It's aggressive, but this
is probably the most important task that we
have in front of us for this year.

And so the Committee members, co-chairs for that Search Committee are Trustee Askew and Trustee Schwartz. And I will thank them in advance because they may not be talking to me after it's all over. But I do thank them for stepping up and agreeing to Co-Chair that.

And we certainly expect and need to have the commitment of everybody on the Committee to make the meetings first of all, all of the meetings that the Co-Chairs will have that the Committee will have. So that we can conduct a fair search and to get that done.

So thank all of you that have agreed. It does include, you know everybody always wants to be on every committee that you create. That's never going to happen. But we did try to get broad representation including someone from the community to sit on the Search Committee as well.
So, don't have a Committee of the Whole report. Academic and Student Affairs, Trustee Schwartz, any additional?

TRUSTEE SCHWARTZ: No additional.

We occupied half of your meeting tonight. And the biggest --

(Laughter)

TRUSTEE SCHWARTZ: The biggest issue we had to discuss was it going to be academic and student affairs or student affairs and academic affairs. And I think Dr. Petty won.

CHAIRPERSON CRIDER: Dr. Petty won. Always.

TRUSTEE SCHWARTZ: Thanks. Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON CRIDER: Okay. As part of your Committee, we have two tasks force.

TRUSTEE SCHWARTZ: That's correct.

The alumni and --

CHAIRPERSON CRIDER: One is new
for the alumni. Mr. Shelton?

TRUSTEE SHELTON: Briefly, small
groups have been identified from the histor --
a group has been -- volunteers from the
historic schools. I spoke today with an
alumnus of the Community College. I'll be
talking to the Community College about
recommending other alums.

I have an alum who is attending
the law school, who I haven't had a chance to
speak to about it. But I intend to. She's
sitting right here to my left. So that we can
combine the student effort and the alumni
effort to try to service it better.

And we should be meeting in early
December.

CHAIRPERSON CRIDER: Okay. And
let me on the record thank Mr. Shelton. He
agreed to take on the -- he agreed to sit on
a third committee so that he could in fact
take on the responsibility of chairing and
creating. This is the first time since I've
been on the Board that we really have given
some directed attention to alumni.

And I'm certainly hoping that this
results in better relationships with the
alumni society and greater participation from
that body. And so I thank him for agreeing to
take this on.

And then the student
communications task force?

TRUSTEE BENNETT: Thank you Madam
Chair. The student communication task force
will convene tomorrow at 10:30 at 801 North
Capital.

We are trying to -- one of my
biggest moves is to incorporate having student
leaders move around to campuses and to include
-- we're going to move to P.R. Harris next,
the law school, flag ship, because I think the
presence is needed at every single institution
here.

In the age of communication, I
realize that communication is this
University's biggest problem unfortunately.
And it is my hope that that meeting will
convene the structure of the communication
task force as well as to address some
corns.

I must applaud Student Life, Ms.
Kimberly Pennerman, if she's not here. Or if she's here. I want to just applaud her for the effort, she's been working with me very closely in getting the message out to the students. Email reminders of the Board of Trustee meetings.

I think there is advocacy in presence. I'm a big proponent of that concept. That you've been present in advocating even with your -- just being there you have advocated for yourself.

One of the other issues that we'll be having also is addressing the type of leadership concerns that we are having where students don't know where to go. Trying to build out a hierarchy. We've been working
with Dr. Epps on that hopefully to have it incorporated in the handbook that they will be giving out in our next academic year.

So we just having the work cut out for us and working with other administrators and staff members in building out what we want this University to be. So thank you.

CHAIRPERSON CRIDER: Thank you.

Audit, Budget and Finance. Mr. Felton?

TRUSTEE FELTON: Yes, thank you Madam Chair. The Audit, Budget and Finance Committee did meet on November 6. Again, we talked about the two issues, one is the FY '14 financial close out and audit.

We thought we would have had that completed by the end of October but it has taken longer. The auditors arrive on November 17. And they expect the completion of that audit by mid-December.

The draft financials are due to the District CFO by the middle of December.

And it looks as if there's a preliminary
projected surplus of $3 million. But however, that's derived primarily from our endowment income.

Our endowment balance is as of September 30 is approximately $44 million. But as we all know, that's mostly restricted.

The other issue had to do with the FY 2016 budget. Development, the first meeting of the University Operating Budget Committee was held October 30.

The Budget Committee has a subcommittee that is responsible for analyzing the budget data and developing initial budget parameters. That subcommittee met four to five times in preparation for the October 30 Budget Committee meeting.

In addition we talked about several unfunded Tier One items which are being considered to address critical issues that are legally and contractually mandated. And then the other of course was the Committee did hold a closed session in which a matter
related to contacting and budget was discussed.

CHAIRPERSON CRIDER: And we will be going into closed session tonight to discuss one issue related to that.

TRUSTEE FELTON: Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON CRIDER: Okay, thank you Mr. Felton. The Community College? Anyone from the Committee have a report on the Community College of whether you met?

TRUSTEE THOMPSON: We did not.

CHAIRPERSON CRIDER: You did not meet. Okay, thank you. Operations. Mr. Askew?

TRUSTEE ASKEW: Thank you Madam Chair. The Operation -- newly formed Operations Committee met on November 10.

For those of you who are not aware, this Committee has several different areas of responsibility which range from facilities, human resources, contracting and procurement, marketing and branding,
information technology, general counsel and
government relations. That's it. That is it.

So you know, as a way to kind of
really focus our Committee, I work with Mr.
Rogers as well as several of the folks that
are part of this cluster, a number of the Vice
Presidents, to really have our first session
really focus in on information. And kind of
level setting kind of where the institution is
today.

The purpose of doing some of that
is to really find some real focus on some top
priorities that this Committee will focus its
attention on. There's no way with that number
of areas of responsibilities, all of which
have their own priorities, that you can --
that I could figure out a way where I could
achieve a result.

So the direction, working with the
Board Chair, was really ask the Departments to
really begin to work cross-functionally. To
talk about what are the top priorities for the
institution that are within your groups?

You know, and understanding that just because you know, the top three priorities may be in a particular area, say facilities for example, that that was any discredit to the high priorities that are in human resources. But really what the institution really needs is for everybody regardless of what area you're in, for us to agree on you know, what we're going to achieve on a step by step basis.

So really and my bogey was set for what can we achieve? What are some of the things that we realistically can achieve and measure over the next six months? And if we can't achieve them in six months, what about a year?

That doesn't mean that the other priorities are forgotten about. But it is a recognition of you know, what is our high priorities? Because I think sometimes we've gotten to this mind set that we're just trying
to do so many things at once that we don't --
sometimes it doesn't feel like we achieved
anything.

And so I do believe that our first
Committee meeting was a great step towards
understanding what the priorities are in some
of the units. And from that we will work
together to come up over the next month or so,
come up with what we think are you know, the
top you know, five or six that we can measure
and make significant progress.

So you know, with that, you know,
we started off with a document that I believe
Ms. Franklin shared with the entire Board?
Maybe not? Okay. But I'll ask her if she can
share it with the entire Board.

So we started off with a document
that had scope and responsibility of you know,
each area. What their structure and personnel
looks like both today and in 2015. There was
a lot of discussion about the FTEs the NTEs.

And though Trustee Felton, some of
it was probably in your area as it relates to a dollar amount, when you get information like that, and you see these increases and decreases and you think about what our Vision 2020 Plan. But I didn't mean that you know, really we were also focused on Vision 2020 as well.

There was a significant amount of discussion on whether or not this was consistent with our Vision 2020 already initially. So if we saw significant increases in FTEs, we also associated that there's a cost associated with that. Right?

And we just went through an HR -- over the last year and a half we've gone over personnel or position reductions. And so if we see numbers that are creeping up, you know, our FTEs are increasing significantly, but our enrollment is going down and we haven't brought in any additional revenue, is that consistent with where we are seek -- of the objectives we are seeking to achieve?
So again, the document that was provided gave us at least an opportunity to start those discussions as we began to look at it. We also looked a little bit at you know, at the budgets associated with it.

And we also talked about you know, what did the units -- you know, what did the units accomplish in 2014? What are their major accomplishments? And we got a couple of them which were good.

And we also looked at what you know, 2015 major initiatives would be. And again, from that major initiative you know, we'll begin to weed out and come up with what we think are some of the priorities.

We also -- they also did a good job of kind of like setting some metrics for each unit. Like you know, we had categories where you had like on the metrics and this was what was recommended. Like the number of major gifts.

You know, we know we want our
target for 2014 is going to be two major
gifts, percentage of alumni giving per year at
five percent. And again, some of these you
know, it's hard because some of these kind of
cross over to other Committees. But it is
still good information despite the fact that
it might be a little bit out of our view --
our purview.

But that's you know, we spent a
lot of our time again, you know we went
through each unit. We know that one of the
biggest issues that the Committee will be
faced with or at least coming up with a
relatively decision soon is what we're going
to do with 801 North Capital Street.

We've asked that there be
information provided to the Board as to what
our options are so that we can finally come to
a conclusion as to you know, really you know,
what we want to do. And I think that you
know, once we make our decision, I think the
University will be better positioned.
Because I think you know, just you know, the number that keeps stuck in my head is $4.5 million every year that we are -- and every moment that we don't have a secure source of funding to fund that $4.5 you know, are resources that you know, quite frankly could probably be used in other areas of the institution given the fact that you know, we may have space.

But again, there are other options out there that need to be explored. And I hope to be able to come back to the next Board meeting with a recommendation for the Board to consider.

We've also been asking for a good informa -- substantive information on a kind of where do we stand? Like again, we went through all these reductions in positions.

So what we want to know now is we want to have a clear picture of okay, you know, here's where we were before these abolishment initiatives as it relates to FTEs
and the costs associated with them. Here's
where we are you know, right after the
abolishment. Here's our goals that we set as
a part of 2020. And then here is you know,
where we are currently today.

Because again, I think that in
order for us to have these conversations with
the people that told us we needed to right
size, you know, we need to be able to speak to
all of these different areas. And
particularly are issues that have been raised
by some of our external and to be quite frank,
have been raised by the Board and others.

So we look forward to the
substantive conversation that will come out of
that. Again, we're working to be as focused
as we possibly can. We welcome other members
if they have an interest in knowing what the
Committee is taking up.

And I want to thank all the
Committee members who participated and gave of
their time. And in fact they probably gave of
you know, three plus hours just for us to go through the number of areas of responsibility the Committee is engaged in.

But I'm excited about it. So thank you Madam Chair.

CHAIRPERSON CRIDER: Thank you Trustee Askew. And let me just say there were well at least one other area with respect to the HR that we are looking for information. And that is you know, we did a RIF, it hasn't been a year ago.

And we have some obligations under the DCMR with respect to people on the RIF list. And we are very interested in seeing where we are with respect to that. Have there been new positions created? Have there been new hires? What does it look like with respect to people that are on the RIF list having been brought back into employment?

Because we want to make sure that we first honor those people that in fact we had to let go last year. So we are very
interested in that. And certain positions
that have been created, certainly have been
filled, should have been filled and hopefully
were filled by people who were on the RIF
list.

So we'll be looking at that as
well. And just let me say to the Trustees
overall, I think that if you really want to
get a good feel for what's working or not
working and what goes on on a daily basis,
this is the Committee that you want to visit.

Because they really are touching,
it's great to understand academics, it's great
to understand what's going on in student
affairs. You obviously can't do much without
a budget you know.

But you also need to understand
that there is an operational aspect of a
University. The business end of the
university. And that's what this Operations
Committee is attempting to do.

And without the business end, it
doesn't matter if you have you know, students
and everybody else. Unless we are conducting
our business right, we won't have any of them
for very long.

And so we really need to put some
focus on trying to clean up our business
operations. And that's what this Committee
will be looking at. So I really appreciate
that.

Is there any unfinished business
that we have or new business? If not, I am
going to move for -- to go into executive
session. And we will not be returning to this
room after executive session. We'll close out
the meeting.

A voice vote please. Okay, so in
accordance with Section 2-57510 of the D.C.
Code, the Board of Trustees hereby gives
notice that it may conduct an executive
session for the purpose of discussing the
appointment, employment, assignment,
promotion, performance evaluation,
compensation, discipline, removal or
resignation of government appointees,
employees or officials.

Ms. Franklin can you call the --
or take the vote please. Oh, I'm sorry, may
I have a motion to go into executive session.

TRUSTEE ASKEW: So moved.

TRUSTEE FELTON: Second.

CHAIRPERSON CRIDER: It's been
moved and a lot of seconds. All in favor?

MS. FRANKLIN: Enter the roll
call.

CHAIRPERSON CRIDER: Okay and the
roll call vote.

MS. FRANKLIN: Mr. Askew?

TRUSTEE ASKEW: Yes.

MS. FRANKLIN: Mr. Bell?

(No response)

MS. FRANKLIN: Ms. Bennett?

TRUSTEE BENNETT: Yes.

MS. FRANKLIN: Ms. Castillo?

(No response)
MS. FRANKLIN: Dr. Crider?

CHAIRPERSON CRIDER: Yes.

MS. FRANKLIN: Dr. Curry?

TRUSTEE CURRY: Yes.

MS. FRANKLIN: Mr. Dyke?

(No response)

MS. FRANKLIN: Mr. Felton?

TRUSTEE FELTON: Yes.

MS. FRANKLIN: Dr. Lemus?

TRUSTEE LEMUS: Yes.

MS. FRANKLIN: Dr. Lyons?

PRESIDENT LYONS: Yes.

MS. FRANKLIN: General Schwartz?

TRUSTEE SCHWARTZ: Yes.

MS. FRANKLIN: Mr. Shelton?

TRUSTEE SHELTON: Yes.

MS. FRANKLIN: Dr. Tardd?

TRUSTEE TARDD: Yes.

MS. FRANKLIN: Ms. Thompson?

TRUSTEE THOMPSON: Yes.

MS. FRANKLIN: Mr. Vradenburg?

(No response)
MS. FRANKLIN: Mr. Wyner?

TRUSTEE WYNER: Yes.

(Whereupon, the above-entitled matter went off the record at 8:38 p.m.)
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