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Adjourn
(5:22 p.m.)

CHAIR CRIDER: Okay. Ms. Franklin, I'd like to call to order the regular Board meeting of the University of District of Columbia Board of Trustees. Can you call the roll, please?

MS. FRANKLIN: Mr. Askew?

TRUSTEE ASKEW: Present.

MS. FRANKLIN: Mr. Bell?

MS. FRANKLIN: Present.

MS. FRANKLIN: Ms. Castillo? Dr. Crider?

CHAIR CRIDER: Here.

MS. FRANKLIN: Dr. Curry? Mr. Dyke? Mr. Felton?

TRUSTEE FELTON: Here.

MS. FRANKLIN: Dr. Lemus? Dr. Lyons?

DR. 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?

Mr. Wyner?

TRUSTEE WYNER: Here.

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

CHAIR CRIDER: Okay. Thank you, Ms. Franklin. Sorry. Okay. The first item on the agenda is approval of the minutes for our June 10th, 2014 meeting.

DR. LYONS: So moved, Madam Chair.

TRUSTEE SHELTON: Second.

CHAIR CRIDER: Moved and second.

Any discussion, corrections to the minutes, if not all in favor vote aye.

(Chorus of ayes)

CHAIR CRIDER: Any opposed or
abstentions? That motion carries. Ms. Franklin, I'd like to move to add a couple items to the agenda and also to rearrange the agenda if I can. Do we have to do each one separately? Okay.

So in terms of new items added to the agenda, we'd like to add the restructuring of Board Committees, the proposed rulemaking for that, the election procedures and the executive appointments to the Committee agenda.

In terms of reordering the agenda, what I'd like to do first is to take all action items at the beginning of the meeting and go through each of the action items and then come back and do the Committee reports on the back end.

DR. LYONS: Okay.

CHAIR CRIDER: So if I could have motion.

TRUSTEE FELTON: Clarification, Madam.
CHAIR CRIDER: Yes.

TRUSTEE FELTON: You said to separate the resolutions, in some cases the Committee reports have included resolutions.

CHAIR CRIDER: Right. And so normally what you do is you'll give your reports and then you would go through the action items.

TRUSTEE FELTON: Right.

CHAIR CRIDER: What I'd like to do is to take all of the action items, essentially, out of the report and move that to the front --

TRUSTEE FELTON: Okay.

CHAIR CRIDER: -- and then you would come back and do the rest of your report.

TRUSTEE FELTON: All right.

CHAIR CRIDER: Is that --

TRUSTEE FELTON: Sure.

CHAIR CRIDER: -- clear? Does that make sense?
TRUSTEE FELTON: Yes.

CHAIR CRIDER: Okay. And I don't have to give a reason why I want to do it.

DR. LYONS: Because you're bad like that.

CHAIR CRIDER: I'm just bad like that. And I am bad. Okay. So hearing no further discussion, I need a motion.

TRUSTEE SCHWARTZ: So moved.

TRUSTEE SHELTON: Second.

CHAIR CRIDER: It's been moved and second, any further discussion? All in favor vote aye.

(Chorus of ayes)

CHAIR CRIDER: Any opposed? Any abstentions? Great. Thank you so much for that. So the first things I'd like to do would be the -- and it just so happens that each of the new items we added to the agenda require an action. Is that right? That's right.

DR. LYONS: Yes.
CHAIR CRIDER: Okay. So we've got a lot of action items tonight. So I think we should take the --

DR. LYONS: Oh, I just wanted to take a look at what you added, since we --

CHAIR CRIDER: Yes. So the first one I'd like to do is the restructuring of the Board Committee. Sorry. And as you know, again, we voted at the last Board meeting to change the structure of the Committees.

And we combined and consolidated certain Committees, so that we would now have a Student Academic Affairs Committee, we would have an Audit, Finance and Budget Committee, we would have an Operations Committee and we would have, of course, the Executive Committee to the Board.

We also voted at the last meeting that the Executive Committee would be comprised of the Offices of the Board.

And so therefore, based on that, therefore, be it resolved that the Board of
Trustees of the District of Columbia hereby
takes final rulemaking to amend Chapter 1 of
the university roles to reflect the changes as
indicated, those that I just went through.

And that the General Counsel is
hereby directed to publish, this would not be
a Notice of Final Rulemaking, right, or is it?
Okay. So hereby directed to publish this
Notice of Final Rulemaking in the D.C.
register as soon as practicable.

I'd like a motion to do that,
please, in terms of approval. This is
approving our new Committee structure.

TRUSTEE THOMPSON: So moved.

(Simultaneous speaking)

CHAIR CRIDER: Been moved. Is
there a second.

TRUSTEE FELTON: Second.

CHAIR CRIDER: Any discussion.

Hearing no discussion, all in favor vote aye.

(Chorus of ayes)

CHAIR CRIDER: Any opposed or
those abstaining? Thank you. That motion carries to restructure our committees. And I'll make new Board assignments within the next week or so based on our restructured Board.

The next is the revised election procedures for the alumni trustees. And it's simply, whereas the president and elections administrator have reviewed the election procedures and recommend the approval of the procedures.

Therefore, be it resolved that the Board of Trustees of the university of the District of Columbia hereby approves the attached procedure for the conduct of elections for alumni members of the Board of Trustees. May I have a motion for that?

TRUSTEE THOMPSON: So moved.

TRUSTEE SHELTON: Second.

(Simultaneous speaking)

CHAIR CRIDER: It's been moved and second. Any discussion, questions?
TRUSTEE ASKEW: Madam Chair?

CHAIR CRIDER: Trustee Askew.

TRUSTEE ASKEW: Okay. So --

COURT REPORTER: On your --

TRUSTEE ASKEW: I see that --

COURT REPORTER: -- microphone --

TRUSTEE ASKEW: -- in --

COURT REPORTER: -- please.

DR. LYONS: Mic.

TRUSTEE ASKEW: Sorry.

CHAIR CRIDER: Use the mic, sir.

TRUSTEE ASKEW: So in Section 1.4, it looks like the university shall mean and include the university of the District of Columbia including the Community College and the David A. Clarke School of Law.

I'm trying to figure out like were there -- well, let me ask this first. Was this referred to any committee for review?

CHAIR CRIDER: Maybe.

TRUSTEE ASKEW: Because this is the first I'm seeing it. And I don't know
whether it went through another committee and just, you know, didn't make it out or whether this is something that is brand new that's being presented to the full Board.

TRUSTEE FELTON: Your question is did this --

TRUSTEE ASKEW: My question is --

TRUSTEE FELTON: -- go to a committee before coming to the --

TRUSTEE ASKEW: -- what committee --

TRUSTEE FELTON: -- full Board?

TRUSTEE ASKEW: -- did this go through to review this?

CHAIR CRIDER: I thought that this was one of the ones, and I may be incorrect, but was this one Mr. Shelton that went to your committee, but --

TRUSTEE SHELTON: It did.

CHAIR CRIDER: -- didn't have a quorum --

TRUSTEE SCHWARTZ: It didn't have
a quorum --

CHAIR CRIDER: -- we were not able --

TRUSTEE SCHWARTZ: -- and never --

CHAIR CRIDER: -- to act on that.

TRUSTEE SCHWARTZ: -- had a presentation at the committee. And then it was going to be fixed until it would come here. But it never got to full quorum meeting.

TRUSTEE ASKEW: Okay. But this was not one of the initiatives that was on our last because we've had a quorum at our last meeting --

TRUSTEE SHELTON: Yes, this was --

TRUSTEE ASKEW: -- but this was not --

TRUSTEE SHELTON: -- not on the agenda to be done. It was mentioned that they were working on it and it's being brought to us now.

TRUSTEE ASKEW: Okay. So normally
I would have an issue with that, but let me just -- because I know that we've had some, and my mind is not at functioning 100 percent right now because I can't -- we have had similar discussion about whether or not eligibility for either student running for the Board of Trustee position as a community college student could run.

And the answer that came out, working with administration, was no, that you can't. A community college student is not eligible to run for a student Board of Trustee position.

And so I am trying to reconcile the fact. So now, what we're saying is that however, if someone has an Associate's degree, and again, I'm not quite sure, does it say degree or could it be a Alum certificate on that?

I'm just not quite clear on why a community college graduate would be eligible to run for a Board of Trustee position that
has responsibility over the entire
institution, not just one component of it.

And the same is not true when we
talk about our student trustee. To me there
seems to be somewhat of a conflict between
what our position is.

CHAIR CRIDER: So I know that for
the regular student elections at one point
when the community college was first
separated, they did make a decision that they
were going to have their own elections.

TRUSTEE ASKEW: Yes.

CHAIR CRIDER: And therefore,
those students would not be eligible to run in
the general election for the students
elections here.

I don't know that that ever came
up as part of the alumni. And so I don't know
that your question has ever actually been
raised --

TRUSTEE ASKEW: Right.

CHAIR CRIDER: -- then.
TRUSTEE ASKEW: Nor has it been discussed --

CHAIR CRIDER: Yes.

TRUSTEE ASKEW: -- with even the alumni --

CHAIR CRIDER: Yes.

TRUSTEE ASKEW: -- who should, in my view as an alumni representative also, have some say on whether they believe that is the direction that we should be moving in.

CHAIR CRIDER: Yes.

TRUSTEE SHELTON: And I was also going to, on the same 1.4, it seems that my limited lessons that if priority is given to placement in a series and they're now moving it to the first position describing who's eligible. And I think that that's not appropriate.

I think it should be where it says that David A. Clarke School of Law and if you intend to include the Community College, then you need to put it there. That was one of the
things that caught my eye.

The debate about the Associate's degree and the four year degree are critical questions in this process. And I'm not belittling either certificate --

TRUSTEE ASKEW: Yes, me either.

TRUSTEE SHELTON: -- I'm just suggesting that the expectation is the terminal degree which is the B.S.

TRUSTEE ASKEW: I would hope for those, at least.

CHAIR CRIDER: Yes. So I guess one of the questions I hear you raise is whether or not there was any alumni input into the procedures at all. And --

TRUSTEE ASKEW: I'm not going to leave this, so. And again --

CHAIR CRIDER: Mr. Rogers, can you answer that question?

MR. ROGERS: You know, there was not a --

COURT REPORTER: On your
microphone, sir.

MR. ROGERS: Is that the button?

Here we go. Okay. Basically, the procedures we've used here, proposed here, are the same procedures that have been used in three subsequent elections, 2005 and 2009.

The only changes that were made are the ones that are redlined here, that we looked at. So I guess we, perhaps, wrongly concluded that the questions that are being raised now have been settled, you know, by the adoption by previous boards. But just to, you know, clarify the history --

CHAIR CRIDER: Why don't we just --

MR. ROGERS: -- on these rules.

CHAIR CRIDER: Sorry. I think the question is specific to the community college which was not addressed in the --

MR. ROGERS: Right.

CHAIR CRIDER: -- previous versions of the regulations. And so the
question is here is the addition of the community college into the alumni election procedures.

MR. ROGERS: Yes. Stacie, that was added for --

MS. MILLS: As another component to --

CHAIR CRIDER: Mic.

MR. ROGERS: Hold it. But the Associate's degree aspect of it, there had been Associate's degrees at the university before and that's why it was included, right.

So the community college is added by name because it became an entity subsequent to the last election, but the university had offered Associate's degrees --

CHAIR CRIDER: Always.

MR. ROGERS: -- before. So I suppose that's why --

CHAIR CRIDER: Yes, always.

MR. ROGERS: -- it's still in the rules.
DR. LYONS: Do you have a question?

TRUSTEE WYNER: Yes.

CHAIR CRIDER: I'm sorry. Trustee Wyner.

TRUSTEE WYNER: So I understand we may not settle this today, but it seems to me that there are a number of Associate's degrees at the community college that don't articulate to Bachelor's degrees.

And I would be concerned if our conclusion was that students who chose to pursue a two year degree in a field that has a terminal degree or chose to pursue a two year degree here and for life reasons or whatever other reasons there was a focus of study that led them to another university.

They wanted to complete their Bachelor's here, but felt a sense of gratitude and belonging to the institution that we would preclude them from participating fully as alums.
I'm not sure why the decision is made. It seems to me that the community college is part of this university and the goal here is one institution and my understanding is that we remain unified.

And for that reason I would hope that the signal to the students wouldn't be that your rights were somehow lessened. And even if the Community College chooses to have its own governance structure for programs there, there is still the institution-wide.

Now, it may be that UDC would decide in this context where we've got a law school and an undergraduate flagship and a community college that the undergraduate flagship would want to have a separate governance structure so that it makes sure that there's some opportunity there.

But as far as the overall governance structure, I would hope that all students would feel empowered, especially in light of the fact that we have had not as much
engagement as we, perhaps, would have wanted amongst students.

I would hope that we would want to signal to every student that they have value. And every alumni, that we want them engaged, contributing to the university, owning their degrees from here.

And while I agree that for many students, maybe most of the institution, that a Bachelor's degree is the aim, it's not so for every student, so.

But those are my thoughts about this and to the extent that we continue the conversation at the committee level, and I don't believe I'm on that committee. I don't know how things will be restructured. I just wanted to voice those views.

CHAIR CRIDER: Yes, thank you, Trustee Wyner. I think that because this is almost a new issue for us, you know, in having to deal with this, that some of this hadn't been, maybe, thought out.
For example, I think the community college students were able to run for the trustee seat, you know, as a student trustee, but yet, we never talked about it from the alumni perspective. And I think those are things that we probably need to do.

I'm just wondering, what is the timeline for the student trustee election? I know they should have been placed in May, but they weren't. And so what's your current timeline?

MR. ROGERS: For the --

CHAIR CRIDER: Election.

MR. ROGERS: -- this election, February of '15.

CHAIR CRIDER: Okay.

MR. ROGERS: The election period, making the announcement, issuing the ballots -- well, making the announcement, getting petitions for candidates, then getting the ballots all should take place, based on the current time schedule, between November and
December.

And the vote would be in, you know, you said January or February, so that we would hope to conclude it by February 15th. So that if there are protests those can be resolved before the term begins in May.

CHAIR CRIDER: Okay. So the term would still be --

MR. ROGERS: In --

CHAIR CRIDER: -- a May term?

MR. ROGERS: Right.

CHAIR CRIDER: Okay.

MR. ROGERS: Right.

CHAIR CRIDER: What I'd like to suggest and I think I'm looking for a motion to maybe table this discussion for now and allow the trustees to put this in one of the committees, either the -- well, it's probably going into the --

DR. LYONS: Operations or Student

--

CHAIR CRIDER: -- Operations --
DR. LYONS: -- Affairs.

CHAIR CRIDER: -- or Student Affairs, one of those committees. And I'll decide which one we can put it into and let them fully vet it at one of those committees and then bring it back for our November meeting for action.

TRUSTEE TARDD: I move to table.

DR. LYONS: Second.

CHAIR CRIDER: Moved and second.

All in favor?

(Chorus of ayes)

CHAIR CRIDER: Any opposed? Thank you for that. That motion carries.

TRUSTEE BELL: Quick question on the student trustee election. Is there a possibility where we could have someone appointed on an interim basis until the election occurs, the head of student government or something so that there's no absence --

CHAIR CRIDER: Of students, yes.
TRUSTEE BELL: -- of students

that's in the -- yes.

CHAIR CRIDER: Yes. That's a good

idea, Trustee.

TRUSTEE FELTON: Question, would

it have to be someone who would not be seeking
election? Because then you stand the risk of

--

TRUSTEE BELL: I don't know what

qualifications would have to be, but my

concern is that there's not a voice during

that whole period. So it seems logically it

would be a student government leader. I don't

know that they should be precluded from then

seeking the position if they want to.

MS. MILLS: Just to clarify, I

think we've confused the two elections.

There's the alumni election, which are the
dates that Mr. Rogers is giving.

TRUSTEE BELL: Okay.

MS. MILLS: And then the student

trustee election which the Student Affairs, I
believe they're going to speak on today. They
provided an update in the Committee meeting --

TRUSTEE BELL: Okay.

MS. MILLS: -- and that's a
separate timeline.

TRUSTEE BELL: Okay.

MS. MILLS: But to answer the
question, currently there isn't a provision
that allows for a temporary appointment for
the student trustee. But I believe that their
election is moving and they may have a
representative sit in --

TRUSTEE BELL: Okay.

MS. MILLS: -- on the issues.

TRUSTEE BELL: Thank you. I was
confused. Thank you.

CHAIR CRIDER: Okay. The next
action item is on the appointment of Dr. Diana
Phillips as CEO of the University of the
District of Columbia's Community College.
I'll make the motion. I'll have it --

TRUSTEE BELL: Second.
CHAIR CRIDER: -- second and then we'll have discussion. So whereas, Dr. Diana Phillips has been recommended to serve as the CEO of the University of the District of Columbia's Community College based on her knowledge, past accomplishments and experience servicing as Executive Vice President Educational Services and Chief Academic and Student Services Office at Brookville Community College, Dean of Technical Education at Monroe Community College and Director for the Center for Workforce Development at the Board of Cooperative Education Services. And whereas, after review of her credentials, it has been determined that she is well-qualified for such position and that the recommended salary adequately reflects the job duties and experience. Now, therefore, be it resolved that the Board of Trustees of the University of the District of Columbia approves the appointment of Dr. Diana Phillips as the Chief
Executive Officer of the University of the District of Columbia's Community College effective November 17, 2014. I'd like a motion that we --

DR. LYONS: So moved.

CHAIR CRIDER: It's been moved.

Is there a second.

TRUSTEE FELTON: Second.

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

TRUSTEE ASKEW: Madam Chair --

CHAIR CRIDER: Yes.

TRUSTEE ASKEW: -- it would be helpful for those of us who are not able and did not attend any of the interviews to hear a little bit about Ms. Phillips.

I've read her resume and I've read her CV, however, it would be helpful just to understand a little bit more about her, what her vision is based upon the information she has received from the university.

And again, I haven't met her and I
don't know if there is somebody from the Committee who can speak to that or if the candidate is actually here.

CHAIR CRIDER: Yes, well, she's not --

TRUSTEE ASKEW: Okay.

CHAIR CRIDER: -- here, but I'm looking to see if there are people from the --

DR. LYONS: Myrtho --

CHAIR CRIDER: -- Committee.

DR. LYONS: -- why don't you start --

CHAIR CRIDER: Yes.

DR. LYONS: -- and then I will --

CHAIR CRIDER: And also --

DR. LYONS: -- just ask for any --

CHAIR CRIDER: -- to suddenly say that --

DR. LYONS: -- other trustees.

CHAIR CRIDER: -- Trustee Tardd and Trustee Thompson --

TRUSTEE THOMPSON: Thompson, yes.
CHAIR CRIDER: -- both participated in the interviews of the finalists. And I'd like for them to give their impressions.

COURT REPORTER: Could I just take a break for them to turn on the telephone?

MS. BLANCHARD: Myrtho Blanchard, Vice President for Human Resources. I'm sorry, I didn't hear the question.

DR. LYONS: Tell a little bit about her.

MS. BLANCHARD: Oh, I didn't bring all of her papers, but I reviewed her background. She seems to have the appropriate educational background, the work background. And from the HR perspective, we --

CHAIR CRIDER: Just give us one second. We have a --

MS. BLANCHARD: Certainly.

CHAIR CRIDER: -- Trustee that's trying to call in. Sorry. Okay, thank you.

Okay, Ms. Blanchard.
MS. BLANCHARD: Yes.

CHAIR CRIDER: Thank you.

MS. BLANCHARD: And so her resume reflected a number of years, I don't remember unfortunately. I don't have the resumes. I think they may have been forwarded to the various members of the Committee.

She has over 12 years of experience as either executive vice president of Academic Affairs. She was director of Workforce Development. And her vision seems to reflect, or at least is shared with our University of the District of Columbia's Community College vision as well, seem to share similar vision.

She's committed. I personally verified her references. I called colleagues. I called her supervisors. She even went as far as providing the number of her current president, which often candidates don't do until you offer them a job.

So our president here had a
lengthy conversation with her current 
president and also her past president. And 
the committee highly recommended her. And she 
is one amongst 115 applicants who applied for 
the position at the university. 

And the Committee felt pretty 
strong and I think that members of the Board 
of Trustees also interviewed her. I had 
lengthy conversation with her. 

I didn't necessarily officially 
interview her, but I did have a conversation 
with her before the Committee met with her, 
after the Committee met with her and more 
recently she called very excited to get 
information on the university and was ready to 
begin. 

She seems to meet all of the 
criteria and answered all of the appropriate 
questions. She also seemed to have the 
personality to fit well. 

She's collegial and one of her 
references said to me that if you do not
appoint her, we are certain she will be the
next president at the college where she is
now. But at any rate, you will certainly will
hear about her in the State of New Jersey.
They think so high of her and I've personally
verified all her references.

CHAIR CRIDER: Okay. Either Mary
or -- I'm sorry, Trustee Thompson or Trustee
Tardd, want to give your views.

TRUSTEE TARDD: Dr. Phillips was
one of three candidates that we spoke with.

TRUSTEE THOMPSON: Yes.

TRUSTEE TARDD: And it was clear
to us each one of the three could do it, okay?
Each one of the three people that we brought
in was capable of doing the job.

Her credentials and her interview
and her experience stood well-above the other
candidates that we spoke with. In addition to
the fact that the Community College Committee
also interviewed her and felt very strongly
about Dr. Phillips.
TRUSTEE THOMPSON: In addition, she was spunky. She has energy.

TRUSTEE TARDD: Yes.

TRUSTEE THOMPSON: She liked what she saw at UDC. And for my money those are important traits to do the job. She was excited about coming to Washington, but she was excited about coming to UDC.

TRUSTEE TARDD: And if I could say one more thing, she was definitely plugged into student success --

TRUSTEE THOMPSON: Exactly.

TRUSTEE TARDD: -- retention, completion and graduation. So she, yes, she was focused.

CHAIR CRIDER: Trustee Wyner.

TRUSTEE WYNER: I wasn't able to participate in the interviews, but her prior position, not immediately prior, but before that at Monroe as the head of the Career and Technical Education programs, they've got a very, very strong reputation. I don't know if
it was built subsequent to her tenure or dates back. I can't imagine it would be as strong as it is.

But it's in the Rochester area and they really are a nationally known program that's worked extraordinarily hard in the career and technical education area to work with students even into high school to really be thinking about pathways to jobs and aligning their programs with jobs.

And their use of data, they have, I'll just give you an example, a lot of colleges will do surveys of students after they leave to try to figure out where they are placed because it's hard to find out through state data systems.

They've achieved a 70 percent response rate. The national average is in the teens as I understand it, or 20 percent. So their connection to students, both their ability to connect and be innovative and trying to figure out where they are after they
leave.

You spoke about alumni affairs, but also in aligning what they're doing to the real jobs that exist for students, thinking not just about what happens on campus, but what happens afterwards is nationally well-recognized.

MS. BLANCHARD: And to that end, there was an article published about her stating exactly those things. I can certainly share that with you. It was forward to me by someone who --

CHAIR CRIDER: Did you have something?

DR. LYONS: I would simply add that when I called her current supervisor and a former supervisor one of the questions that I asked was knowing her as you do, her strengths and her weaknesses, what advice would you give me to discuss with her when she arrives that would help her.

And interestingly enough in
different ways both of them said the same thing. Tell her to catch her breath, slow down, you're in this for the long haul.

They said that she is just so energetic and rearing to go that that's what they would suggest I do when she comes in the door.

And I talked to two different people in two different states on two different occasions and both spoke about her energy and excitement in coming to the University of the District of Columbia, but tell her to slow down, it's going to be here, you know.

CHAIR CRIDER: I think some other things that we can certainly, if we haven't already, Ms. Blanchard, to make sure that each of the Trustees gets her resume.

MS. BLANCHARD: Absolutely.

CHAIR CRIDER: And we can share that with you guys. But I think some of the other things is that is was very clear that
she did our homework about us. She wanted to
know who we were and to get a picture of what
the University of the District of Columbia was
about.

And I think she did that to a far
greater extent than any of the other
candidates did. And to me, that spoke volumes
about her interest in us.

She believes that there is great
potential here, not just for a local presence,
but that this university should be a national
model.

And that I think if anybody has
the energy to do that, she probably is the one
that can help us to put some of those things
in place.

She also talked about some
relationships with students which I think is
important. And so those things were things
that helped her stay a little bit above the
other candidates.

For me, I think one of the things
that carried the greatest weight is that
despite the fact that the president asked the
committee and none of us were on the committee
except for Trustee Dyke was a part of the
committee representing the trustees.

And although the president asked
them not to rank the candidates, I think they
were so enthusiastic about this particular
candidates, about Diana Phillips, that when
they came in they ordered them, I think
automatically, in terms of their preference.

And even when he said I told you
not to give me the rank, they went back to the
same thing. And so it was clear that this
lady stood out for them and that she was the
one that the Committee felt was the one.

They were very, very excited about
her. And I see Pearl is back there, she was
on the Committee with us. If you wanted to
add anything from the Committee perspective.

No? Pearl? Dr. --

TRUSTEE THOMPSON: Who are you
looking for?

DR. LYONS: Dr. Pearl --

TRUSTEE THOMPSON: Yes, what's her last name?

CHAIR CRIDER: Do you want to add anything, no? Okay. Well, she was on the committee that presented to us. And she was enthusiastic then, anyway. So I believe that it was the right choice. I think it's a different choice for us.

TRUSTEE THOMPSON: That's for sure.

CHAIR CRIDER: And I think it'll be a breath of fresh air for the community college and for the university. I think she gets it in terms of the relationship between the university and the community college.

She also understands her role in relationship to the University President. I think that was important for us to hear. And so some of the struggles that we've had in the past, I don't think we'll have to deal with
with her, you know.

At the same time, I believe she's strong enough that she'll stand up and she'll fight for what she believes is the right thing for the college.

I don't think she'll just roll over to the university or to the community college. I think she's going to do what she believe is right, so I think that's also a breath of fresh air for us.

TRUSTEE SHELTON: Just because I was there.

CHAIR CRIDER: Yes.

TRUSTEE SHELTON: Thank you. In my observation of her in that brief meeting, she, for me, was the classic worker in the system, you know, for her boss. Get the job done, whatever, sign and take care of it and get it done, and she was now ready for the opportunity.

And she had the wealth of experience. And again, it was a tough choice.
There were three very strong candidates, but she clearly stood as the one who was ready. You know, you want to pick that fruit from the tree that's 100 percent ripe. And I hope I'm not using any insulting, you know, terminology. But she appeared to be a very hard worker who was really wanting the opportunity to lead a school. And this platform for her, she thought would give her the opportunity that she could be most successful. And again, her presentation, she was ready to be the CEO of a community college, clearly.

TRUSTEE ASKEW: So Madam Chair, you know --

CHAIR CRIDER: Yes.

TRUSTEE ASKEW: -- so for the record, there was faculty involvement, student involvement, administration involvement --

CHAIR CRIDER: Yes.

TRUSTEE ASKEW: -- and Board involvement.
CHAIR CRIDER: Yes.

TRUSTEE ASKEW: And did we have anybody from outside the university participate?

CHAIR CRIDER: I don't believe --

TRUSTEE ASKEW: Okay.

CHAIR CRIDER: -- so, but -- no?

No.

TRUSTEE ASKEW: Okay. But all four of those stakeholder groups --

CHAIR CRIDER: Were represented.

TRUSTEE ASKEW: -- were represented. Okay and that's just for the record. But just two --

CHAIR CRIDER: Let me just make sure about the student. I know that the administration, faculty, workforce development was represented.

TRUSTEE ASKEW: Yes.

CHAIR CRIDER: I'm not certain if there was a student. So there was not a student.
TRUSTEE ASKEW: No student, okay.

Okay. All right. So most of our stakeholder groups --

CHAIR CRIDER: Yes.

TRUSTEE ASKEW: -- were represented including the faculty who was actively --

CHAIR CRIDER: Right.

TRUSTEE ASKEW: -- engaged.

CHAIR CRIDER: There was only one trustee member.

TRUSTEE ASKEW: Yes.

CHAIR CRIDER: And everybody else that was on that committee was from the community college. So it wasn't even, you know, four year university --

TRUSTEE ASKEW: Yes.

CHAIR CRIDER: -- faculty and staff. It was community college faculty and staff that sat on that committee --

TRUSTEE THOMPSON: Making your own decision.
CHAIR CRIDER: -- with the exception of Trustee Dyke.

TRUSTEE ASKEW: Okay. And I appreciate that and I expect others will appreciate that as well.

CHAIR CRIDER: Well, some won't, but most will.

TRUSTEE ASKEW: Right, exactly. And just the other thing, you know, just because we are a unique institution --

CHAIR CRIDER: Yes.

TRUSTEE ASKEW: -- and as academic institutions are today, I mean, the other thing is is I assume that there was conversation about the relationship between the university and the Government.

CHAIR CRIDER: Absolutely.

TRUSTEE ASKEW: And it sounds like she welcomed that, but understood that because that could be and has always been a force of frustration for our leadership.

CHAIR CRIDER: Yes.
TRUSTEE ASKEW: And I think that we should be up front. And I know that you were up front about that and that we'll just have to manage through that process. But it's important, at least, to have that --

CHAIR CRIDER: Yes.

TRUSTEE ASKEW: -- conversation so, we're managing expectations and making them as realistic --

CHAIR CRIDER: Yes.

TRUSTEE ASKEW: -- as we -- and learning from our mistakes from the past. Think very clear about where we want to go with the Community College as it relates to the institution.

DR. LYONS: I was up front.

TRUSTEE ASKEW: Okay. Great.

DR. LYONS: Very up front.

TRUSTEE ASKEW: Very good. Very good.

CHAIR CRIDER: Well, we were too -
DR. LYONS: Though it's difficult to believe.

CHAIR CRIDER: -- and there were a couple of questions --

TRUSTEE ASKEW: It's always difficult, you're absolutely right.

CHAIR CRIDER: There were also a couple of direct questions about our unique relationship with the District Government and things like that that she responded to.

But again, this woman was also very, I think, somewhat perceptive about the challenges even before she had gotten in there, you know, really good.

She was perceptive about some of the things that we face just in some of the questions that were asked and some of the discussions that, you know, she had with people, so --

TRUSTEE ASKEW: Okay.

CHAIR CRIDER: -- she understands.

But, again, one of the things that was
comforting without, you know, saying who the
other candidates were, she seemed to be the
most clear that the university is one entity.

TRUSTEE ASKEW: Yes.

CHAIR CRIDER: And that the
community college is an important part of the
university, but it is part of the university
--

TRUSTEE ASKEW: Right.

CHAIR CRIDER: -- not, you know,
out there --

TRUSTEE THOMPSON: Not separate.

CHAIR CRIDER: -- on its own.

TRUSTEE ASKEW: Yes.

CHAIR CRIDER: There was another
candidate that seemed a little less sure-footed about that relationship.

TRUSTEE ASKEW: Right. Right.

CHAIR CRIDER: But she seemed very
clear. But is that fair --

TRUSTEE TARDD: That's right.

CHAIR CRIDER: -- Dr. Tardd? She
seemed very clear about, you know, who's on first here and that when she gets some of those calls that the first person she's going to communicate with is back.

So the president knows, you know, what's going on, what's been asked of them and, you know, that kind of thing. So I think that's important that those lines of communication --

TRUSTEE ASKEW: Absolutely.

CHAIR CRIDER: -- around, you know, this is what we're being asked. And she was clear that she doesn't do that all by herself, you know --

TRUSTEE ASKEW: Yes.

CHAIR CRIDER: -- those things, so.

TRUSTEE ASKEW: And then one --

TRUSTEE TARDD: She --

TRUSTEE ASKEW: -- one last thing. I'm sorry.

TRUSTEE TARDD: -- did have 12
years of military experience.

TRUSTEE ASKEW: Yes, I appreciate that.

TRUSTEE TARDD: Yes. Yes, 12 --

CHAIR CRIDER: She follows --

TRUSTEE TARDD: -- years.

CHAIR CRIDER: -- orders.

TRUSTEE TARDD: And so she understands chain of command.

TRUSTEE THOMPSON: Chain of command.

TRUSTEE ASKEW: Absolutely.

TRUSTEE THOMPSON: Yes.

TRUSTEE ASKEW: Great. And then the other thing is because I did notice that, I mean, she's coming from an institution that had a community college budget of $97 million.

CHAIR CRIDER: Yes.

TRUSTEE ASKEW: I mean, and had like I think, what, 28,000 students as opposed to our community college where she's going to have, you know, not even a fourth of what she
had there. She's working off of about, what, 14 to 16 million?

CHAIR CRIDER: Yes.

TRUSTEE ASKEW: And so, again, the honest relationship about the level of resources and it being her responsibility. One responsibility is about the resources because as much as I appreciate the things that we need to do and student success models, at the end of the day infrastructure stuff, what allows us to do that is generating financial resources and bringing them.

And it's just a new view of what new leadership looks like at universities and community colleges.

CHAIR CRIDER: I also think, though, that, you know, sometimes people want bigger and better.

TRUSTEE ASKEW: Yes.

CHAIR CRIDER: And so somebody moving from a $97 million budget to a, you know, 16 or 17 million may not be exciting.
TRUSTEE ASKEW: Yes.

CHAIR CRIDER: I think what she wants is the opportunity to be a CEO. And this gives her that opportunity. I think she's ready for that opportunity.

And so if the choice is let me stay in the same position at another college, you know, where I get the same experience or let me move to, you know, a college where I can get the next level experience, and I think that's what she chose, so.

I do believe that everybody that talked to her was honest with her about what she faced here. She had read so much about us that I don't think it was possible to hide much from her just by the questions that she asked.

And I think she was not afraid. Certainly, there were some concerns about the fact that we will, at some point, have a new president, but, you know, she didn't let that shy her away or deter her from taking this
job. So I think she's confident about her
ability to handle this.

TRUSTEE FELTON: I would hope the
advantage for us is that she has worked at a
community college of that magnitude and I
can't imagine the kinds of contacts and
resources that she may have available to us
that, you know, someone else may not have had.

CHAIR CRIDER: Yes.

TRUSTEE FELTON: But all we can do
is take folks for their word.

CHAIR CRIDER: Yes.

CHAIR CRIDER: Trustee Wyner.

TRUSTEE WYNER: Two questions, one
is what is the process moving forward, and
secondly, Dr. Lyons, I'd be delighted to meet
her. Having not participated in the interview
process, but want to make sure that we follow
your lead, but our opportunities for the Board
Members to hear a little bit more about her
vision.

I understand as to why she
wouldn't be here today as we're making a
decision about her fate or about the offer
that would be made. But, so what is the
process moving forward? When would an offer
be extended and what is her expected start
time, what is the target?

CHAIR CRIDER: November 17.

DR. LYONS: We are asking that an
offer be approved tonight at this meeting with
a starting date of November 17th. If you
approve our recommendation -- what?

If you approve our recommendation,
we will have her come back. We want to
introduce her to the mayor and members of City
Council as well as Trustees, so. But the
first step is your approval this evening.

TRUSTEE ASKEW: Madam Chair, do we

--

TRUSTEE WYNER: So, I'm sorry.

TRUSTEE ASKEW: Do we have the,

well, not the agreement, the --

TRUSTEE BELL: Contract?
TRUSTEE ASKEW: -- contract. What do we call it?

TRUSTEE THOMPSON: The appointment

--

CHAIR CRIDER: The contract?

TRUSTEE TARDD: -- letter?

TRUSTEE ASKEW: The appointment letter, that's what --

CHAIR CRIDER: We don't have that yet.

TRUSTEE ASKEW: Okay.

DR. LYONS: No.

CHAIR CRIDER: No.

TRUSTEE ASKEW: Okay.

TRUSTEE SHELTON: Move the agenda, Madam Chair.

CHAIR CRIDER: I just want to make sure, were you done with your question?

TRUSTEE WYNER: I am. Thank you.

CHAIR CRIDER: Okay.

TRUSTEE SHELTON: Call for the question.
CHAIR CRIDER: Wait a minute, Jerome. Were you going to say something?

DR. LYONS: No, no, I'm fine.

CHAIR CRIDER: Okay.

TRUSTEE SHELTON: Call for the question.

CHAIR CRIDER: All in favor of approving the appointment of Dr. Diana Phillips as Chief Executive Officer of the University of the District of Columbia's Community College vote aye.

(Chorus of ayes)

CHAIR CRIDER: Any opposed or abstention? Thank you. That motion carries. Thank you so much.

TRUSTEE THOMPSON: We finally have to --

(Simultaneous speaking)

CHAIR CRIDER: Okay. So looks like we have quite a few, again, action items. If we could just go through the agenda here.

Under the executive we have Sponsored Program
Policies. Okay.

And as you may recall, we recently had a settlement with the National Science Foundation. And as a result of that agreement, one of the things that we were required to do was to put in place certain policies and to have a program of compliance. And so this resolution speaks to that compliance program.

DR. LYONS: So moved. Are you going to do the one in the binder --

CHAIR CRIDER: Yes, let me do the --

DR. LYONS: -- that you --

CHAIR CRIDER: Yes, the whereas the university has drafted the following policies governing Sponsored Programs for approval of the Board of Trustees. This is under the third tab in your binders --

TRUSTEE WYNER: Thank you.

CHAIR CRIDER: -- allowable costs, at-risk accounts, direct charging of
administrative and clerical costs, cost allocation, cost sharing, cost transfers, equipment, financial reporting and closeout, program income, retention of and access to records responsive program, sub recipient monitoring and time and effort reporting.

Now, therefore, be it resolved that the Board of Trustees hereby adopts the above-referenced policies as attached and incorporated herein.

And there are policies that go with each one of those titles that I read. So I'd like a motion to approve these. Oh, this was an action that was approved by the Executive Committee, so we're looking for a ratification by the full Board.

TRUSTEE BELL: So moved, Madam Chair.

DR. LYONS: Second.

CHAIR CRIDER: Been moved and second for ratification. All in favor of --

TRUSTEE FELTON: Just a question.
CHAIR CRIDER: -- ratifying --

TRUSTEE FELTON: Just a

clarification --

CHAIR CRIDER: Yes.

TRUSTEE FELTON: -- that these

policies, obviously, were in response to the

review and I'm assuming that those who

conducted the review are in full agreement and

support with this proposal?

CHAIR CRIDER: Do you mean those

here at the university? These were the things

that we had to put in place in order to settle

on --

TRUSTEE FELTON: Right.

CHAIR CRIDER: -- the complaint

that we had.

TRUSTEE FELTON: So that

settlement, that is now a settlement? They're

now in agreement? I just want to be sure --

CHAIR CRIDER: They --

TRUSTEE FELTON: -- we didn't --

CHAIR CRIDER: -- being NSF?
TRUSTEE FELTON:  Correct.

CHAIR CRIDER:  Yes.

TRUSTEE FELTON:  Okay.  That was it.

CHAIR CRIDER:  Okay.

TRUSTEE THOMPSON:  This is just one more.

CHAIR CRIDER:  Okay.  Additional questions or discussions?  All in favor of approval of ratifying the action that was taken by the Executive Committee to approve the Sponsored Program Policies vote aye.

(Chorus of ayes)

CHAIR CRIDER:  Any opposed or abstentions?  That motion carries.  The next one is the University Anti-Discrimination and Harassment Policy.  Was that part of the same package or was that a different one?

DR. LYONS:  This is the one a little further back.  It's the --

CHAIR CRIDER:  Okay.

DR. LYONS:  -- revised one.
CHAIR CRIDER: It's --

TRUSTEE THOMPSON: Just is --

DR. LYONS: It's the next round of

the extension --

(Simultaneous speaking)

CHAIR CRIDER: Okay. Anti-
discrimination. So whereas the United States

Department of Education has issued guidance

and recommendation since the last review of

the University Anti-Discrimination and

Harassment Policy by the Board of Trustees.

And whereas the University Anti-

Discrimination and Harassment Policy as

revised, incorporates the guidance and

recommendations issued by the U.S. Department

of Education as well as best practices for

such policies.

Now, therefore, be it resolved

that the Board of Trustees adopts the

University Anti-Discrimination and Harassment

Policy attached and incorporated.

And again, the Executive Committee
approved this at its July 15th meeting and
this is an action for ratification by the full
Board.

TRUSTEE WYNER: So moved.
CHAIR CRIDER: Been moved.
TRUSTEE BELL: Second.
CHAIR CRIDER: Is there a second?

Any further discussion or clarification
needed? All in favor vote aye.

(Chorus of ayes)

CHAIR CRIDER: Any opposed or
abstentions? That motion carries. In all of
these, the next several will all be
ratifications.

The next ratification is for the
extension of the appointment of Dr. Rachel
Petty as Interim Provost of the University of
the District of Columbia.

Whereas, Dr. Petty is currently
serving as the Interim Provost of the
University of the District of Columbia and the
Board has determined that the interim
appointment should be extended based on extenuating circumstances.

Now therefore, be it resolved that the Board of Trustees of the University of the District of Columbia approves the extension of the appointment of Dr. Rachel Petty as the Interim Provost of the University of the District of Columbia for a time not to exceed one year from the date of appointment, consistent with the terms and conditions in her appointment letter. And this is also for ratification.

TRUSTEE SCHWARTZ: So moved.

CHAIR CRIDER: Been moved.

TRUSTEE BELL: Second.

CHAIR CRIDER: Moved and second.

Any discussion?

TRUSTEE ASKEW: Madam Chair?

CHAIR CRIDER: Yes, Trustee Askew.

TRUSTEE ASKEW: Well, first of all, I'm glad that Dr. Petty has agreed to continue to serve. So this has nothing to
really do with her. This is more technical in nature.

So the term interim, I thought we got rid of interim and we'd use acting? Just as a matter of just legal and technical sufficiency.

It's one of the two that we use and one of them we don't. Because we've actually defined one of them and I believe it's acting. And again, I could be wrong, but just as a matter of the proper term for that.

CHAIR CRIDER: I'm looking at our legal --

TRUSTEE ASKEW: If we can just -- and again, we don't need to do anything other than just make sure it's legally and technically sufficient.

CHAIR CRIDER: Okay.

DR. LYONS: Well, I'm interim.

TRUSTEE ASKEW: Well, you may be--

DR. LYONS: I want to be sure I'm legit.
TRUSTEE ASKEW: Yes, exactly.

Actually, I want to make sure you're right, man. Absolutely, so.

(Simultaneous speaking)

TRUSTEE ASKEW: Yes, so.

DR. LYONS: I mentioned it in that question as well.

TRUSTEE ASKEW: You're just acting like the interim. But again, Madam Chair, that has nothing to do, I mean, I support the resolution --

CHAIR CRIDER: Yes.

TRUSTEE ASKEW: -- but just from a technical --

CHAIR CRIDER: Okay.

TRUSTEE ASKEW: -- legal and technical standpoint.

CHAIR CRIDER: Can one of our legal folks answer that? I see they're furiously trying to find the answer to that --

TRUSTEE ASKEW: Yes.

CHAIR CRIDER: -- if they can
answer that for us. That's not going to hold up. What you might --

TRUSTEE ASKEW: This has nothing to do --

CHAIR CRIDER: -- is just --

TRUSTEE ASKEW: It really doesn't --

CHAIR CRIDER: -- to --

TRUSTEE ASKEW: -- require any -- for us to do anything other than when they --

TRUSTEE FELTON: Because we have--

TRUSTEE ASKEW: -- present the --

TRUSTEE FELTON: -- other appointments here that are acting --

DR. LYONS: Absolutely.

TRUSTEE FELTON: -- so.

TRUSTEE ASKEW: Should be acting.

(Simultaneous speaking)

MS. BLANCHARD: Well, in the human resources industry when you're an acting position, it's usually an actor can hold the position for approximately a year.
And in a position the actor does not necessarily apply for the regular position, whereas an interim is considered a person who can do the full duties of the job, can assume the job and does it fully.

Whereas an actor may be able to do part of the job, 80 percent of the job, and usually it's about a year. But an interim takes full responsibility of any job. But --

TRUSTEE ASKEW: Yes, but I --

MS. BLANCHARD: -- the legal,

whether the --

TRUSTEE ASKEW: Right. So to me this is not a practice thing in what they do in that area. It actually is. I think we, actually, and I know it's in the same section. It's in here somewhere, I just have to, you know, speed through and get it. But we don't really have any interim. I think it's acting. And again, it's --

MS. BLANCHARD: I was --

TRUSTEE ASKEW: We don't really
have to get into a big discussion about it,
not at all, Madam Chair.

CHAIR CRIDER: Right.

MS. BLANCHARD: We don't have to--

CHAIR CRIDER: So I think what --

MS. BLANCHARD: -- make a
distinction between the two in HR.

TRUSTEE ASKEW: Just to --

CHAIR CRIDER: I think, then, what
we need to do is we can proceed with the vote
to approve the appointment of Dr. Petty and
then, before I sign anything, I'll make sure
that the correct language is in the document
--

MR. BARASH: Yes, that --

CHAIR CRIDER: -- if that's okay?

MR. BARASH: We would recommend

that.

CHAIR CRIDER: Okay, great.

MR. BARASH: And we, apparently,
it is acting. Apparently, the regulation --

CHAIR CRIDER: Okay.
MR. BARASH: -- was changed.

Although, in my experience around here in six
months we've used interim. But we will use
acting going forward and we'll make sure that
the resolution is changed for you sign.

CHAIR CRIDER: Okay. Thank you.

TRUSTEE ASKEW: Okay.

CHAIR CRIDER: Any further
discussion --

TRUSTEE SCHWARTZ: Yes.

CHAIR CRIDER: -- Trustee

Schwartz?

TRUSTEE SCHWARTZ: Yes, Madam

Chair. Again, nothing to do with Dr. Perry,
but are we moving to filling the Provost
permanently rather than acting or interim?

TRUSTEE ASKEW: Are we waiting on
the president?

DR. LYONS: Yes.

TRUSTEE SCHWARTZ: So what was the
thing that we --

TRUSTEE TARDD: Are we waiting --
TRUSTEE WYNER: But --

TRUSTEE TARDD: -- for the new president?

TRUSTEE WYNER: Yes, are we waiting for the --

CHAIR CRIDER: He needs to be --

TRUSTEE WYNER: Are we waiting --

TRUSTEE TARDD: Are we waiting for the new president or --

CHAIR CRIDER: -- because he's acting at the door. Okay.

DR. LYONS: We have talked about either waiting for the new president or proceeding, I won't say at the same time, but given enough lead time on the part of the presidential search to begin the provost search, so that the successful person would be able to be involved in that appointment.

TRUSTEE WYNER: Yes.

CHAIR CRIDER: Yes.

TRUSTEE WYNER: So I think there would need to be enough lead time to make sure
that the specifications for what we are looking for, in fact, align with whatever --

   DR. LYONS: Who you pick then.

   TRUSTEE WYNER: -- the new president's vision is.

   DR. LYONS: Exactly.

   TRUSTEE WYNER: And I do think that outset, I mean, the provost is an exceptionally important position, obviously, at the institution. And I've seen where very good provosts and very good presidents who did not have aligned visions did not serve the institution very well.

   So this is not about the competencies of the individuals, but it is about a vision for the institution moving forward. So, you know, to me, I would want to make sure that there was full input, not just at the final review --

   DR. LYONS: Right.

   TRUSTEE WYNER: -- but even on setting what it was that was being looked for
and in the search process.

CHAIR CRIDER: Yes, the search for provost has not started. I don't even think --

TRUSTEE WYNER: Very good.

CHAIR CRIDER: -- that the discussion --

DR. LYONS: No.

CHAIR CRIDER: -- around what we want in a provost has started because I do believe it's important that the next president have a lot a say in what that looks like. We may have a different challenge in time of timing that we'll have to address --

TRUSTEE WYNER: Thank you, Dr. Crider.

CHAIR CRIDER: -- at some point.

But for now, you know, that search hasn't started. And I think we're all in alignment with what we think should happen with that.

TRUSTEE WYNER: Thank you.

CHAIR CRIDER: Okay. So we voted
on this, right? Did we vote?

TRUSTEE BELL: I don't think we voted.

CHAIR CRIDER: Okay. We didn't.

So all in favor of extending the appointment of Dr. Petty as Acting Provost making the corrections that we've identified, please vote aye.

(Chorus of ayes)

CHAIR CRIDER: Any nos or abstentions? Thank you. That motion carries.

And then the next action under the Executive Committee is the appointment of Dr. Connie Webster as Acting Associate Provost for Academic Programs. I don't even know if she's here.

Whereas, Dr. Webster has been recommended to serve as the Acting Associate Provost for Academic Programs based on her knowledge, past accomplishments and extensive experience, earning the respect and trust of university faculty and administrators for her
leadership including serving previously as the chairperson for the Department of Nursing and Allied Health and the Director of the Associate degree and R.N. to B.S.N. programs, in addition to having administrative oversight for the Certified Nursing Assistant Program and Licensed Practical Nursing Program.

And for serving as President of the Faculty Senate, an elected position and for having distinguished herself as a teacher and lecturer both in the College of Arts and Sciences and the College of Agriculture, Urban Sustainability and Environmental Sciences, as well as in the local and national communities.

And whereas, after review of her credentials, it has been determined that she is well-qualified for such position.

Now, therefore, be it resolved that the Board of Trustees of the University of the District of Columbia approves the appointment of Dr. Connie Webster as the Acting Associate Provost for Academic Programs
effective August the 16th, 2014. And this is looking for ratification of our prior action. I'd like a motion for that.

TRUSTEE TARDD: So moved.

TRUSTEE SCHWARTZ: Second.

CHAIR CRIDER: Been moved and second. Any discussion, questions? All in favor vote aye.

(Chorus of ayes)

CHAIR CRIDER: Any opposed or abstentions? That motion carries as well.

Thank you. On Academic Affairs, we have two actions and are you -- no? Okay. Dr. Curry is not here from Academic Affairs, yet.

We have the appointment of Dr. Kathleen Dockett as Professor Emeritus and appointment of Dr. Robert L. Burgdorf as Professor Emeritus.

DR. LYONS: Move that we do them together, Madam Chair.

CHAIR CRIDER: Okay. Okay.

TRUSTEE BELL: Second.
CHAIR CRIDER: Right. Been second that we do those together for the appointment of Dr. Dockett and Dr. Burgdorf as Professor Emeritus. Any discussion or questions on those appointments.

TRUSTEE ASKEW: No --

CHAIR CRIDER: Trustee Askew.

TRUSTEE ASKEW: Thank you, Madam Chair. I just wanted to say that, you know, I had the good fortune of being able to be educated and taught by Dr. Burgdorf.

I know that he is a scholar, probably world-renowned in his area of constitutional and disability law. He has been a real asset to the institution and he's here for the right reasons.

And so I am happy to see that he is being extended this honor as I do think we should be in the business of recognizing our distinguished professors who are well-accomplished and recognized in their area of expertise.
So thank you, Mr. President and those of you who were on the committee for bringing him to the Board. And I fully support his nomination and recommendation.

CHAIR CRIDER: Thank you. Any further discussion? All in favor of approving the appointments of Dr. Burgdorf and Dr. Dockett vote aye.

(Chorus of ayes)

CHAIR CRIDER: Any opposed or abstentions? Those motions carry as well. Thank you. Mr. Shelton, we have two action items coming out of your committee.

TRUSTEE SHELTON: I think it's three, yes.

CHAIR CRIDER: Three, I'm sorry.

TRUSTEE SHELTON: Yes.

CHAIR CRIDER: Okay.

TRUSTEE SHELTON: The first is Notice of Proposed Rulemaking 8B DCMR Chapter 19, Background Checks.

DR. LYONS: Your mic's not on.
TRUSTEE SHELTON: Okay. That'll work.

CHAIR CRIDER: Just keep going.

TRUSTEE SHELTON: The whereas, proposal identifies several sensitive positions and work areas such as those located within Child Development Center and those who encounter or may have access to children ages 17 and under and require recurring background checks for persons working in those positions.

The proposed rules also defines suitability and actions that may be taken against those deemed unsuitable as a result of the content of their background check.

Therefore, be it resolved that the Board -- I'm sorry, I should have made a motion to accept the proposals, before I went through reading them. A motion to accept the Notice of Proposed Rulemaking 18B DCMR Chapter 19, Background Checks.

TRUSTEE ASKEW: So moved.

TRUSTEE SHELTON: Thank you.
Second?

TRUSTEE TARDD: I'll second.

TRUSTEE SHELTON: All right.

CHAIR CRIDER: Moved and second.

TRUSTEE SHELTON: All right. The effort is to comply with the law that has been published and we further resolve that the Board of Trustees at the University of the District of Columbia hereby takes proposed rulemaking action to adopt Chapter 19 of the university rules, Title 8B DCMR.

And be it further resolved that the General Counsel's hereby directed to publish this Notice of Proposed Rulemaking in the D.C. register as soon as practical for a comment period of not less than 30 days in accordance with the provisions of the D.C. official code. This is a compliance issue and should, again, if moved and seconded, I call for the question. Madam Chair.

CHAIR CRIDER: Discussion?

TRUSTEE SHELTON: Discussion --
CHAIR CRIDER: I move for discussion.

TRUSTEE SHELTON: -- okay.

CHAIR CRIDER: Okay.

TRUSTEE SHELTON: I'll give you all a chance.

CHAIR CRIDER: And this is on the pre-employment background checks.

TRUSTEE SHELTON: Background checks.

TRUSTEE SHELTON: And many of the questions have been addressed.

CHAIR CRIDER: Yes.

TRUSTEE SHELTON: And there is a marked through document in case you want to read further on the background --

CHAIR CRIDER: Yes.

TRUSTEE SHELTON: -- of the history of this development of this proposal.

TRUSTEE ASKEW: Okay. Madam Chair --

CHAIR CRIDER: Yes.
TRUSTEE ASKEW: -- I just want to commend the folks who actually worked on this. You know, this is before the actual committee --

CHAIR CRIDER: Yes.

TRUSTEE ASKEW: -- on two separate occasions. And there was a very healthy exchange, I believe, to help make this policy really, I think, you know, probably closer to a model --

CHAIR CRIDER: Yes.

TRUSTEE ASKEW: -- as to where various universities and various jurisdictions are moving, in particular as we talk about criminal background checks and you start to see legislation --

CHAIR CRIDER: Yes.

TRUSTEE ASKEW: -- of ban the box because of the impact that it could have on employment for returning citizens. You know, there was a lot of work, I think, that was also done on 1906.4 because there, you know,
were some sensitivity as to, you know, if you
are a current employee working in a non-
sensitive position would you be subject to a
criminal background check?

And I think where we landed is a
good place to land because basically, you
know, if you're offered a non-sensitive
position and you're already employed with the
university, the position being filled, if it's
a sensitive position, background checks must
be completed unless the employee's being
offered a sensitive position or has a
background check on file that's been completed
within the last three years.

So it allows, you know, for an
opportunity for employees to move from a
sensitive position to a non-sensitive
position.

And if you had a background check
within the last three years and you're moving
to a sensitive position, then you don't have
to worry about going through that background
check again.

And I think that that was progress based upon some of the testimony that we received. And also based upon the direction of the District of Columbia and their posture on this.

So I want to thank the Committee Chair for his active engagement in this as well as the administrators who also worked to make this a better policy. Thank you, Madam Chair.

CHAIR CRIDER: Thank you. I think I just had one broad question that has been on my mind that I didn't ask, although, I was here both times this came.

And it's a simple question that I'm certain won't take a whole lot, Ms. Myrtho. And that is we've identified specific positions within the university as sensitive positions subject to this policy and yet, almost any position within the university could, in fact, come in contact with our
targeted population that we're seeking to protect.

And so I'm just curious as to why any employee of the university is not subject to background checks or every employee is not subject to background checks?

TRUSTEE THOMPSON: Yes, good question.

CHAIR CRIDER: That's just for my own education. I don't know. Sometimes I know the answer and ask the question, this time I don't.

MS. BLANCHARD: The question is likelihood. For example, we chose, we selected, we identified positions, for example, if you're in the classroom, if you're in the resident's hall, if you're with the 4H program where, more than likely, on the day to day performance of your duties you will encounter youth or children, 17.

And as we know, some of our students are 17 years old. You know, we are
a higher education institution, most of our kids are 18 and older. But we do have a lot of youngsters who are 17.

So again, in selecting those position, we look and see what are the position where you would have more of a chance to address.

For example, if you are in HR, would you come in contact with youth on a regular basis? Not as much. And that's the essence of how we selected the positions.

CHAIR CRIDER: I know that public safety is on the list. What about --

MS. BLANCHARD: Yes.

CHAIR CRIDER: -- janitorial or maintenance and those kinds of positions?

MS. BLANCHARD: Maintenance are contracted out. And I did, as we were looking at this policy and did speak with a procurement officer and ask her to make sure that when we are contracting out that we require background checks --
CHAIR CRIDER: Okay.

MS. BLANCHARD: -- all of the employees that we're bringing in.

CHAIR CRIDER: Okay. That satisfies my question, Mr. Chair.

TRUSTEE SCHWARTZ: Well, that's a good point. Thank you.

CHAIR CRIDER: Okay.

TRUSTEE SHELTON: All right. The next item is proposed amendment to the university rules regarding performance management.

CHAIR CRIDER: And I think -- did we vote on it?

DR. LYONS: Did we vote on this already?

TRUSTEE SHELTON: We didn't vote.

TRUSTEE FELTON: You're not keeping up.

TRUSTEE SHELTON: My apologies.

All in favor of the Notice of Proposed Rulemaking 8B DCMR Chapter 19, Background
Checks say aye.

    (Chorus of ayes)

    TRUSTEE SHELTON: Opposed,

abstentions? All in favor? Okay. It's done. All right. Madam Chair, the Committee is also reporting out a proposed amendment to the university rules regarding performance management.

    Again, this is to improve our evaluations up and down the system, to amend Chapter 8 of the university rules and that General Counsel is directed to publish this at its earliest convenience if approved by the Board. A motion to approve is in order.

    CHAIR CRIDER: I'm sorry, Mr. --

    TRUSTEE SHELTON: It's all right. It's just me. Motion to approve.

    TRUSTEE SCHWARTZ: So moved.

    TRUSTEE SHELTON: Thank you --

    CHAIR CRIDER: Been moved and second?

    TRUSTEE SHELTON: -- General
Schwartz. And I need a second.

TRUSTEE FELTON: Oh, I'll second,

but I'm just --

CHAIR CRIDER: Any discussion.

TRUSTEE SHELTON: Yes, Mr. Felton.

And now questions.

TRUSTEE FELTON: Question about --

TRUSTEE SCHWARTZ: Discussion.

TRUSTEE FELTON: -- best practices

or model guidance. Can someone just share to

what extent that was included in drafting

this?

TRUSTEE SHELTON: Okay. Good

call.

MS. BLANCHARD: I'm sorry. I

didn't hear the question. Myrtho Blanchard

again.

TRUSTEE SHELTON: Question --

TRUSTEE FELTON: To what extent

were best practices or other proven models

used in making the changes?

MS. BLANCHARD: Well, we looked at
best practices at other universities, but we
were looking at more trying to automate the
process because right now the process that we
use is fairly good. And we look at other
institutions, we look at private sectors, we
look at other models.

But currently we are doing it
manually on paper. So we looked around to
find an automated version. And DCHR offers an
automated version that fits the purpose.

And so we tweaked it and we're
looking to implement it so that we can better
monitor and offer better assistance to
supervisors and to employees as they are doing
performance evaluation and holding employees
accountable.

TRUSTEE FELTON: So you believe
that this approach will, in fact, identify
employees who perhaps are operating at a
marginal level as opposed to unsatisfactory?

MS. BLANCHARD: It's not the two.
And I'll be frank with you, we have a
performance evaluation plan and the idea is to find a tool that helps people do the work.

But for us it's to go out and train the supervisors and making sure that we monitor because when it's paper you're receiving hundreds of pieces of papers. And the way it is you have a mid-year evaluation which we don't receive. And by the end when it is completed it's often too late to take any action.

TRUSTEE FELTON: Right.

MS. BLANCHARD: So this is providing more detail information and it's also allowing you a tool on line where it can be there and assist the supervisors much earlier in holding folks accountable.

TRUSTEE FELTON: And how much do we anticipate costing to train the workforce --

MS. BLANCHARD: We're doing the training ourselves.

TRUSTEE FELTON: -- on the new
system?

MS. BLANCHARD: We're doing the training ourselves.

TRUSTEE FELTON: So what's the timeline?

MS. BLANCHARD: We're trying to implement it the next -- we had to complete because the evaluation period is ending on September 30th. We did not get this approve and we have not communicated the process yet.

So we are now in the process of closing out this year's evaluation year, if you will, and then we'll start the following year with this.

TRUSTEE FELTON: So you expect the training to be completed by when?

MS. BLANCHARD: Within the next couple of months.

TRUSTEE FELTON: Thank you.

TRUSTEE SHELTON: Okay. And what I endorse about this process, it allows HR to help the manager stay on top of evaluation.
That's often a problem that I've observed in evaluation is that you get behind and you can't catch up.

So this system allows us to look at our managers who are successful and that, you know, let them continue. But those who are not on task and on target, to come in and give them whatever assistance is available to help get the evaluations moving in the right direction.

It helps us manage our managers as well as our working staff. So it puts pressure on both of them to keep up with the assessment process.

So I would hope that you all would vote for this. It's been through the Committee. I'm ready to ask for the question when you're ready to receive it.

CHAIR CRIDER: Just one more question.

TRUSTEE ASKEW: Madam Chair --

CHAIR CRIDER: Yes.
TRUSTEE ASKEW: Just --

CHAIR CRIDER: Yes, sorry. Go ahead.

TRUSTEE ASKEW: So I spoke about this particular area and I'm looking at Section 1141 which is the performance ratings. And in committee on two separate occasions we've had extensive conversation about the rating levels.

And I appreciate receiving, you know, some information that the committee requested, which was Madam Chair. There was a question in Committee whether or not the module that they're using, which won't cost us an money today, could be modified.

And the answer was that well, it probably could be customized in such a way, however, there would be some potential costs associated with it.

And so we asked that the executive team let us know how much a change in the grade levels or any change, I guess, for that
matter, would cost. And they sent back
something in the range of 60 to $70,000.

The other question that came up is
okay, assume that we keep the model as it is,
could we actually draw a policy that says that
the last level, Level 1, inadequate performer,
is not one that could actually, you know, that
you could inform employees, but that's not a
level that you can actually choose.

And I guess some of that will
carry on in the discussion today. But the
reason why we were focusing so much attention
in that area is because in my view what this
institution needs to survive and ensure that
it's able to achieve its vision --

MS. BLANCHARD: Absolutely.

TRUSTEE ASKEW: -- is to have
employees who, to be quite honest, are beyond
a valued performer, which means you are just
doing your job.

MS. BLANCHARD: Yes.

TRUSTEE ASKEW: And that we need,
you know, effective performers and we need role model performers.

    MS. BLANCHARD: Yes.

    TRUSTEE ASKEW: And so I'm 120 percent with that. Where I disconnect is where you have Level 2, which is a marginal performer, which we were told means that you would be put on a 90-day performance development plan.

    And after that, you know, a 90-day performance plan and then after that there's actually a possibility that the next go around there's a possibility that you have other options, the possibility you could be ranked an inadequate performer.

    And the next question that was asked was well, if you're an inadequate performer could you still be put on a performance development plan? To me, you can't.

    I mean that to me is just from an evaluation standpoint to say that someone is
an inadequate performer and they could potentially still be on a performance development program, to me, doesn't speak to the caliber of team that we want to have at this institution.

Again, we do not have time for inadequate performers. I believe, and I think that when you put things out like that, employees may get confused by the fact that, oh, okay, you know, I was a marginal performer, but, you know, I'm not an inadequate performer so, you know, therefore there's a thought that --

CHAIR CRIDER: I'm still here.

TRUSTEE ASKEW: -- I still have some level of job security. Now, again, I know that to change the module it may take 60 to $70,000 to do that. And with our tight budget, that might be a stretch.

But I will say, you know, to my fellow Board Members that we really do have to be clear in this particular area, right?
CHAIR CRIDER: Okay.

TRUSTEE ASKEW: I mean, a performer, I mean, you know, you're doing your job, but our students need better than that. And for me, I cannot support, to be quite frank with you.

If you can put somebody as a marginal performer on a 90-day performance plan and if they don't meet, you know, the objectives that are set to get them up to at least a performer, it's time for them to --

MS. BLANCHARD: Yes --

TRUSTEE ASKEW: -- exit.

MS. BLANCHARD: -- and that is --

TRUSTEE ASKEW: This is not the place for you.

MS. BLANCHARD: No, no.

TRUSTEE ASKEW: But that's --

MS. BLANCHARD: If you get that, if you do not meet the performance improvement plans, what is not established, you don't meet it, you can be terminated. We are doing that
now.

TRUSTEE ASKEW: Right.

MS. BLANCHARD: In the past, perhaps, we haven’t, but we have been pretty strong and we’ve been very supportive of supervisors who are willing to work with us.

And what this is going to afford us is the ability to be closer to them and see what is happening. Because as I stated before, the key to this is really making sure that it is automated, so that we can monitor it. So that you don’t get to a performance evaluation period, the end, and that you’re saying a one.

TRUSTEE ASKEW: Should be in mid-year, right?

MS. BLANCHARD: If the person is barely making it, barely, and he’s willing, we want to put you in a performance improvement plan.

But we shouldn’t be, exactly, I agree with you, we shouldn’t be where a person
is absolutely not adequate that we're worrying about. But the plan, the module is as it is.

    And we're going to help support
the module by training and working with the
supervisors to understand. When you're
marginal, you will be placed on a performance
improvement plan. But if you don't need it,
at that point you are turning it in.

    TRUSTEE ASKEW: Yes, but can I
just --

    MS. BLANCHARD: We're doing that
now.

    TRUSTEE ASKEW: So what's the need
for the inadequate, right? So what you just
said supports what I just said.

    MS. BLANCHARD: No, no, I
appreciate it.

    TRUSTEE ASKEW: All right. So
what's the need, because again, I think that
there's an amount of confusion that could
possibly associated with having that last
level.
Because an employee could think,
who's not sitting here in this room today,
could read that and be like I'm a marginal
performer, if I don't, within the 90 days
achieve performer, then the last chance that
I have is inadequate.

Because, again, what we were told
in committee that could still mean that you
are on a performance development plan while
still being an inadequate --

CHAIR CRIDER: Person.

TRUSTEE ASKEW: -- person.

MS. BLANCHARD: And that would
mean for a supervisor who had not held their
part in doing this. And that's what it is and
hopefully, this is the last year this is
happening.

TRUSTEE ASKEW: Yes.

MS. BLANCHARD: And that's why we
believe that with an automated version, we'll
clip this. I promise you next year we won't
have this.
We will not have people in that category because we would have trained folks to understand when people are minimally doing their job, you are put on a performance improvement plan. You do not perform, it's time to go.

TRUSTEE ASKEW: Okay. Again --

MS. BLANCHARD: And I understand your point --

TRUSTEE ASKEW: I think what I'm trying to get --

MS. BLANCHARD: -- it's just that we don't have another module.

TRUSTEE ASKEW: The bottom line we're trying to get to is to get rid of the --

MS. BLANCHARD: And we will.

TRUSTEE ASKEW: -- somehow. And if that is, and I think, you know, in talking with the president, he wants us to be very clear about this from at least --

MS. BLANCHARD: Absolutely.

TRUSTEE ASKEW: -- committee
meeting, right? And I'm just trying to figure out is there a way to make it clear that, you know, inadequate performer means terminated.

MS. BLANCHARD: Yes.

TRUSTEE ASKEW: There's no more 30 day --

CHAIR CRIDER: Chances.

TRUSTEE ASKEW: -- chances. You are gone. If you from performer to inadequate performer --

MS. BLANCHARD: Right.

TRUSTEE ASKEW: -- you're gone.

MS. BLANCHARD: Right.

CHAIR CRIDER: Yes.

TRUSTEE ASKEW: That's it.

MS. BLANCHARD: Right.

TRUSTEE ASKEW: You know, if you were marginal, in the 90 days you --

MS. BLANCHARD: Yes.

TRUSTEE ASKEW: -- had not met the objectives as set by you and your supervisor, and I emphasize you and your supervisor --
MS. BLANCHARD: Yes.

TRUSTEE ASKEW: -- you're gone.

MS. BLANCHARD: Right. Because I believe --

CHAIR CRIDER: But I think that's --

MS. BLANCHARD: -- by the time we -- I'm sorry.

CHAIR CRIDER: Oh, I'm sorry.

MS. BLANCHARD: No, go.

CHAIR CRIDER: Just so that I'm clear, I think that really is the crux of the question.

MS. BLANCHARD: No, I understand.

CHAIR CRIDER: Is there an ability to rate someone from Level 2 and at the end of a 90-day period, rate them again as Level 1 or would they automatically --

MS. BLANCHARD: No.

TRUSTEE ASKEW: Yes.

MS. BLANCHARD: No, no.

CHAIR CRIDER: So the only time
the Level 1 rating would come into play would be -- let me ask the question before you answer.

MS. BLANCHARD: Yes, absolutely.

CHAIR CRIDER: So the only time a Level 1 rating comes into play is if this is a fresh rating for me and you have rated me as an inadequate performer and based on that, I would be terminated. Do I get a 90-day performance plan at any point where I am an inadequate performer?

DR. LYONS: Sure.

MS. BLANCHARD: If you had not been evaluated before, and that's the key thing --

CHAIR CRIDER: Okay.

MS. BLANCHARD: -- if you had not been. But if you had been and you are inadequate, we can terminate.

TRUSTEE FELTON: But let us keep in mind that this is a framework.

MS. BLANCHARD: Yes.
TRUSTEE FELTON: The challenge will be for supervisors to clearly --

CHAIR CRIDER: Exactly.

TRUSTEE FELTON: -- articulate --

CHAIR CRIDER: Exactly.

TRUSTEE FELTON: -- the goal and what is expected.

TRUSTEE ASKEW: Management gets it.

TRUSTEE FELTON: So if you give your employee a sort of general unclear kind of goal, then, you know --

CHAIR CRIDER: That's what you get.

TRUSTEE FELTON: -- it's our fault. So that's why I'm concerned about having adequate and sufficient training, so people understand, whether it's a video or something, so people understand. And in a video you can say, look, your goal is not to be inadequate and this is why.

But if a supervisor fails to
clearly define the goal and the outcomes and
the measures, this is just all paper.

CHAIR CRIDER: Yes. So --

TRUSTEE FELTON: So we agree with
you.

TRUSTEE BELL: So I just want to
make sure that I was clear. Did you say then,
that if it's an inadequate performer, if
they've not had a review previously --

CHAIR CRIDER: Yes.

TRUSTEE BELL: -- they can have a
performance improvement --

CHAIR CRIDER: Correct.

TRUSTEE BELL: -- plan.

CHAIR CRIDER: Correct.

TRUSTEE BELL: And then if they
have had one, if they've had a previous one
and then they're found inadequate --

MS. BLANCHARD: They're gone.

TRUSTEE BELL: -- they're gone.

MS. BLANCHARD: Absolutely.

Because you would have failed --
TRUSTEE BELL: But I'd want at
least 90 days to --

MS. BLANCHARD: You would have
failed the performance improvement plan.
Correct.

TRUSTEE ASKEW: Yes, well, let me
just say, again, that's a tough one for me.
I won't lie because it's just I just think
that inadequate performance is exactly what it
is. It means that they haven't been doing
hardly anything that you've asked them to do.
And by giving them --

TRUSTEE FELTON: Do you see that,
though? Is it any different from the old
category of unsatisfactory?

CHAIR CRIDER: That's right.

TRUSTEE FELTON: Because that's
all this is saying is you're unsatisfactory.

CHAIR CRIDER: You're saying
you're unsatisfactory.

TRUSTEE ASKEW: Right. See in my
real world that I operate in, you're gone.
TRUSTEE FELTON: Yes.

TRUSTEE ASKEW: That's it. It's just --

CHAIR CRIDER: Yes --

TRUSTEE ASKEW: It's just --

CHAIR CRIDER: -- I think that's traditional --

TRUSTEE ASKEW: Right.

CHAIR CRIDER: -- so.

TRUSTEE ASKEW: We only have three levels.

TRUSTEE FELTON: Yes.

CHAIR CRIDER: Yes.

TRUSTEE ASKEW: And it's --

TRUSTEE FELTON: Well --

TRUSTEE ASKEW: -- leading --

TRUSTEE FELTON: -- there is system --

TRUSTEE ASKEW: performing --

TRUSTEE FELTON: -- that somebody tells --

TRUSTEE ASKEW: -- and developing.
All right? That's it. This is, you know, this is five different levels.

TRUSTEE FELTON: But we could've chosen three.

TRUSTEE ASKEW: Yes.

CHAIR CRIDER: But I think, too, the other place, maybe some of this goes to the language. I'm sorry, but when you say potential to improve --

COURT REPORTER: You need to turn your microphone on.

CHAIR CRIDER: When you say here potential to improve is not evident, it raises the question why do you continue to invest time if after whatever this period of performance ends, which I assume is a 12-month period that people are being evaluated.

So you worked with me for 12 months, right, you have seen over a 12-month period of time that I am unable to meet minimum requirements of the position and you've rated me now after 12 months of
performance that way, and you're going to give me another 90 days to continue to show you that I can't meet the requirements of the position.

And so I think that's where some of this disconnect is. If I've already demonstrated, over a period, that I can't meet it, how many chances do I get to show you that I can't meet it?

TRUSTEE FELTON: My understanding was six months, mid-year.

TRUSTEE SHELTON: You have a mid year, right?

TRUSTEE BELL: Mid year.

CHAIR CRIDER: That's correct.

TRUSTEE FELTON: So that's the point where the supervisor --

MS. BLANCHARD: And --

TRUSTEE FELTON: -- can't play around.

TRUSTEE SHELTON: But what happens if the process is, in my opinion, automated?
COURT REPORTER: Microphone, please.

CHAIR CRIDER: There's something going on with these mics.

TRUSTEE SHELTON: What happens in the monitoring process as you do each stage of the process, the manager's able to go immediately to that employee who is struggling and identify quickly with any time during the process that they are not performing to the goals that we have established. And once that has been established, then we start our 90 days. It doesn't say wait until the end of the year.

TRUSTEE FELTON: Or wait six months.

TRUSTEE SHELTON: Or wait. We're trying to get the process on the front end so that we can have our managers understand what we're expecting, have the employees understand what we're expecting and then before the year is up, have done the process.
What happens in normal evaluation is you don't find out until April or May --

CHAIR CRIDER: It's the end of the year.

TRUSTEE SHELTON: -- that you really had a problem that you've been shuffling for six months. But it's clearly demarked stages that have to be documented and for upper management to be able to keep an eye on this process.

This is what this system will afford us to see if we really have the problem that we think we have --

CHAIR CRIDER: Right.

TRUSTEE SHELTON: -- or we have another kind of problem.

CHAIR CRIDER: Correct.

TRUSTEE SHELTON: But it allows us to attack our expectations earlier than we have been doing in the past.

CHAIR CRIDER: But weren't we supposed to be doing it like --
TRUSTEE SHELTON: Yes, ma'am, we were.

CHAIR CRIDER: So just let me, you know, be a little devil's advocate --

TRUSTEE THOMPSON: Yes.

CHAIR CRIDER: -- right now --

TRUSTEE THOMPSON: Yes we were.

TRUSTEE SHELTON: We all agree.

CHAIR CRIDER: -- because the introduction of an information system or some sort of cute little module that tells you whether or not somebody did this, doesn't get the job done.

It is still relying on people to get the job done. And so to the extent that this was already a requirement, it struck me at the committee meeting to hear that right now 20 to 30 percent of our employees get a performance appraisal.

That is just completely unacceptable. And so what you guys are telling us is that we'll put in place this
system and all of a sudden we've got, you know, Camelot. And everybody's going to do what they're supposed to do and --

TRUSTEE SHELTON: No.

CHAIR CRIDER: -- and they're going to get their, you know, 90-day appraisal and all this is going to work when that people factor is still there.

So, in addition to the training that goes with it, what else is out there that does what Trustee Shelton just talked about, which is that at the first time they're supposed to do an appraisal that first appraisal occurs so that it is not 12 months later --

MS. BLANCHARD: Correct.

CHAIR CRIDER: -- when somebody is getting their first identification that your just not --

MS. BLANCHARD: Absolutely.

CHAIR CRIDER: -- working out.

MS. BLANCHARD: Absolutely.
CHAIR CRIDER: And how does that happen?

MS. BLANCHARD: I agree with you. Because any tool is just a tool. It's how it is used and how we hold people accountable for their not using it that gives you good result.

I certainly appreciate what you're saying. What I'm saying is the automated process give us an opportunity to get in a whole lot sooner and to monitor it a lot sooner.

What happened before, the way we were able to improve, it wasn't the process or the tool. There are a lot of tools out there. You have to make sure your tool is valid, but it's holding people accountable.

And the automated version gave us the opportunity to send reminders on a regular basis to their supervisors, copying their vice president.

And it got to a point where when we were not hearing from the vice president,
the president was copied. And all of a
sudden, as I joke with my staff, I had a line
behind my door the morning that it was
required. I'm sorry. Dr. Tardd may remember
part of that. He was --

TRUSTEE TARDD: Yes.

MS. BLANCHARD: -- there when some
of those processes took place. But seriously,
it's really holding people accountable. And
what I'm saying is I understand all of what
you're saying.

A tool is not going to change this
overnight, but it's the really holding people
accountable, establishing your goals, an
objective, and having something to hold people
accountable to.

Before, okay, well, you do this.
Okay, you do this when, how? When is it due?
And during that time you don't do it, then I
hold you accountable. We have not been doing
that consistently.

And what our attempt here is is to
go out and train people and help them hold the employees accountable. And with that the burden is not only on HR, it's not only on the supervisor, it's going to be on the vice president, it's going to be on each and every one of us.

CHAIR CRIDER: Trustee Schwartz and then Trustee Felton.

TRUSTEE SCHWARTZ: Yes, ma'am. I think, and it's written here, the process that's being used, being you're focusing on appraisals, which is almost the last step in the process.

Establishing a plan up front with your employee and progressive counseling, pre-audit counseling until you get to appraisal. You shouldn't get an appraisal and then find out that the employee isn't doing well or the employee shouldn't find out that they're not doing well --

CHAIR CRIDER: Correct.

TRUSTEE SCHWARTZ: -- at the point
of appraisal.

    CHAIR CRIDER: Correct.

    TRUSTEE SCHWARTZ: So implementing what you have written is key.

    CHAIR CRIDER: Yes.

    TRUSTEE SCHWARTZ: Individual development plans --

    MS. BLANCHARD: Correct.

    TRUSTEE SCHWARTZ: So, it's --

    MS. BLANCHARD: Establishing goals.

    TRUSTEE SCHWARTZ: -- a contract between you and your employee right up front.

    MS. BLANCHARD: Correct.

    TRUSTEE SCHWARTZ: And then periodic counseling which should be mandatory to tell you how you're doing.

    MS. BLANCHARD: Yes.

    TRUSTEE SCHWARTZ: Are there mid-stream corrections that you need to make.

    MS. BLANCHARD: Correct.

    TRUSTEE SCHWARTZ: And then comes
the time for writing up that appraisal and
determine what level you'd be getting. So it
shouldn't be a surprise to you or the employee
at the time of appraisal.

The second question I have is our
relationship with the union. I know we've had
some problems in the past. If we have a well-
documented process and we share that with our
union, then we cut back on the complaints
because they're walking along with us and they
understand.

So when an employee runs to the
union because they didn't like the appraisal
and we present our package during the plan,
the counseling, the PIP that may have been
developed along the way and then the final
rating, I think that would minimize any issues
that we have. Thank you, Madam Chair.

CHAIR CRIDER: Okay. Trustee Felton.

TRUSTEE FELTON: Yes, two point.

Well, I think we need clarification what
comments the union has even offered on this proposal because certainly as the General said, we don't want to be in a situation where the first time there's a complaint, we find out that we have to go back to the drawing board.

The second point I want to clarify that I think you said, in practicality, a first level supervisor in his or her own evaluations --

MS. BLANCHARD: Yes.

TRUSTEE FELTON: -- would be the extent to which they properly implemented --

MS. BLANCHARD: Correct.

TRUSTEE FELTON: the performance management.

MS. BLANCHARD: Correct. Each level, yes sir.

TRUSTEE FELTON: So that I --

MS. BLANCHARD: Yes, sir.

TRUSTEE FELTON: -- manage it. If I'm being evaluated on how I evaluated my --
MS. BLANCHARD: Correct.

TRUSTEE FELTON: -- people, I mean, that's quite a bit of leverage.

CHAIR CRIDER: Yes, I think that the concern is not that this doesn't make sense or that this is something that we should move to. I really don't think that's the question.

I think my concern is the implementation of this requirement. Because already, the supervisors are responsible for something that they don't do on a --

TRUSTEE FELTON: They do not remember.

MS. BLANCHARD: To train.

CHAIR CRIDER: And they're not being held accountable. And so --

TRUSTEE TARDD: Yes, that's a problem.

CHAIR CRIDER: -- to the extent that 20 to 30 percent of our people are evaluated annually shows you that 70 percent
of our people are not being evaluated.

And in each of those 70 percent of those people have a supervisor that's not doing what they're supposed to do and they continue to do that. And so where my concern is, it's great to have these tools, if the tools are not properly --

MS. BLANCHARD: Used.

CHAIR CRIDER: -- implemented, you know, if they are not used and if the people responsible for using the tools are not held accountable, we still have a system that's not working.

And so I think part of what we're struggling with is what is the system of accountability that is going to be put in place that holds the vice president, that holds the president. I mean, we certainly hold the key to president's --

MS. BLANCHARD: Right.

CHAIR CRIDER: -- you know, lack of performance.
MS. BLANCHARD: Yes.

CHAIR CRIDER: But the president is responsible for everybody else.

MS. BLANCHARD: Yes.

CHAIR CRIDER: And so, you know, we've got to make sure --

MS. BLANCHARD: Yes.

CHAIR CRIDER: -- that at every level from the president on down, that system of accountability is in place and it is working. If not, none of this matters.

TRUSTEE SHELTON: It's true.

CHAIR CRIDER: None of this matters. So I think --

TRUSTEE SHELTON: Any --

CHAIR CRIDER: Go ahead.

TRUSTEE SHELTON: Yes, sir.

DR. LYONS: Yes, Madam Chair, I was going to plead with the Chair and Trustee Askew to go ahead and approve this policy for the reasons you just described.

I mean, it's at the end of the
day, none of us want to continue in the
culture that we have. And it's going to be
about the implementation.

At the end of the day, none of us
want employees walking around saying well, I'm
an inadequate performer, you know. I mean,
there's no purpose in that and we shouldn't
have to pay $60,000 to take this off the page.

Because in fact, the last two
categories, we could make just as strong an
argument that we don't want employees here who
are marginal performers and inadequate
performers.

I mean, so it's not really the
tool as you said. But I think that the tool
is a start to get moving in the right
direction, but it's the implementation and
it's the accountability.

And you have to, as you've
suggested, demand that the president and the
vice presidents of deans and directors turn
this thing around, or the tool won't make any
difference.

CHAIR CRIDER: That's right.

DR. LYONS: So I would encourage you to support the process that has been outlined here before Trustee Askew.

CHAIR CRIDER: I'm sorry, Trustee Shelton asked a question that we need to -- and that is to the extent that this has been viewed, either Mills, Stacie or Smruti, one of you, in terms of the union engagement around the performance plan and what has that engagement been?

MS. BLANCHARD: There is a monthly labor --

CHAIR CRIDER: Or is it required?

MS. BLANCHARD: -- management meeting before this was presented to you. I had that discussion with them. The president had asked me and then they were sent a copy of it.

CHAIR CRIDER: But we --

MS. BLANCHARD: But --
CHAIR CRIDER: -- have more than one union here, though, right? I mean, there --

MS. BLANCHARD: This is not for faculty. We have NEA, this is not faculty at all. The faculty has been arbitrated. Their evaluation is totally separate. This is for non-union and union employees, regular --

CHAIR CRIDER: So --

MS. BLANCHARD: -- staff --

CHAIR CRIDER: -- what performance plan --

MS. BLANCHARD: -- minus faculty.

CHAIR CRIDER: -- would faculty be under?

MS. BLANCHARD: Pardon?

CHAIR CRIDER: What performance plan would faculty be under?

MS. MILLS: Somebody else will fix that. I mean, we just say separate --

MS. BLANCHARD: There is one that was negotiated and arbitrated by NEA. So I'll
let --

MS. RADKAR: Smruti Radkar, assistant general counsel. The faculty would be under the arbitration award, which will ultimately become the Seventh Master Agreement and we're also going to go into negotiations on the Eighth Master at some point in the near future.

CHAIR CRIDER: But would it include some of the same principles that we're looking at here in terms of performance, when we would evaluate the setting of performance expectations and all of those things or is it just --

MS. RADKAR: The --

CHAIR CRIDER: -- that we have no idea.

MS. RADKAR: -- evaluation article was arbitrated. For the most part the arbitrator choose the university's last best offer, so it's specifically delineated in the award.
CHAIR CRIDER: Okay.

MS. RADKAR: And it has a
different set of standards, can't remember all
the titles off the top of my head, but it's
specifically in the award and that would be
incorporated into the Seventh Master.

TRUSTEE ASKEW: Madam Chair?

CHAIR CRIDER: Trustee Askew.

TRUSTEE ASKEW: So let me just say
ditto everything Trustee Felton, the
President, the Chairman and Jerome said. So
again, if we don't get folks at the highest
level engaged in this process, it just won't
work. All right. So I got that. And I
apologize for being so stuck on this Level 1,
but I am still stuck on it. All right.

So I think, you know, when we were
having this discussion in committee meetings,
I mean, if we said we're keeping the levels,
but we could change the definition to, okay,
so you're a marginal performer, you're on a
90-day performance development plan, you did
not meet the objectives of performance plan, you now are a Level 1 and you're terminated.

To me, I got that. Right?

Because then you automatically, after the 90 days, right? And you don't have any questions about whether or not you can be put on another performance plans.

After 90 days, right, under Level 2, if you don't meet the objectives as set by your supervisor and the employee, if you don't meet it then you are at Level 1 and termination. You know, I mean, why --

TRUSTEE FELTON: Agreed.

TRUSTEE ASKEW: Okay.

TRUSTEE FELTON: Yes. I mean, I think that, you know, this is the framework, my expectation would be that HR would develop a Q&A for employees to explain how this will operate. And that's certainly one of the questions.

If I'm at this level, you know, what am I entitled to? And she might be
entitled to a 90-day plan, however, if you
don't demonstrate performance at that level or
higher, you will be terminated.

TRUSTEE ASKEW: Right. But --

CHAIR CRIDER: I think that --

TRUSTEE ASKEW: -- do we need to
say something --

CHAIR CRIDER: I understand the --

TRUSTEE ASKEW: Right.

CHAIR CRIDER: -- distinction

you're making.

TRUSTEE ASKEW: Right. You
understand, right.

CHAIR CRIDER: In fact, you
understand the distinction because there are
two opportunities for somebody to receive --
I think what Trustee Askew is concerned about
is whether or not there are two opportunities
for someone to receive a Level 1. And the
first is --

COURT REPORTER: Please turn on
your microphone.
CHAIR CRIDER: -- this is my first time being appraised or evaluated and I get a Level 1 and I have an opportunity to improve. So --

TRUSTEE ASKEW: Correct.

CHAIR CRIDER: -- I'll get a PIP. And if I do good with my PIP, then I may go up to a Level 2 or whatever.

TRUSTEE FELTON: No, you have to go up to it.

CHAIR CRIDER: I must go up.

TRUSTEE FELTON: Yes.

CHAIR CRIDER: I understand.

However, the second opportunity for somebody to get a Level 1, and what his concern is, is that I might move from a Level 2 to a Level 1 and still have somebody implement for me another performance improvement plan.

Because there's nothing in the language here that implies that that couldn't happen. And I think that's where your concern is.
TRUSTEE ASKEW: Absolutely.

CHAIR CRIDER: The --

TRUSTEE FELTON: That's the coaching.

CHAIR CRIDER: -- ability for somebody who has been already determined that they can improve. So it wouldn't be that they would move to Level 1, they would automatically move to termination.

From Level 2, I did not meet the performance plan that was set for me as a Level 2 and I'm automatically terminated. They wouldn't go to Level 1. That's the --

TRUSTEE FELTON: I think --

CHAIR CRIDER: -- question you're --

TRUSTEE FELTON: -- I understand what you're saying.

TRUSTEE ASKEW: Yes, I'm just saying --

TRUSTEE FELTON: But I think that --
TRUSTEE ASKEW: -- we can't change the levels. I mean, to me --

TRUSTEE FELTON: You could clarify.

TRUSTEE ASKEW: -- you can still keep the levels, but I'm just wondering --

COURT REPORTER: Your microphone, sir.

TRUSTEE ASKEW: -- again --

TRUSTEE FELTON: Microphone.

TRUSTEE ASKEW: Oh, I'm sorry. I'm sorry. Again --

TRUSTEE FELTON: But I think at every level, you shouldn't have a note. I mean, you could have been at a higher level --

TRUSTEE ASKEW: Yes.

TRUSTEE FELTON: -- and if you didn't perform, you get your 90 days and then you're out.

CHAIR CRIDER: But I could be a Level 5 and maybe instead of hitting Level 5, I hit Level 3, that's not a reason to
terminate me, right?

TRUSTEE FELTON: Well, you wouldn't get a 90-day performance plan --

CHAIR CRIDER: Exactly.

TRUSTEE FELTON: -- only at Level 2.

CHAIR CRIDER: Right.

TRUSTEE ASKEW: Only at --

CHAIR CRIDER: So I couldn't be at any level.

TRUSTEE ASKEW: -- Level 2 or Level 1, now, at this stage, yes.

CHAIR CRIDER: I guess --

TRUSTEE ASKEW: And so again, all --

CHAIR CRIDER: -- we're all trying to --

TRUSTEE ASKEW: -- I'm trying to do is --

CHAIR CRIDER: -- say here.

TRUSTEE ASKEW: -- so I --

TRUSTEE FELTON: You're just want
it to be clear.

TRUSTEE ASKEW:  Madam Chair.

TRUSTEE FELTON:  You want it to be clear.

TRUSTEE ASKEW:  Actually --

TRUSTEE SHELTON:  Excuse me.

Okay.  Joe, what you're asking for is, I believe, an amendment to the action that's on the table.  Are you prepared to go that far?

TRUSTEE ASKEW:  Yes, I am prepared.  I don't want it --

TRUSTEE SHELTON:  And then --

TRUSTEE ASKEW:  I'm not trying to --

TRUSTEE SHELTON:  And if you are prepared --

TRUSTEE ASKEW:  Yes.

TRUSTEE SCHWARTZ:  -- to go that far, then it would seem to be that you would be making a motion that would require a second.  Because I appreciate your position, I fully understand what you're saying, but we
need to have an actual idea so that we can end
the debate.

Everybody appreciates, but we need
to have an actual statement with a second, so
that we can go further or make the correction
here or do something later on.

TRUSTEE ASKEW: Okay. Well, let
me just ask another question as it relates to
the module then. If we change the, I guess,
Myrtho?

TRUSTEE FELTON: Ms. Riegle's
here. Do you want to --

TRUSTEE ASKEW: Ms. Riegle?

TRUSTEE SHELTON: They're having a
meeting now.

CHAIR CRIDER: I'm getting tired.

MS. BLANCHARD: I'm sorry, I
didn't hear the question.

TRUSTEE ASKEW: On this module
that we can't change unless we're willing to
pay 60 to $70,000, are we able to at least
influence the definition of what inadequate
performer is?

So in other words, after your 90 days, if you don't meet the objectives --

MS. BLANCHARD: Yes.

TRUSTEE ASKEW: -- as established by your supervisor and the employee, you now become an inadequate performer and subject to termination.

MS. BLANCHARD: If you are -- repeat that?

TRUSTEE ASKEW: Well, if you --

MS. BLANCHARD: Because if you fail the 90 day performance, you're gone.

TRUSTEE ASKEW: Again, I don't necessarily know that this is --

MS. BLANCHARD: The PIP rather clear?

TRUSTEE ASKEW: -- that clear because it gives you another level to go to. I was trying to keep the levels, while at the same time trying to figure out if we could change some of the language or at least in
some form of guidelines or policies have it very clear --

MS. BLANCHARD: Okay. Well --

TRUSTEE ASKEW: -- that --

MS. BLANCHARD: -- guidelines --

TRUSTEE ASKEW: -- a Level 1, and I think we had a conversation about this --

MS. BLANCHARD: Yes.

TRUSTEE ASKEW: -- equals termination.

TRUSTEE FELTON: Unless it's your first evaluation.

MS. BLANCHARD: That's the point I'm making. You have to give --

TRUSTEE ASKEW: Madam Chair.

TRUSTEE FELTON: Or --

MS. BLANCHARD: -- someone notification.

TRUSTEE FELTON: -- if you are a temporary employee --

MS. BLANCHARD: Exactly.

TRUSTEE FELTON: -- or a
probationary employee.

MS. BLANCHARD: If you have never been given notification --

TRUSTEE ASKEW: Yes.

TRUSTEE FELTON: You're going to lose.

MS. BLANCHARD: And that's where the training and working with the supervisor is critical. Because if you've looked at me throughout the 12 months, you've never said anything to me, you cannot come in and say, okay, bye-bye.

If the person was already performing at that low level, it is really important, it's critical for the supervisors to contact us and develop a performance improvement plan. If you fail that, you're gone. It's as --

TRUSTEE ASKEW: Okay.

MS. BLANCHARD: -- simple as that.

TRUSTEE ASKEW: So let me ask you this --
MS. BLANCHARD: Because we do it now.

TRUSTEE ASKEW: -- where can we make that clear though? See, I mean, again --

MS. BLANCHARD: It's --

TRUSTEE ASKEW: -- the way it's written today, it's not that clear.

MS. BLANCHARD: -- pretty clear.

TRUSTEE ASKEW: It's actually not that clear.

MS. BLANCHARD: Okay. We can do that. Because right now, I mean, we just did one based on that policy. If you failed a performance improvement plan --

CHAIR CRIDER: Yes, but where --

MS. BLANCHARD: -- you're gone.

CHAIR CRIDER: -- does it say that?

TRUSTEE ASKEW: Okay. And is there something that states that, though, within our guidelines?

MS. BLANCHARD: I can't --
TRUSTEE ASKEW: It's really just -

MS. BLANCHARD: -- quote it --

TRUSTEE ASKEW: -- to know and --

MS. BLANCHARD: But --

TRUSTEE ASKEW: -- where is I?

MS. BLANCHARD: I can't quote you, but I do it on a regular basis since I've been here. If you fail a performance improvement plan, we have the right to terminate. And I'm going to cross my colleague. It is anywhere in the policies?

MS. MATTHEWS: DCMR 8, 1143.

MS. BLANCHARD: Okay.

TRUSTEE FELTON: You have to come to the mic, I'm sorry.

MS. MATTHEWS: Jennifer Mathews, Director of Employee and Labor Relations.

DCMR 8, 1143. If an employee currently is below expectations on a performance management review, on the annual review, they get a minimum of 90 days to improve.
And if they're failed expectations, they get a minimum of 30 days.
At the end of either performance improvement plan, they are assigned a rating.

If the supervisor assigns a rating of failed expectation at the end of the performance improvement plan, there are three choices currently in DCMR 8. They are reassigned, demoted or terminated.

TRUSTEE ASKEW: Okay. So now what she just said --

MS. MATTHEWS: That's the current DCMR 8.

TRUSTEE ASKEW: I hope you understand. What she just said is, which really is the same level. Because what she's just said, in 90 days if you don't meet the objectives, then you can get an additional 30 days, which really puts you --

MS. MATTHEWS: No. No.

TRUSTEE ASKEW: Okay.

MS. MATTHEWS: No, you're assigned
TRUSTEE ASKEW: What was the 30 days?

MS. MATTHEWS: -- a rating of failed expectation. And when you're at the end of your PIP, if you're assigned a rating of failed expectation --

TRUSTEE ASKEW: Yes.

MS. MATTHEWS: -- the current DCMR 8, which I would gladly --

TRUSTEE ASKEW: Okay.

MS. MATTHEWS: -- work on, currently gives three choices, reassign, demote, terminate. The majority has been terminated.

TRUSTEE FELTON: At who's decision? At the supervisor's?

MS. MATTHEWS: It's the supervisor's decision and consultation with Human Resources. It specifically says the supervisor's decision and consultation with Human Resources.
TRUSTEE FELTON: I just wanted to clarify that it wasn't the employees choice. That's all I was saying.

MS. MATTHEWS: No, not the employee's choice.

TRUSTEE ASKEW: I just want to make -- because clearly I didn't understand it. So the 90 days, and you mentioned something about 30 days, what's the 30 days relate to?

MS. MATTHEWS: Well, in the new system the numbers are different. In the current system the ratings are 4, 3, 1, 0. There is no 2 in the current rating. In the proposed rating there is a 2. The current system is 4, 3, 1, 0. One, minimum of 90 days, zero, minimum of 30 days.

At the end of the PIP, performance improvement plan, the supervisor in consultation with HR, assigns a rating. The rating assigned is failed expectation.

The current DCMR 8 has three
options only, demotion, reassignment, termination. And so far the ones I've seen are all termination. And that's staff, that's not faculty. Faculty is totally different and not on the table.

TRUSTEE ASKEW: So what you just said, I mean, so there's only four levels then?

MS. MATTHEWS: Today.

TRUSTEE ASKEW: Today.

MS. MATTHEWS: We're proposing --

TRUSTEE ASKEW: Not five. You're proposing --

MS. MATTHEWS: -- something different.

TRUSTEE ASKEW: Right. You're proposing five, but today you only have four.

MS. MATTHEWS: Today.

TRUSTEE ASKEW: Right. So now we have -- and again, this is where the river meets the road for me because I think there should only be four. You know, but now we've
got five.

And again, and the reason this is so important because, I mean, in reality we're talking about other contracts with employees that, I can tell you one of the biggest things that we've been challenged with is this whole discussion about performance with all of our employees, faculty, union, non-union.

And I think that we have to be, again, very clear on what our expectations -- because I mean, we have to hold our all of our employees at at least an expectation that has some level of parody. All right?

And so, you know, to me going into discussions, you know, with the faculty and they've got four and then there's five over here.

You now, again, it gets back to your question, Madam Chair and Trustee Felton, you know, I mean, it's how do you reconcile and how do we come to a level, I mean, because we have four now and now we're going to five.
MS. BLANCHARD: But let me make one point though. You did touch on the four. The four, the reason it's five, we added a top. The two at the bottom exist now. That's --

TRUSTEE ASKEW: Now, there are two --

MS. BLANCHARD: -- the point I --

TRUSTEE ASKEW: -- at the bottom.

MS. BLANCHARD: And clearly, we are trying to move away from bottom. We start by putting a top one. There is an exceed model. We did not add anything at that bottom because like you, I understand the points you are trying to raise.

CHAIR CRIDER: Yes --

MS. BLANCHARD: But it's just --

CHAIR CRIDER: -- I think the answer, you know, is that one, we know who to hold accountable if this --

MS. BLANCHARD: Correct.

CHAIR CRIDER: -- doesn't work.
TRUSTEE ASKEW: Yes.

MS. BLANCHARD: Yes.

CHAIR CRIDER: And, you know, to the extent that this is the proposal, you know, we need to move something forward that allows us to improve what we're doing today. This, at least, is the first step in doing that.

But beyond this, it really is how they implement it and how they hold themselves and the rest of the staff accountable to getting this done. And that's what the Operations Committee is going to be paying attention to as we go forward.

So it's a challenge out there to you, HR staff, to make sure that you implement this in a way that you deliver on what you're telling us you're giving us today. Because we're going to be watching this one. I think this is really important for us.

MS. BLANCHARD: It stand accepting the challenge.
CHAIR CRIDER: Okay.

TRUSTEE BELL: Okay.

CHAIR CRIDER: So --

TRUSTEE BELL: I have a --

CHAIR CRIDER: -- if we can --

TRUSTEE BELL: -- quick question.

CHAIR CRIDER: Oh.

TRUSTEE BELL: I'm sorry. I just
want to make sure, I think Ms. Riegle
addressed this when we spoke before, but is
there going to be some type of ranking among
these categories so that everyone's not a role
model or everyone's not a highly effective --
I mean, is there going to be some type of
allocation --

MS. RIEGLE: Kris Riegle --

TRUSTEE BELL: -- or is there --

MS. RIEGLE: -- Director

Classification, Total --

TRUSTEE BELL: Yes.

MS. RIEGLE: -- Compensation.

There will not be a forced ranking --
TRUSTEE BELL: Okay.

MS. RIEGLE: -- but that will be part of the training. Usually about 60 to 70 percent of your workforce kind of fall into you're meeting expectations.

TRUSTEE BELL: Right.

MS. RIEGLE: And then you get up to like 10 to 15 percent for the fourth level. And really, only about five percent are really your really top performers.

TRUSTEE BELL: Yes, so there'll be training about --

MS. RIEGLE: Oh yes.

TRUSTEE BELL: -- that?

MS. RIEGLE: Absolutely. We'll have to provide examples of what that looks like in a higher education environment.

TRUSTEE BELL: Okay.

MS. RIEGLE: There'll be lots of training. Personally, just from my conversations with leaders getting started to launch this next --
TRUSTEE BELL: Yes.

MS. RIEGLE: -- performance evaluation, I just think we need to level set on what is an acceptable behavior.

TRUSTEE BELL: Sure.

MS. RIEGLE: And they really need some basic training with that.

TRUSTEE BELL: Okay.

MS. RIEGLE: And that they have our support in executing and there'll be --

CHAIR CRIDER: Yes, that's right.

MS. RIEGLE: -- performance manuals.

CHAIR CRIDER: Yes, and I think that we, you know, we'll look to hear how this is implemented and how things are going. And we'll be able to tell from if we see that number rise from 20 to 30 to --

MS. RIEGLE: Yes.

CHAIR CRIDER: -- something, you know, north of 70 or 80 percent, you know.

And then we'll know whether this is working or
not.

MS. RIEGLE: Absolutely.

CHAIR CRIDER: And right now, you know, whatever we're doing now isn't working. So we've got to move something. So I'd suggest that we --

TRUSTEE SHELTON: We're ready for the question?

TRUSTEE TARDD: Okay. Can we pose the question?

CHAIR CRIDER: Okay. All in favor?

TRUSTEE SHELTON: Yes, thank you.

TRUSTEE TARDD: I call the question.

TRUSTEE SHELTON: In favor say aye.

(Chorus of ayes)

CHAIR CRIDER: Any --

TRUSTEE SHELTON: All --

CHAIR CRIDER: -- opposed?

TRUSTEE SHELTON: -- opposed?
CHAIR CRIDER: Yes.

TRUSTEE SHELTON: The ayes have it. Motion carries.

CHAIR CRIDER: Okay.

TRUSTEE SHELTON: Thank you. One more and then I'll move to my little private area over on the side.

CHAIR CRIDER: All right.

TRUSTEE SHELTON: We have proposed amendment to the university rules to delegate the authority, approve executive appointments of Deans, Associates and Assistant Deans of Academic Colleges to the President.

Therefore, be it resolved that the Board of Trustees of the University of the District of Columbia motion to -- the Committee has recommended this for approval and a motion for approval would be appreciated, so. I'm making the motion. I need a second.

DR. LYONS: Second.

TRUSTEE SHELTON: Thank you.
CHAIR CRIDER: It's been moved and second. Any discussion?

TRUSTEE FELTON: Can you just share --

TRUSTEE ASKEW: Madam Chair?

TRUSTEE FELTON: -- what is the issue here? I mean --

DR. LYONS: The --

TRUSTEE FELTON: -- you're saying that the Board would no longer approve appointments, that this would be all delegated to the president, correct?

CHAIR CRIDER: Not all appointments.

DR. LYONS: Not all appointments. But this is trying to bring our Board of Trustees into the operation that's pretty standard. And boards of trustees typically do not -- well, in fact, I shouldn't say typically. I don't know of any Board of Trustees that get into approving assistant deans.
Yes, so we're not suggesting that there will no longer be Board approval, but we're just trying to eliminate some positions from having to bring to the Board of Trustees.

TRUSTEE FELTON: And what is the rationale for including deans in that? You don't think that --

DR. LYONS: Well, the deans report to the Provost and the Chief Academic Officer. And the Provost reports to the President. So, you know, how many levels down does the Board want to go. And we're suggesting that the Board stop at deans.

TRUSTEE FELTON: Is it related to salary and compensation at all?

DR. LYONS: There is a salary issue. There is a salary level, I think, above which still come to the Board. But it isn't really about salary, it's about positions primarily.

TRUSTEE FELTON: Yes.

TRUSTEE ASKEW: Madam --
CHAIR CRIDER: Trustee Askew.

TRUSTEE ASKEW: Yes, thank you.

CHAIR CRIDER: Yes.

TRUSTEE ASKEW: So yes, and I agree. I mean, there was a good amount of conversation since. So let me just preface this with my comments have nothing to do with the associate deans and assistant deans.

I absolutely agree that in most institutions that I've taken a look at when I did some of the research, you don't have the Board engaged at a high level at that.

However, on a deans side, that is not necessarily the case. In fact, if you look at the American Council on trustees and alumni, if you look at a lot of other organizations now, that have expertise in education, they are saying that part of the board's fiduciary responsibility is to ensure that it has the right type of leadership in these positions.

It's not just second guess the
president to see who can second guess the
president, but it is to ensure that at the
higher levels, and particularly at the dean
level, that there is some level a board
working together with the president to ensure
together that that is the right thing to do.

I think the other thing is that, I
mean, we're not an institution that has a
whole lot of deans. And if we're doing what
we're supposed to be doing and getting the
deans that are here for the right reasons, we
won't see the level of turnover that we see
today.

I think part of our challenge, and
why I can see why the administration may want
to push some of this is because of just kind
of the instability in those positions that we
have had.

However, I mean, I think that
with, you know, I mean, given that we have a
strategic plan in front of us that talks about
making sure we have the highest level of
competency and expertise, I think that we actually would be going in another direction than some other institutions that are challenged with the same issues that we're challenged with.

Again, this has nothing to do, I absolutely agree, as it relates to the assistant deans and the associate deans, but I have not heard a compelling reason based on this institution and our infrastructure why the Board, again, as you know, the president was given great weight in all of this, right?

I mean, I just, you know, I just cast my individual vote for a CEO of a community college because I'm looking at people who are sitting at this desk who at least had an opportunity to have a conversation with that person.

So the likelihood that the president would recommend a dean that we're adamantly opposed to, in my view, is highly unlikely. And, in fact, I have not seen that
at this institution as of yet. Though I think
that we probably should have made some
different decisions in the past.

And again, that's, you know,
that's when you got to get into the highest
level of judgment within the leadership. So,
you know, it is for that reason, Mr. Chairman,
you know, I voiced concern last time because
when you took the dean out of the equation to
have Board input and approval, you actually
took out the ability for the faculty to have
input on the deans.

And I, along with others including
the Chair, thought that that was an important
part of the process, at least at the dean
level, not the associate dean. And it may
have input there, I just don't know as much on
that side.

But it is for those reasons, you
know, why I will be, you know, asking that we
retain our ability to have approval authority
along with the president for the dean
searches.

CHAIR CRIDER: Let me just ask you, Trustee Askew --

TRUSTEE ASKEW: Yes.

CHAIR CRIDER: -- in terms of the involvement or engagement of faculty, if they are included in the search teams --

TRUSTEE ASKEW: Yes.

CHAIR CRIDER: -- you don't see that as adequate involvement for them? How is the executive appointment process ensuring the engagement of faculty in terms of those dean appointments versus including them in the search committee process?

TRUSTEE ASKEW: So they've proposed that leading the deans --

CHAIR CRIDER: Yes.

TRUSTEE ASKEW: -- out as --

CHAIR CRIDER: Executive appointments.

TRUSTEE ASKEW: -- administrators --
CHAIR CRIDER: Yes.

TRUSTEE ASKEW: -- and so today,

it would be faculty involvement because you

would have to -- because they way where they

originally moved it --

CHAIR CRIDER: Yes.

TRUSTEE ASKEW: -- was to a

section. There's one section that said today,
as it exists, the president has to do a

national search for provost --

CHAIR CRIDER: Yes.

TRUSTEE ASKEW: -- and CEO and I

think there's some others.

CHAIR CRIDER: Yes.

TRUSTEE ASKEW: Right. And then

it goes on to say and shall involve the

faculty. Where they've moved it now -- and it

also requires that the Board ratify those

particular CEO, the dean and, I think, the

community college president.

CHAIR CRIDER: Yes.

TRUSTEE ASKEW: And again, so what
they did now, is they've moved it to an area
where the president may or may not do a
national search. All right.

And they had originally during our
committee review, we raised the issue, well,
okay, if you do that, then there's no mandate
that the faculty --

CHAIR CRIDER: Yes.

TRUSTEE ASKEW: -- have a role.

And so the General Counsel has now, since then
fixed that issue, but I'm going beyond that.

I think, again, because of the dean of our few
schools are such critical components to the
overall leadership of the institution, that
they really should be subject to Board,
working with the president, approval by the
Board.

TRUSTEE BELL: Question. Would
you be comfortable if the president, instead
of being made, was required to include the
faculty in review, but the president still had
the decision? At least way there could be
faculty input --

TRUSTEE ASKEW: Yes.

TRUSTEE BELL: -- to that process.

Would that make you feel better? Because you're right, right now it does say that he or she can decide or not decide to do it.

But if we change the language such that they are required to include the faculty, but that it's still his or her call as to whether or not the dean gets hired, does that make you feel better?

Because that gives the faculty input, but it also addresses the fact that once it come up here, it's probably not going to be rejected by the Board.

TRUSTEE ASKEW: Right. And I think they've done that because if you look at 212.5 --

TRUSTEE BELL: Yes.

TRUSTEE ASKEW: -- the last sentence, it says process shall include faculty and participation --
TRUSTEE BELL: Right.

TRUSTEE ASKEW: -- and shall be completed. So I think that they --

TRUSTEE BELL: Well, my part though, is that it has it in his discretion. It's in his or her discretion to have a search. If they do the search, they have to do the faculty. So all I'm saying is if --

TRUSTEE ASKEW: Oh.

TRUSTEE BELL: -- they're required to do the search --

TRUSTEE ASKEW: Yes.

TRUSTEE BELL: -- and we require them to have faculty input, but we still leave it up to him as to whether or not that person gets hired, does that address your concern?

TRUSTEE ASKEW: Well, I guess I may have read that paragraph a little bit differently --

CHAIR CRIDER: Yes, I'm --

TRUSTEE ASKEW: -- than you read it.
CHAIR CRIDER: -- thinking that, wait, something is different here. Because this basically says that these positions are subject to executive appointment, which comes through the Board, right? Executive appointments are done by the Board.

DR. LYONS: Well --

TRUSTEE SHELTON: 210.2

CHAIR CRIDER: I'm looking at --

TRUSTEE BELL: 212.5.

CHAIR CRIDER: -- 212.5.

TRUSTEE SHELTON: I know. But 210.2 says that the Executive Committee shall also review the qualifications of the appointee being considered prior to the appointment being made.

CHAIR CRIDER: I --

TRUSTEE SHELTON: Now, that's to believe.

CHAIR CRIDER: -- understand that. But 212.5 which follows that says the president, in his or her discretion, may
conducted a formal or informal search or provide
for a recruitment process to fill an academic
dean, associate dean or assistant dean
position by executive appointment.

The president doesn't do executive
appointments, right? Executive appointments
are done by the Board, right, or is he doing
the executive appointments?

TRUSTEE ASKEW: No, I think it
depends upon the position. Because some of
this, and actually, I'm off because my mind is
losing fast.

TRUSTEE FELTON: 210.1 says that
the President is authorized.

CHAIR CRIDER: Now, I know the
intent of this was to allow the president to
be able to make -- he is doing the, he or she
would be doing the executive appointments.

It is to allow the president to
appoint positions for deans and below. So it
would be to allow him to do those
appointments. We retain the ability --
COURT REPORTER: Turn on your microphone.

CHAIR CRIDER: -- to approve the provost, vice president, CEO of the college and of course the president and, basically, any C level appointments and the vice presidents and the Provost.

TRUSTEE BELL: I'd say that there's an inconsistency here in 212.1, how executive appointment is defined.

CHAIR CRIDER: Right.

TRUSTEE BELL: Because we intend for executive appointment to be the Provost, Community College CEO. And then, the associate and assistant deans under the proposal, as I understand, would not be included as an executive appointment. The debate that you're having is whether or not deans should be included as well.

TRUSTEE ASKEW: Right. And actually, it's getting a little bit more confusing now.
CHAIR CRIDER: It is.

TRUSTEE ASKEW: I mean, because

see this list right here --

CHAIR CRIDER: It's not --

TRUSTEE ASKEW: -- I mean, it is --

CHAIR CRIDER: Right.

TRUSTEE ASKEW: It's getting a little bit more confusing now, but because

they didn't take out associate deans --

TRUSTEE BELL: Right.

TRUSTEE ASKEW: -- and they didn't take out the deans.

TRUSTEE BELL: There's an inconsistency there.

CHAIR CRIDER: Well, I think the two that should have come out of 212.1 would have been the Provost and the Community College CEO because those would require our approval. But this speaks to the authority of the president.

What should have been in here was
deans of the college and associate and
assistant deans. And then your concern was
you didn't want deans in there.

TRUSTEE ASKEW: Right. I didn't
want -- right. Exactly.

CHAIR CRIDER: So I think this
section is --

TRUSTEE BELL: To be reworked.

CHAIR CRIDER: Yes. The language
is not what we were looking for. Where is HR?

So this language is different then what we've
been talking about here, again.

MS. BLANCHARD: 212.1?

CHAIR CRIDER: 212.1.

TRUSTEE BELL: Well, what they
tried to do, I think, is just say that with
respect to follow through, meaning --

TRUSTEE SCHWARTZ: 212.

TRUSTEE BELL: -- we would go on
to have the Executive Committee and ratified
by the Board.

MS. BLANCHARD: But the heading of
212 is executive appointment for academic administrators, which means the deans and the assistant and associate deans. If you look at the other section, it says none academic.

CHAIR CRIDER: Right, but within 212, there appear to be inconsistencies within Section 212.1 with what you've requested and what's written here.

What you all have requested was the ability of the president to appoint deans and below. You're included in 212.1 the Provost and the Community College CEO which are obviously higher than the dean level.

And then the question that's coming from Trustee Askew really relates to the dean because he believes that that's also an inappropriate --

MS. BLANCHARD: It state that at the top, but if you look at 212.3 --

CHAIR CRIDER: Right.

MS. BLANCHARD: -- it takes away -
TRUSTEE BELL: The other ones.
MS. BLANCHARD: -- the chief executive and the Provost and puts it at the Executive Committee level.
CHAIR CRIDER: Right.
MS. BLANCHARD: Then it then continues. It says that the president shall have then the authority to do the others.
CHAIR CRIDER: So you don't think that's confusing?
TRUSTEE FELTON: But that is --
TRUSTEE SHELTON: It's just --
TRUSTEE FELTON: -- confusing in 212.1.
TRUSTEE SHELTON: -- not consistent.
CHAIR CRIDER: Right.
TRUSTEE FELTON: So we need to eliminate something from 212.1.
DR. LYONS: Eliminate one or the other.
TRUSTEE BELL: I mean --
CHAIR CRIDER: Yes.

TRUSTEE BELL: -- it's unclear,

but I mean, the intent was to eliminate or to
require that the Provost and the CEO would be
the only ones coming to the Board. And that
everything else --

MS. BLANCHARD: Office of the --

TRUSTEE BELL: -- if you brought

it to the --

MS. BLANCHARD: -- OGC wanted to

clarify something.

TRUSTEE BELL: Yes, right?

MS. BLANCHARD: Because the point

I just making is correct that executive

appointment doesn't necessarily mean the

president. It is an appointment. It could be

by the president or it could be by the Board.

TRUSTEE ASKEW: We made the

assumption that executive appointments, again

--

CHAIR CRIDER: But I asked a few

minutes ago, who did executive appointments
and so I mean, I think that just creates even more discussion. If the executive appointment means any of us, the Board and/or the president, then this is probably more unclear than I thought it was.

MR. BARASH: Scott Barash, General Counsel. Executive appointment in Section 212 is intended to be a generic term for appointment of an executive, right?

So then it has the four categories listed, Provost, Deans, Associate Deans and Community College Chief Executive Officer. Then you go to 212.3, that says very clearly that the Provost and the Community College CEO shall be approved by the Executive Committee and ratified by the Board.

CHAIR CRIDER: Okay. But --

MR. BARASH: So, right? So that's clear?

CHAIR CRIDER: I understand that, Mr. General Counsel.

MR. BARASH: All right.
CHAIR CRIDER: However --

MR. BARASH: All right.

TRUSTEE THOMPSON: You know --

CHAIR CRIDER: And so --

TRUSTEE THOMPSON: -- it's very

wordy.

CHAIR CRIDER: -- how am I

supposed to --

TRUSTEE FELTON: Which one is

correct, there?

CHAIR CRIDER: Yes, exactly. So

if you're telling me that executive

appointment could be me and it could be him,

in this case you're saying I have to jump down
to the third provision to understand that in

d this case executive appointment is referring
to the Board for two positions.

But we've talked about executive

appointment in the leading paragraph, you

know. And I still think that the way they

used to teach me was the leading paragraph

really set the stage for everything. It told
you what was to follow.

Everything else was like window dressing to the main event, which was the first paragraph. It's been a long time since I took basic reading, but I think that still stands.

So for me, when you say here executive appointment and you list all four positions, it is unclear then, that what we're really doing is trying to separate out.

And I actually support the proposal, but it's got to be clear in here, Mr. President. I know what you're trying to do, but we need it to be clear so that there's no question about what we have and who is the executive that is doing the appointing at this point in time.

DR. LYONS: Madam Chair, I appreciate what both the gentle lady and the gentleman are saying, you know, because you're right, that was all we were trying to do.

Now, we didn't get into the issue
of faculty input because, at least in my thinking, there was never a question about faculty involvement in the search for a dean.

So we're really getting out there. And I guess, as we try to circle back and take this back home with us one more time --

TRUSTEE THOMPSON: Yes, and --

DR. LYONS: -- because --

TRUSTEE THOMPSON: -- clean it up.

DR. LYONS: -- if you read it and it isn't clear, then it isn't clear.

CHAIR CRIDER: Well, I think --

DR. LYONS: I mean, you know. And so the only question that remains for me then, at this point, is whether the deans would be included as a part of the group that the president approves or not. I mean --

CHAIR CRIDER: Right. So --

DR. LYONS: -- you know, and that--

CHAIR CRIDER: -- what I would suggest is that --
DR. LYONS: -- seems to be --

CHAIR CRIDER: -- we send it back
to committee --

DR. LYONS: Yes.

TRUSTEE BELL: The new committee.

CHAIR CRIDER: Yes, the new Operations Committee or actually, I think this is going to come under Academic and Affairs and Student Affairs, that combined committee to discuss this. And then bring it back in final form to us one more time to hopefully approve it.

And I think it allows some more concentrated vetting of Mr. Askew's concern with respect to the dean. You know, I really want us, as a Board, to be a high functioning board. And I want us to begin to focus less on day to day activity and more on what we should be focused on.

I'd also like to see us operate more like other universities. We have enough constraints that come from District Government
that we don't need to put constraints on ourselves that aren't needed. And so to the extent that, you know, we can, you know, reduce or eliminate some of the stuff that we do to ourselves, I think it would be appreciated. And so if this committee can take it back and bring it to us again in a form that really, at least considers it. I'm not saying that it has to give in on the deans, but at least the committee, I think, should talk about it and reach a resolution on what the committee wants to do and bring it back to the Board as a whole. And we can take it up again in November.

TRUSTEE SHELTON: That's a motion, Madam Chair.

TRUSTEE ASKEW: Second.

TRUSTEE SHELTON: Second, okay.

CHAIR CRIDER: Moved and second.

No further discussion.

TRUSTEE ASKEW: Okay.
CHAIR CRIDER: All in favor vote aye.

(Chorus of ayes)

TRUSTEE SHELTON: Okay. For the record, personal privilege, I'd to thank the HR. We've been trying to get these policies through and they have been tenacious and thorough and very supportive.

And I'd like to thank the Board Members who have taken the serious time it took to review this. This has been a very challenging opportunity and we've been working at it and we appreciate the effort of staff to get it done. Thank you.

CHAIR CRIDER: Okay. Great.

TRUSTEE BELL: Agreed.

CHAIR CRIDER: Next action item is the final rulemaking updated tuition structure for Community College, Flagship, Graduate and Law School students. Major General Schwartz.

TRUSTEE SCHWARTZ: Madam Chair,

the Student Affairs Committee provides this
resolution to Notice of Final Rulemaking to Chapter 7, updating tuition structure for the Community College, the Flagship and the Graduate students.

The foundation of this is based on D.C. code 38.1202, where the District of Columbia law provides for the Board of Trustees of the University of the District of Columbia to fix tuition and fees addition to tuition to be paid by residents and long resident students attending the university.

So whereas, the Board of Trustees of the University of the District of Columbia adopted under Resolution Number 2012-27 on June 13, 2012 a policy of increasing tuition by a rate of growth of the consumer price index plus the previous year plus one percent.

So operating under December 2013, we present this proposal for the increase of tuition. So we as the Student Affairs Committee met and considered this proposal. We present this to the Board of Trustees,
hereby adopts the Notice of Final Rulemaking
attached as incorporated.

Now, what I would like to do is to
go through by colleges, if you will, and
Flagship where those tuition increases are.

Community College Associate's degree granting
programs for the Washington D.C. resident, it
will be $102.50 per credit hour, the
metropolitan area residents is $172.20 per
hour and all other residents would be $290.08
per credit hour.

For the degree granting programs
for the Flagship, Washington D.C. residents is
$283.38 per credit hour, the metropolitan area
students is $327.80 per credit hour and all
other residents would be $594.30.

The Flagship Graduate degree
granting programs, Washington D.C. residents
would be $448.91 per credit hour, the
metropolitan area residents would be $508.12
per credit hour and all other residents would
be $863.46.
For the David A. Clarke Law School degree granting programs, full-time programs in the fall and spring semesters only, the Washington D.C. residents would be $5,310 and all other residents would be $10,620.

All other students, the Washington D.C. residents would be $360 per credit hour and all other residents would be $712.

So be it further resolved that the General Counsel is hereby directed to publish this Notice of Final Rulemaking in the D.C. register as soon as practicable. I hereby call for the vote.

CHAIR CRIDER: Okay.

DR. LYONS: Second.

CHAIR CRIDER: It's been moved and second. Discussions? I certainly have a -- oh, go ahead --

TRUSTEE FELTON: Oh no.

CHAIR CRIDER: -- Trustee --

TRUSTEE FELTON: Well, I just have a little --
CHAIR CRIDER: -- Felton.

TRUSTEE FELTON: -- clarification that I'm sure you've answered before. We have a general tuition full-time program student for law school, we do not have a general full-time price for our Flagship? At some point it's not just -- you take --

TRUSTEE SCHWARTZ: Yes, yes.

TRUSTEE FELTON: -- 12 hours or 15 or 18 hours, it used to be the same many years ago. But --

TRUSTEE SCHWARTZ: Right.

TRUSTEE FELTON: -- are we saying there is no cap? You just pay the hourly no matter how many hours you take?

TRUSTEE ASKEW: That shouldn't be what we're saying.

TRUSTEE SCHWARTZ: It caps at 12 hours.

TRUSTEE FELTON: Then it should have been told.

TRUSTEE ASKEW: Yes, it's capped
at 12 hours. What's the question again?

CHAIR CRIDER: Basically --

TRUSTEE FELTON: Is there a cap --

CHAIR CRIDER: -- what's the tuition for full-time --

TRUSTEE FELTON: -- for tuition --

CHAIR CRIDER: -- students.

TRUSTEE FELTON: -- for the --

TRUSTEE ASKEW: For?

TRUSTEE FELTON: -- Bachelor degree.

CHAIR CRIDER: It was 7,000-

something.

TRUSTEE FELTON: You know, like most tuitions would say --

TRUSTEE ASKEW: Right.

TRUSTEE FELTON: It says law school, right, I only pay 5,310.

CHAIR CRIDER: Somebody should be able to answer that question.

TRUSTEE FELTON: Does anybody know the answer to that?
DR. LYONS: Did you hear the question?

TRUSTEE ASKEW: For the full-time tuition --

TRUSTEE TARDD: Yes.

TRUSTEE ASKEW: -- that's the question.

TRUSTEE SCHWARTZ: Microphone.

TRUSTEE TARDD: Students who are taking 12 credits or more -- oh, I'm sorry.

COURT REPORTER: Someone got the time on that one.

TRUSTEE THOMPSON: Someone will say September of '09.

TRUSTEE ASKEW: Yes.

TRUSTEE FELTON: For students who are taking 12 or more credits, what is the full time tuition?

MR. RICKFORD: Oh, I thought I did it now. I don't know.

CHAIR CRIDER: Your lights not on.

MR. RICKFORD: It's still not on?
It depends on whether you're a resident or a non-resident. There are a range of rates if you are from out of state and so forth.

TRUSTEE TARDD: Exactly.

TRUSTEE FELTON: But this document doesn't show that.

CHAIR CRIDER: No.

MR. RICKFORD: I'm not sure what document you --

TRUSTEE FELTON: By why shouldn't the D.C. Law School, we say here's what full-time tuition costs. I just simply asked for the Undergraduate Flagship is there not a cap for full-time undergrads or do you just simply pay, there is no cap?

MR. RICKFORD: My understanding is that there is a cap in the number of credits you can take as a full-time student. And anything above that, I believe it's 15, that you pay additional money by credit hour, you know, so.

TRUSTEE THOMPSON: You could pay
that way --

TRUSTEE BELL: You could take 12
or so --

TRUSTEE THOMPSON: -- you don't --

(Simultaneous speaking)

MR. RICKFORD: That's my
understanding of the direction we're going.

CHAIR CRIDER: Okay. So what was
this now?

MR. RICKFORD: So to be full-time
it's 12. From the time you hit 12 hours, it's
full-time. Below that you're charged per
credit hour.

CHAIR CRIDER: Sorry. Trustee,
let me just see that for a second. Trustee
Tardd, on the website it does show essentially
our tuition. And currently --

TRUSTEE TARDD: Right.

CHAIR CRIDER: -- the
Undergraduate resident tuition 12 or more
credits, the total tuition, that's tuition and
fees, is $3,627.64. That's for, I guess, one
semester on this, so.

TRUSTEE TARDD: Full-time, that's about right.

CHAIR CRIDER: That would be a --

TRUSTEE TARDD: Yes.

CHAIR CRIDER: -- full-time student.

TRUSTEE TARDD: Yes, about 7,500.

Yes, that's right.

CHAIR CRIDER: So about $7,500 a year --

TRUSTEE TARDD: Yes, that's right.

CHAIR CRIDER: -- would be the full-time. Thank you, Ms. Franklin.

TRUSTEE FELTON: So I could go to law school cheaper.

CHAIR CRIDER: Exactly. So I have some issues --

TRUSTEE FELTON: Okay.

CHAIR CRIDER: -- with that.

TRUSTEE FELTON: So is it our intent not to clarify that so the students
would understand that there is a cap?

TRUSTEE SCHWARTZ: Yes, I think we'll have to do that and make sure that the FIS --

TRUSTEE FELTON: Right.

TRUSTEE SCHWARTZ: -- says that. And the FIS doesn't say that right now.

TRUSTEE FELTON: Okay.

CHAIR CRIDER: Also I have a question with respect to the Law School. I guess, I'm struck by a couple things here. One, the title does not include the Law School although, you know, Chapter 7 title, you know, was to the -- I'm sorry, on the resolution itself --

TRUSTEE SCHWARTZ: Yes, well --

CHAIR CRIDER: -- the Law School was not --

TRUSTEE SCHWARTZ: The resolution is okay.

CHAIR CRIDER: Yes, that did not include the Law School in that title. So I'm
not certain if we need to include the Law
School in that title?

TRUSTEE SCHWARTZ: Yes, Madam Chair.

CHAIR CRIDER: Okay.

TRUSTEE SCHWARTZ: We'll adjust
that to --

CHAIR CRIDER: Okay.

TRUSTEE SCHWARTZ: -- reflect the
Law School because the FIS also addresses the
Law School --

CHAIR CRIDER: Right.

TRUSTEE SCHWARTZ: -- fees, so
we'll have to --

CHAIR CRIDER: Yes.

TRUSTEE SCHWARTZ: -- adjust that.

CHAIR CRIDER: The second thing,
though, is that in the Notice of Final
Rulemaking we show -- don't let me assume, let
me ask the question. The fees that we show
here are the increased fees that we would
expect students to pay beginning in the
spring?

TRUSTEE SCHWARTZ: That is correct --

CHAIR CRIDER: Okay.

TRUSTEE SCHWARTZ: -- because we took the index in December of 2013, so right --

CHAIR CRIDER: Right.

TRUSTEE SCHWARTZ: -- and that's how the --

CHAIR CRIDER: Okay.

TRUSTEE SCHWARTZ: -- fees were determined.

CHAIR CRIDER: So the Law --

TRUSTEE SCHWARTZ: Yes.

CHAIR CRIDER: -- School fees are the same. The current spring semester, in the document here, your final rulemaking, you know, maybe that doesn't matter now because the FIS shows the Law School fees increasing which is what they should do. The Board voted to increase Law School fees as well.
TRUSTEE SCHWARTZ: That's correct, yes.

CHAIR CRIDER: And it shows that the Law School tuition beginning in the spring of '15 would be $5,443. This Notice of Final Rulemaking shows --

TRUSTEE SCHWARTZ: Does not.

$5,310, so we need to --

CHAIR CRIDER: Right. So which one is correct?

TRUSTEE SCHWARTZ: The FIS.

CHAIR CRIDER: Okay.

TRUSTEE SCHWARTZ: The FIS --

CHAIR CRIDER: So this would --

TRUSTEE SCHWARTZ: -- is correct.

CHAIR CRIDER: -- have to be changed --

TRUSTEE SCHWARTZ: That's correct.

CHAIR CRIDER: -- as well.

TRUSTEE SCHWARTZ: That's correct.

CHAIR CRIDER: Okay. Now, I wanted to make sure we weren't overlooking the
increase in Law School.

TRUSTEE ASKEW: So, Madam Chair,

so just --

CHAIR CRIDER: Yes.

TRUSTEE ASKEW: -- on that note,

though, what number did the proposed
rulemaking have in it? Because if the number
is wrong, you actually are going to probably
have to republish that number.

MS. MILLS: I'll have to look.

TRUSTEE ASKEW: Okay.

TRUSTEE FELTON: I'm sorry, what

was the answer?

TRUSTEE ASKEW: She'll have to

look. She'll just have to check.

MS. MILLS: I'll have to go and

verify to see what number was published --

CHAIR CRIDER: Okay.

MS. MILLS: -- and then get back
to you.

CHAIR CRIDER: Okay.

TRUSTEE SCHWARTZ: And this
appears that there are several numbers that
need to be looked at within the resolution.
Not only the Law School, but full-time and
part-time Law School numbers that need to be
reworked. And there is no part-time Law
School in the resolution that I can see.

CHAIR CRIDER: All right. That's
correct.

TRUSTEE SCHWARTZ: So we need to
rework the resolution to reflect the numbers
in the FIS --

CHAIR CRIDER: Okay.

TRUSTEE SCHWARTZ: -- and make
sure that what we've published are --

CHAIR CRIDER: He needs to review
these numbers.

TRUSTEE SCHWARTZ: -- consistent.

CHAIR CRIDER: So are you going to
pull this?

TRUSTEE SCHWARTZ: I'm going to
pull the resolution until --

CHAIR CRIDER: Okay.
TRUSTEE SCHWARTZ: -- the numbers

balance with the FIS.

CHAIR CRIDER: Trustee Felton.

TRUSTEE FELTON: I guess I'm

concerned that we may not be able to wait

until November. We may have to say approval

and clarify which number, I don't know.

CHAIR CRIDER: I'm probably not --

TRUSTEE FELTON: I don't know.

CHAIR CRIDER: -- comfortable with

that, General. I mean, usually I'm okay, but

I think I want to know that the numbers that

we --

TRUSTEE FELTON: Are correct.

CHAIR CRIDER: -- are correct. We

could --

TRUSTEE FELTON: You don't think

November's too late, though?

CHAIR CRIDER: -- do it by

executive committee --

TRUSTEE FELTON: Okay. All right.

CHAIR CRIDER: -- and then have it
ratified by the --

TRUSTEE FELTON: That's fine.

CHAIR CRIDER: -- full board.

TRUSTEE FELTON: Okay. I'm comfortable with that.

TRUSTEE SCHWARTZ: Okay.

CHAIR CRIDER: We can do that.

Okay. So we're going to pull that.

TRUSTEE SCHWARTZ: We're going to pull that and then if we --

CHAIR CRIDER: Yes, and --

TRUSTEE SCHWARTZ: -- can work to get this --

CHAIR CRIDER: -- if we have to --

TRUSTEE SCHWARTZ: -- redone as soon as --

CHAIR CRIDER: Yes, we need to --

TRUSTEE SCHWARTZ: -- possible.

TRUSTEE ASKEW: We're going to need to do it again.

CHAIR CRIDER: Yes, we need to do this quickly because if we --
TRUSTEE SCHWARTZ: Yes.

CHAIR CRIDER: -- have to republish then that means --

TRUSTEE SCHWARTZ: Yes.

CHAIR CRIDER: -- the start of the 30-day clock --

TRUSTEE SCHWARTZ: Yes.

CHAIR CRIDER: -- all over again --

TRUSTEE SCHWARTZ: Right. Right.

CHAIR CRIDER: -- and --

TRUSTEE SCHWARTZ: But once the General --

CHAIR CRIDER: -- everything.

TRUSTEE SCHWARTZ: -- Counsel has verified that the numbers are correct, you know.

CHAIR CRIDER: Yes, I know. Yes, we wanted to do this in January.

TRUSTEE BELL: Yes.

CHAIR CRIDER: We've got to move quickly.
TRUSTEE SCHWARTZ: So if we can do it by Executive Committee --

CHAIR CRIDER: Yes, we can do it --

TRUSTEE SCHWARTZ: -- I'll decide to go up there.

CHAIR CRIDER: -- by Executive Committee.

TRUSTEE SCHWARTZ: Yes.

CHAIR CRIDER: Okay. Okay. I think those were all of the action items, which are now, don't forget, that's everything we're moving in action tonight, right?

DR. LYONS: We didn't discuss the tuition rate for the --

CHAIR CRIDER: We were going to do that one in November. Okay. One of the things that we are trying to avoid all these last minute additions and things to the agenda, so.

DR. LYONS: So you're going back to the Committee.
CHAIR CRIDER: Yes, so now, if you can go back to the committees. These reports should be brief because it looks like all the meat was taken up by the actual action items that we had today.

And I just want to emphasize that when we get our committees formed, I really hope to see that most of the work that we do is done at that committee level, so that a lot of the discussions that we have, the back and forth, is really covered at the committee level.

And that reports are done in a way that the full Board is comfortable that these issues have been fully vetted and we are prepared to take a vote and we don't have to spend, you know, 30 minutes on one topic because it's just not clear to us what has happened.

And that certainly goes to a lot better or more preparation by the administration in bringing stuff to us, Mr.
President.

TRUSTEE ASKEW: Stacy said she found --

CHAIR CRIDER: Stacy found it?

Okay.

MS. MILLS: The tuition rates for the Law School were published with the increase, so the oversight is on the resolution, not on the publication.

CHAIR CRIDER: Okay.

MS. MILLS: So the Law School was $5,443 for Washington D.C. residents and $10,886 for all other residents.

CHAIR CRIDER: Okay. And what about the part-time question that was raised?

TRUSTEE ASKEW: Is that the last category?

MS. MILLS: Is that the last --

TRUSTEE ASKEW: It says on the --

TRUSTEE SCHWARTZ: Other students.

TRUSTEE ASKEW: Yes, other students.
MS. MILLS: All other students?

TRUSTEE SCHWARTZ: Yes, that's on 720.6.

TRUSTEE ASKEW: Yes.

MS. MILLS: Yes. So no, it's not the last category. So that's also on there. It's $369 for Washington D.C. residents and $738 for all other residents.

TRUSTEE ASKEW: But is that for the Law School part-time?

MS. MILLS: Yes.

TRUSTEE ASKEW: Oh, it is. Okay.

DR. LYONS: So the rulemaking has taken into account the increase?

MS. MILLS: Yes.

DR. LYONS: So the resolution is what has the --

TRUSTEE SCHWARTZ: That's correct.

DR. LYONS: -- incorrect numbers.

MS. MILLS: Correct.

TRUSTEE SCHWARTZ: So --

DR. LYONS: So we can deal with
that a lot easier to correct the --

TRUSTEE SCHWARTZ: Madam Chair,
then, if we can then vote for the modification
to the resolution --

CHAIR CRIDER: Okay.

TRUSTEE SCHWARTZ: -- based upon
what was published and the FIS, I think we can
move forward with this.

TRUSTEE FELTON: Second.

DR. LYONS: Right.

CHAIR CRIDER: Okay. It's been
moved and second.

TRUSTEE SCHWARTZ: Discussions?

CHAIR CRIDER: Any further
discussion? So just to be clear, we are
moving and have second approval of the updated
tuition structure for the Community College,
Flagship, Graduate students and David A.
Clarke School of Law.

TRUSTEE SCHWARTZ: And all other
students.

CHAIR CRIDER: And that we will
correct in the final resolution the David A. Clarke School of Law tuition statements as they were here to be corrected --

TRUSTEE SCHWARTZ: Right.

CHAIR CRIDER: -- according to the FIS and what was published in the --

TRUSTEE SCHWARTZ: Published, that's correct.

CHAIR CRIDER: -- final rulemaking.

TRUSTEE SCHWARTZ: Yes.

CHAIR CRIDER: And we'll also be clear that the 728.6 is part-time Law School students.

TRUSTEE ASKEW: Correct.

CHAIR CRIDER: And I think --

TRUSTEE SCHWARTZ: Yes.

CHAIR CRIDER: -- those were --

TRUSTEE SCHWARTZ: Yes.

CHAIR CRIDER: -- all of the corrections --

TRUSTEE SCHWARTZ: That's --
CHAIR CRIDER: -- we were looking at.

TRUSTEE SCHWARTZ: Yes, ma'am.

CHAIR CRIDER: Okay. All in favor of approving this with those corrections vote aye.

(Chorus of ayes)

CHAIR CRIDER: Any opposed or abstentions? That motion carries as well.

Thank you. Okay. So we can go back to the regular agenda now. We'll have the report of the President.

DR. LYONS: Thank you, Madam Chair. In the interest of time, I want to move right to what I'm calling a special topic. And we have our Assistant Provost here tonight, Mr. Dwight Sanchez, who's going to talk to us about enrollment management. Okay.

MR. SANCHEZ: Dwight Sanchez, Assistant Provost for enrollment management.

Good evening, everyone. In front of you there's a document, which I conceived.
And there's six pages, but if we can quickly just go to the fifth page, so I don't keep you very long. You will see, basically, the four objectives or areas of focus for me and my unit. Yes.

TRUSTEE ASKEW: You're talking about which document?

MR. SANCHEZ: Yes.

DR. LYONS: Which document?

MR. SANCHEZ: Okay, sir. Right.

On Page 5, I want you to think of this as a praxis, basically an operational guide relative to how I plan to ameliorate with the help of my directors, increasing enrollment, maintaining retention and ultimately, rather, let's just say creating a new dynamic recruitment approach to how we find our niche, how we cultivate those 20/20 students and the kind of nuances that's going to place us as an institution of chose for all prospects nationally and globally.

So number one, as you saw in terms
of a strategic enrollment plan, the enrollment manager has to conceive a guide that focuses on increase yield, inquiry, application and ultimately a demographic approach to the student body.

So I identified six actionable items, one, of course, is the dynamic recruitment plan, the others, a robust communication plan, a predictive modeling tool.

Let me give you an example of that quickly, so you can understand what that means. So let's use the three Board of Trustees member right there, Trustee Thompson, Trustee Shelton and Trustee Askew.

If they were to apply to UDC the recruitment counselors now, would have conversations with them. We would actually time their application stages.

So for example, if Trustee Thompson applied tonight, but 30 days from now she submitted just one document to the
application versus Trustee Shelton who applied yesterday and by the 15th day submitted all of the application versus Trustee Askew who applied three days from now and 90 days after that point hasn't submitted anything.

It would allow us to prioritize our applicant pool and actually designate a strategic cultivation and engagement approach towards yielding those two students and then allowing, what we call a case load methodology, increasing and implementing an eight plan or eight prong approach of communication that does not only include the Office of Admissions, but also calls for the faculty, peer to peer contact and also other offices within the university to appeal to the student to ask the question, why UDC.

That's the predictive tool that I'm going to also implement. That also allows for the Office of Financial Aid to even consider the notion of what we call leveraging.
So for example again, if Trustee Thompson has a 3.5 and she has Federal aid, but we have scholarship, what I'm going to do is make sure she applies for Federal aid first to see if it's fully covered and if it's not, then I'm going to use institutional money to leverage her to complete the matriculation process.

Whereas as Trustee Shelton has a 2.5 and he has all the aid, what I'm going to do to incentivize him is complete this semester, get a 3.5 next semester, you're eligible for scholarship.

So this scientific approach allows us to really streamline who is the right fit for UDC from an academic and a financial aid standpoint. And then it also allows us to understand the academic needs of each of these students who apply.

So another example, not to sound rather all over the place, so the eight steps I told you in the recruitment process, at the
level six the academic advising unit will then
engage each applicant to create what we call
a pre-advise-ment portfolio.

That would allow the Office of
Admissions, the Office of Financial Aid and
even the faculty to whom that, rather, the
area of which the student is interested to
prepare for that student academically, so that
we can also think pre-retention strategies to
intervene and to make sure that that student
completes his or her intended degree major.

So those are the kind of things
I'm going to be implementing in the
recruitment approach. I'm sorry if I'm
speaking rather quickly.

The other methodology is a social
media approach. So a part of the eight prong,
the sixth, seventh and eighth prong will be
social media, rather being nimble in
communicating information and allowing us to
be more responsive than rather waiting on the
prospect.
Lastly, a vibrant on and off campus experience. So typically what that means, Trustees, is that we have open houses. We have admitted days. What I want to do now, is called, rather, add to the open houses and the spring open houses, what we call advisement days.

So once the students have been admitted, they come to campus and they spend a day where they actually go and sit in classrooms and see what a classroom experience is before coming to campus.

They meet with the academic units to go through their pre-advisement counseling. So that by August comes around, we're not waiting to see who's going to yield, but we have a clear picture of what the potential yield is and what we need to have in place before they come to be proactive and preventative, if that makes sense.

That's just the recruitment effort alone. Then if you look at the second point,
I'm talking about increasing their tuition revenue through improving the proportion of entering students capable of paying most or all of the unsubsidized tuition.

So what I'm going to do now with the appropriation of the Provost is basically looking at the four growth areas for the District of Columbia.

That is ultimately international students at the domestic level and also across seas, which are the undergraduate and the graduate level with the capacity to pay.

Then I'm going to be looking for diverse students at the high school level who needs some assistance, but also have what we call third party assistance to come to the institution.

Then of course, I'm going to continue going after the domestic population who relies heavily upon the Pell Grant. But I'm trying to diversify those pipelines so that we can start working towards achieving
NTR, net tuition revenue, and what that actually looks like for the University of the District of Columbia, if that makes sense to you.

Then in terms of improving retention rate and completion --

TRUSTEE FELTON: Excuse me.

MR. SANCHEZ: -- where the --
sorry. Am I going too fast?

TRUSTEE FELTON: No, no, that's all right.

MR. SANCHEZ: Okay. With improving the retention rate and completion rate, we hired a new director. What we need to do, which we don't have currently, is a retention plan.

We're going to focus on retention and progression. That allows us to identify four areas which nationally students begin to attrit.

It's either academic, it's more traditional, it's psycho-social and financial.
Again, at the recruitment point, we're supposed to be able to project which one of these issues would highly impact the progression.

Progression is from one year to another, persistence is semester to semester. So putting all of these things together would allow me to report to the President and the Provost and ultimately you from year to year moving forward what the likely yield is going to be with much certainty rather than waiting haphazardly to see who yields, if that makes sense.

And then also putting into play a retention plan that is even intrusive and interloping. Intrusive in the sense that moving forward, which will be going to the Provost for authorization, is allowing the requirement to put in place for every freshman to now meet with an academic advisor three times a semester, fall and then three times in the spring.
That allows us to look at academic progress, that allows us to evaluate financial need, to see the likelihood of you coming back the following semester or year. Those are just little granular examples to give you an understanding of how I'm thinking in ameliorating this issue.

Then lastly, it's the modification of the environmental climate. What that means is I want to really understand the perception of our external influences in terms of the District of Columbia.

How do they see us, not necessarily in consideration of the negative or pejorative image, but really what do we really have to offer academically.

And then what is the experience like for students once they enter the door until graduation. That's what I want to consider.

Then I also want to understand what is the classroom experience like and what
are what we call the social experiences as a student interacting with other students, a student interfacing with administrators, a student interfacing with operational units to be serviced accordingly.

So these are the areas that I will focus on that I think are very primary to essentially yielding a strategic enrollment plan that will in essence tell us what we need to do and how the enrollment is going to look four to five years from now, if that makes sense.

So I just try to condense it as best I could to give you an understanding of how I'm thinking and how I'm going to employ the services of the directors who are currently in place.

And then, as you can see, the critical next steps for implementation of ultimately is the establishment of a strategic enrollment committee, unveiling a customer service plan, a blueprint for transfer
students because that's one of our growth areas and then ultimately the vertical alignment which has already been completed.

And what that means, so you can understand, and rather I continue with the lingo of enrollment management, vertical alignment is again, using the three Trustees as example, the recruiter who recruits them is the person's who's responsible for making sure they are no longer inquiry, they become applicants, they've been decided upon.

After that it's the responsibility of the Admissions Council to take that caseload of decided upon students to the financial aid counselor who's responsible for that case load.

So from now on parents or external influences who has information about a particular student is going to be on a case load.

So if I recruited him, he's going to call for Dwight, but if he's been decided
upon, then he needs to go to James, who's that financial aid counselor.

Once we've done the financial awarding, then James will then transfer that to Timothy Hatchett in academic advising, who's now responsible for the academic advising.

So in theory and in practice, you're supposed to only be speaking to three people in the recruitment approach until matriculation at which point then you engage faculty and other university offices.

And that is to prevent, in theory, the student going from office to office to office and we're basically, intentionally controlling it in that regard. So that's a vertical alignment, if that makes sense to you. Okay.

And then ultimately the operational manual for each office, and I always make this joke because it has happened to me, at which point the Provost decides
she's tired of me, the next person who comes
into play has to have a plan where he or she
can take it from where I left it.

And that is going to be a
requirement for all of the directors in
Financial Aid and all of the other offices, so
that we have a plan of action that is
consistent and continuous, rather than
somebody coming in and always trying to change
it and there's no stability and no focus
forward, if that makes sense.

And then lastly in conjunction
with the Office of Advancement is conceive a
marketing plan that is going to focus on those
growth areas.

And my goal is to being that
conversation and ultimately yield with a
piece, which is what we call it in enrollment,
a marketing piece that focuses on the areas
that I enumerated for you. So this is my plan
in theory and in practice and now I will
entertain your questions if you have any.
TRUSTEE THOMPSON: Nurse?

CHAIR CRIDER: Trustee Felton.

TRUSTEE FELTON: Well, we've been energized.

TRUSTEE THOMPSON: We've needed you for you very long time.

TRUSTEE FELTON: Very ambitious.

I may have missed the earlier comments --

MR. SANCHEZ: Okay.

TRUSTEE FELTON: -- but I think the plan makes the assumption that there's this great potential of students who are interested in coming here. And can you just comment on --

MR. SANCHEZ: Yes.

TRUSTEE FELTON: -- the marketing to get people to even consider this institution --

MR. SANCHEZ: Okay.

TRUSTEE FELTON: -- or your comments, maybe you're already --

MR. SANCHEZ: Sure.
TRUSTEE FELTON: -- there.

MR. SANCHEZ: So we have, let me --
- I'm theorizing here, but I'm also becoming
because of experience. So when it comes to
the University of the District of Columbia you
roughly have 7,000 applications annually.

But like I disclosed to the
President and the Provost, only half of those
applications are really real applications.
And then in the Office of Financial Aid, of
those who submitted a FASFA, you have an
additional 3,500 who have indicated the
institution as a choice option, but never
applied.

So when you put those numbers and
the actual 3,500, you only have a pool of
roughly 6,000 students who are really, in
theory, have considered us as an option.

So what that tells me as the
enrollment manager is we don't necessarily
have to have 10,000 applicants or 15,000
applicants to yield a class.
What we have to do is find our niche. And to answer your question, there is a niche of students who are interested in the University of the District of Columbia.

Where we have fallen short fall in two areas. Ready for this, real recruiting and real cultivating of the students who are really interested because they apply and then we lose them after 30 to 90 days because in 15 days of application 18 universities, in theory, will attack or try.

I like to use the word attack because you're getting information. So, for example, you would apply to UDC, you will a traditional responding email saying we got your application and these are the things you need to submit, nothing more outside of that.

Whereas if you apply to American, Georgetown or any other HBC's for that matter, not only do you get the primary acknowledgment or receipt of the application and then the next steps which you get somebody to call you.
Then you get somebody else from another office to engage you because what you're trying to do is understand what it is it will take to get you to yield, which is what I'm trying to get us to understand how to do that, if that makes sense.

CHAIR CRIDER: It sure does.

TRUSTEE TARDD: Do you have any numeric goals?

MR. SANCHEZ: What?

TRUSTEE TARDD: Numeric goals?

MR. SANCHEZ: Well, I told the President for spring my goal is to bring us an additional 1,055. That's 650 for the community college, 350 for the Flagship and 55 Graduate students for a total of 1,055. Yes.

TRUSTEE ASKEW: Yes, you know --

CHAIR CRIDER: That's aggressive.

TRUSTEE ASKEW: Yes, I mean, that is aggressive and I applaud you and, you know, this plan in theory. And we hope in practice it actually works. But I don't think, like
you said, I don't know if we've had a plan in theory --

CHAIR CRIDER: We haven't.

TRUSTEE ASKEW: -- before, as well or as articulated and set out as you have today. So I applaud you for stepping up to the plate and at least putting together, you know, what I think most of us think could, you know, lead to some real results.

You know, I was looking in the presidential report, you know, in the enrollment section and if you read that, we're already offline on our vision 2020.

I mean, you have a 11 percent decrease in the community college, which I just can't -- I mean, 10 percent. I think it was 10 percent --

CHAIR CRIDER: Yes.

TRUSTEE ASKEW: -- which actually just kind of blows up away.

MR. SANCHEZ: Yes.

TRUSTEE ASKEW: Because we started
off with enrollment at levels that were significantly at least one or two years higher than the Flagship.

MR. SANCHEZ: Right.

TRUSTEE ASKEW: And the Law School numbers, which you didn't speak to, so I assume that we're going to see the Law School present something to us that is similar to what you presented, you know.

So I mean, you know, you've got the plan and with all these plans there's the resources that you're going to need to put behind it.

I mean, because you're talking about, I mean, really touching students where they are. And this plan as good as it is, it's, you know, it's a matter of making sure you've got the resources --

MR. SANCHEZ: Right.

TRUSTEE ASKEW: -- to implement the plan. And I know you'll be working directly, I mean, that's why the president
brought him on because, you know, he is going
to be working with you and his administration
to make sure you've got the resources to do it.

I mean, and I'm glad, I was going
to ask the question, you know, so why do you
think, you know, the university has not been
as successful.

And you quickly pointed out that
we haven't had a recruitment strategy, a real
one at least --

MR. SANCHEZ: Right.

TRUSTEE ASKEW: -- and a retention
strategy.

MR. SANCHEZ: Well, if I may speak
in terms of resources --

TRUSTEE ASKEW: Yes.

MR. SANCHEZ: -- and I don't say
this rather imprudently --

TRUSTEE ASKEW: Yes.

MR. SANCHEZ: -- especially for
the University of the District of Columbia.
You don't need a lot of money, what you need, and I've shared this with the Director of Academic Advising, is you need someone to really pick up the phone --

DR. LYONS: Watch out now. We'll send you over to him.

TRUSTEE ASKEW: Yes, yes, yes --

MR. SANCHEZ: Oh, no, no --

TRUSTEE ASKEW: -- yes, you've been.

MR. SANCHEZ: No, no, I'm getting to the actual work.

CHAIR CRIDER: I'll get you a brother.

TRUSTEE ASKEW: Yes, yes. Yes, yes, you better.

MR. SANCHEZ: No, but let me take you to the work.

TRUSTEE ASKEW: Where's that meaning? You'd better be careful.

MR. SANCHEZ: Yes, results, right.

What I'm getting at is this. What I'm getting
at is this.

    DR. LYONS: You were doing all
right up until that point. You were really on
the roll.

    MR. SANCHEZ: Okay. No, but my
point was, not that we do need money, but my
point is first, for spring in particular,
which is how I'm going to be able to test even
the first part of the plan, is this case load
methodology.

    We need people who come to work
everyday, pick up the phone, cultivate,
follow-up, stick to it and then begin to
assess what we're doing.

    That is what we need and we don't
currently have that fully. And I'm working to
get that. I'm working to get that in place,
you know.

    And I'm also working with the
Financial Aid Office, who have done a good
job, even where it is right now, to award our
students.
But they too, have to be able to do what we call financial aid counseling, meaning pick up the phone and tell Mary Jane, hey Mary Jane, you got 3,500. This is how much you need, this is how much we'll give you.

This amount is timed so when you come to campus you're not shocked or surprised. But even if you do, we still are going to counsel you. So it's as much of doing it and doing it fully and not haphazardly. So that's where I'm coming from in terms of the resource which I'm trying to align to competency in that regard.

TRUSTEE ASKEW: Yes, and I don't know how you got your numbers with your goal, but I'm glad you said 55 and it should be plus Grad member students. I mean, because I've always said, and I think a lot of members of the Board have always said that, I mean, there's significant room for growth in our graduate programs.
MR. SANCHEZ: What I did for the Graduate program is I did a regression analysis and I looked at what you did for the past three years.

TRUSTEE ASKEW: Yes.

MR. SANCHEZ: And I looked at the based on what the Provost has disclosed to me, the areas for growth in the Graduate school.

TRUSTEE ASKEW: Yes.

MR. SANCHEZ: And which program has the capacity for spring first. And I went from that perspective. Then for next fall, we're looking to increase that by 3.5 percent for the Graduate program itself because there's much growth there, but at the domestic graduate and international graduate levels.

TRUSTEE ASKEW: All right. Yes, so now, you know, because the goal -- and again, and I just say this because it's just a part of our plan. I mean, our goal is five percent growth on an annual basis until --

MR. SANCHEZ: 3.5.
TRUSTEE ASKEW: What?

MR. SANCHEZ: 3.5.

TRUSTEE ASKEW: Well, I'm just saying in the --

CHAIR CRIDER: The strategic plan.

TRUSTEE ASKEW: -- strategic plan, vision 2020 --

CHAIR CRIDER: It is --

TRUSTEE ASKEW: -- it's --

CHAIR CRIDER: -- five percent.

TRUSTEE ASKEW: -- five percent each year. And again, I mean, which is why I'm just trying to make sure that we're communicating in the best way. Because I believe this whole student enrollment process, both from recruitment to admission to retention to graduation --

MR. SANCHEZ: Right.

TRUSTEE ASKEW: -- to a job is really all the components to a true, in my view, you know, plan for achieving success. Because if we're retaining them and they're
not graduating --

MR. SANCHEZ: Right.

TRUSTEE ASKEW: -- you know we still have a problem. If we are graduating them and they can't get a job, we're still having problems. So the metrics that you talk about really will be critical --

MR. SANCHEZ: Right.

TRUSTEE ASKEW: -- for us to assess our successes as well as areas where we need to give some focus. I already know that if you're at 3.5 percent, I mean, there's already some financial adjustments that we're going to have to make --

MR. SANCHEZ: Right.

TRUSTEE ASKEW: -- associated with that. And I think that is in some of the Chief Financial Officer's fiscal impact.

But again, I haven't seen this level of energy and I have not seen this level of detail summarized in a very concise and understandable way. So I appreciate you for
doing that and look forward for other
presentations in the future.

MR. SANCHEZ: Okay. Thank you.

CHAIR CRIDER: I have just a
couple of quick -- I'm sorry, did you have
something to --

TRUSTEE SHELTON: No, I'll just
wait. Mine would be after you.

CHAIR CRIDER: You can go ahead.

TRUSTEE SHELTON: Okay. I just
want to say to the team we're all here to get
students into the university. Your roles and
your presentation here this evening suggests
that you have the ability to achieve the goals
of your leader.

Please stick together and bring
our kids here, please. Okay? And good luck
and if there's anything we can do, please let
us know through your boss.

CHAIR CRIDER: Trustee Thompson,
did you have something or you're --

TRUSTEE THOMPSON: I just think
that we have needed you for such a long time.

And there's nothing that will get students
here more quickly than individual contact.

They need guidance from day one to
four years later. They need consistent help
from staff on a regular basis, not just in HR,
not just in the finance office, they need it
from their professors. So I take my hat off
to you.

MR. SANCHEZ: Thank you.

CHAIR CRIDER: I just have a
couple quick questions --

MR. SANCHEZ: Yes, ma'am.

CHAIR CRIDER: -- for you. And
one of them, I certainly enjoyed the
statistical information that you have in the
report here. In particular, where it cites
the Almanac of Higher Educations projections
for enrollment increases in higher education.
And --

MR. SANCHEZ: Yes.

CHAIR CRIDER: -- I wanted to
know, one, what tools or strategies will you
use to attract or get our share of the diverse
population that is arrayed here --

MR. SANCHEZ: Yes.

CHAIR CRIDER: -- or, you know,
what kinds of tools or strategies will you
need. If you haven't developed them yet, at
some point I assume you will bring that to us
just so we'll be informed of what you're
doing.

But I'm happy to see that, if I
heard you correctly, you do plan to look at
diverse populations as well. And as we see
here, you know, we certainly have in this
city, a diverse population that we can recruit
from.

MR. SANCHEZ: Right.

CHAIR CRIDER: So I'm excited to
hear you say that. That includes the top
three populations in here are all populations
that, I think, are consistent with our mission
--
MR. SANCHEZ: Right.

CHAIR CRIDER: -- for the most part, at least two of the three anyway.

DR. LYONS: Madam Chair, just though I'd -- his last name is Sanchez.

CHAIR CRIDER: I understand.

DR. LYONS: Okay.

CHAIR CRIDER: Yes. I'm happy to hear that. That's why we have two on the Board in that regard. But I'm being sincere about that, you know. I'm really excited to see that we're going to put some effort in recruiting more diverse populations --

TRUSTEE THOMPSON: Absolutely.

CHAIR CRIDER: -- number one.

Number two, which may not be quite as pretty a question, but when you came before us the last time, you know, one of the things that you talked about, which, you know, I appreciate openness and transparency and, you know, honesty and all of those things.

And what you showed us the last
time was a report that dealt with the A133 audit findings.

MR. SANCHEZ: Yes.

CHAIR CRIDER: And what it showed was that the majority of those findings had nothing to do with the, what's our system called, with Banner, but it really had to do with people errors and the people, you know.

And I guess, with all of these great things that you've proposed to do in the plan, how will you, at the same time, manage things so that those errors, which are largely people errors, go away and we don't continue to be plagued with these deficiencies in our A133 audit.

I was happy. It was like a breath of fresh air to really get an understanding of what we faced and what they found in those audits.

MR. SANCHEZ: Well, firstly, is Kris Riegle here? No, she's gone. Well, I wanted to mention her because she's helping me
with the recruitment of people with adequate work experience and to demonstrate that those work experience translates to success related to working with the CRM, such as Banner.

And then when we bring them in, because I have experience with it, both on the financial aid and the admissions end, I ask very granular, very operational and very technical questions that all have to do with accountability, engagement and assessment.

So for example, the directors now, when I, because I'm now their manager, moving forward a part of the evaluation plan for the directors --

CHAIR CRIDER: Yes.

MR. SANCHEZ: -- has to with two things, how they use it for the purposes that I've outlined and how are they holding their team accountable.

CHAIR CRIDER: Very good.

MR. SANCHEZ: And then what is the secondary and tertiary levels of, how should
I say, accountability. So I did something, then you check it off, then somebody else checks it off before it comes to me to make sure that these things are in place. That's we're starting to do in the enrollment unit.

CHAIR CRIDER: Yes.

MR. SANCHEZ: The other thing is, something that they have not done recently, is every Monday and Friday the directors send me two reports.

One is a very formal report and in it I asked them exactly to report all deficiencies that has to do with personnel or even just operational.

And then I respond to them and say, well, you could do this. And then why are you only waiting now to do this and what is your plan moving forward because I put it back on them. And then I let him or her know that it's not really Mary Jane, because she's under your purview. It's you who have to model.
CHAIR CRIDER: Yes.

MR. SANCHEZ: So I set the tone and I model for them to basically permeate the environment which I manage. So that's how I'm doing all of that, if that makes sense to you.

CHAIR CRIDER: Yes, absolutely.

MR. SANCHEZ: Yes. Yes.

TRUSTEE THOMPSON: Very good sense.

CHAIR CRIDER: Trustee --

TRUSTEE ASKEW: Yes.

CHAIR CRIDER: -- Askew.

TRUSTEE ASKEW: Just one other point and probably question. I mean the other thing as you look for a diverse group of students base, to me that you have to look at it as the District's only public institution of higher learning.

You know, it really is, you know, where's our need the greatest. I mean, when you look at certain wards with the District of Columbia and you look at the unemployment
rates because they don't have, you know,
certain either skills or academic experiences.

You got them, you know, as a part
of this whole discussion about diversity. And
making sure we're serving the District of
Columbia in the best way and I hope that you
are also looking where some of the -- I mean,
the need is across the city for sure.

But there are certain areas that
are more in urgent need than others. And
these are people where really the issue is not
necessarily capacity --

MR. SANCHEZ: Right.

TRUSTEE ASKEW: -- because they
haven't been given the information in order to
deliver it back, you know. But it is an issue
of strategically thinking how do you go to
recruit someone who's never been told that
education can change your quality of life.

MR. SANCHEZ: Right.

TRUSTEE ASKEW: So you've got to
have a program that's designed around that
because not everybody is going to come to the institution and say, hey, you know, I want to learn more about it. I mean, because they don't know to do that.

MR. SANCHEZ: Right.

TRUSTEE ASKEW: And, in fact, they fear it because they don't believe the financial resources are there or, you know, they just have an insecure feeling about their ability to be successful, you know, in a higher education.

And of course, you know, the beauty of this institution is that we go from, you know, workforce development programs that, you know, to Associate's degrees to Bachelor's degree to Graduate degree, to law school. So we can be a resource for, you know, probably most, if not all, of our population here in D.C.

CHAIR CRIDER: Yes.

MR. SANCHEZ: Yes.

CHAIR CRIDER: Okay. Any other --
TRUSTEE FELTON: I just want to comment then, and I'm sure you've looked at this in addition to, of course, you know, your support system.

Again, back to the alumni and those who have not been engaged because they're been waiting for somebody to ask them to help. And so I'd be interested as we move forward to what degree you will engage some of those alumni who are here in the City who are willing.

MR. SANCHEZ: And that's on Page 5, is actually the sixth bullet where it says identify and effectuate an affinity pipeline. And that is cultivating the relationship with the alumni, who basically, better than I, can go out and tell someone exactly why UDC.

And so, yes, in conjunction with the Office of Advancement, that is one of the actionable items to yield a higher student population to the use of alumni.

TRUSTEE FELTON: Yes.
MR. SANCHEZ: Yes.

TRUSTEE FELTON: Thank you.

CHAIR CRIDER: Okay. Any other questions? Thank you, Mr. Sanchez.

DR. LYONS: Just a comment, Madam Chair.

CHAIR CRIDER: Yes.

MR. SANCHEZ: Thank you.

DR. LYONS: Madam Chair, members of the Board, there are number of other things that Mr. Sanchez could have discussed, but I did ask him to hold his presentation to 15 minutes because I wanted you to have an opportunity to ask questions. But one of the areas that he could've spent the entire 15 minutes on is the issue of retention.

MR. SANCHEZ: Right.

DR. LYONS: He's talked about and highlighted a lot of the admission recruitment, financial aid pieces, but the retention effort is critical. It's less expensive to retain students that you already
admitted, to move them through.

And we've got to do a much better job in that. So when we talk about the whole umbrella, strategic enrollment, management, to me also includes the retention piece of the, you know.

CHAIR CRIDER: I think we'll look forward to, you know, additional updates or information from enrollment management as we go forward. And as you implement your plans we'll be happy to hear more. Okay. Thank you.

DR. LYONS: Thank you.

CHAIR CRIDER: The Academic Affairs Committee, Dr. Curry, isn't here. I don't know if there were any meetings or anything that that committee needed to report --

TRUSTEE THOMPSON: It didn't --

CHAIR CRIDER: -- out.

TRUSTEE THOMPSON: -- meet.

CHAIR CRIDER: Okay. Thank you.
Budget and Finance, Mr. Felton?

TRUSTEE FELTON: Yes, Madam Chair, we have our CFO here as you are aware in all of this. Now, he's been issuing monthly various financial reports. And a call has been, if you have questions to call me or call anyone on the committee or certainly call Don.

But if you wish Don to go over any of those, highlight what's in those reports, he could do that fairly fast if you have --

CHAIR CRIDER: Okay.

TRUSTEE FELTON: -- the time and interest.

CHAIR CRIDER: Have you all received those financial statements and, if so, do you have questions?

TRUSTEE SHELTON: Not --

CHAIR CRIDER: Trustee Shelton.

TRUSTEE SHELTON: There was a snafu during the summer.

CHAIR CRIDER: Yes.

TRUSTEE SHELTON: It's been
corrected and I do thank you, that we all our now receiving it.

CHAIR CRIDER: Right.

TRUSTEE SHELTON: And at some point, I hope to schedule a staff development for me so that I can follow it better. But no, I do appreciate getting it and I'm glad to see that it's published. I heard it was published --

CHAIR CRIDER: Yes.

TRUSTEE SHELTON: -- and I'm glad to receive the copies because then I can play with it.

CHAIR CRIDER: Okay.

TRUSTEE SHELTON: Okay?

CHAIR CRIDER: Trustee Askew.

TRUSTEE ASKEW: Yes, I do have a couple of questions. So --

TRUSTEE SHELTON: Which report?

TRUSTEE ASKEW: This is on the first one is the University of the District of Columbia a component unit of the Government of
the District of Columbia statement of
revenues, expenses and changes in net assets.
And this is for the month ended August 31st,
2014 and you have also 2013.

TRUSTEE FELTON: Where'd you get a
print out?

TRUSTEE SHELTON: You printed that
yourself --

TRUSTEE ASKEW: Yes --

TRUSTEE SHELTON: -- right?

TRUSTEE ASKEW: -- I did. I did.

I printed this myself.

TRUSTEE SHELTON: Okay.

TRUSTEE ASKEW: Can you speak to,
I wanted to understand better as it related to
the Budget 2014 and you've got an asterisk and
you've got an footnote for Number 1. And this
pertains to it says policy changes.

There's a reduction and it says
and the reason why it's policy changes by the
D.C. Office of Budget and Planning on the
establishment of grant budget authority
resulting in overstatement in the university's restricted funds.

Can you just give me a little bit more clarity because this is under the student tuition and fees and the Federal grants and contracts for operating revenue. And it seems to be that it will have some impact.

MR. RICKFORD: Yes, well what it is that historically we are allowed to have placeholders for the different grant budgets, Federal grants, private grants or grants we get from District agencies.

TRUSTEE ASKEW: Yes.

MR. RICKFORD: And as we get awards during the year, we can draw from the placeholder, so that we can immediately set up a budget for the program office to begin spending that money.

During this year, the OPP, the Central Budget Office, notified us that they would not allow us to do that. We had that set up at the beginning of the year.
And the City would not allow us to use the placeholders anymore, which required us then to, as we receive awards during the year, you don't get it all at the beginning of the year, we have to send them downtown to OPP. And some of them even have to go to the council for approval --

TRUSTEE ASKEW: Right.

MR. RICKFORD: -- a process that takes as much as 45 to 60 days depending on --

TRUSTEE ASKEW: Right.

MR. RICKFORD: -- how large the grant amount is and so forth. So it really changed the ball field for us and I think we've come up with some solutions that addresses the challenges that we face.

Dr. Lyons probably can talk about some of them because the deans were really on him and on the number of grants we got during the summer that we were not able to load the budget and Banner as early as they were accustomed to.
TRUSTEE ASKEW: Yes.

MR. RICKFORD: And it's really created some challenges for us during the summer, but most of those challenges have been resolved, including being able to set up the budgets at the beginning of fiscal year '15 in the meeting in October 1st coming up.

TRUSTEE ASKEW: Yes. So in it, is this one of those things whereby they're treating us like a regular city agency and not understanding how, as a, you know, institution of higher learning, that's just not what is normal?

TRUSTEE FELTON: Different calendar.

TRUSTEE ASKEW: Yes.

TRUSTEE FELTON: And they don't buy it.

TRUSTEE ASKEW: Okay.

TRUSTEE SHELTON: No. Don't we have to ask the question to get the service delivery that we need? We haven't asked the
question --

CHAIR CRIDER: Right. But some things --

TRUSTEE SHELTON: -- or --

CHAIR CRIDER: Yes, some things, I think, the answer comes back because of home rule. Everything is because of home rule. And so, you know, we need to develop a strategy to address the because of home rule issue.

And there are a couple things that we are doing before we can actually create the strategy. And I can share that with you later.

MR. RICKFORD: Okay.

CHAIR CRIDER: Okay?

TRUSTEE SHELTON: Just, okay. Are you finished?

TRUSTEE ASKEW: I have some other questions.

TRUSTEE SHELTON: Okay. Just one cosmetic thing, when you send it to us, kind
of orient it the same way. You know, if it --

TRUSTEE THOMPSON: Yes, they come all over the screen.

TRUSTEE SHELTON: It comes this way --

MR. RICKFORD: Yes.

TRUSTEE SHELTON: -- this way --

MR. RICKFORD: Okay. I'll --

TRUSTEE SHELTON: -- okay, and this way. Okay. And if it --

MR. RICKFORD: I --

TRUSTEE SHELTON: -- could come all this way or all this way, it would --

MR. RICKFORD: Yes.

TRUSTEE SHELTON: -- be very helpful for those of us --

MR. RICKFORD: We don't send it directly to --

TRUSTEE SHELTON: -- who are --

MR. RICKFORD: We cannot send --

TRUSTEE SHELTON: -- limited --

MR. RICKFORD: -- things directly
to the Board.

TRUSTEE SHELTON: -- 2.5 GPA --

MR. RICKFORD: It actually comes -

TRUSTEE SHELTON: -- and it comes

off the scale.

MR. RICKFORD: -- through the

front office.

TRUSTEE ASKEW: Yes, and then

later on, on this particular report, I would

like to talk to you about kind of structuring

in a way that at least for me helps me get to

the areas in which, you know, you may want to

focus a little bit more attention on, which

includes some of the variances.

Because right now we don't have

any variances and so I have to go and

calculate and all this stuff. So having some

of the variances, you know. For example, you

know, the variance between, you know, what is

our, you know, do we have monthly budgets as

well?
MR. RICKFORD: Oh yes.

TRUSTEE ASKEW: Okay. So like actual budget and then the variance.

MR. RICKFORD: Yes. Yes.

TRUSTEE ASKEW: Right. For me, that helps me.

MR. RICKFORD: Yes.

TRUSTEE ASKEW: You know, then you get to the year to date versus the budgeted, you know, year to date where we thought we were going to be --

MR. RICKFORD: Yes.

TRUSTEE ASKEW: -- in the variance. But anyway, that's more of a structural thing. I can talk to you offline.

MR. RICKFORD: But we send out two sets of reports, one that addresses the variances, that shows the --

TRUSTEE ASKEW: Right you guys?

TRUSTEE SHELTON: Yes.

CHAIR CRIDER: Right.

MR. RICKFORD: -- budget, actual
and the balance available for the year.

TRUSTEE ASKEW: Okay. So you got

that. I must have missed that one.

TRUSTEE FELTON: Madam Chair --

TRUSTEE ASKEW: So I'll go --

TRUSTEE FELTON: -- maybe at a

future meeting you could really block a little

time --

CHAIR CRIDER: Yes, I'd like to do

--

TRUSTEE FELTON: -- because --

CHAIR CRIDER: -- that.

TRUSTEE FELTON: -- he and the

staff have done a lot of work to get us the

reports that we've asked for and that way we

can address all those issues.

CHAIR CRIDER: Okay. All right.

TRUSTEE FELTON: I mean, go on. I

wasn't stopping you, I was just saying --

TRUSTEE ASKEW: Right. Right.

Because finance is important, man.

TRUSTEE FELTON: Exactly.
TRUSTEE ASKEW: Right. Right. And it's --

TRUSTEE FELTON: And we've come a long way.

TRUSTEE ASKEW: And we've come a long way.

CHAIR CRIDER: Definitely.

TRUSTEE ASKEW: So now I'm looking at the University of the District of Columbia the physical '14 budget by program and activity --

MR. RICKFORD: Yes.

TRUSTEE ASKEW: -- which, you know, has some -- and again, just the things that just kind of stuck out on this is, I think, the first category is dealing with unrestricted funds.

I think the second part of it is restricted funds. Oh yes, so the first part of it's just restricted funds. And what this shows is the budget, the total expenditures, obligations, the available balance and then
the percentage of balance left.

MR. RICKFORD: Yes.

TRUSTEE ASKEW: And so I was looking at under agency management. And it says under the area of financial services, it looks like, you know, it's like, I guess, $6.2 million was budgeted.

MR. RICKFORD: Yes.

TRUSTEE ASKEW: We spent 3.7 million of it and so we have an available balance of 2.5 which is basically 40 percent of what our budgeted amount is.

MR. RICKFORD: Yes.

TRUSTEE ASKEW: Are we expecting anything big to come up?

MR. RICKFORD: No. Yes, that is where we have any contingent budgets that we have during the year.

TRUSTEE ASKEW: Yes.

MR. RICKFORD: In addition, it has the funds for year-end closing, things for accruals, any write-off of receivables and
things like that. We set aside part of the
budget to handle those issues.

TRUSTEE ASKEW: Under that
particular category?

MR. RICKFORD: Yes. Yes.

TRUSTEE ASKEW: Okay. Okay.

Great. And then on the same types of
questions on the unrestricted. And this is
again for that physical '14 budget for
programs and activities.

MR. RICKFORD: Yes.

TRUSTEE ASKEW: And this is mostly
in the area of Academic Affairs.

MR. RICKFORD: Yes.

TRUSTEE ASKEW: Because we've got
some in here who have available balances and
though we are well within the fiscal year of
86 percent and one of them's 93 percent. The
86 percent is in the area of, and this how I
know I'm getting older, academic support/the
provost.

MR. RICKFORD: Yes.
TRUSTEE ASKEW: So it looks like they had a budget of $18.6 million --

MR. RICKFORD: Yes.

TRUSTEE ASKEW: -- and they've only spent 2.7.

MR. RICKFORD: You remember I just said to you, we had the placeholder accounts?

TRUSTEE ASKEW: Yes.

MR. RICKFORD: To reduce it, we couldn't just go in and reduce the budget, eliminate those placeholders. We have to submit a request downtown --

TRUSTEE ASKEW: Yes.

MR. RICKFORD: -- for them to amend the budget which has to go through that process. And we're still waiting for them. We should get those documents back this week or next week to be able to record those adjustments.

TRUSTEE ASKEW: No, I'm saying --

MR. RICKFORD: So effectively what I'm saying --
TRUSTEE ASKEW: -- for most of that whole category of academic or that's --

MR. RICKFORD: Yes.

TRUSTEE ASKEW: -- just that one?

MR. RICKFORD: Yes, it's a lot of grant. You see, we started with a placeholder identifying what we expect to get during the year and we --

TRUSTEE ASKEW: Yes.

MR. RICKFORD: -- normally would be able to use this. But because they changed the rules in the middle of the year, we had the placeholder amongst there that they tell us we can't use anymore --

TRUSTEE ASKEW: Yes.

MR. RICKFORD: -- and we had to submit individual grant awards downtown for them to approve and then they would set up individual budgets for that.

So effectively, you had somewhat of a double count in there, which is what we have to eliminate. Now, we've requested them
to eliminate those placeholder accounts. That would significantly reduce those budgets. But until we get that back from them, we have no authority to either increase or reduce the budgets.

TRUSTEE ASKEW: You know, I mean, that right there is, I mean, that is almost somewhat crippling to the operation of this university.

TRUSTEE FELTON: Well, our chair suggested that we come talk to him when we have examples.

TRUSTEE ASKEW: Yes.

TRUSTEE FELTON: This is another example of --

CHAIR CRIDER: Yes.

TRUSTEE ASKEW: Yes.

TRUSTEE FELTON: -- what he could do if he wanted to.

CHAIR CRIDER: Yes.

TRUSTEE ASKEW: Yes.

CHAIR CRIDER: But I think we do
I have to address it too, from the overall perspective of other things. There are several things that prohibit us from operating the way we need to, you know, that get put on home row, so. But we still have some stuff that we have to fix, no question.

TRUSTEE FELTON: We've come a long way.

CHAIR CRIDER: We have come a long way. And I'm getting weary.

TRUSTEE FELTON: I know.

TRUSTEE ASKEW: And don't waste time.

CHAIR CRIDER: Thank you.

TRUSTEE ASKEW: Don't waste time.

CHAIR CRIDER: I am a little tired.

TRUSTEE ASKEW: Don't waste time. You're not allowed. You're not having any of it.

CHAIR CRIDER: Okay.

TRUSTEE FELTON: Well, if can work
the next agenda maybe --

CHAIR CRIDER: Yes.

TRUSTEE FELTON: -- you can --

CHAIR CRIDER: I think --

TRUSTEE FELTON: -- just block some time.

CHAIR CRIDER: -- that would be great --

TRUSTEE FELTON: Okay.

CHAIR CRIDER: -- to be able to have some time focused on the meeting and the finance --

TRUSTEE FELTON: Okay.

CHAIR CRIDER: -- piece. So you can work with Don --

TRUSTEE FELTON: Right.

CHAIR CRIDER: -- to help us. I think, Trustees, if there are any particular areas of focus or interest that you have, can you let Trustee Felton know and then he can work with Mr. Rickford to, you know, give us the kind of education information that we want
TRUSTEE ASKEW: Okay. Great.

CHAIR CRIDER: -- at the next meeting that will be in November.

TRUSTEE FELTON: 17th of November.

CHAIR CRIDER: Okay. Great.

Thank you, Trustee Felton. Trustee Shelton, anything from Audit, Administration and Governance other than those --

TRUSTEE SHELTON: We have some things that'll be going to the new committee that we'll --

CHAIR CRIDER: Okay.

TRUSTEE SHELTON: -- have to be brought back, yes.

CHAIR CRIDER: Okay.

TRUSTEE SHELTON: That's is.

CHAIR CRIDER: Student Affairs, Trustee Schwartz, anything for us?

TRUSTEE SCHWARTZ: No, just that we need to pay attention to Title 9. And it's the president's initiative, not the audit
president.

CHAIR CRIDER: The real president.

(Simultaneous speaking)

TRUSTEE THOMPSON: Shame on you.

TRUSTEE BELL: For the record, she meant that in a loving way.

DR. LYONS: I've been called acting interim?

(Simultaneous speaking)

DR. LYONS: She's acting up.

CHAIR CRIDER: I am acting up, right?

TRUSTEE SCHWARTZ: And secondly, we all have to do a do out to the Board on the student center and the way ahead on that, and student housing.

CHAIR CRIDER: Okay.

TRUSTEE SCHWARTZ: Those are going to be three areas that we are going to be paying attention to.

CHAIR CRIDER: Okay. Thank you.

TRUSTEE SCHWARTZ: Thank you,
ma'am.

DR. LYONS: Madam Chair?

CHAIR CRIDER: Yes.

DR. LYONS: And at the next meeting my special topic will be Title 9. So we'll have some time to --

CHAIR CRIDER: Okay.

DR. LYONS: -- talk about that.

CHAIR CRIDER: Great. Community College, Trustee Dyke is not here. Anybody from the Committee that you need or I think the biggest news coming out of that is the --

TRUSTEE THOMPSON: Is the CEO.

CHAIR CRIDER: -- CEO --

TRUSTEE THOMPSON: Yes.

CHAIR CRIDER: -- of the college and I think you'll all be excited.

Facilities, Trustee Bell.

TRUSTEE BELL: Yes, Facilities met and we didn't vote on anything, but we talked about a lot of things including the students --
COURT REPORTER: Your microphone.

TRUSTEE BELL: Oh sorry. We met, we didn't have anything to vote up for this Committee for the Board meeting, but we did discuss a lot of topics.

The student center is coming on board spring 2015. We're excited about that. There's other projects that are going on. I'm sorry?

TRUSTEE SHELTON: Auditorium.

TRUSTEE BELL: The auditorium as well, renovation of the children's playground, various ongoing renovations that are being aligned with the Provost to make sure our accreditation needs are being met. So that's all good.

Additionally, there's been some opportunities with real estate in the area that were mentioned. And I think that the university needs to think about those.

There's some properties that are becoming available that would fit in nicely
with a strategic growth plan. So we need to 
look at those and see what we want to do. 

We are monitoring housing as well, 
to see what opportunities exist there. And so 
I always ask questions about that at 
Facilities and at Trustee Schwartz's meeting. 

And so hopefully we'll continue to 
make progress on those fronts so that when Mr. 
Sanchez is successful with his wonderful 
enrollment plan and bringing students here, 
we'll be able to house those students and have 
good academic buildings for them as well. So 
that's it.

CHAIR CRIDER: Okay. Thank you, 
Mr. Bell.

TRUSTEE BELL: Thank you.

CHAIR CRIDER: Okay. I do want to 
have a quick executive session, but before we 
do that, we've had a request by the Faculty 
Senate Chair to speak to us, two minutes. And 
can I just say, I am acting up today, but I 
want this on the record.
I would like to request, Ms. Franklin, that if people want to speak before the Board that they get on the agenda in a timely manner so that we are not here at almost 9 o'clock with all this business that we had to take care of today.

So within a couple of days of your setting the agenda, can we get any request to come before the Board so that we're not getting these last minute requests? Okay.

MS. KING-BERRY: Okay. Thank you, Dr. Crider. And I did request to speak this weekend, but for whatever reason the transmission didn't go through. So I appreciate you giving me a few minutes.

CHAIR CRIDER: Okay.

MS. KING-BERRY: And I did want to address some of the resolutions, but they're already ratified. So I will just say that chair governance is key to effective implementation of policies and procedures by this university.
Therefore, the inclusion of faculty in all senate matters pertaining to academic programs is essential. Meetings should be scheduled during the academic year to ensure shared governance.

In this regard, several resolutions were adopted in the June meeting without faculty input. Faculty Senate represents the collective voice of faculty. Any representation of faculty outside of the senate recommendations are individual and do not represent the collective view of the senate and may give the appearance of impropriety.

So those resolutions that were passed during the summer, they were already ratified now, so can't go back.

CHAIR CRIDER: Okay.

MS. KING-BERRY: But we hope in the future when you have resolutions that we ensure that we have a voice and then that we also feel very strongly that the dean should
be included in the formal process that in
2112.4, we really agree with our Trustee Askew
in that regard.

And we look forward to having a
wonderful year and being very involved with
academic policies and procedures. And thank
you for allowing me to speak.

CHAIR CRIDER: Okay. Thank you.

When is our November meeting, Ms. Franklin?

MS. FRANKLIN: It's --

CHAIR CRIDER: What's the date?

TRUSTEE BELL: November --

CHAIR CRIDER: Okay. That's okay.

I wanted to see, I think it is appropriate for
us, before we go into executive session, I
think it is appropriate for us to recognize
and to thank Dr. Woodland for his service to
us over the last, what, a year-and-a-half,
almost two years, as the CEO of the Community
College. And okay, so November 18th, so good
that we do it tonight.

And so I just wanted to publicly
recognize you and to thank you on behalf of
the Board of Trustees for the work that you
did in holding the college together and to,
you know, move it ahead.

I know that things weren't always
easy. You and I had our little fights, but we
made it. We always made up. But, you know,
I know that you worked hard and you really put
in a great effort to carry out the work of the
college.

And on behalf of the Board, you
should be publicly recognized for what you
did. So thank you so much for that and we'll
miss you. Do you want to say anything?

MR. WOODLAND: Yes, I think this
is my last Board meeting.

CHAIR CRIDER: As he says with a
smile.

MR. WOODLAND: Thank you, Dr.
Crider and members of the Board and Dr. Lyons.
I really have appreciated the opportunity to
serve in this capacity. You know, this is my
nearly 45 years in higher education.

And for most of the time when I tried to apply for positions here at UDC for 30 years, things didn't move through. But I really appreciate the opportunity having to round out my career serving at a public university here in D.C.

And I have a lot of relatives here. My grandmother's people are from Washington and so they've been clocking my progress here as well.

But it has been a real tribute. And I also want to thank my leadership team because without a good staff, you know, you can't make things happen. And they have worked hard, they've worked well together.

And I will certainly extend my support for the new CEO and will invite her, once all the contract negotiation takes place, I'll have her come down and help her get transitioned because it --

CHAIR CRIDER: That's great.
MR. WOODLAND: -- does required some assistance. But I do, again, want to thank each of you individually and collectively for your support.

And especially working with Dr. Crider. It's been a delight and I've learned a lot of things about, you know, governance. And certainly, working in a city which is dynamic as D.C. Thank you so much and I'll be coming by on occasion to visit --

CHAIR CRIDER: Yes, we'll be happy to see you.

MR. WOODLAND: -- ceremony.

Thanks again.

CHAIR CRIDER: Good luck to you.

Okay. In accordance with Section 2-57.5(b)(10) of the Open Meetings Act of 2010, 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,
demotion, removal or resignation of Government appointees, employees or officials. So I'd like to have --

TRUSTEE THOMPSON: You need to make a motion.

CHAIR CRIDER: Oh, so I'd like move that we go into --

DR. LYONS: So moved.

CHAIR CRIDER: -- executive session.

TRUSTEE BELL: Second.

CHAIR CRIDER: It's been moved.

Can you --

TRUSTEE SCHWARTZ: Ma'am, would you be coming --

MS. KING-BERRY: Okay. Will you come back to this session?

CHAIR CRIDER: We will not be coming back into this session.

MS. KING-BERRY: So do you want me to forego that.

CHAIR CRIDER: We will adjourn the
full Board.

TRUSTEE FELTON:  No, after.

CHAIR CRIDER:  We do that after in

the room there. So can you do a roll call

vote, please?

MS. FRANKLIN:  Mr. Askew?

TRUSTEE ASKEW:  Yes.

MR. FRANKEL:  Mr. Bell?

TRUSTEE BELL:  Yes.

MS. FRANKLIN:  Ms. Castillo? Dr.

Crider?

CHAIR CRIDER:  Yes.

MS. FRANKLIN:  Dr. Curry? Mr.

Dyke? Mr. Felton?

TRUSTEE FELTON:  Yes.

MS. FRANKLIN:  Dr. Lemus? Dr.

Lyons?

DR. 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?

Mr. Wyner? Okay.

CHAIR CRIDER: Thank you.

TRUSTEE FELTON: Thank you.

DR. LYONS: Thank you all.

(Whereupon, the above-entitled matter went off the record at 8:47 p.m.)
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